


1992

Internship programs for the preparation of school leaders: profiles of two new approaches

Pearl Lenora Jefferson
Iowa State University

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

 Part of the [Adult and Continuing Education and Teaching Commons](#), and the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jefferson, Pearl Lenora, "Internship programs for the preparation of school leaders: profiles of two new approaches " (1992). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 10118.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/10118>

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.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced 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 9311498

**Internship programs for the preparation of school leaders:
Profiles of two new approaches**

Jefferson, Pearl Lenora, Ph.D.

Iowa State University, 1992

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

Internship programs for the preparation of school leaders:

Profiles of two new approaches

by

Pearl Lenora Jefferson

**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 Education Major

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

**Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa**

1992

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Research Questions	4
Significance of Study	5
Basic Assumptions	5
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	7
Introduction	7
Historical Perspective	8
Evolution of principal training	8
Problems Within Existing Leadership Training Programs	11
Recommendations for Changing School Leaders by Training	13
Incorporate practice related to the new role of school leaders	13
Framework for instructional leaders	15
Three new models	21
School district internship model	21
University based/school district internship model	22
Danforth internship model	22
Summary	23
CHAPTER 3. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	24
CHAPTER 4. FINDINGS	29
Introduction	29
Program Facilitator Data Analysis	32
Question 1: What is the structure of the internship programs?	32
Internship program structure	32

	<u>Page</u>
Question 2: What is the method of identifying intern entry level competencies?	38
Internship program assessment of intern entry level competencies	38
Question 3: What are program practices related to the mentor principal component?	39
The mentor component	39
Question 4: What is the total number of days allocated for the school site/field experience?	41
Days spent at the school site/field experience	41
Question 5: Do mentors coach interns during the field experience?	42
The mentor as coach	42
Question 6: Who evaluates the field experience and how is the intern's total program experience evaluated?	43
Evaluation of the intern's performance	43
Question 7: Is job placement a component of the program?	45
Intern job placement	45
Effectiveness of Program Components	45
Intern Data Analysis: Telephone Interviews	48
Process for matching interns with mentors and a description of what was helpful and not and why	49
The number of days allocated for the field experience and how they were distributed	52
The arrangement/allocated time for coaching by mentor	56
The process for evaluating performance in class	59
The process for evaluating performance during the field experience	63

	<u>Page</u>
Job placement at completion of the internship program	67
Field experience activities and/or experiences most beneficial to developing leadership skills and how program managers could make the field experience better	67
Activities and/or experiences that were most beneficial during the total program in developing leadership skills and the most helpful component(s), activities, and experiences	75
CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	83
Summary	83
Elements of Danforth and university programs - Program managers	85
Effectiveness of program components - Intern perceptions	86
Helpful and not helpful internship activities and experiences and what program managers can do to improve the field experience: Intern telephone interviews	88
Discussion and Recommendations	91
Program structural elements	92
Field experience elements	93
Recommendations for Further Research	94
REFERENCES	96
Interviews	100
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	101
APPENDIX A. SURVEY INSTRUMENTS	102
APPENDIX B. LIST OF DANFORTH, UNIVERSITY, AND SCHOOL DISTRICT PROGRAMS	113
APPENDIX C. CORRESPONDENCE	115

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1. Participating programs, return rate and percentages represented in the study	26
Table 2. Participating program interns, surveys sent, return rate and percentage	27
Table 3. Telephone interview request: participating program interns, postcards sent, return rate, and percent	28
Table 4. Student enrollment status utilization of cohort, cohort participation in activities outside of the program, and non-cohort involvement for Danforth and university internship programs	34
Table 5. Length of program, frequency of admission, number of interns admitted per cycle, mechanism for addressing problems, degree, and who delivers instruction for Danforth and university internship programs	36
Table 6. Criteria used for intern entry level assessment for Danforth and university internship programs	38
Table 7. Mentor identification, mentor screening, mentor training, matching mentor with interns for Danforth and university internship programs	40
Table 8. The number of days allocated for the school site/field experience for Danforth and university programs	42
Table 9. Frequencies of mentors used as coaches during the field experience	43
Table 10. The individual who evaluates the intern(s) performance during the field experience and criteria for evaluating performance during the total program for Danforth and university programs	44
Table 11. Job placement assistance and/or non-assistance for Danforth and university programs	45
Table 12. Danforth and university intern perceptions of their total program experience indicated by mean scores	47
Table 13. Processes used for matching interns with mentors for Danforth and university programs and a description of what was helpful and not helpful	50

	<u>Page</u>
Table 14. Scheduled time for the field experience, how days were dispersed for Danforth and university programs, and a description of what was helpful and not helpful	53
Table 15. Time arrangement/allocated time for coaching by mentors for Danforth and university programs and a description of what was helpful and not helpful	57
Table 16. Processes used for evaluating intern's course work and a description of what was helpful and not helpful and why	60
Table 17. Processes used for evaluating intern performance during the field experience and a description of what was helpful and not helpful and why	64
Table 18. Processes used for job placement assistance at completion of the total program and a description of what was helpful and not helpful and why	68
Table 19. Most beneficial activities and experiences during the field experience and what program managers can do to improve the field experience	70
Table 20. The most beneficial activities and experiences during the total program and a description of activities and experiences not helpful in the total program for Danforth and university programs	76

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Interest in public school leadership has become practically universal. It appears that authorities in education are in agreement that the focus on preservice preparation programs for school leaders is badly needed (Conran, 1989). The advancement of public schooling necessitates training that will produce quality administrators to meet the challenges and complexities of the 21st century. School leaders of the 21st century must direct schools that: (1) demonstrate they are learning communities - the school staff regularly participates in profession growth activities; (2) promote student learning - requiring proper assessment and instructional grouping to help problems that impede learning; and (3) encourage involvement - include community and business leaders, retired people, and others interact with the school as advocates for children providing the necessary resources.

A number of authorities have noted the need to change administrator training programs because they lack relevance, effectiveness, and because beginning administrators often are unable to apply university theory to real life day-to-day school situations (Thompson, 1988; Daresh, 1987; Manasse, 1983). Professional associations contend that demands have increased for greater correspondence between the content and structure of program offerings and the changing needs of those who practice in the field (National Association of Secondary School Principals Report [NASSP], 1985). The movement toward new approaches to prepare tomorrow's administrators suggests an internship approach which links theory to practice realizing the full sweep of responsibility involved in an actual

administrative position (Danforth Foundation, 1989; Goodlad, 1985; Holmes, undated; NASSP, 1985).

Administrator preparation programs that include internships are expected to meet the challenge of producing effective administrators because they provide a structure that emphasizes: (1) supervised practice geared toward training and preparing principals who are able to handle the fragmented and ambiguous duties that frame the principalship; (2) the acquisition of administrative skills; (3) the applications of research findings and methods to problems; effective internships are built around specific experiential learning activities and usually include a one-year field-based experience; and (4) demonstration of competence; participants are in an assigned administrative position, placed with a mentor principal/administrator, and are carefully supervised (Daresh, 1987; NASSP, 1985; Thompson, 1988; National Commission of Excellence in Education Administration report [NCEEA], 1987).

There are three prevailing approaches to preparation programs that include internships for training/developing school leaders: (1) school district-based internships; (2) university/school district-based internship programs; and (3) Danforth field-based internships (Daresh, 1990). School district-based internships assist program participants currently employed by their district by providing field experiences that familiarize them with district processes (Wiesner, 1989). University-based internships work in cooperation with school districts to develop training programs that produce interns who understand the activities and styles of leaders of effective schools (Florida Council on Educational

Management, 1989). Danforth-based internships are highly supervised preparation programs that emphasize mentoring and a lot of "hands-on experiences." They are supported by the Danforth Foundation (Danforth, 1989).

Statement of the Problem

Various universities, school districts, and professional agencies have developed and are now using the internship approach to prepare school administrators. Program managers, however, know little about how effectively these programs are preparing school administrators. Additionally, they don't know to what extent processes, components, program design, and experiences improve and/or develop intern leadership skills. This specific information is essential to the further development, improvement, and implementation of school leader preparation programs that produce administrators who can provide leadership for improving schools and student achievements.

The study was designed to examine three school administrator internship program approaches, in order to determine the activities being carried out in school district, university and Danforth administrative preparation programs and the effectiveness of these programs in preparing school leaders. The problem for this study is to determine the extent to which these programs are preparing school leaders, the specific components contributing to preparation, and how field-based preparation programs can be improved.

Research Questions

Specifically, this study was designed to answer questions that addressed 15 elements or aspects of principal preparation:

1. What is the program delivery/design for operating university and Danforth administrator internship (site-based) programs?

Program structural elements include:

- (1) criteria used for identifying intern entry level competencies,
- (2) elements of the principal as mentor component,
- (3) number of days allocated for school-site field experience,
- (4) coaching by mentor/supervisor,
- (5) identification of who evaluates the intern's performance during the school-site/field experience,
- (6) criteria used for evaluation of the intern's total internship performance: course work, and field experience, and
- (7) job placement at completion of the program.

2. To what extent do interns believe that the following processes, components, experiences, and program design improved and developed their leadership skills?

Field experience elements include:

- (1) matching interns with mentors,
- (2) number of days allocated for the school-site/field experience and how they were distributed,

- (3) time allocated/arrangement for coaching by mentor,
- (4) process used for evaluating intern performance in class,
- (5) process used for evaluating intern performance during the school-site/field experience,
- (6) job placement at completion of the program,
- (7) most beneficial experience(s)/activities in the total program,
- (8) which aspects were helpful and/or not helpful and why.

Significance of Study

In effective schools there is a principal who has been trained to be strong, knowledgeable and effective in providing leadership to school improvement (Manasse, 1983). This study was important because while there are three widely used approaches to internships that prepare aspirants to be effective school supervisors and instructional leaders: school district-based internships, university-based internships, and Danforth-based internships. Learning what occurs in these programs and what makes the processes, components, experiences (program design and delivery) work well will improve and/or develop the intern's leadership skills.

Basic Assumptions

The basic assumptions of this study are as follows:

1. Internship experiences are important for developing administrative leadership skills.

2. Program managers of preparation programs are able to provide accurate information about how the internship originated, and how it operates.
3. The program intern is one of the best determinates of program effectiveness (program design and delivery) in improving and/or developing intern leadership skills and how to improve them.

CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine three approaches to school administrator internship programs: school district-based internship programs, university/school district-based internship programs, and Danforth field-based principal preparation programs. The study was explicitly designed to determine the program design and delivery system for operating school district, university, and Danforth-based administrator internship programs. Questions addressed included: What is the criteria used for assessing intern entry level competencies for planning and goal setting? What are elements of the principal as mentor component? What are the numbers of days allocated for the school-site field experience? Is the school site supervisor expected to coach? Who evaluates the intern's total internship performance (course work and field experience), and what criteria are used? Is there a job placement component at completion of the program? Additionally, the study was designed to examine to what extent which specific processes, components, and experiences (program design and delivery) improve and develop intern leadership skills.

The review of the literature provides an overview of past practices and emerging trends of principal training programs whose structures include an internship component incorporating experiential learning activities. The chapter is divided into four major categories: (1) historical perspective; (2) problems within existing leadership training programs; (3) recommendations for changing school leaders by

training; and (4) organized efforts to change the way school leaders are trained.

Historical Perspective

Evolution of principal training

School administrators in the 1800s were typically selected from the teacher ranks. No administrative training was either provided or required (Snyder, 1986). Major responsibilities of the early teacher/administrator were to clarify the roles and duties of teachers and to ensure these tasks were carried out in the most efficient manner. As schools grew larger, the head or principal teacher in the early 1800s began to assume more responsibilities. Some of these responsibilities included: (1) serving as head of the school attendance unit; (2) regulating classes and courses of instruction; (3) reporting any defects to the district's trustees of the district; (4) giving necessary instructions to other teachers in the building; (5) appointing teacher assistants; (6) classifying students; (7) safeguarding the schoolhouse and furniture; (8) keeping the school clean; (9) instructing the other teachers; (10) refraining from impairing the standing of other teachers; and (11) requiring the cooperation of all the assistant teachers (Knezevich, 1984; National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration [NCEEA], 1987).

Principals' roles and the responsibilities changed from clerical duties to management as student enrollment increased. The need for formal training became more urgent as the head teacher or "teacher as principal" became responsible for the managerial aspects of the job (Morris et al., 1984; Knezevich, 1984; NCEEA, 1987). The urban school setting in the

1830s also grew in complexity. As enrollment increased, school management changed. Enrollment growth fostered problems such as assembling and allocating resources, organizing and structuring classrooms, and controlling/managing conflict. While some school districts created many one-teacher buildings to keep enrollment small, many school districts created the position of principal following the lead of the Quincy School in Boston, cited as the first school (1847) to unite under a single principal. There was a need for administrator training as the "teacher as principal" became responsible for leadership that involved managing human resources and materials (Knezevich, 1984; NCEEA, 1987). This need, however, was seldom addressed.

From the mid-1800s until the early 1900s, educators discussed the need for administrator training. Not until 1930, however, did universities begin to establish training programs (Knezevich, 1984). The training was informal and geared toward liberal arts emphasizing educational philosophy, communication, and public speaking (NCEEA, 1987).

In the 1940s, the approach to training school managers, influenced by the Hawthorne studies of the 1930s, moved toward human relationships. The Hawthorne studies provided useful information concerning the impact of informal groups on work productivity. The findings clearly indicated that informal groups and their norms greatly influenced the level of human productivity. As a result, many universities created administrator training that emphasized the relationship between both the emotional and sociological side of the individual and work output (Knezevich, 1984; Cooper, 1987; Snyder & Anderson, 1986; NCEEA, 1987; Hoy & Miskel, 1978).

In the 1950s and 1960s, theoretical research and an observation (field experience) orientation approach were introduced to administrator training. As a discipline, the theory-based constructs came from other disciplines--sociology psychology, political science, and economics. The field experience was designed for aspirants as a means to observe what principals did but was not designed to provide them hands-on experience (Hoy & Miskel, 1978; National Commission for the Principal, 1990).

In the 1970s, research was introduced related to factors that have significant influence on learning; these included effective teaching, teacher expectations (standards the teacher believes each student can achieve) and principals' behavior being directed by school mission and specific job competencies. This research led educators to examine the manner in which administrators were trained. As a result, administrator preparation programs began to provide training related to the principal as instructional leader: knowledge of classroom teaching strategies and methods, and evaluation of teachers (National Commission for the Principal, 1990; Hoy & Miskel, 1978; Daresh, 1987; 1989; Smith & Andrews, 1989).

The 1980s introduced new expectations for schools and placed new demands upon school leaders. This was a result of the widely disseminated report on effective schools research. Thus, a new framework was required for preparing educational leaders. Despite this, many university training programs continued to present theory; i.e., school law, school finance, supervision, curriculum, educational philosophy and history, research methodology, community relations, role and function of the principalship,

with little emphasis on how to apply it in real life day-to-day school situations (National Commission for the Principalship, 1990; NASSP, 1985; NCEEA, 1987; Pitner, 1988; Daresh, 1989; Hersey, 1990; Mitchell, 1990).

The dominant pattern of school administrator training in the 1980s emphasized the managerial aspects of the principalship, seldom included any systematic and serious study of curriculum, leadership, and pedagogy, and incorporated field experiences/internships that allowed opportunity for functioning in an actual position of administrator, and seldom demonstrated the link between theory and practice (Lieberman, 1990).

Problems Within Existing Leadership Training Programs

Several professional organizations and several reports in the 1980s, such as A Nation at Risk (1983), served as a catalyst for identifying existing problems within schools and a need for quality school leaders able to put effective schools research into practice.

A major report addressed the need for quality educational leadership. A team of 27 educators, commissioned by University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), examined university educational administration programs at universities that were members of UCEA. Findings from the report indicated that much of the criticism of current administrative preparation programs stemmed from the following inadequacies: (1) self-selection process; (2) low admission standards and poor candidates; (3) the absence of minorities and women; (4) failure to collaborate with practicing administrators (program delivery); (5) disjointed and fragmented curriculum; and (5) inappropriate field experiences (NCEEA, 1987).

Admission standards for administrator preparation programs are often low because university programs depend on a steady flow of trainees to maintain their programs (NCEEA, 1987). Frequently because of self-selection, most applicants are accepted; however, academically candidates are not always the best. Talented candidates are often overlooked because traditionally those chosen exhibit strong authoritarian traits associated with discipline and control. This is not what we need. This perspective of school leaders, however, results in a deficit of talented and creative people entering the field of educational administration. Furthermore, negative images held by some professor managing administrator preparation program resulted in an absence of minority and women candidates entering programs.

Despite changes in the laws, discrimination persists and preparation programs continue to foster a view that deprive programs of the potential candidates who can serve as role models but who have capabilities of becoming effective leaders (Kaplan, 1989; Griffin, 1990; NASSP, 1985; Danforth, 1989; Daresh, 1987; 1989; 1990; Sweeney, 1990).

Program delivery deals with concepts and theory being taught in principal preparation programs and what is reflected in practice. Leadership programs often lack activities that provide students the opportunity to experience independent thinking that prepares aspirants to make the transition from a subordinate position to a superordinate position in the public school setting, especially in preparation for a role of leadership and management in effective schools (Manasse, 1983; Glickman, 1986; Achilles, 1987; Pitner, 1988; Danforth, 1989; Kaplan,

1989; National Association of Elementary School Principals [NAESP], 1990). At some universities, curriculum delivery is by professors who (1) lack the ability to: lead and motivate, (2) establish effective communication with students, (3) lack adequate knowledge of child growth and development, and (4) lack adequate knowledge of technological advances related to applications of management and instruction. Many of the professors fail to include curriculum context related to culture and climate in school leader training, and (5) too often they demonstrate an inability to acquire and use appropriate research data for decision making (Achilles, 1987; Pitner, 1988; Danforth, 1989; NAESP, 1990).

In summary, many administrator preparation programs still continue to offer incoherent training that lacks sequence, and modern content; i.e., (1) the current effective schools and effective leadership research--research grounded in the philosophy that all children can and will learn, (2) effective leadership, and (3) instructional strategies. The inability of most administrator preparation programs to link theory with practice has generated criticism and variance in opinion among educators about what kind of training is appropriate and/or effective for school leadership (Danforth, 1989; Manasse, 1983).

Recommendations for Changing School Leaders by Training

Incorporate practice related to the new role of school leaders

The school population is rapidly changing. There are shifting patterns in the nation's class and family structure, in its immigration flow, in its work force and social-support systems, and its regional concentration of people. The role of educators in the 1990s will be

challenged by rising enrollment, rising minority enrollment, rising enrollment of language-minority children (speaking other than English), rising special education enrollment, and rising pre-primary enrollment. School leaders will have to deal with drastic changes as children enter school. The traditional training model will not produce a pool of leaders with the expertise or leadership skills needed to respond appropriately to such changes (Hodkinson, 1986; Pliska, 1984).

In addition, the school leader/principal/administrator of the future must be able to facilitate learning and support the socialization of pupils. Administrator training programs that fail to conceptualize, define, and include exposure to these new roles within the curricula will contribute little toward the development of the projected new role of school leadership (Daresh, 1988; 1989; 1990; Duke & Stiggins, 1985; Florida Council on Educational Management, 1989; Council on the Assistant Principals, 1991).

Many universities are examining the process by which school leader/principal candidates are selected, trained, and inducted. The NCEE (1987) suggest a rigorous approach to recruitment and selection incorporating the following requirements when screening for the best administrator candidates: GRE score, leadership experience, social skills: ability to speak, write clearly and persuasively; emotional maturity, adequate health, decent character, vision, understanding of America's varied cultures, sensitivity to change, and motivation (Daresh, 1987).

In the effort to establish effective internship programs, a variety of approaches have been implemented. Some university programs are cooperating/collaborating with school districts and educational organizations to provide a new delivery of instruction, focusing on bridging the gap between theory and practice in establishing effective internship programs.

Internships include university courses, workshops, seminars, professional conferences, study councils, retreats, school visits, and state departments of education. University programs cooperate with school districts offering skill development in communication: listening, writing and speaking, analytic skills, facilitative skills, decision-making skills, budgeting, power and authority skills, motivation skills. Educational organizations such as Danforth and the Ford Foundation collaborate, sponsor, and arrange for resource availability at school district and university levels (Danforth, 1990; Florida Council on Educational Management, 1989; NCEEA, 1987).

Framework for instructional leaders

The new framework for administrator training programs, introduced in the late 1980s, began developing a forum for inquiry--collaboration/cooperation with aspirants, university professors, and school districts (Daresh, 1987; 1989; 1990; Danforth, 1990; Mitchell, 1990). A number of authorities on administrator preparation programs report that training efforts involving schools with whom there is collaboration and cooperation appear to produce interns with excellent leadership skills. These programs (1) provide many opportunities for hands-on experiences/clinical

experiences that are monitored and incorporate an immediate feedback emphasis, (2) enhance and increase the recruitment, retention, preparation, and placement of minorities--the benefit contributing to the improvement of all students, especially of educational opportunities for minority pupils, and (3) anticipate the future and incorporate other significant concepts/insights/facts validated by research for successful schools (Daresh & Playko, 1989; Gresso & Hersey, 1990; Griffin, 1990; Mitchell, 1989-90; NASSP, 1988).

The National Commission for the Principalship provides a picture of what effective internship programs should be like their program design, instructional delivery, and general operation.

Inductive methodology would be employed to develop information about the contemporary school rather than relying upon traditional deductive approaches alone. The new knowledge base, therefore, would reflect the outcomes of a task analysis of the principalship as well as a conceptual model of the principalship. It would involve focus group processes as well as deductive analysis processes. And the primary data source would be principals, their immediate supervisors, and their immediate subordinates. This approach avoids looking exclusively through a theoretical lens that the complexities of the situation become blurred. The central question addressed was this: What must principals do in today's changing school, and what knowledge and skills are required to do it well? (1990, p. 17)

There is general agreement that a new approach to principal training must result in the development of strong principals whose training includes: instructional leadership, basic leadership skills, theory/knowledge and practice/skills provided through an effective field experience.

A study of teacher perceptions about strong principals showed an instructional leader as being able to: (a) mobilize resources and promote

staff development to support academic goals; (b) provide resources; (c) engage in, promote, demonstrate and assess communication appropriate to speaking, writing, organizing, implementing, evaluating, problem solving and team building; (d) express a vision for the school, model behavior consistent with school vision, and manage time to be seen around the building during school hours (Smith & Andrews, 1989).

School leadership should include experiences in site-based experience for implementing basic principles of leadership. Leadership, as defined by Smith (1989), is the ability to envision ideals, to persuade others, and to develop strategies to accomplish the goals allowing ownership among staff and faculty. Programs often lack experiences that deal with realities of leadership in the following areas: (a) the fast pace and frequent interruptions of work; (b) conflict management; and (c) face-to-face communication. Further, if leadership theory can be used to improve behavior, it can be the foundation for principal training programs. The basic leadership training ought to be vigorous, more interesting, more enticing, and more integrated into the real school problems (Smith, 1989).

Preparation programs must also reflect the scope of responsibility faced by principals and provide the knowledge and skills required to accomplish the tasks that accompany the changing role of principals. The National Commission for the Principals (1990, p. 21) describes the performance of strong principals as that where the principal "selects from a generous palette of knowledge and experience and perspective to influence the direction of the school. Throughout the school year,

effective leaders mix and match proficiencies to shape the instructional climate, lift aspirations, and reduce environmental enlivenment constraints." The Commission's suggested framework of 21 domains organized into four domains blends the traditional "content-driven" curricula with leadership and process skills and interpersonal skills required to perform the role of strong principal. The four domains are as follows: (1) functional domains, (2) programmatic domains, (3) interpersonal domains, and (4) contextual domains (National Commission for the Principals, 1990).

Functional domains address processes and techniques most likely to foster achievement of a school's mission: information collection, problem analysis, judgment, organizational oversight, implementation, and delegation. These skills are founded in the assumption that school leaders must assume a crucial leadership role in public school reform developing school and community support. This domain clearly indicates that there is a distinction between leadership skills involving persuasion, goals setting, and the development of community consensus behind them.

Programmatic domains focus on instructional programs, curriculum design, student guidance and development, staff development, measurement and evaluation, and resource allocation. Training programs incorporating this domain envision, enable auxiliary programs. For example, they interpret school districts curricula with staff while meeting the needs of students within the attendance boundary.

Interpersonal domains recognize the significance of motivating others, sensitivity, oral expression, and written expression. This domain acknowledges the importance of human relationships to the fulfillment of individual goals as they relate to the achievement of the school's purpose.

Contextual domains reflect the school's philosophical and cultural values, legal and regulatory applications, policy and political influences and public and media relationships. They explore the tradition and emerging issues that encompass the school climate and culture.

In summary, there is a relationship between strong principals, ability levels of administrator aspirants, and leadership training programs. The following goals are representative of the various recommendations for establishing and/or revising principal preparation programs that produce leaders who are capable of working in and/or establishing effective schools: (1) encourage the flow of ideas among state public schools, universities, educational agencies, and the business community; (2) recruit and select teachers and others who exhibit strong potential for leadership; (3) provide a system of mentoring for the development and growth of future school administrators; (4) provide a custom-tailored preparation program that includes both campus and field-based experiential learning activities and a sequenced instructional program. If carefully designed, the internship which allows a "hands-on" real life experience comes nearest to helping school leader/principal candidates realize the complexity of an actual principalship. Internship models should expect interns to understand the concept of school culture

as it ranges from the classroom to the attendance office, faculty and student activities, and professional growth involvement (Thomson, 1988; NASSP, 1985; Daresh, 1987; Danforth, 1987).

The strategy that emerges as most reasonable for developing effective school leaders through a clinical experiences/internship is one based on liberal professional education rather than job targeting or technical training. Liberal professional education is conceptualized as an integration of liberal arts and professional socialization perspectives (Duke, 1988). Such a view supports the recent trend of the 1990s in which state departments of education, regional service agencies, universities, professional organizations and school districts provide their own clinical experience/skill-building opportunities/internships for principals (Snyder, 1986; NASSP, 1985; NAESP, 1990; and others).

Opportunities within the internship should provide for systematic observation and participation in several field settings under the joint supervision of faculty and experienced practitioners/mentors.

The main role of the internship is to provide opportunities to test the candidate's ability to handle actual day-to-day school matters. A residency or internship before appointment as principal: (1) strengthens readiness for the principalship; and (2) provides time for analysis and discussion rather than sporadic involvement while manning the full-time principalship (Daresh, 1987; Thompson, 1988; Gresso, 1990; NASSP, 1985).

Effective internships pair aspirants with accomplished mentors who are responsible for projects and experiential learning activities directed toward advanced skill attainment including a number of categories:

communication skills, analytic skills, mediation skills, facilitator skills, motivational skills, decision-making skills, power and authority skills, and procedural skills (Pepper, 1988; Exchange, 1990; Gresso, 1990).

Three new models

There are three new approaches to internship preparation programs which emphasize the internship for developing school leaders: school district-based internships, university based/school district internship programs, and Danforth field-based principal preparation internships (Daresh, 1990). They are described below.

School district internship model

School district-based internships for administrators assist aspirants currently employed by their district (in most cases a teacher) by providing field experiences that familiarize them with district processes (Wiesner, 1989). For example, the Florida Council on Educational Management (1989) describes its school-based academy for training school administrators as collaborative with emphasis on cooperation with the Florida State Department of Education. Together, they develop and establish a set of behaviors for program participants. Candidates are required to participate in a one- to two-day workshop reviewing established behavioral objectives. And as school districts continue to address the need for effective administrators, some schools offer an alternative certification to managers outside of education but who are capable of school leadership (Peterson et al., 1987).

University based/school district internship model

University/school district-based internships seek to develop training programs that produce interns who understand the activities and styles of leaders of effective schools by working in a partnership with each other. NASSP (1985), Florida Council on Educational Management (1989), Goodlad (1989), Daresh (1987, 1990), NCEFA (1987), and Holmes (undated) concur that, as a result of this collaboration and cooperation, there are new dimensional strands and/or instructional areas for training school administrators.

These strands include theory, technical core, problem solving through applied research, supervised practice, demonstration of competence, intern recruitment and selection, minimum skills-- communication, analytic, facilitative, procedural (filing, calculations, budgeting) power and authority, and motivation skills; collaboration/cooperation with the public schools, professional community and state department.

Danforth internship model

Danforth preparation programs are designed to create internships where university program managers work closely with designated school district. Participating universities agree to follow guidelines established by the Danforth Foundation. These guidelines include the following: (1) incorporation of effective schools research; (2) providing a site-based focus that is at least one full year of an actual administration position; (3) mentoring (intern matching, mentor training,

intern evaluation), feedback/coaching observing for understanding of tasks; (4) program inclusion of minorities and women, cohort group; and (5) intern evaluation both formative and summative (Hersey & Gresso, 1990). Implementation of Danforth internship programs began in 1987 and their programs continue to operate in cycles that accept no more than five new university participants year: Cycle I - 1987, Ohio State University and University of Alabama; Cycle II - 1988, University of Houston, Indiana University, University of Massachusetts at Amherst; Cycle III (1989), Brigham Young, East Tennessee State, University of Tennessee-Knoxville, University of Virginia; Cycle IV - 1990-91, University of Connecticut, University of New Mexico, Virginia Tech, Western Kentucky University. Originally there were eighteen Danforth Principal preparation programs, but Cleveland State, University of Connecticut, Georgia State University no longer have internship programs.

Summary

The internship is a powerful alternative to traditional administrator training. This approach allows aspirants to develop leadership skills in a safe and non-threatening environment with university supervision (Mitchell, 1989-90). Essential aspects of preparation programs with internships include: (1) a strict recruitment and selection process; (2) program design that includes courses that prepare the aspirant to become instructional leaders knowledgeable of leadership theory and skills; (3) an effective field experience that lasts longer than one semester and places the intern with an accomplished mentor; and (4) time allocated for coaching and feedback related to the intern's performance.

CHAPTER 3. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The study was explicitly designed to determine the program design and delivery system for operating school district, university, and Danforth-based administrator internship programs. Additionally, the study was designed to examine to what extent specific processes, components, and experiences (program design and delivery) improve and develop intern leadership skills. It required identification of a sample population, development of two instruments and survey questions, telephone interviews and questions, and analysis of data. These are described below.

ISU Human Subjects Committee granted approval to survey subjects. At the end of the spring 1990 semester, data were gathered from the three internship programs: school district based, university-based programs, and Danforth programs. A list of thirty school districts with newly implemented school-based internship programs had been identified by researcher Glenn Wiesner (1989). Surveys were sent to twenty-five of these programs chosen by random selection. The University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) in Tempe, Arizona, was asked to identify universities with principal preparation programs providing internship experiences. UCEA provided a list of fifty university internship programs which was reduced to twenty-five by random selection. Danforth corporate headquarters in St. Louis, Missouri, provided the researcher with the names of its programs. Data were gathered from all Danforth-sponsored programs, which totaled sixteen at the time of this study (Appendix A).

The Program Facilitator School Leader Questionnaire (Appendix A) and the Intern School Leader Questionnaire (Appendix A) were developed by the

researcher to examine practices and the effectiveness of university and Danforth-based administrator internship programs. Program managers were asked to respond to 42 survey items designed to determine program design/structure and delivery practices. The Intern School Leader Questionnaire was developed to collect intern perceptions of the effectiveness of internship program components. Interns rated 23 survey items as to the extent to which major internship components, program design, and delivery were effective in or related to improving and developing their school leadership skills.

In fall of 1989, both instruments were field tested. Dr. Mitchell, professor at Iowa State University, engaged her theory class in the field test of this study. This included: (1) establishing time required to take the test; (2) making corrections: grammar, punctuation, and sentence structure; and (3) asking questions related to item clarity.

Spring 1990 survey data were gathered from the three internship programs: school district based, university-based programs, and Danforth programs. Questionnaires were mailed to 25 university program facilitators, 25 school district program facilitators, and 16 Danforth program facilitators. Data from this study, however, reflect responses from two internship approaches: Danforth and university field-based programs. The return rate for school district program facilitators was insufficient to provide a representative sample. Despite three follow-up letters and phone calls, only four facilitators responded. The findings reported represent data gathered from analysis of returned surveys from 22

preparation programs: 11 Danforth facilitators and 11 university-based facilitators.

Table 1 shows the two types of internship programs examined in the study, total number of surveys mailed, the total number of surveys returned, and the percentage.

Table 1. Participating programs, return rate and percentages represented in the study

Internship programs represented	Surveys mailed	Surveys returned	Percent
School district	25	4	20
University	25	11	44
Danforth	16	11	69

Each program facilitator was also asked to provide the name of three interns who had completed or were near completion of their program. Some internship programs were newly organized, while other programs did not follow up on interns who had completed their program. In such cases, intern names were not submitted to the researcher. The names of 36 interns were provided. Of these, 21 were Danforth and 15 were university.

Intern School Questionnaires were mailed to the 36 interns identified by program facilitators. Twenty-six were returned. The findings reported represent data gathered from analysis of returned surveys from 11 Danforth interns and 15 university interns. Table 2 shows

the program interns examined in the study, the total number of surveys returned, and the percentages for each.

Table 2. Participating program interns, surveys sent, return rate and percentage

Program interns	Surveys sent	Surveys returned	Percent
University	15	15	100
Danforth	21	11	52

Telephone interviews were planned to learn more about specific aspects of their internship. Twenty-six requests for interview were mailed to the Danforth and university interns (see Appendix C). Seventeen interns responded, indicating they would participate in the interview.

Each of the 17 interns were mailed telephone interview questions and told the interview would take approximately 15-20 minutes. Ten Danforth and 7 university interns responded. Table 3 shows the telephone interview request: total number of letters mailed, the number of post cards returned, and the percentage.

Table 3. Telephone interview request: participating program interns, postcards sent, return rate, and percent

Program interns	Postcards mailed	Postcards returned	Percent
University	15	7	47
Danforth	11	10	91

Telephone data format was developed by the researcher (Appendix C). Interviews were conducted during May 1992. Questions addressed specific aspects of the internship activities and experiences. These included descriptions and clarifications as to what was helpful and not helpful to them during the total program and why. Additionally, interns reported their perceptions as to what program managers might do to improve the preparation program and most beneficial activities and experiences which they believed improved and developed their leadership skills.

Because of the small sample size, no statistical analyses were conducted. Frequencies, means, and percentages are reported for responses to questions. Anecdotal information is provided to clarify the responses to interview questions.

CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter provides data gathered from the investigation of two internship programs designed to facilitate the development of school leaders. Internship program, as it is used in this study, refers to a combination of learning experiences that include the presentation of theory in a classroom-like atmosphere plus hands-on learning activities at the school-site. School-site activities are considered to be field experiences. The two internship programs studied were Danforth field-based principal programs and university-based internship programs. Data were gathered from two survey instruments: Program Facilitator School Leader Questionnaire and Intern School Leader Questionnaire, and from telephone interviews with interns. Program facilitators responsible for overseeing the internship program identified key components of the internship program design and delivery system utilized in their internship programs; while interns rated their internship experiences: the extent to which they believed that key internship program components were effective in or related to improving/developing the skills needed for school leadership. Interns who participated in telephone interviews further described and clarified what was helpful and not helpful in their field experience and other aspects of their program.

The following key program components were examined to determine the design and delivery of two internship program approaches:

- (1) structure of the internship program,

- (2) method of identifying intern entry level competencies,
- (3) elements of the principal as mentor component,
- (4) number of days allocated for school-site field experience,
- (5) coaching by mentor/supervisor,
- (6) who evaluates the intern's performance during the school-site/field experience,
- (7) job placement at completion of the program.

The following key elements were examined to determine program effectiveness as perceived by interns:

- (1) matching interns with mentors,
- (2) number of days allocated for the school-site/field experience and how they were distributed,
- (3) allocated time/time arrangement for coaching by mentor,
- (4) process used for evaluating course work course,
- (5) process used for evaluating intern performance during the school-site/field experience.
- (6) Job placement at completion of the program.
- (7) Most beneficial activities and/or experiences during the field experience and how managers could make the field experience better.
- (8) Most beneficial activities and/or experience during the total program and not helpful component(s), activities, and experiences.

Questionnaires were mailed to 26 university program facilitators, 25 school district program facilitators, and 16 Danforth program

facilitators. The return rate for school district program facilitators did not meet specified guidelines, and data were not used in this study. The findings reported represent data gathered from analysis of returned surveys from 22 internship facilitators: 11 Danforth facilitators and 11 university-based facilitators.

Additionally, each program facilitator was asked to provide the name of three interns who had completed or were near completion of their program. Some internship programs were newly organized, while other programs did not follow up on interns who had completed their program; in such cases, intern names were not submitted to the researcher.

Questionnaires were mailed to the 42 interns identified by program facilitators. Twenty-six were returned. The return rate for school district interns did not meet specified guidelines, and data were not used in this study. The findings reported represent data gathered from analysis of returned surveys from 26 interns: 11 Danforth interns and 15 university interns. Additionally, telephone interviews were conducted with interns who responded to a request to provide more information about specific aspects of their internship. A total of 36 requests were mailed. Seventeen interns responded: 7 university interns and 10 Danforth interns.

The chapter is divided into two sections. Presented in the first section are the results of the responses to the Program Facilitator School Leader Questionnaire. The findings reflect practices in the eight key internship program components. The questionnaire can be

seen in Appendix A. Presented in the second section are the results of intern responses to the Program Facilitator School Leader Questionnaire and telephone interviews. Findings in this section reflect intern perception of the effectiveness of key elements of the internship program.

Seven key research questions were developed and are addressed by these findings. Each question is followed by a table and a brief explanation of the results shown in the table.

Program Facilitator Data Analysis

Question 1: What is the structure of the internship program?

Internship program structure Question one was designed to identify the key structural elements of the different internship programs. Ten aspects were identified as key elements of internship program structure. Four elements relate directly to students; the remaining elements relate to the institution. Institutional elements include practices related to general internship program operation and the instruction program.

Student-related elements include practices specifically related to: (1) intern student enrollment status, (2) movement through the program as a cohort group, (3) non-program students in cohort experiences, and (4) cohort participation in activities outside of the program. General operation elements include practices specifically related to: (1) the length of the internship program, (2) frequency of admissions into the program, (3) number of students admitted per cycle, (4) mechanism for addressing internship program problems, and (5) degree granted in the

program. The instructional element (10) addresses who delivers instruction.

Table 4 shows key student-related elements of the internship program. These include intern's student status, utilization of a cohort group, cohort participation in activities outside of the program, and nonprogram students in cohort experiences.

In 16 of the 22 programs, the interns attend on a part-time basis. Three programs enroll interns on a full-time basis; two of these are Danforth programs. Three have a combination of full-time and part-time interns.

Fifteen of the 22 programs that train principals utilize cohort groups (students admitted at the same time who go through the program as a cohort group). Five of the 7 programs that do not utilize cohort groups are university programs.

Eleven of 20 programs allow students not in the preparation program to enroll in program classes. Of the nine programs that do not allow non-cohort members to participate, 5 are Danforth programs.

Table 5 shows the structural elements related to general operations and instruction within the internship program. These include the length of the internship, frequency of admissions into the program, number of interns admitted per cycle, mechanism for addressing internship program problems, degree granted, and who delivers instruction.

Table 4. Student enrollment status utilization of cohort, cohort participation in activities outside of the program, and non-cohort involvement for Danforth and university internship programs

	Danforth	University	Total
<u>Student enrollment status</u>	N=11	N=11	n=22
Part-time	8 (36%)	8 (36%)	16 (72%)
Full-time	2 (9%)	1 (5%)	3 (14%)
Combination	1 (5%)	2 (9%)	3 (14%)
Total	11 (50%)	11 (50%)	22 (100%)
<u>Utilization of cohort group</u>	n=11	n=11	n=22
Cohort group	9 (41%)	6 (27%)	n=15 (68%)
Non-cohort group	2 (9%)	5 (23%)	n= 7 (32%)
Total	11 (50%)	11 (50%)	n=22 (100%)
<u>Non-cohort involvement</u>	n=10	n=10	n=20
Mingle	5 (25%)	6 (30%)	11 (55%)
Exclusive cohort	5 (25%)	4 (20%)	9 (45%)
Total	10 (50%)	10 (50%)	n=20 (100%)
No response	1	1	n= 2

In thirteen of 20 programs, the total program experience requires a minimum of one year. Seven of 20 programs require one year, while none require more than two years. Seven programs that require less than one year require one semester. Of the six that require 18 months or more, 5 are Danforth programs.

Eleven of the 22 programs admit students into the program once per year. Of the nine programs that admit students twice per year, 7 are Danforth programs. Two Danforth programs admit students every two years.

Nine of the 22 programs admit 6 to 15 students per cycle/length of program. Seven programs admit 16 to 20 students per cycle. One program admits more than 25 students per cycle. Three programs admit 1 to 5 students per cycle and only two admit 21 to 25 students per cycle. Six Danforth programs admit 16 or more students and one of the six admits more than 25 per cycle.

Nineteen of 20 programs use student conferences to resolve program problems. Three of 20 programs use a formal appeal method, and 1 of 20 uses an informal session approach to address program problems.

Nineteen of the 22 programs grant the Master of Education degree. Ten grant the Educational Specialist degree. Eleven of the 19 programs granting the Master of Education degree at completion of the internship program are Danforth programs. One university program restricts the internship program to students pursuing the doctorate degree.

Table 5. Length of program, frequency of admission, number of interns admitted per cycle, mechanism for addressing problems, degree, and who delivers instruction for Danforth and university internship programs

	Danforth	University	Total
<u>Length of program</u>	N=11	N=9	N = 20
One semester	2 (10%)	4 (20%)	7 (30%)
One year	3 (15%)	4 (20%)	7 (35%)
18 months	3 (15%)	--	3 (15%)
19-24 months	2 (10%)	1 (5%)	3 (15%)
More than 2 years	--	--	0
Total	11 (65%)	9 (35%)	N = 20 (100%)
<u>Frequency of admission</u>	n=11	n=11	N = 22
Once per year	7 (32%)	4 (18%)	11 (50%)
Twice per year	2 (9%)	7 (32%)	9 (41%)
Every two years	2 (9%)	--	2 (9%)
Total	11 (50%)	11 (50%)	22 (100%)
<u>Number of interns admitted per cycle</u>	N=11	N=11	N = 22
1-5	--	3 (14%)	3 (14%)
6-15	5 (22%)	4 (18%)	9 (41%)
16-20	4 (18%)	3 (14%)	7 (31%)
21-25	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	2 (9%)
More than 25	1 (5%)	--	1 (5%)
Total	11 (50%)	11 (50%)	N = 22 (100%)

Table 5. (Continued)

	Danforth	University	Total
<u>Mechanism for addressing problem^a</u>	n=11	n=9	n=20
Conference	10 (50%)	9 (45%)	19 (95%)
Formal appeal	3 (15%)	--	3 (15%)
Informal session	1 (5%)	--	1 (5%)
Total	n=11 (70%)	n=9 (45%)	n=20 (115%)
Number of responses	14	9	23
<u>Degree</u>	n=11	n=11	n=22
Master of Education	11 (50%)	8 (36%)	19 (86%)
Educational Specialist	6 (27%)	4 (18%)	10 (45%)
Doctorate	--	1 (5%)	1 (5%)
Total	n=11 (77%)	n=11 (59%)	n=22 (136%)
Number of responses	17	13	30
<u>Who delivers instruction?</u>	N=11	N=11	N=22
University faculty	10 (45%)	7 (32%)	17 (77%)
Mentor	5 (23%)	3 (14%)	8 (37%)
Practitioner	7 (32%)	3 (14%)	10 (46%)
Total	n=11 (100%)	n=11 (60%)	n=22 (160%)
Number of responses	22	13	35

^aProgram Managers checked all responses that applied to their internship program.

Seventeen of the 22 programs allow university faculty to teach theory. Eighteen internship programs also utilize mentors and practitioners to deliver instruction. Twelve of the 18 programs are Danforth programs. Only six university programs utilize mentors.

Question 2: What is the method of identifying intern entry level competencies?

Internship program assessment of intern entry level competencies

Question number two was designed to determine the criteria used for identifying intern entry level competencies. Four key criteria were identified. These include undergraduate academic performance (GPA), performance on the GRE and/or MAT, acceptance into Masters program, and assessment center rating. Table 6 shows these key criteria and the programs that employ them.

Table 6. Criteria used for intern entry level assessment for Danforth and university internship programs

Criteria used for assessment	Danforth	University	Total
	n=11	n=9	n=20
Academic performance (GPA)	5	5	10
Performance on GRE or MAT	1	1	2
Performance in assessment center	2	--	2
Acceptance into Masters program	1	2	3
Combination of academics and standardized test	2	1	3
Total	11	9	n=20
No response		2	

Half of the programs (10) consider academic performance when assessing the interns' entry level competencies. Three programs consider academic performance (GPA) and performance on standardized tests. Of the three programs that consider acceptance into Master's programs, 2 are Danforth. Two university programs consider rating/performance in assessment center setting.

Question 3: What are program practices related to the mentor principal component?

The mentor component Question three was designed to examine practices of the mentor principal component of internship programs. Table 7 shows the four key elements examined: (1) identifying mentors, (2) screening, (3) training, and (4) matching one mentor with the intern.

Program facilitators reported that more than one strategy is used to identify mentors. Of the 16 programs that nominate mentors, some (40%) also use self-nomination and recruitment in identifying mentors. An equal number (4 each) of Danforth and university programs recruit mentors.

Fourteen of 20 programs utilize screening when identifying mentors. An equal number of Danforth and university programs (3 each) do not screen mentors.

Ten of 20 programs train principals to be mentors. Of the ten programs that train mentors, 8 are Danforth programs while only 2 of 9 university programs train mentors. Two university programs did not respond.

Table 7. Mentor identification, mentor screening, mentor training, matching mentor with interns for Danforth and university internship programs

	Danforth	University	Total
<u>Mentor identification</u> ^a	n=11	n=9	n=20
No response		2	
Self-nominated	5 (25%)	3 (15%)	8 (40%)
Nominated	8 (40%)	8 (40%)	16 (80%)
Recruited	4 (20%)	4 (20%)	8 (40%)
Combination	5 (25%)	3 (15%)	8 (40%)
Number of responses	22 (110%)	18 (90%)	40 (200%)
Total	n=11	n=9	n=20
<u>Mentor screening</u>	n=11	n=9	n=20
Yes	8 (40%)	6 (30%)	14 (70%)
No	3 (15%)	3 (15%)	6 (30%)
Total	11 (55%)	9 (45%)	20 (100%)
No response		2	
<u>Mentor training</u>	n=11	n=9	n=20
Yes	8 (40%)	2 (10%)	10 (50%)
No	3 (15%)	7 (35%)	10 (50%)
Total	11 (55%)	9 (45%)	20 (100%)
No response		2	

^aProgram Managers checked all responses that applied to their internship program.

Table 7. (Continued)

	Danforth	University	Total
<u>Matching mentor with intern^a</u>	n=11	n=9	n=20
Assigned by program	9 (45%)	8 (40%)	17 (85%)
Intern's choice	3 (15%)	2 (10%)	5 (25%)
Mentor's choice	2 (10%)	2 (10%)	4 (20%)
Number of responses	14 (70%)	12 (60%)	20 (130%)
No response		2	
Total	n=11	n=9	n=20

Program facilitators indicated that more than one strategy is used when assigning mentors. In 17 of 20 programs, mentors are assigned by the program facilitator and some of these (15%) also permit interns and mentors to choose new interns. Five of 20 programs assign mentors according to intern choice, and 4 permit mentors to choose their interns.

Question 4: What is the total number of days allocated for the school site/field experience?

Days spent at the school site/field experience Question four was designed to determine the number of days interns spend at the school site in the internship programs. These days were grouped as follows: (1) less than 25, (2) 26-50, (3) 51-75, (4) 76-90, (5) 90 or more days, and (6) varies.

Table 8 shows that one of the Danforth programs requires interns to spend less than 25 days at the school-site/field experience, while two

Table 8. The number of days allocated for the school site/field experience for Danforth and university programs

Days spent at school-site	Danforth	University	Total
	n=11	n=11	22
Less than 25		2 (9%)	2 (9%)
26-50	2 (9%)	3 (13%)	5 (23%)
51-75	2 (9%)	1 (5%)	3 (13%)
76-90	2 (9%)	1 (5%)	3 (13%)
90 days or more	4 (18%)	3 (13%)	7 (32%)
Varies	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	2 (9%)
Total	11 (50%)	11 (50%)	22 (100%)

university programs (9%) spend less than 25 days. In 18 of the 22 programs, interns spend between 26-90 days at the school-site/field experience. Of the 18 (83%), 4 Danforth and 3 university programs require interns to spend 90 or more days. In 1 Danforth and 1 university program, the amount of time spent at the school site varies with each new cycle of interns.

Question 5: Do mentors coach interns during the field experience?

The mentor as coach Question five was designed to determine extents to which mentors coach the intern during the field experience. Table 9 shows the number of programs that utilize mentors as coaches.

Nineteen of 20 programs utilize mentors to coach interns during the field experience. All 11 (100%) Danforth programs use mentors as coaches.

Table 9. Frequencies of mentors used as coaches during the field experience

Mentor as coach	Danforth	University	Total
	n=11	n=9	20
Yes	11 (55%)	8 (40%)	19 (95%)
No	--	1 (5%)	1 (5%)
Total	11 (55%)	9 (45%)	20 (100%)

Question 6: Who evaluates the field experience and how is the intern's total program experience evaluated?

Evaluation of the intern's performance Question six was designed to determine who evaluates the intern and the key criteria used for evaluating the intern's total internship programs.

Table 8 shows who evaluates the field experience and the criteria used when evaluating intern's performance during the total internship program experience.

In most programs, more than one individual evaluates the intern's performance during the field experience. In all Danforth and university programs (100%), the mentor principal evaluates the interns, and in some (2 Danforth and 1 university), the university/program faculty and intern evaluate the field experience. In 20 of the 22 programs (91%) university/program faculty evaluate interns, and 9 programs allow the intern to evaluate their own field experience.

More than one strategy is used to evaluate the intern's total program performance. In 16 of the 22 programs a written examination and

Table 10. The individual who evaluates the intern(s) performance during the field experience and criteria for evaluating performance during the total program for Danforth and university programs

	Danforth	University	Total
<u>Individual who evaluates the field experience^a</u>	n=11	n=11	n=22
University			
facilitator	9 (41%)	11 (50%)	20 (91%)
Mentor principal	11 (50%)	11 (50%)	22 (100%)
Intern (self-evaluation)	8 (18%)	5 (23%)	9 (41%)
Combination of faculty, mentor, and intern	9 (9%)	11 (4%)	20 (14%)
Total	n=11 (118%)	n=11 (127%)	n=22 (246%)
Number of responses	37	42	71
<u>Criteria for evaluating the total internship experience^a</u>	n=11	n=11	n=22
Written exam	10 (45%)	6 (27%)	16 (73%)
Oral exam	4 (18%)	5 (23%)	9 (41%)
Special project	4 (18%)	5 (23%)	9 (41%)
Field experience	8 (36%)	8 (36%)	16 (73%)
Class activities	4 (18%)	5 (23%)	9 (41%)
Combination (2 or more)	8 (23%)	7 (32%)	12 (54%)
Total	n=11 (159%)	n=11 (164%)	n=22 (323%)
Number of responses	36	36	71

^aProgram facilitators checked all responses that applied to their internship program.

the field experience are used to evaluate the intern. Twelve of the 22 programs (5 Danforth and 7 university) use a combination of an oral examination (9 programs), special project (9 programs) and class activities (9 programs) to evaluate the intern's total program experience.

Question 7: Is job placement a component of the program?

Intern job placement Question seven was designed to examine job placement practices of internship program at the completion of the program. Table 11 shows the number of programs that provide for job assistance.

Only six of the 21 programs provide job placement. There is an equal number of Danforth and university programs providing job placement for interns.

Effectiveness of Program Components

The following data represent findings from the Intern School Leader Questionnaire. Danforth and university interns responded to statements

Table 11. Job placement assistance and/or non-assistance for Danforth and university programs

Job placement	Danforth	University	Total
	n=10	n=11	n=21
Yes	3	3	6
No	7	8	15
Total	10	11	21
No response	1		

designed to examine their perception of the extent to which they believe elements of the total internship program experiences were effective in developing and improving their school leadership skills. Interns also responded to statements designed to examine perceptions of their internship program experiences.

Table 12 shows the results for the 11 Danforth and 15 university interns who rated 8 specific elements of their internship programs. These elements include: (1) the process for matching interns with mentors, (2) the number of days allocated for the school-site/field experience and how they were distributed, (3) time arrangement/allocated time for coaching by mentor, (4) the process used for evaluating course work, (5) the process used for evaluating intern's performance during the field experience, (6) job placement at completion of the program, (7) overall school-site/field experience rating, and (8) overall total internship program rating.

Danforth interns reported that matching interns with mentors is very effective (8.9). University interns rated the same element in their program moderately effective.

Danforth interns reported the time allocated for the school-site/field experience in their internship was effective (7.9). University interns reported the same element in their program moderately effective.

Danforth interns reported actual time (length) spent at the school-site/field experience was effective. University interns reported the same element in their program moderately effective.

Table 12. Danforth and university intern perceptions of their total program experience indicated by mean scores

Program elements	Danforth mean	University mean	Differences
Total	n=11	n=15	Total N=26
Matching interns with mentors	8.9	6.0	2.9
Allocated time for the school-site/field experience	7.9	5.2	2.7
Actual time (length) spent at the school site	8.0	6.6	1.4
Coaching by mentors (allocated time)	7.7	5.0	2.7
Evaluation of intern performance	8.0	8.0	--
Job placement at completion of the program	6.0	6.0	--
Overall school-site/field experience rating	8.7	6.0	2.7
Overall total internship program experience rating	8.6	6.0	2.6
Overall Average Score	7.9	6.1	2.5

^aPossible ratings: 0 = Not applicable; 1-2 = Ineffective; 3-4 = Somewhat effective; 5-6 = Moderately effective; 7-8 = Effective; 9-10 = Very effective.

Danforth interns reported allocated time/arrangement for mentor coaching was effective. University interns reported the same element in their program moderately effective.

Both university and Danforth interns reported their performance evaluation during their internship program was conducted effectively.

Job placement at completion of the program for both Danforth and university interns was reported moderately effective. Danforth interns noted the extent to which their internship components, activities and/or experiences were effective in improving and developing their leadership skills were effective (7.9). University interns rated their internship components, activities and/or experiences as effective in improving and developing their leadership skills as moderately effective (6.1).

Intern Data Analysis: Telephone Interviews

Telephone interviews were conducted during May 1992 with interns who responded to a request to provide additional information about specific aspects of their internship. Seventeen interns responded, 10 Danforth and 7 university. The telephone interview questions addressed specific internship program practices. These include: (1) the process for matching interns with mentors; (2) the number of days allocated for the school-site/field experience and how they were distributed; (3) time arrangement/allocated time for coaching by mentor; (4) the process used for evaluating course work; (5) the process used for evaluating intern's performance during the field experience; (6) job placement at completion of the program. Additionally, (7) interns were asked to give the most beneficial experience(s)/activities in their field experience, and (8) total internship program and the extent to which each of these aspects were helpful and/or not helpful and why in developing and improving intern leadership skills (see Appendix E). The following tables show data and summaries of findings.

Process for matching interns with mentors and a description of what was helpful and not and why

Survey respondents indicated that the process for matching interns with mentors was good (mean = 7.5). Interns were provided the opportunity to: (1) identify and clarify the process(es) used for matching interns with mentors; and (2) report what was helpful and not helpful in matching interns with mentors and why. Table 13 shows the processes used for matching interns with mentors.

Nine of the 17 interns (53%) reported no formal process for matching interns with mentors. Eight of the 17 interns (47%) reported their program specifically matched interns with mentors. Apparently, matching interns with mentors for some programs involved only assigning the intern to an approved building principal/mentor. Of the 8 interns who reported their individual program matched interns with mentors, 5 were Danforth.

Two of the 10 Danforth interns reported school district personnel and university supervisor(s) facilitate mentor/intern matching. Two of the 10 interns reported their superintendents and university supervisor(s) facilitate the matching process. As reported earlier, 5 of the 10 Danforth interns reported no formal mentor/intern matching. Two Danforth interns reported the process used for mentor/intern matching was helpful because the superintendents made good decisions about mentor appointments and school district and university collaboration made a difference. Two Danforth interns indicated that mentor/intern buddy system matching was not helpful and contributed to distinctly varied field experiences.

Table 13. Processes used for matching interns with mentors for Danforth and university programs and a description of what was helpful and not helpful

Program (intern)	Process	What was helpful/ why?	What wasn't helpful/ why?
Danforth:	Choose from mentor pool	Superintendent selected mentors/ Superintendent knew the accomplished principal Danforth	Intern selected on buddy system/Appeared on the surface unfair
Danforth:	None		
Danforth:	University manager facilitated match.	I got a good match/Mentor willing to spend time.	
Danforth:	Superintendent choose, university conferred with superintendent, and match made	Screening by Superintendent/he made good decisions about who would become mentors	Mentor experiences varied/interns had varied experiences
Danforth:	University and school district facilitated match	Cooperation and collaboration/informal assessment	
Danforth:	None		
Danforth:	None		
Danforth:	University manager facilitated match	Match different from regular assignment/broadened experience	
Danforth:	None		
University:	None		
University:	Intern responsible for matching/getting mentor	Intern initiated match/Proves self-directed. I knew what was needed for me to advance	

Table 13. (Continued)

Program (intern)	Process	What was helpful/ why?	What wasn't helpful/ why?
University:	Intern responsible for matching outside of district where employed	University approved any mentor/Simplified the matching process	Intern out of district generated match/Wanted in-district training
University:	None		
University:	University randomly assigned from district mentor pool	Guaranteed match	"...being randomly matched."/No real match - no choice
University:	None		
University:	None		
N = 17			
No Response = Danforth 5/50%; University 4/57%			
Mean: 7.45/ University 6; Danforth 8.9 (the mean score reflects all 36 interns who participated in the study)			

Two of the 7 university interns (29%) reported that they themselves were responsible for facilitating their mentor match. One of the 7 interns (14%) reported being randomly assigned a mentor from an approved pool of mentors created by the school district. As reported earlier, 4 of the 7 interns reported no formal mentor/intern matching. One university intern indicated mandatory out-of-district matching was not helpful because in-district experiences were desired.

The number of days allocated for the field experience and how they were distributed

Survey respondents listed allocation and distribution of days in the field experience as good (mean = 7). Interns were provided the opportunity to: (1) indicate the number of days allocated for the field experience and describe how they were distributed; and (2) report what was helpful and not helpful in the allocation and distribution days for the field experience and why. Table 14 shows the allocation and distribution of days for the field experience.

Nine of the 17 interns (53%) reported 90-94 days were allocated for their field experiences and distributed over one semester. Six of the 17 interns (35%) reported 100-180 days were allocated and distributed over two semesters. The remaining 2 interns reported 72 and 20 days, and over one semester.

Five of the 10 Danforth interns indicated they spent 90 days in the field experience, distributed over one semester. One of 10 reported 94 days over 15 months. Three of the 10 reported 100-120 days over two semesters. The remaining Danforth intern reported 180 days distributed over one school year and a summer. Seven of the 10 interns reported that when their time was compressed, it made a difference because they were able to see things daily and see how things evolved on a daily basis. They apparently were able to stay more focused. One of the 10 interns reported that more time for the field experience would have been helpful, and another reported that when only half days were allocated, it was difficult to bring closure to some activities in the school(s).

Table 14. Scheduled time for the field experience, how days were dispersed for Danforth and university programs, and a description of what was helpful and not helpful

Program (intern)	Schedule	What was helpful/ why?	What was not helpful/why?
Danforth:	100 days/full time	Day-to-day experiences/Assigned to an administrator	
Danforth:	180 days plus summer session/ two days per week	Experienced day-to-day activities	Three days in the classroom/Wanted more time at work site
Danforth:	One semester/full time	Gained a lot of experience/Paid leave of absence	
Danforth:	94 days/spread over 15 months	One year assigned as principal and 5 months central office shadowing/ Gained two types of school leader experiences	
Danforth:	90 days/daily	Fall semester assignment (opening of school)/Accepted by staff	
Danforth:	90 days/daily	Daily assignment/ Worked with parents and committees	
Danforth:	120 days/full time	Assigned as administrator/ Actually doing the job	
Danforth:	90 days/full time	Assigned as administrator/Dealt with parents and learned conflict resolution skills	

Table 14. (continued)

Program (intern)	Schedule	What was helpful/ why?	What was not helpful/why?
Danforth:	90 days/spread over two years	District agreed to hire sub/Students had the same sub	Limited to not more than five day con- secutive days/Cre- ated inconsistency own work assignment
Danforth:	120 days/full time	Assigned as principal/Working with staff and parents	
University:	120 days/two quarters	Intern developed plan for serving time/ Cooperative effort	
University:	72 days/one semester	Flexibility; days not set/Worked around other obligations	Required time excessive/Needed to fit in one semester
University:	90 days/3 credits or 180 days/6 credits	Completed two field experiences/Wanted training in two areas	Assigned to site where employed/ Wanted different exposure
University:	90 days/intern decided when	Each meeting and special project counted as day/ Could trade off undetermined number of days	Undetermined number of trade-off days/ Work-site time disparity
University:	90 days/1/2 day every day	One month at each site: elementary, middle, high school/ experienced all levels	
University:	180 days/90 days assigned full time another 90 days spent developing personal project	Two internship experiences/ Additional district recognition	

Table 14. (continued)

Program (intern)	Schedule	What was helpful/ why?	What was not helpful/why?
University:	20 days/spread over 10 weeks	Intern developed work schedule/ Flexibility	Twelve month employee and part time student/ Traded personal and vacation time for internship
N = 17			
Mean: 7/ University interns 6; Danforth interns 8 (mean reflects all 36 interns who participated in the study)			

Three of the 7 university interns reported they spent 90 days in the field experience distributed over one semester. Two of the 7 reported they spent 100-180 days distributed over two semesters/one school year. One of the 7 interns reported spending 72 days during one semester. The remaining intern reported spending 20 days during one semester. Four of the 7 indicated that the process for allocation and distribution of days worked because they were able to decide how the allocations of days was determined. This apparently gave them flexibility and helped them fit their schedule to situational needs. Two of the seven interns reported being assigned to the school site in which they were presently teaching, and being forced to use personal and vacation time for their internship experience was not helpful to them. One intern reported the allocated time for the field experience was excessive (72 days for one semester).

The arrangement/allocated time for coaching by mentor

Survey respondents indicated that the process for the arrangement/allocated time for mentor coaching was good (mean = 6.35). Interns were provided the opportunity to: (1) clarify the process for the arrangement/allocated time for coaching by mentors; and (2) report what worked and/or didn't work and why. Table 15 shows the process used for the arrangement/allocated time for coaching by mentors.

Eleven of the 17 interns reported mentors were always available for coaching and mentors practiced an "open door" policy, the latter meaning that mentors were available for unscheduled conferences. One of the 17 interns indicated activities performed during the week were logged and coaching occurred on weekends. Three of the 17 interns reported no real coaching arrangement, but there were meetings referred to as "reflective sessions." The remaining two interns reported no mentor coaching.

As reported earlier, eight of the 10 Danforth interns reported their mentors were always available for mentor coaching. One of the 10 Danforth interns indicated coaching occurred on weekends, and another intern indicated their university supervisor also was a coach. Eight interns reported the process used for mentor coaching worked because mentors were willing to spend time with them. Two interns indicated working in a non-threatening environment and working with a mentor who was a leader in the district and/or in the community also was helpful. No Danforth intern reported any aspect of the mentor coaching not helpful.

Table 15. Time arrangement/allocated time for coaching by mentors for Danforth and university programs and a description of what was helpful and not helpful

Program (intern)	Process	What was helpful/ why?	What was not helpful/why?
Danforth:	Always available	Availability/Will- ingness to spend time	
Danforth:	"Open door policy"	Always available/ Continued support	
Danforth:	University super- visor coached	Replaced mentor/ Mentor became ill	
Danforth:	Weekend coaching sessions	Scheduled time/ Committed mentoring	
Danforth:	Open door policy and sometimes in- cluded university supervisor	Mentor was readily available/Mentor willingness to coach	
Danforth:	Mentor was always available	Daily guidance/ Assured assistance	
Danforth:	Talked informally daily and met formally once a week	Mentor committed/ Willingness to spend time	
Danforth:	Mentor available "as needed"	Open door policy/ Willingness to be available	
Danforth:	"Mentor was always available."	Communication: Com- pared notes about teachers, routines, and files/I was not threatened	
Danforth:	Open door policy	Reflective sessions and closeness of the offices/Accomplished administrator	

Table 15. (continued)

Program (intern)	Process	What was helpful/ why?	What was not helpful/why?
University:	Journal writing	Good relationship with mentor/Founda- tion for assistance and discussions	
University:	Reflective sessions Scheduling time/ Coaching occurred when requested		Assuming coaching would automatically occur/Didn't receive full benefit of mentor's experience
University:	No real coaching		Mentor regularly unavailable/Experi- ence lacked feedback
University:	Elementary: no coaching, Middle school: no coach- ing, High school: open door policy	Elem.: Regular feedback sessions, High school: Will- ingness to spend time/Provided opportunity for support	Middle school: Little contact with mentor/"I was on my my own"
University:	Reflective sessions/Required to log	Regular contact/ Knew where I stood	Logging/Time consuming
University:	Regular interaction with me/Immediate feedback	"...willing to spend time with me"	Not knowing when mentor would be out of the build- ing/Desired input before starting task
University:	Scheduled coaching sessions	Cooperative effort by all involved/ Following agreed- upon plan	
N = 17			
Mean: 6.35/ University 5; Danforth 7.7 (the mean score reflects all 36 interns who participated in the study)			

Two of the 7 university interns reported mentor coaching occurred during their field experiences. Three of the 7 university interns reported no real mentor coaching, but there were meetings referred to as "reflective sessions." The remaining two interns reported no coaching. Two interns who reported mentor coaching indicated mentors' willingness to spend time made a difference. The 3 interns who reported receiving support from "reflective sessions" reported logging/journal writing and mentor's adhering to the agreed-upon plan was very helpful to them. One university intern indicated that experiencing little contact with the mentor deprived him of full benefit of the mentor's experiences.

The process for evaluating performance in class

Survey respondents indicated that evaluation of interns' total performance during the internship program was very well done (mean = 8). The telephone survey was designed to identify how the intern's performance in class was evaluated. The 17 interns interviewed by phone indicated that the process for evaluating their performance during course work was at the high end of good (mean = 7.9), almost very effective. Interns were provided the opportunity to: (1) identify/clarify the process for evaluating their course work; and (2) report what was helpful and/or not helpful in the evaluation of classroom performance and why. Table 16 shows the processes for evaluating intern performance during course work within Danforth and university internship programs.

Sixteen of the 17 interns (94%) reported their individual student performance was evaluated through student class participation, their

Table 16. Processes used for evaluating intern's course work and a description of what was helpful and not helpful and why

Program (intern)	Process	What was helpful/ why?	What was not helpful/why?
Danforth:	Class performance	Projects, presentations/assigned traditional letter grade	
Danforth:	Class performance	Projects, presentations/assigned traditional letter grade	
Danforth:	"Essay writing requiring higher order thinking... a lot of analyzing situations, hypothesizing, and scenario role playing"	Varied teaching strategies. Relevant to real life	
Danforth:	Class performance	Projects, presentations/assigned traditional letter grade	
Danforth:	Class performance	Projects, presentations/assigned traditional letter grade	
Danforth:	Class performance	Projects, presentations/assigned traditional letter grade	
Danforth:	Class performance	Projects, presentations/assigned traditional letter grade	
Danforth:	Class performance	Projects, presentations/objectives	

Table 16. (continued)

Program (intern)	Process	What was helpful/ why?	What was not helpful/why?
Danforth:	Class performance	Projects, presenta- tions/assigned traditional letter grade	
Danforth:	Class performance	Projects, presenta- tions/assigned traditional letter grade	
Danforth:	Class performance	Projects, presenta- tions/assigned traditional letter grade	
University:	Class performance	Projects, presenta- tions/assigned traditional letter grade	
University:	Class performance	Projects, presenta- tions/assigned traditional letter grade	
University:	Class performance	Projects, presenta- tions/assigned traditional letter grade	
University:	Class performance	Projects, presenta- tions/assigned traditional letter grade	
University:	Class performance	Projects, presenta- tions/assigned traditional letter grade	

Table 16. (continued)

Program (intern)	Process	What was helpful/why?	What was not helpful/why?
University:	Class performance	Projects, presentations/assigned traditional letter grade	
University:	Class performance	Projects, presentations/assigned traditional letter grade	
University:	Class performance	Projects, presentations/assigned traditional letter grade	

N = 17
Mean: 7.9/ University 7.1; Danforth 7.8 (mean reflects only the 17 interns interviewed by phone)

student projects, and student presentations given in class. One of the 17 interns reported the program course work: evaluation included essay writing, hypothesizing, analyzing, and role playing.

Nine of the 10 Danforth interns reported their class performances were evaluated by their class participation, projects, and presentations given in class. Only one of the 10 Danforth interns reported the process for evaluating performance in class was essay writing, analyzing school-related situations, hypothesizing, scenario, and role playing. All Danforth interns reported that assigning a letter grade was helpful/worked because it was a practice they were familiar with. No Danforth intern

reported any aspect of the process for evaluating their performance in class that was not helpful.

All university interns indicated their class performance was evaluated by their participation, their projects, and presentations given in class. Interns reported the process of assigning the letter grade worked because they are accustomed to the letter grade. No university intern reported any aspect of the process used for evaluating their performance in class that was not helpful.

The process for evaluating performance during the field experience

Survey respondents indicated that evaluation of their performance during the total internship program was very well done (mean = 8). The telephone survey was to identify and clarify how intern performance was evaluated during the field experience. The 17 interns interviewed by phone indicated that the process for evaluating their performance during the field experience was good (mean = 7.5). Question 5.a provided the intern's opportunity to: (1) identify and clarify the processes used for evaluating their performance during the field experience; and (2) report what was helpful and/or not helpful in the evaluation process and why. Table 17 shows the processes used for evaluating intern performance during the field experiences.

Twelve of the 17 interns indicated the mentor monitored student performance during the field experience. Five of the 17 reported a variety of approaches used to evaluate their performance: these included

Table 17. Processes used for evaluating intern performance during the field experience and a description of what was helpful and not helpful and why

Program (intern)	Process	What was helpful/ why?	What was not helpful/why?
Danforth:	Monitoring	Reporting progress to university supervisor/ Mentor knowledgeable of performance	
Danforth:	Mentor monitoring	Mentor assigned grade	
Danforth:	Mentor monitoring and assigned letter grade	Mentor knowledgeable of performance/ Traditional	
Danforth:	End of the year retreat	Reflecting by mentor, university and intern/ Collaborative effort	
Danforth:	Input from mentor university and intern	Collaborative evaluation/Validation by supervisors	
Danforth:	Logged and categorized activities and experiences	Supervisor had input regarding grade/ Learning sessions	
Danforth:	Mentor, university, and intern evaluated field experience	Collaborative/ Indicator for growth	
Danforth:	Visitation by university supervisor and extensive logging	Logging and university visits/Documentation for later discussions	
Danforth:	Pass/fail grades	Logging and reflective sessions/Good recall	
Danforth:	Written projects and site participation	Journal writing/ Received university credit	

Table 17. (continued)

Program (intern)	Process	What was helpful/ why?	What was not helpful/why?
University:	Mentor assigned grade	Mentor knowledgeable of performance/ Traditional	
University:	Mentor assigned grade	Mentor knowledgeable of performance/ Traditional	
University:	Mentor assigned grade	Logging and categoriz- ing activities/ Objective	
University:	Mentor assigned grade	Logging and categoriz- ing activities/ Objective	
University:	Collaborative grading: mentor, university supervisor, and intern	Logging and mentor report/Collaborative effort	
University:	Logging and feedback/ discussion sessions	Opportunity to ask questions/Targeted areas for improvement	
University:	Internship course, seminar sharing, and university visitation evaluated	Collaboration between mentor and university supervisor/ communication	

N = 17

Mean: 7.5/ University 7; Danforth 8 (mean reflects only the 17 interns interviewed by phone)

an end-of-the-year retreat, pass/fail grade, logging, collaborative assessment of their performance, and written projects.

Six of the 10 Danforth interns reported the mentor monitored their performance as a means of evaluating their performance during the field experience. Two of the 10 interns indicated they were required to document what they did during the field experience in writing. The remaining 2 interns reported their individual mentor, university supervisor, and they evaluated. Eight interns indicated the evaluation process was beneficial because visitations by university supervisor, mentor's knowledge of tasks, logging, and collaborative sessions made a difference. Two interns reported mentor consistently worked with them while they were performing tasks and opportunities for questioning were helpful to them. No Danforth intern reported any aspect of the evaluation of their performance during the field experiences that was not helpful.

Five of the university interns reported the process used for evaluating their performances during the field experience was the mentor monitored them. Two of the 7 interns reported logging, feedback sessions, internship course, and visits by university supervisor were used to evaluate their performance. Three interns indicated the process for evaluating their performance during the field experience was beneficial because logging and collaborative sessions with their individual mentor made a difference. No university reported any aspect of the process for evaluating their performance during the field that was not helpful.

Job placement at completion of the internship program

Survey respondents indicated that job placement was good (mean = 6.9); however, 15 of the 17 respondents surveyed by phone reported no job placement at completion of their internship program. Question 6.1 provided interns the opportunity to: (1) identify and clarify processes used for job placement; and (2) report what was helpful and/or not helpful in the job placement process and why. Table 18 shows the processes used for job placement within Danforth and university internship programs.

As reported earlier, 15 of the 17 respondents indicated that job placement was not an aspect of their internship program. The 2 interns who reported job placement both were Danforth interns.

Eight of the 10 Danforth interns reported that job placement was not an aspect of their internship program. Two of the 10 interns reported that their university supervisor developed a job bank for them. The two interns also reported strong networking/cooperation/collaboration between school district mentors and the university, and their university supervisor's awareness of job openings made a difference. Neither of the 2 Danforth interns reported any aspect of their job placement process not working.

As reported earlier, all university interns reported that job placement was not a component of their internship programs.

Field experience activities and/or experiences most beneficial to developing leadership skills and how program managers could make the field experience better

Survey respondents rated their field experiences as good (mean = 7.3). Interns were provided an opportunity to: (1) identify and describe

Table 18. Processes used for job placement assistance at completion of the total program and a description of what was helpful and not helpful and why

Program (intern)	Process	What worked/ why?	What didn't work/ why?
Danforth:	University supervisor developed job bank	Strong networking unit/Mentor and university supervisor aware of abilities and recommended jobs	
Danforth:	School district informs university of personnel need	Cooperation and collaboration/ Assigned to my school and assigned to the administrative opening	
Danforth:	None		
Danforth:	None		
Danforth:	None		
University:	None		
Danforth:	None		
Danforth:	None		
University:	None		
Danforth:	None		
University:	None		
University:	None		
University:	None		
University:	None		
Danforth:	None		

Table 18. (continued)

Program (intern)	Process	What worked/ why?	What didn't work/ why?
Danforth:	None		
University:	None		
N = 17			
Mean: 6.9/ University 6; Danforth 7.9 (the mean score reflects all 36 interns who participated in the study).			

intern perceptions about what activities and/or experiences in the field experience were most beneficial in developing their leadership skills; and (2) report what university managers can do to make the field experience better. These responses were categorized to better understand the activities and experiences described by the intern (Table 19). These areas included communication-centered activities, technical skills, and university faculty and curriculum content.

Seven of the 17 interns reported their most beneficial activities and/or experiences were things that fit the technical skills area. These included supervision and management staff through placement as an administrator in the school. Five of the 17 interns reported communication-centered activities, and these included conferencing with parents and students, intern/mentor reflective sessions, shadowing mentor, involvement with school and community projects, and support from district employees. Three of the 17 interns reported university faculty and curriculum content in the internship seminar class as being helpful to

Table 19. Most beneficial activities and experiences during the field experience and what program managers can do to improve the field experience

Program (intern)	Two or three field experiences activities/experiences most beneficial in developing leadership skills	How program managers can make the field experience better
Danforth:	Technical activities/experiences: Opportunity to make decisions, deal with students, and authority	Develop strong relationship with school district(s). Select university managers who are committed to the program and committed to excellence.
Danforth:	University faculty and/or curriculum content activities/experiences: Exploring instructional supervision: learning how to conference, observe, and coach teachers.	Quick evaluation of intern/mentor match. Work more with site-based management.
Danforth:	Communication activities/experiences: Support from faculty (good listeners) Support from the school district, school staff and central office	Provide internships that include the opening and closing of school.
Danforth:	Communication activities/experiences: Involvement with school/community relations. Opportunity to explore communicating with adults and students.	Everything is all right.
Danforth:	Technical activities/experiences: Advisor for the sixth grade student council. Interacting with irate parents/learning strategies for defusing situations. Opportunity to chair curriculum and budget coordination committees.	Start internship at the beginning of the school.

Table 19. (continued)

Program (intern)	Two or three field experiences activities/experiences most beneficial in developing leadership skills	How program managers can make the field experience better
Danforth:	Communication activities/ experiences: Effective mentor; friendly, "laid back," supportive and will- ingness to participate in a lot of sharing sessions. Opportunity to work with the teachers, observations and conferencing.	Nothing.
Danforth:	Communications and university faculty and curriculum activities/experiences: Strong mentor, Reflection Sessions, Invaluable cohort experience	Require mentor training Develop a process of effective matching of intern/mentor
Danforth:	Technical activities/experi- ences: Being allowed to as- sume responsibility. Being able to evaluate and confer- ence, and problem solve	Get more financial backing for substitute teachers. Provide longer field experience.
Danforth:	Technical activities/ experiences: Being able to experience the day-to-day operations of the school, especially the interworking of the principalship.	Provide training in conflict resolution
Danforth:	Technical activities/ experiences: Treated as an equal by the mentor/Allowed to question the mentor with- out her feeling threatened/ Exposure to a variety of school activities/Being able to use my own judgment when approaching and assignment or project/Gained conferenc- ing techniques	Correct the problem of unavailable substitute teachers. Assign a continuing substitute/ Sub reports for the same teacher(s).

Table 19. (continued)

Program (intern)	Two or three field experiences activities/experiences most beneficial in developing leadership skills	How program managers can make the field experience better
University:	Technical activities/experiences: School policy involvement and exploration of effective communication. Learning how to read a spreadsheet and write grants.	Work closely with district practitioners. Professors teaching theory should include practitioners.
University:	Communication activities/experiences: Sharing with other practitioners. Great mentor. Networking with cohort group.	Reduce the number of interns per cycle. More visits by university to the field experience. More intense mentor training.
University:	Technical activities/experiences: Opportunity to be involved in building level state audit. Looked at as an authority figure.	More opportunities for: parent conferencing and involvement with different ethnic groups. More training in time management. Require computer courses. Include involvement with community agencies.
University:	Communication and technical activities/experiences: Conferencing with parents. Being involved with curriculum development. Planned and implemented an in-service.	Incorporate lots of role playing involving uncomfortable situation and difficult problems.
University:	Technical activities/experiences: Shadowing my mentor, being able to observe meetings, parent conferences. Getting feedback on what can and cannot be done.	Train in counseling specific to the level of supervision where employed.

Table 19. (continued)

Program (intern)	Two or three field experiences activities/experiences most beneficial in developing leadership skills	How program managers can make the field experience better
University:	Technical activities/experiences: Exposure to team building, group processing and conflict resolution as it relates to staff and parents	Train mentors. More effective intern/mentor matching
University:	University faculty and university curriculum content activities/experiences: Situational leadership course (basic theory) Supervision course Opportunity for trial and error in the field experience	Make more internship visits More interactions with other interns

N = 17

Mean: 7.3/ University 6; Danforth 8.7 (the mean score reflects all 36 interns who participated in the study)

them. One of the 17 interns reported two categories: communication-centered activities and technical skills. These included conferencing with parents and interacting with staff, supervision and management of staff.

Four of the 10 Danforth interns reported experiences in the technical skills area as beneficial in developing their leadership skills. These included supervision and management of staff. Three of the 10 interns reported activities and experiences in communication-centered activities area as beneficial. These included conferencing parents, daily

interaction with staff, reflective sessions, and faculty support. Two of the 10 interns reported helpful activities under two areas: technical skills and university faculty and curriculum content as most helpful to them. These included supervision and management of staff and university faculty. The remaining intern reported beneficial communication centered on activities such as conferences with students and parents, intern/mentor reflective sessions, shadowing mentor. Two Danforth interns indicated university managers can improve technical skills area experiences if they want to make the field experience better. This included appropriating a fund for hiring substitute teachers who are replacements for interns during their field experiences. Two interns reported managers could improve activities and experiences provided in the area of technical skills. These included arranging the allocated time and distributing the days for the field experience to incorporate the opening and closing of schools. One intern reported managers could make the field experience better by improving activities in the communication area; develop strong relationship with participating school district(s). Another intern reported university managers should provide conflict resolution training prior to the field experience in order to make the field experience better.

Three of the 7 university interns reported activities and experiences in the technical skills area as beneficial in developing their leadership skills. These included supervision and management of staff. Two of the 7 interns reported communication-centered activities, such as conferencing with teachers and students, reflective sessions, school and community relations project involvement, and district support. One of the

7 interns reported university faculty and curriculum content experienced through the field experience seminar class were helpful. The remaining intern reported communication-centered activities as beneficial in developing leadership skills. These included conferencing with parents, reflective sessions, and faculty support. Three of the university interns reported university managers can make the field experience better by improving curriculum content through training in time management, computers, conflict resolution, and management of community resources. Four of the 7 interns indicated improvement in the area of university faculty and curriculum content: these included intern/mentor matching process and mandatory mentor training and more frequent university manager visits to the field experience site and creation of an intern cohort group.

Activities and/or experiences that were most beneficial during the total program in developing leadership skills and the most helpful component(s), activities, and experiences

Survey respondents rated their total programs as good (mean = 7.3). Question 8.a provided the interns an opportunity to: (1) identify and describe intern perceptions about activities and/or experiences within the total program that were most beneficial in developing their leadership skills; and (2) describe which components, activities, and/or experiences not helpful to them. These responses were categorized to better understand the areas described by the intern (see Table 20). The three areas included: (1) communication-centered activities, (2) technical skills, and (3) university faculty and curriculum content.

Table 20. The most beneficial activities and experiences during the total program and a description of activities and experiences not helpful in the total program for Danforth and university programs

Program (intern)	Two or three experiences and/or activities within the total program that were most beneficial in developing leadership skills	Any internship program component, activity, and/or experience not helpful
Danforth:	University faculty and university curriculum activities/experiences: Practical course work; i.e., guest speakers who were practitioners and seminar classes. Strong relationship with the school district's central office personnel. "I felt like I was 'on board' as an intern and they wanted me to be a success."	Requiring prerequisite of belonging to the school district's administrative pool.
Danforth:	University faculty and university curriculum activities/experiences: Training in consensus building and being an instructional supervisor	Assigned a few days a week to the school-site/(Being assigned as a full-time administrator is better.)
Danforth:	Communication activities/experiences: Cohort group member. Total commitment of university faculty. Willingness of local school district to mentor.	School district not hiring those interns they released to be trained.
Danforth:	Technical and university faculty and university curriculum activities/experiences: Being able to choose classes. Being assigned as an assistant principal. Support of university staff.	

Table 20. (continued)

Program (intern)	Two or three experiences and/or activities within the total program that were most beneficial in developing leadership skills	Any internship program component, activity, and/or experience not helpful
Danforth:	University faculty and university curriculum activities/experiences: One instructor was exemplary; during field experience I modeled instructor's behavior.	"I was the only male in the program." The lack of males gave me the feeling of selective avoidance, or discussions being one-sided.
Danforth:	University faculty and university curriculum activities/experiences: Understanding of leadership and how the leader sets the tone for the entire school.	
Danforth:	Technical and university faculty and university curriculum activities/ experiences: Holistic experience: strong cohort experience, exploration of theory and school-site practice, seminar sessions.	Moving from traditional courses to Danforth format was a good experience, but it made other courses appear to be lacking.
Danforth:	University faculty and university curriculum activities/experiences: Practical application of theory (relevant to real world experience). Intensive - thorough and cohesive course work.	Everything worked.
Danforth:	Technical and university faculty and university curriculum activities/ experiences: Actual hands- on experience. Appropriately structured course work (law).	Job assistance Liaison effort with school district as interns completed the program; "A letter of commendation to the school district was not sent."

Table 20. (continued)

Program (intern)	Two or three experiences and/or activities within the total program that were most beneficial in developing leadership skills	Any internship program component, activity, and/or experience not helpful
Danforth:	University faculty and university curriculum activities/experiences: Practitioner taught courses; central office personnel, State Secretary of Education, experts and specialist in education and teleconferences were held when they were unable to actually be in the classroom. Brainstorming sessions with cohort group.	
University:	Technical and university faculty and university curriculum activities/experiences: Leadership classes. Ph.D. program students allowed to participate.	
University:	Communication and university faculty and university curriculum activities/experiences: Superintendent of schools taught theory course (Unit: District Assessment and Developing a Vision). Acquired network of friends and professors (professional colleagues).	
University:	University faculty and university curriculum activities/experiences: Introductory course to administration and leadership had a dynamic instructor. Internship delivery system	Some instructors did not show a strong interest in the internship program.

Table 20. (continued)

Program (intern)	Two or three experiences and/or activities within the total program that were most beneficial in developing leadership skills	Any internship program component, activity, and/or experience not helpful
University:	Technical activity: Learned how to structure time and use it wisely.	Mentor matching. Summer field experience provided little contact with students and staff. Not being assigned to a full administra- tive position.
University:	University faculty and university curriculum activities/experiences: Supervision class - learned techniques of evaluation. Group processing class - learned to reach consensus and concept of team building.	
University:	Community and university faculty and university curriculum activities/ experiences: Exploration of community skills and conflict resolution skills. Involvement in a wide variety of school experiences.	Process for matching intern/ mentor
University:	Community activities/ experiences: Working with a mentor. Having a lot of different experiences.	Too much time required for completion of total program.
N = 17		
Mean: 7.3/ University 6; Danforth 8.6 (the mean score reflects all 36 interns who participated in the study).		

Eight of the 17 interns reported their most beneficial activities and/or experiences were university faculty and university curriculum content area. These activities and experiences included classes where practitioners taught; i.e., State Secretary of Education, teleconferences when practitioners were unable to be present in the classroom, seminar classes, exploration of leadership, and training in consensus building and classroom evaluation. Four of the 17 interns reported technical skills and university faculty and curriculum content were beneficial. These included strong cohort group and internship seminar, leadership class, and placed/assigned to the school site full time experiencing the interworkings of the principalship. Two interns indicated communication and university faculty and curriculum content as helpful to them. These activities and experiences included conflict resolution training, involvement in school community relations, and acquisition of friends. Two interns reported communication-centered activities, and they included cohort group member, willingness of school district employees to mentors and constant feedback from mentor. The remaining intern reported technical skills as helpful in developing leadership skills. This included learning time management.

Six of the 10 Danforth interns reported university faculty and university curriculum content area as being most beneficial within the total program for developing their leadership skills. Experiences included classes taught by practitioners: i.e., State Secretary of Education; teleconferences when practitioners were unable to be present in the classroom; seminar classes that included exploration of leadership.

Three of the 17 interns reported experiences in the technical and university faculty and curriculum content areas. These included strong cohort group and internship seminar, and reporting to the school site daily. The remaining intern indicated the communication skills area as most beneficial in developing leadership skills. These skills included cohort group membership, willingness of school district employees to mentor and feedback from mentor. One Danforth intern reported lack of job assistance, while another reported the mentor matching process not helpful to them. Two interns reported no aspect of the total internship program as not helpful to them.

Two of the 7 university interns reported activities and/or experiences in two areas: (1) communication, and (2) university faculty and curriculum content as beneficial. These included conflict resolution training, involvement in school community relations, and acquisition of friends. Two of the 7 interns indicated university faculty and curriculum content as being helpful to them. These included classroom evaluation class, training in consensus building, and seminar classes that included exploration of leadership. One of the 7 university interns reported communication experiences related to receiving feedback from mentor as being helpful. One of the 7 interns reported technical skills; i.e., learning time management (" . . . structuring and using time wisely"). The remaining intern reported technical skills and university faculty and curriculum content activities and experiences as helpful. These included reporting to the school site daily for one semester and learning conflict resolution skills. Two university interns reported that

the process for matching interns with mentors was not helpful to them. One intern reported too little time allocated for the field experience, while two of the university interns reported no aspect of the total internship program as not helpful.

**CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS
AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The improvement of internship programs that prepare school leaders as principals is a major focus of many universities and educational organizations. Demands have increased for improved principal preparation programs and increased cooperation between university managers of administrative internship programs, practitioners, and local schools. Internship programs examined in this study combine learning experiences that include the presentation of theory in a classroom-like atmosphere plus the clinical experience at the school-site/field experience.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine two approaches to school administrator internship programs: university field-based internship programs and Danforth field-based principal preparation programs. The study was explicitly designed to determine the program design and delivery system for operating university and Danforth administrator internship programs. Additionally, the study was designed to examine to what extent selected processes, components, and experiences (program design and delivery) improve and develop intern leadership skills. What follows is a summary of the findings for specific elements in Danforth and university internship programs. These include: (1) the process of matching interns with mentors, (2) the number of days allocated for the school-site/field experience and how they were distributed, (3) allocated time/time arrangement for coaching by mentor, (4) the process used for evaluating

course work, (5) the process used for evaluating intern performance during the field experience, and (6) job placement at completion of the program. Additionally, (7) interns were asked to give the most beneficial experience(s)/activities in their field experience, and (8) total internship program and the extent to which each of these aspects were helpful and/or not helpful and why in developing and improving intern leadership skills.

Two survey instruments, "Program Facilitator School Leader Questionnaire" and "Intern School Leader Questionnaire," and telephone interviews with program interns were utilized to address 7 key research questions. Twenty-two managers representing internship programs responded to 42 questions presented in the "Program Facilitator School Leader Questionnaire," and 26 program interns from university field-based and Danforth field-based preparation programs responded to 23 questions presented in the "Intern School Leader Questionnaire." Seventeen of these 26 program interns participated in a phone interview designed to further clarify what was helpful and not helpful in the field experience and other aspects of their program. Interns surveyed by phone were asked to describe the most beneficial experience(s)/activities in their individual field experience and in their total program and to describe what program managers could do to improve the field experience. Interns were also asked the extent to which specific program practices were helpful and/or not helpful and to explain why they were helpful or not helpful in developing and improving their intern leadership skills. What follows is

a summary of the research over time and a summary of the findings for the program managers and interns and conclusions of the study.

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What is the structure of the internship program?
2. What is the method of identifying entry level competencies for planning and goal setting?
3. What are elements of the principal as mentor component?
4. What is the number of days allocated for the school-site/field experience?
5. Does the mentor coach during the field experience?
6. Who evaluates the intern's performance during the school-site/field experience?
7. Is there a job placement component at completion of the program?

Elements of Danforth and university programs - Program managers

A summary of the findings follows.

1. Most Danforth and university internship programs: (1) enroll interns on a part-time basis, (2) utilize cohort groups (students admitted at the same time who go through the program together), and (3) allow students not in the internship program to enroll in internship program classes.
2. More than half of Danforth and university internship programs:
 - (1) require more than one year for the total internship experience,
 - (2) admit between 6-15 students once during the year, (3) grant the Master of Education degree, (4) utilize university faculty, mentors

and practitioners to deliver instruction, and (6) use one-to-one conferences to assist students with problems.

3. More than half of the Danforth and university internship programs use undergraduate academic performance as a criterion for identifying intern entry level competencies.
4. Most Danforth and university internship programs identify mentors through nomination and screening. The nomination process is directed by university program supervisor, school district personnel, and by mentor self-nomination.
5. Most Danforth and university internship programs allocate between 26-90 days for the field experience, and none require interns to spend less than 25 days in the field experience.
6. Most Danforth and university internship programs utilize mentors as coaches during the field experience.
7. Most Danforth and university internship programs utilize the mentor principal to evaluate the intern's performance during the field experience.
8. Most Danforth and university internship programs evaluate the intern's performance during the total program using oral examination, special projects, and class activities.
9. Most Danforth and university internship programs do not provide job placement as a component of the internship program.

Effectiveness of program components - Intern perceptions

Twenty-six interns were asked their perceptions of the level of effectiveness their internship programs had in developing and improving

their leadership skills. The summary below provides selected key findings from the 8 key research questions. Danforth and university interns reported the following:

1. The matching of interns with mentors was effective.
2. The number of days allocated for the field experience and how they were distributed were satisfactory.
3. The actual time (length) spent at the school-site/field experience was satisfactory.
4. The time allocated for mentor coaching was moderately effective.
5. Their performance evaluation during the internship program was conducted effectively.
6. Job placement at completion of the program was moderately effective.
7. The field experience was effective.
8. The total program experience was effective.
9. Danforth internship programs are perceived to be more effective by interns than university internship programs. Two important differences were: (1) Danforth interns rated specific aspects of their internship program experiences an average of 3 points higher than university interns, and (2) Danforth interns reported perceptions of their field experiences and total internship program activities/experiences as effective, while university interns reported perceptions of their field experiences and total internship program activities/experiences as moderately effective.

Helpful and not helpful internship activities and experiences and what program managers can do to improve the field experience: Intern telephone interviews

1. More than half of the Danforth and university interns reported no formal process for matching interns with mentors. Apparently matching interns with mentor for some programs involved only assigning the intern to an approved building principal/mentor.

Helpful: Two of 10 Danforth interns reported the process used for mentor/intern matching was helpful because the superintendent made good decisions about mentor appointments and school district and university collaboration made a difference.

Not helpful: Some university interns indicated that mentor/intern buddy system matching was not helpful and contributed to distinctly varied field experiences. Another intern reported mandatory out-of-district matching was not helpful because in-district experiences were desired.
2. More than half of the Danforth and university interns reported 90-94 days were allocated for their field experience and distributed over one semester.

Helpful: Seven of the 10 Danforth interns reported that when their field experience time was compressed, it made a difference because they were able to see things daily and see how things evolved on a daily basis. They apparently were able to stay more focused.

Not helpful: One university intern reported when only half days were allocated, it was difficult to bring closure to some activities in the school(s), and another university intern reported being

assigned to the school site in which they were presently teaching and being forced to use personal and vacation time for their internship experiences were not helpful to them.

3. More than half of Danforth and university interns reported mentors were always available for coaching, and mentors practiced an "open door" policy, the latter meaning that mentors were available for unscheduled conferences.

Helpful: Four Danforth and 2 university interns reported working with mentors who demonstrated a willingness to spend time was helpful. Two Danforth interns reported working in a closely supervised environment also was helpful.

Not helpful: One intern indicated that experiencing little contact with the mentor deprived her of the full benefit of the mentor's experiences.

4. Most Danforth and university interns reported their class performances were evaluated through class participation, their projects, and presentations given in class.

Helpful: Sixteen of the 17 interns reported that assigning a letter grade worked because it was a practice they were familiar with.

Not helpful: No intern reported any aspect of the process for evaluating their performance in class that was not helpful.

5. More than half of the Danforth and university interns indicated the mentor monitored performance as a means of evaluating their performance during the field experience.

Helpful: Twelve of the 17 interns indicated the evaluation process was beneficial because visitations by their university supervisor, mentor's knowledge of tasks, logging, and collaborative sessions made a difference.

Not helpful: No intern reported any aspect of the evaluation of their performance during the field experience that was not helpful.

6. Most Danforth and university interns reported that job placement was not an aspect of their internship program.

Helpful: Two Danforth interns reported strong networking/cooperation/collaboration between school district mentors and their university supervisor's awareness of job openings made a difference.

7. Slightly less than half of the Danforth and university interns reported their most beneficial activities and/or experiences fit the technical skills area. These included supervision and management staff through placement as an administrator in the school.

Helpful: Two Danforth interns reported things under two areas: technical skills and university faculty and curriculum content as most helpful to them. These included supervision and management of staff and university faculty.

Managers can improve: Two Danforth interns reported managers can improve technical skills area experiences if they want to make the field experiences better. This included appropriating a fund for hiring substitute teachers who are replacements for interns during their field experience. Three university interns reported managers

can make the field experience better by improving curriculum content through training in time management, computers, conflict resolution, and management of community resources.

8. Half of the Danforth and university interns reported their most beneficial activities and/or experiences fit the university faculty and university curriculum content area. These activities and experiences included classes where practitioners taught; i.e., State Secretary of Education, teleconferences when practitioners were unable to be present in the classroom, seminar classes: exploration of leadership, and training in consensus building and classroom evaluation.

Helpful: Some university interns indicated that communication and university faculty and curriculum content were helpful to them. These activities and experiences included conflict resolution training, involvement in school community relations, and acquisition of friends.

Not helpful: One Danforth intern reported lack of job assistance, the mentor matching process, and too little time allocated for the field experience not helpful to them.

Discussion and Recommendations

The need to change principal preparation programs is apparent; however, there are those who are engaged in planning and implementing internship programs to meet the needs of the 21st century. As a result of examining the perceptions and suggestions of program managers and interns,

it has been determined that specific elements comprise an ideal school administrator preparation program. These are presented below.

Program structural elements

1. **Enrollment status:** Students should be allowed to enroll on a part-time or full-time basis. This would allow more who cannot attend full time to participate and also provide them an opportunity to mix with full-time students.
2. **Criteria used for identifying student entry level competencies:** Program managers should use multiple criteria when identifying student entry level competencies. These should include: (1) undergraduate academic performance records, (2) standardized test scores (i.e., GRE or MAT), (3) data obtained from rigorous leaderless groups, and (4) leadership experiences.
3. **Cohort group:** Students who are admitted at the same time should be encouraged through the program together (enroll in the same classes) because cohort interaction broadens relations and provides support. More importantly, retention rate and program success are likely to increase.
4. **Non-cohort students:** Students not in the internship program should be allowed to enroll in program courses. Non-cohort students learn from the involvement/participation and add a different perspective to program activities.
5. **Admissions:** Once-a-year admission of students into the program would make it easier to facilitate the use of a cohort group.

6. **Delivery of instruction:** University program managers should include mentors and practitioners in the delivery of formal classroom instruction. This would provide a practical and effective means of linking theory with practice prior to and during the internship.
7. **Student program problems:** Student conferences should be used to address problems that occur during the internship. This would help the program manager(s) and professors understand the nature of problems and enhance student/professor communication.

Field experience elements

9. **Mentor component:** More than one strategy should be used to identify mentors. These could include self-nomination, nomination by college supervisor, etc. Selection of mentors should be based on: effective/successful leadership, work experience, commitment to internship program, willingness to spend time with interns. Mentors should be properly trained in coaching. This would ensure that the intern experiences would be guided by committed mentors with appropriate expertise.
10. **Number of days allocated for the field experience:** Students should spend approximately 90 days at the school-site/field experience. Time should be blocked all together as much as possible because interns are better able to see things daily, see how things evolve on a daily basis, and able to stay more focused if they have blocks of time instead of intermittent days spread over a long period of time.
11. **Mentor as coach:** Mentors should be encouraged to be coaches and have a proper orientation to the internship program. While the

mentor is the expert in the field, the intern's performance is enhanced when the mentor is available and willing to spend time with them. Leadership skills are developed through regular feedback on performance.

12. **Evaluation of intern performance during the field experience:** This should be conducted by the intern's mentor and university supervisor and include a variety of techniques. These include: (1) review of assigned tasks, (2) logging notes/journal, (3) involvement in required feedback sessions, (4) visits to the school-site/field experience by the university supervisor, and (5) collaboration between mentor and university supervisor. Assignment of letter grade should be used to evaluate performance during the field experience because it is a practice interns are familiar with.
13. **Job placement:** Job assistance/placement occurs naturally when strong networking exists between local school districts and preparation program curriculum content includes topics such as interviewing techniques and resume writing. In the absence of such components, a formal job placement element should be included in the program.

Limitations

The study had the following limitations:

- (1) Small sample size, and
- (2) Telephone interviews were limited to interns. The mentors were not included in the study, and program managers' responses were restricted to the survey instrument.

Recommendations for Further Research

There is more to be learned about internships for administrator preparation programs. Below are three recommendations for further research. A study should be conducted to:

- (1) gather explicit information about what interns really do, and this would be very helpful to those planning and implementing internship experiences,
- (2) follow up on the same interns who participated in the study after three years on the job in school leadership positions, and
- (3) ask specific questions about helpful experiences described in this study.

REFERENCES

- Achilles, C. M. (1987). "Some Mysteries of Administrator Preparation: A Reflective Prospect." National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, Leaders for America's Schools. San Francisco: McCutcheon, 1988.
- Anderson, Mark E. (1988). Hiring Capable Principals: How School Districts Recruit, Groom, and Select the Best Candidates. Volume 31, Number 9. Eugene, Oregon: Oregon School Study Council.
- Beck, John. (June 1987). "Profile of the Principalship. A Study of Principal's Perceptions." (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 289228)
- Bennis, W. (August 1984). "The Four Competencies of Leadership." Training and Development Journal, 38(8), 15-19.
- Bey, Theresa M. and Glickman, Carl D.. (1986). Supervision. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Bickel, W. E. and Artz, N. J. (April, 1984). Improving instruction through focused team supervision. Educational Leadership, 41(7), 22-24. (University Microfilm No. EJ 299 429)
- "The Bulletin of the National Network for Innovative Preparation." (1990). Exchange, volume 2, no. 1, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa.
- Callahan, R. E. and Button, H. W. (1964). Historical change in the role of the man in the organization, 1865-1950. In National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, Leaders for America's Schools. San Francisco, CA: McCutcheon, 1988.
- The Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Cooper, Bruce S. and Boyd, William L. (1988). The Evolution of Training for School Administrators. In National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, Leaders for America's Schools. San Francisco, CA: McCutcheon, 1988.
- Daresh, John C. (February 1987). "The Practicum in Preparing Educational Administrators: A Status Report." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Boston, Massachusetts.

- Daresh, John C. (1988). "Learning at Nellie's Elbow: Will It Truly Improve the Preparation of Educational Administration?" *Planning and Changing*, 19(3), 178-87.
- Daresh, John C. and Playko, Marsha A. (1989). "The Administrative Entry Year Program in Ohio: A Resource Guide." Project paper of the Ohio Lead Center, Westerville, Ohio.
- Dillman, D. A. (1978). *Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method*. New York: Wiley.
- Duke, Daniel. (1988). "Thoughts on the Preparation of Principals." University of Virginia Press.
- Duke, D. and Stiggins, R. (1985). Evaluating the performance of principals: A descriptive story. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 21(4), 71-90.
- Edmonds, Ronald R. (1981). "A Report on the Research Project: 'Search for Effective Schools and Criteria of the Designs for School Improvement' that are associated with the project." East Lansing, MI: College of Education Michigan State University. Unpublished Report prepared for National Institute of Education.
- The Florida Council on Educational Management. (1989). *Guidelines for the Approval of University Educational Leadership Programs*. Tallahassee, Florida: Author.
- Glickman, Carl D. (1988). "Supervision and the Rhetoric of Empowerment; Silence or Collision." *Action in Teacher Education*. Unpublished paper.
- Goodlad, John I. (January 1989). "School-University Collaboration Is a Symbiotic Relationship Feasible?" Paper presented at the Florida Council on Educational Management meeting, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators*. (1982). American Association of School Administrators. Sacramento: Educators News Service.
- Hall, Robert and Lutz, Keith. (1989). "Clinical Field Experience in Educational Administration: A Regional Survey." Macob, IL: Western Illinois University.
- Hodgkinson, Harold L., the Exxon Education Foundation and others. (May 1986). "Today's Numbers, Tomorrow's Nation: Demography's Awesome Challenge for Schools." *Education Week*, pp. 2-3.

- Holmes, Roger L. (undated) "University Curriculum Development and Delivery Systems." Cleveland State University, Cleveland, OH. Unpublished manuscript.
- Hoy, Wayne K. and Miskel, Cecil G. (1978, 1982). Educational Administration Theory, Research, and Practice (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Random House, Inc.
- Hunter, Madeline and Russell, Doug. (undated) Mastering Coaching and Supervision. El Segundo: TIP Publications.
- Kaplan, George. (1989). Who runs our schools? The Changing Face of Educational Leadership. Washington, D.C.: The Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Knezevich, Stephen J. (1984). Administration of Public Education: A Sourcebook for the Leadership and Management of Educational Institutions (4th ed.). New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Lyman, Lawrence. (May 1988). "The Principal: Responsive Leadership in Times of Change." Paper presented at 1988 Annual Convention United School Administrators of Kansas. Wichita, Kansas.
- Manasse, A. Lorri. (1983). Improving Conditions for Principal Effectiveness: Policy Implications of Research on Effective Principals. Washington, D.C.: Dingle.
- Merriam, Sharan B. (1988). Case Study in Education. A Qualitative Approach. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Boss Inc.
- Monahan, William G. and Hengst, Herbert R. (1982). Contemporary Educational Administration. New York, NY: MacMillan Publishing.
- Morris, Van Cleve, Crowson, Robert L. and others. (1984). Principals in Action: The Reality of Managing School. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.
- National Association of Elementary School Principals. (1990): Principals for 21st Century Schools. Alexandria, Virginia: Author.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. (1985). Performance-Based Preparation of Principals: A Framework for Improvement. Reston, VA: Author.
- National Commission for the Principalship. (1990). Principals for our Changing Schools: Preparation and Certification. Fairfax, VA: Balmar Printing & Graphic.
- National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. (1987). Leaders for America's Schools. San Francisco, CA: McCutcheon.

- Pellicer, Leonard, Stevenson, Kenneth R., and Surratt, Thomas A. (1985). "Go It First, Then Talk About It: A Principalship Practicum." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 65, 6, February.
- Peper, John B. (1988). *Clinical Education for School Superintendents and Principals: The Missing Link*. In National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, *Leaders for America's Schools*. San Francisco, CA: McCutcheon.
- Peterson, Kent. (1987). "Principals, superintendents and the administration art." In National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, *Leaders for America's Schools*. San Francisco, CA: McCutcheon.
- Pitner, Nancy J. (1988). *School Administrator Preparation: State of the Art*. In National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, *Leaders for America's Schools*. San Francisco, CA: McCutcheon.
- Plisko, Valeno White. (1984). "Trends in Schooling." *Principal*, 64(1), 59-63.
- "Principal Preparation Program: The University of Oklahoma Recruitment Brochure." (1989). University of Oklahoma Educational Leadership Department, Norman, OK.
- Robbins, R. Stephen. (1988). *Management (2nd ed.)*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- "Searching for the Right Reforms." (1989). A Report on the Danforth Program for Professors of School Administration, April 1989.
- Smith, Wilma and Andrews, Richard L. (1989). "Foreword," by Patricia L. Conran. *Instructional Leader: How Principals Make a Difference*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Reston, Va.
- Snyder, Karolyn J. and Anderson, Robert H. (1986). *Managing Productive Schools: Toward an Ecology*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press, Inc.
- SPSSx Inc. (1984). *Marketing Department: SPSS-X Basics*. Chicago, IL: SPSS, Inc.
- Sweeney, Jim. (1988). *Tips for Improving School Climate*. American Association of School Administrators. Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.
- Thompson, David C. (1988). "A Working Partnership: Training Administrators in a Cooperative Field-Based Model." *Educational Considerations*, 15, 3.

- Thomson, Scott D. (1988, February). "The Certification of Principals: Recommendations to the New Jersey State Board of Education." Reston: National Association of Secondary Principals.
- Wasden, Del. (1989). "Preparing Principals: New Directions." Educational Considerations, 16(2), 26-29.
- Wiesner, Glenn R. (1989, August). School-Based Management: Annual Report. St. Louis, MO: St. Louis Public Schools.
- Wiles, Jon and Bondi, Joseph. (1986). Supervision: A Guide to Practice (2nd ed.). Columbus: Merrill Publishing Company.

Interviews

- Daresh, John. Expert on administrator internships. Telephone interview - Feb. 2, 1990. University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colorado.
- Grosso, Don. Seminar presentation: Danforth program. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1990.
- Hersey, Paul. Seminar presentation: Danforth program. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1990.
- Kniker, Charles R. Telephone interview. Asst. Dean and Researcher. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1990.
- Mitchell, Jacqueline. Danforth program facilitator. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 1989-90.
- Muse, Ivan. Telephone interview - Danforth Preparation Program Manager, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, December 1989.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. James Sweeney and Dr. Jacqueline Mitchell for their support, guidance, assistance, and encouragement. Specifically, my thanks go to Dr. George Jackson for my assistantship. Sincere gratitude is also extended to Brenda, Irene, Linda F., Vera, Tim, Beth, and Linda M. I would like to thank Professional Studies secretaries, Kris, Marjorie, Jamie, and my typist Carolyn Taylor.

Special thanks are directed to my parents Dolveal and Ora Lee Jefferson, and to my sisters and brother: Vicki, Elaine, and Delester. Thanks go to my many church supporters and adopted Iowa families: the Johnsons, Baileys, and Hunts.

I am thankful for family values and Christian principles that sustained me as I conducted this study.

APPENDIX A. SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

May 18, 1990

Dear Educational Internship Facilitator:

The Department of Professional Studies, Educational Administration is conducting a study designed to examine internships that prepare principals and other school leaders. You have been selected to participate in this study because you are the manager of a university based internship program. We are seeking your assistance in identifying components/ dimensions of your internship program.

In order to gain a broader perception of your program, we need you to identify three interns who have completed your program. Please place those names on the bottom portion of this letter. If your program is so recent that interns have not completed the internship, please send the names of those interns near completion.

Thank you for participating in the study. If you would like a summary of the study, please provide your name and address.

Sincerely,

Pearl L. Jefferson
Graduate student
N227 Lagomarcino
Ames, Iowa 50013
(515) 294-2549

Jacqueline K. Mitchell
Assistant Professor
N229 Lagomarcino
Ames, Iowa 50011
515) 294-5450

[Interns who have completed (or are near completion of) your program.]

NAME: _____ ADDRESS: _____

CITY: _____ STATE: _____ ZIP: _____

NAME: _____ ADDRESS: _____

CITY: _____ STATE: _____ ZIP: _____

NAME: _____ ADDRESS: _____

CITY: _____ STATE: _____ ZIP: _____

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

This survey will cover eight major areas that help to describe the nature of your the internship program.

Program Components:

- Length of time and structure (arrangement) of total internship program
- Process for intern recruitment, selection, screening
- Process of assessing knowledge of intern for goal setting and planning
- Process for mentor principal selection and training
- Field activities guidelines/activities
- Process for monitoring/feedback /coaching
- Process for evaluation - formative and summative
- Job placement at completion of program

FIRST, we would like information about you and your program participants.

1. The program manager(s) gender:
(if more than one manager/supervisor indicate the number in front of the category)
 Male
 Female
2. The ethnicity of the program manager/district supervisor:
 American Indian
 Asian
 Africian-American
 Caucasian
 Hispanic
 other
 if other, please describe _____
3. Place a number in front of the categories below describing interns currently enrolled in your program:
 - a. Gender :
 Male
 Female
 - b. Ethnicity :
 American Indian
 Asian
 African-American
 Caucasian
 Hispanic
 other
 if other, please describe _____

DIRECTIONS: Please indicate which of the following components / dimensions are a part of your internship program by marking or filling in the appropriate blank.

4. How is your program classified?

- Danforth
 University/school district
 School district

5. How did your field-based internship program originate? (Check all that apply)

- state law
 university
 school district
 university/school district program
 Danforth program
 other

if other, please describe _____

6. How long is the total internship program experience?

- one semester
 one year
 18 months
 19-24 months
 more than 2 years
 other

if other, please describe _____

7. To participate in internship program the intern is : (Check all that apply)

- self-selected
 selected by university
 selected by school district
 selected by both university and school district
 other

if other, please describe _____

8. Indicate which of the following is a prerequisite for being accepted into the program as an intern: (Check all that apply)

- completion of post graduate coursework
 academic performance
 performance on GRE
 performance on MAT
 other

if other, please describe _____

9. Admittance into internship program is offered:
 each semester
 once per year
 other
 if other, please describe _____
-
10. Number of participants admitted at the beginning of each internship program:
 (semester, per year)
 1-5
 6-15
 16-20
 21-25
 more than 25
11. Interns participate in the program as: (Check all that apply)
 full-time students
 part-time students
 practitioner
 other
 if other, please describe _____
-
12. Interns who are enrolled: (Check all that apply)
 do not receive any financial compensation (are given release time from their district)
 receive full-salary from the district where they are working
 receive half-salary from the district where they are working
 receive administrator/ intern salary at the site
 receive reduced tuition
 receive a stipend
 other
 if other, please describe _____
-
13. Interns can earn :
 Master of Education
 Educational Specialist
 no degree or certificate
 other
 if other, please describe _____
-
14. Is certification granted upon completion of the program?
 yes
 no

15. If yes, which certification is granted:
 Principal
 Supervisor
 other
 if other, please describe _____
-
16. Is there intern orientation?
 yes
 no
 if yes, when is it conducted:
 during the summer
 at the time of admissions
 no orientation
 other
 if other, please describe _____
-
17. Who conducts the intern orientation? (Check all the apply)
 no orientation
 university faculty
 mentor principal/supervisor
 practitioner/other administrators
18. Do interns enter and move through the internship as a group (cohort group)?
 yes
 no
19. Do participants receive formal instruction through classes, seminars, and/or workshops?
 yes
 no
20. How many hours per week do interns spend receiving formal instruction ?
 no formal instruction
 2 hours or less per week
 3-10 hours per week
 11-20 hours per week
 21-30 hours per week
 31-40 hours per week
21. Attendance in classes, seminars, workshops is restricted to the cohort group:
 yes
 no
22. Who delivers instruction/theory?
 no formal instruction
 university
 mentor principal/supervisor
 practitioner/other administrator
 other
 if other, please describe _____
-

23. What is the prerequisite for beginning the field/school site experience?
(Check all that apply)
- completion of post graduate coursework
- academic performance
- performance on standardized tests
- other
- if other, please describe _____
-
24. The site of the field experience is determined by:
(Check all that apply)
- the intern
- university
- school district supervisor
- joint decision of university and school district supervisor
- joint intern and university and/or school district supervisor
- other
- if other, please describe _____
-
25. The field experience may occur at: (Check all that apply)
- a site outside of the district where the intern is employed
- a site other than where the intern is employed but within the district
- the site where intern is employed
- multiple sites
- the intern's preference
26. During the field experience how many days are spent at a school site?
- less than 25 days
- 26- 50 days
- 51-75 days
- 76-90 days
- 90 days or more
27. During the field experience how many hours per week are spent at a school site?
- 4-10 hours per week
- 11-20 hours per week
- 21-30 hours per week
- 31-40 hours per week
- other
- if other, please describe _____
-

28. The total number of days spent at the school site are?

_____ consecutive days

_____ blocks of days

_____ disbursed throughout the semester/year

_____ other

if other, please describe _____

29. Of the total number of days spent at the school site approximately what proportion of the time is devoted to the following activities:

[a + b + c + d + e = 100%]

a. Observing task(s) :

_____ none

_____ 5-10%

_____ 11-25%

_____ 26-50%

_____ 51-75%

_____ 76-100%

b. Performing assigned task(s):

_____ none

_____ 5-10%

_____ 11-25%

_____ 26-50%

_____ 51-75%

_____ 76-100%

c. Discussing with mentor/supervisor:

_____ none

_____ 5-10%

_____ 11-25%

_____ 26-50%

_____ 51-75%

_____ 76-100%

d. Being coached by mentor/supervisor:

_____ none

_____ 5-10%

_____ 11-25%

_____ 26-50%

_____ 51-75%

_____ 76-100%

e. Receiving feedback:

_____ none

_____ 5-10%

_____ 11-25%

_____ 26-50%

_____ 51-75%

_____ 76-100%

30. Of the total number of days selected in # 26 how many of those days might the intern be removed from his/her assigned duties to receive instruction (theory, work assignment, coaching, etc.) ?

less than 25 days
 25-49 days
 50-74 days
 75-89 days
 90 days or more
 none
 other

if other, please describe _____

31. Do you utilize mentor/supervisor to coach intern during the field experience?

yes
 no

if no, skip questions 32-36

32. To participate as a mentor principal in the internship one must be:
(Check all the apply)

self-selected
 nominated
 recruited
 assigned
 intern selected
 other

if other, please describe _____

33. Do you have a mentor screening process?

yes
 no

34. Do you have mentor training?

yes
 no

if yes, how long is mentor training? _____

35. How are mentors matched with interns?

assigned by university/district
 assessment of intern
 intern preference
 mentor preference
 other

if other, please describe _____

36. Other than the field experience participants are enrolled/engaged in:
 (Check all that apply)
 no other required activity
 course(s) outside of the internship program
 seminars within the program
 school district administrative meeting(s)
 university activities that are related to school leadership
 other
 if other, please describe _____
-
37. Who evaluates the field experience? (Check all that apply)
 university faculty
 on-site supervisor
 mentor principal
 practitioner/other administrators
 intern
 all of the above
 other
 if other, please describe _____
-
38. Who evaluates the interns total internship program experience?
 university faculty
 on-site supervisor/mentor principal
 practitioner/other administrator
 intern (self evaluation)
 all of the above
 other
 if other, please explain _____
-
39. What is considered when evaluating interns at the end of the total experience?
 written examination
 oral examination
 special projects
 field experience
 class activities
 all of the above
 other
 if other, please describe _____
-

40. When evaluating intern and reporting grades which of the following do you do? (Check all that apply)
- assign grades
 - give a written narrative
 - conduct exit interview
 - conference
 - other
- if other, please describe _____
41. What mechanisms are available for correcting problems that occur? (e.g. mismatch with mentor, selection rejection, grades, etc.)
- conference with supervisor/mentor/advisory member
 - formal appeal process
 - other
- if other, please describe _____
42. Is job placement a component of the program?
- yes
 - no

If given a chance to change one thing about your program what would you suggest? _____

We appreciate that you took time to answer this prepaid postage survey.

Please tape questionnaire closed before mailing.

Call (515) 294-5450 if any questions arise.

APPENDIX B. LIST OF DANFORTH, UNIVERSITY, AND SCHOOL DISTRICT PROGRAMS

Table B.1. Mailing list for Danforth Administrative Internship Program sample

Population program 01	Population size N=16
Danforth	
Cycle I - 1987	
Ohio State University	1
University of Alabama	1
Cycle II - 1988	
University of Houston	1
Indiana University	1
University of Massachusetts at Amherst	1
University of Oklahoma	1
University of Washington	1
Cycle III - 1989	
Brigham Young	1
East Tennessee State	1
San Diego State University	1
University of Tennessee-Knoxville	1
University of Virginia	1
Cycle IV - 1990-91	
University of Connecticut	1
University of New Mexico	1
Virginia Tech	1
Western Kentucky University	1
TOTAL N = 16	

(Originally there were 18 Danforth Principal preparation programs; Cleveland State and Georgia State Universities both were Cycle I projects, but no longer have operable Danforth programs.)

Table B.2. Mailing list for University Administrative Internship Program sample

Population program 02	Population size N=25
University/School District	
Arizona State University	1
Boston University	1
Fordham University - Lincoln Center	1
Hafstra University	1
Kansas State University	1
Louisiana State University	1
Northern Illinois University	1
Pennsylvania State University	1
Rider College	1
St. Bonaventure University	1
State University of New York - Albany	1
Temple University	1
Texas A&M University	1
The University of Texas at Austin	1
University of Alberta	1
University of Cincinnati (dropped)	1
University of Florida	1
University of Maryland-College Park	1
University of Missouri-Columbia	1
University of Northern Colorado	1
University of Pittsburgh	1
University of Toledo	1
University of Utah	1
University of Wisconsin-Madison	1
Wayne State College	<u>1</u>
TOTAL N = 25	

Table B.3. Mailing list for School District Administrative Internship
Program sample

Population program 03	Population size N=25
School District	
Allentown City Schools	1
Chatham County	1
City of Chicago	1
Dade County	1
Dallas Independent	1
East Baton Rouge Parish	1
Edmonds	1
Granite	1
Littleton 6	1
Minneapolis Special School District	1
Milwaukee	1
Montgomery County	1
New York City Schools	1
Omaha Public	1
Parkway	1
Paterson	1
Portland School IJ	1
Prince William County Public	1
Putman City	1
Renton	1
Robbinsdale	1
Rochester (MD)	1
Sarasota County	1
St. Louis City	1
Wichita Public	<u>1</u>
TOTAL N = 25	

APPENDIX C. CORRESPONDENCE

April 10, 1992

Dear Colleague,

Two years ago you were asked to participate in a study designed to determine the extent to which you believe specific aspects of your internship principal preparation program were effective in improving and developing your leadership skills.

We have analyzed the data and would like additional information related to specific aspects of your program. Your input will add important data that will contribute to the development of principal preparation programs and future school leaders. Your response will be kept confidential, however, we have agreed to share a summary of findings with preparation programs.

We hope that you will agree to participate. If you agree, I will contact you for a short phone interview or make arrangements for a more appropriate time. Prior to the call you will receive some select interview questions.

Pearl L. Jefferson
Graduate Student
Educational Administration
Iowa State University

Post Card

_____ I am willing to provide more information for your study.

_____ I would like a summary of findings from the study.

Name:

Phone:

Dear Colleague,

A month ago you were asked to participate in an Iowa State University follow-up study designed to determine the extent to which you believe specific aspects of your internship principal preparation program were effective in improving and developing your leadership skills. I have not received your post card indicating that you are willing to provide more specific information.

Your input is important and will add important data that will contribute to the development of principal preparation programs and future school leaders.

We hope that you will agree to participate. If you agree, I will contact you for a short phone interview or make arrangements for a more appropriate time. Prior to the call you will receive some select interview questions.

Thanking you in advance,

**Pearl L. Jefferson
Graduate Student
Educational Administration
Iowa State University**

Dear Colleague,

Thank you so much for agreeing to participate in the Iowa State study designed to examine practices of school administrator internship programs. It should really help those who wish help developing preparation programs. Below is an explanation of what I will be asking during the phone interview. Additional questions will be asked depending on your responses. The interview will take approximately 15-20 minutes.

Interview Questions

I have some idea as to the extent to which each of the following aspects were effective in developing your leadership skills but do not know why. Additionally, I would like to know what was the most important experience in your field experience and why you rate your total internship experience high or low. In other words, I am trying to learn what worked and did not work in these aspects and why.

- (1) Assessment of intern entry level competencies for the purpose of internship planning and goal setting
- (2) Matching interns with mentors (how effective was it?)

Time Aspect (items #3-6):

- (3) Scheduled time for the school-site/field experience
- (4) Actual time (length) spent at the school site
- (5) Coaching by mentors (allocated time)
- (6) Time spent receiving feedback from mentor/supervisor
- (7) Evaluation of intern class performance and field experience performance
- (8) Job placement at completion of the program
- (9) Overall school-site/field experience rating
- (10) Overall total internship program experience rating

I will be contacting you soon and arrangements can be made for a more appropriate interview time.

Thank you again.

Pearl L. Jefferson
 Graduate Student
 Educational Administration