

**Kansas Public School Principal Induction Practices and New Elementary
Principals' Perceptions of Satisfaction and Preparation**

Earl A. Martin
B.A., Harding University, 1968
M.Ed., Rutgers University, 1971

Submitted to the Graduate Department and Faculty
of the School of Education of Baker University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

Doctor of Education
in
Educational Leadership

August 26, 2016

Copyright 2016 by Earl A. Martin

Dissertation Committee

Tes Mehring Ph.D., Major Advisor

Jim Robins Ed.D.

Ann Addison Ph.D.

Abstract

It was the intent of this study to investigate the induction practices for new elementary school principals in Kansas. The research purposes for this study were: to determine to what extent public school districts in Kansas offer formal induction plans to new elementary principals and to identify the types of induction experiences offered; to examine Kansas elementary principals' perceptions of satisfaction and preparation as a result of their induction experiences; and to determine if there are differences in perceptions from principals of large, medium, and small sized school districts.

Eight research questions were used to guide this quantitative study, and five hypotheses were tested using Chi-square tests of independence. Surveys were sent to Kansas school district superintendents and to new elementary school principals to collect data. This study found that few Kansas elementary principals participated in a formal induction program. While new elementary principals were generally satisfied with induction components provided to them, a majority of new elementary principals did not feel well prepared for the principalship. There was not a significant relationship between the size of a school district and the availability of a formal induction plan or the level of principal satisfaction with the induction process. A significant relationship was found to exist between the size of the school district and new elementary principals' perceptions of preparation. New elementary principals from smaller school districts felt less prepared for the principalship than their counterparts in larger districts. This research supports the premise that school districts need to be more intentional in the implementation of leadership development practices to effectively prepare school leaders for their important roles.

Dedication

This work is dedicated to my wife, Pam, who has been so supportive through the craziness of my working on a doctorate at an age when I should have been buying a rocking chair. Pam, you believed in me when I didn't believe in myself; you are my encourager, my partner, my best friend. Thank you. I also acknowledge my adult "kids," Joel, Sarah, and Jeremy, who offered encouragement and understanding, sparing me your incredulity at this delayed endeavor. Traci and Cali, I appreciated your encouragement as well. And to my grandkids—PJ and Lucy—thanks for the love and laughs. You keep me young.

I also want to dedicate this work to my friends and colleagues from my days at Countryside Elementary School. The years that we worked together (1988-2000) still leave a mark on me. They were incredible years of doing good things for kids, working hard, and enjoying each other's company in a community of learners that forged so much of my growth as an educator. Our camaraderie still endures. We seemed to have done something rare.

Finally, I would say, "To God be the glory." You are my rock, my shield, my fortress – you sustain me.

Acknowledgements

It may seem odd to complete a doctorate toward the end of one's career, but I did it for myself. I have had a fulfilling career—as teacher, principal, district director, university instructor—so, for me, completing a doctorate is a fitting acknowledgement of a commitment to life-long learning. I like Alan Greenspan's quote: "Because I'm retired, am I supposed to stop thinking?"

I owe a debt of gratitude to so many. To Dr. Mehring and Dr. Messner: Your guidance in completing this project was invaluable. One-more-revision was not always at the top of my "want to" list, but your thoroughness led to a final product I feel proud of. Yes, you kept encouraging me and telling me that there was a light at the end of the tunnel. Dr. Phil: Thank you for your amazing assistance with the surveys and the analyses. And thank you for allowing me to push back at times. To Dr. Ann Addison and Dr. Jim Robins: Thank you for your assistance on the committee.

There are many in the Olathe School District and at ESU who have influenced my journey as an educator. To Dr. Banikowski: I learned much from you about instructional leadership and the importance of doing everything *for the kids*. You have influenced much of who I am as a leader. Thank you.

John Donne reminded us that "no man is an island, entire of itself." Any small thing that I may have accomplished is a testimony to the contributions of many others in my life. I am fortunate to have received so much from so many.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vi
List of Tables	x
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Background	2
Statement of the Problem	4
Purpose of the Study	6
Significance of the Study	7
Research Questions	8
Delimitations	10
Assumptions	10
Definition of Terms	11
Overview of the Methods of the Study	12
Organization of the Study	13
Chapter Two: Review of the Literature	15
The Changing Role of the School Principal	15
Challenges of a New Principal	19
Task overload	19
Isolation	19

Becoming boss	20
Culturalization.....	21
Technical skills	21
Need for Induction	23
Effectiveness	24
Retention	25
Satisfaction	25
Characteristics of Effective New Principal Induction	26
New Principal Mentoring	28
Phases of Mentoring	29
Characteristics of Effective Mentoring Programs	31
Mentor Selection and Training	32
Benefits of Principal Mentoring	34
Mentoring Versus Coaching.....	35
Components of Principal Induction	36
Summary	37
Chapter Three: Methods	39
Research Design.....	40
Population and Sample	40
Sampling Procedures	41
Instrumentation	41
Measurement	42
Validity and reliability	43

Data Collection Procedures	44
Data Analysis and Hypothesis Testing	45
Limitations	49
Summary	50
Chapter Four: Results	51
Descriptive Statistics	51
School District Survey	51
New Principal Survey	54
Summary Responses	56
Hypothesis Testing	60
Summary	66
Chapter Five: Interpretation and Recommendations	68
Study Summary	68
Overview of the problem	68
Purpose statement and research questions	69
Review of the methodology	70
Major Findings.....	71
Findings Related to the Literature.....	74
Availability of formal induction plans	74
Principal satisfaction with induction	75
Availability of mentoring	76
Influence of district size	76

Preparation	77
Conclusions.....	78
Implications for action	78
Recommendations for future research	79
Concluding remarks	80
References	81
Appendix(ces).....	90
Appendix A. School District Survey	91
Appendix B. New Principal Survey	94
Appendix C. Institutional Review Board (IRB) Application	101
Appendix D. Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approval.....	106
Appendix E. Summary Data for School District Survey.....	108
Appendix E. Summary Data for New Principal Survey.....	111

List of Tables

Table 1. Intersection of Research Questions with School District Survey Items48

Table 2. Intersection of Research Questions with New Principal Survey Items49

Table 3. SDS Responses for Availability of a Formally Planned Elementary Principal Induction Program (RQ1)52

Table 4. SDS Affirmative Responses for Each New Elementary Principal Induction Component53

Table 5. Frequency of Other Induction Component Responses from School District Survey54

Table 6. Comparing Principal Responses with District Responses57

Table 7. Percent Agreement of School District Survey Results with Principal Survey Results58

Table 8. New Principal Survey: Percentage of Responses for Each Principal Induction Component Indicating Percentage of Satisfaction Level for Each Component60

Table 9. Comparisons of Availability of Formal Principal Induction Process with Level of Principal Satisfaction62

Table 10. Comparisons of Availability of Formal Principal Induction Process with Level of Principal Preparation63

Table 11. Comparisons of District Size with Availability of a Formal Principal Induction Process64

Table 12. Percentages and Frequencies of Comparisons of District Size with Principal Level of Satisfaction with Overall Induction Process65

Table 13. Percentages and Frequencies of Comparisons of District Size with Principal Perceptions of Preparation from Overall Induction Process.....66

Chapter One

Introduction

Leadership matters. There is evidence to suggest that leadership makes a difference in virtually every area of human endeavor—from business to sports to school organizations (Maxwell, 2008). In his well-known research on great businesses that outperformed comparison companies by superior stock returns over the course of time, Collins (2001) confessed that the original intent of his study was to ignore the role of leadership in identifying what characteristics set the high performing companies apart. However his research led him to conclude that “all the good-to-great companies had Level 5 leadership at the time of transition,” and “furthermore, the absence of Level 5 Leadership showed up as a consistent pattern in the comparison companies” (p. 22). Collins defined Level 5 Leadership as “a paradoxical blend of personal humility and professional will” (p. 20). Rather than celebrity leaders with big egos, Collins found that Level 5 leaders focused intently on the success of the business without regard for who gets the credit, and they took care to plan for their successors.

Those who look at the importance of leadership in the sports arena need look no further than the Kansas State University football program. According to sports writer, Mellinger (2012), Coach Bill Snyder rescued K-State football from oblivion—twice. Mellinger stated that Snyder turned “K-State football from a big joke to big business,” (n.p.) by guiding the K-State football program from perennial losses to national recognition. The record speaks for itself; sports leadership makes a difference.

Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) and Marzano and Waters (2009) cited research that validated the significant difference that leadership makes in the field of

education. In their meta-analysis of school leadership research, the authors stated that “an effective principal is thought to be a necessary precondition for an effective school” (p. 5). Noting that relatively little research had been done on the impact of school leadership on student learning until recently, Marzano et al. (2005) concluded that the correlation between school leadership and student academic achievement is significant. A U.S. Senate Committee Report stated “In many ways, the school principal is the most important and influential individual in any school” (Marzano, et al., 2005, p. 5).

If leadership is important in business, sports, education, and other areas, then it is important to determine how leadership evolves. This study focused on the importance of educational leadership in meeting the demands of the twenty-first century and investigated what programs are available to prepare new elementary school principals in Kansas.

Background

Given the earlier neglect of attention toward school leadership preparation (Marzano, et al., 2005), many states now mandate preparation experiences for new school leaders. More than half of the states require induction and/or mentoring requirements for new school administrators (Wallace Foundation, 2007). The state of Kansas began requiring new principals to complete a full year of internship in order to become fully licensed in July 2008 (KSDE.org). During their first year after obtaining the Initial School Leadership License, new Kansas principals must complete a District Administered Mentoring Program. The mentoring requirement was initially required to be administered through a university program, but the university link has been

eliminated. School districts must confirm that principals have participated in a mentoring program, but there are no formal requirements for the mentoring.

In 2009-2010, the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) initiated a pilot program to investigate the potential of three principal training programs to provide guidance for school districts in implementing quality principal induction and mentoring programs (Scrivner, personal communication, 2009). The principal training programs piloted included: the New York/Missouri model, the Santa Cruz model, and the Southern Regional Education Board model. Training was provided in each model for a small cohort of selected principals in the state during the 2009-2010 school year.

During the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years, the Santa Cruz principal training model was selected for further consideration and another small cohort of selected principals were trained in the model. Named the “Kansas Network of School Leadership Coaches,” selected participants were assigned to coach a new principal for two years, using the Blended Coaching model facilitated by instructors from the Santa Cruz New Teacher Center. Participating new principals were asked to respond to a questionnaire about their mentoring experiences, but the results were not formally shared. Due to state budget shortfalls, the principal training pilot programs were discontinued after the 2011-2012 school year.

In 2011, the Kansas Educational Leadership Institute (KELI) was established at Kansas State University in partnership with the Kansas State Department of Education and other state professional organizations to promote professional growth for educational leaders in the state. An intended outcome was to facilitate “the move from initial to professional leader endorsement” (Augustine-Shaw, 2011) by creating

mentoring/induction support for new school superintendents and school principals. Through KELI, mentoring was first available to new superintendents, then available to new principals during the 2013-14 school year-with 19 new principals participating. KELI selects, trains, and pays the mentors a small stipend. The KELI mentoring model involves monthly face-to-face visits with a defined checklist of activities and regional cohort meetings. Each school district participating in KELI is required to pay \$500, with KSDE providing an additional \$250 in support.

Statement of the Problem

The problem under study is the limited availability and quality of school leadership preparation practices. In this age of increased accountability, the job of the school principal is more complex and challenging than ever before. Good schools require good leaders, but the process of preparing and training effective leaders is often haphazard and unplanned (Wallace, 2007). In a 2003 report, the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) stated, “The fact is, principals have traditionally been thrown into their jobs without a lifejacket, and they are expected to sink or swim” (p. 8). In his review of principal induction programs, Lashway (2003) concluded that new principals get very little direction or help from their school districts because they are presumed, as recognized leaders, to be already prepared for the job. The Wallace Foundation (2007), in studying the importance of new principal mentoring, concluded that most existing new principal mentoring programs are inadequately implemented to effectively prepare new principals for their new leadership roles. Watkins (2003) stated, “Given the stakes, it is surprising how little good guidance is available to new leaders” (p.4).

To meet the increasing demands of their role and to successfully lead schools to meet the expectations of the twenty-first century, school leaders need to be more than adequately prepared for the job. They need to be able to assume their leadership role with the knowledge, attitudes, and skills to encourage collegiality, build a team, run meetings, evaluate teachers, work with parents, supervise projects, and focus on diversity (Hoerr, 2005). Given the challenges of the role, it is important to determine what leadership preparation strategies and activities need to be in place to ensure success for new school principals.

Classroom teacher quality has long been identified as the most important correlate related to student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2000). In tandem, the importance of new teacher induction and in preparing effective teacher performance has also been well documented in research over time (Lyons, 1992; Weiss & Weiss, 1999). But the relationship between the role of school and district leaders and student and school success has only recently been studied (Marzano et al., 2005). It may be a common assumption that there is an effective leader behind every effective organization, but the school principal's direct impact on student success has often been overlooked (Daresh, 2001). However, according to Leithwood and Day (2008), it is now widely recognized that "school leadership is 2nd only to classroom instruction as an influence on pupil learning" (p. 2). Given that reality, effective leadership preparation and induction programs are critically important.

The importance and impact of school leadership are clear and demonstrable (Marzano, et al., 2005); however, there is a lack of consensus about what constitutes an effective model of new school leadership training and preparation (Bloom et al., 2003). In

view of the belief that “specific preparation makes a difference to the quality of school leadership” (Bush, 2009, p. 377), it is important to identify those components of leadership preparation that will effectively prepare aspiring school leaders for the rigors of the principalship.

Purpose of the Study

The research purposes of this quantitative study were: (a) to determine to what extent public school districts in Kansas offer formal induction plans to first year elementary principals; (b) to identify and quantify the types of induction experiences offered to first year elementary principals in Kansas; (c) to examine the satisfaction level of first year Kansas elementary principals with their induction experiences; (d) to determine if there are differences in satisfaction with induction experiences from first year elementary Kansas elementary principals in large, medium, and small sized school districts; and (e) to determine if there are differences in perceptions of preparation from first year Kansas elementary principals in large, medium, or small sized school districts.

While many Kansas school districts have implemented new principal induction programs, it is not clear if there is a consensus of best practices in the state. The National Association of Elementary School Principals (2003) cited a 1998 research survey indicating that fewer than half of new principals throughout the country participated in a formally planned induction or mentoring program. Lyons (1992) stated that a comprehensive induction program is critical to developing effective school leadership performance. It was the purpose of this research to determine the current availability of formal induction programs in Kansas and to identify the components of induction available to new elementary principals.

It was also a purpose of this study to examine the relationship between induction components and the new principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of these components. Studies have investigated the relationship between new principal induction/mentoring and job satisfaction and/or job retention (Aycock, 2006; Correll, 2010; Jackson, 2010), but there have been relatively few studies investigating the relationship between the new principal induction components provided and the principal's level of satisfaction with the induction process itself.

Additionally, a purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between the size of the school district and the availability of formal induction opportunities and principals' perceptions of satisfaction with induction. The conclusion of some studies is that smaller districts have difficulty providing robust induction programs because of the challenges of geography (Aiken, 2001; Chadwick & Howley, 2002; Elsberry & Bishop, 1993). This study investigated the relationship between school district size and induction programs.

Significance of the Study

One contribution of this study is a clearer understanding of current school leadership induction practices. This study benchmarks what progress has been made toward the development of effective induction and mentoring programs for new principals in Kansas, with a focus on elementary principals. Aycock (2006) studied induction and mentoring processes for new principals in the state of Kansas during the 2000-2005 school years and concluded that there were very few formalized induction processes in place. One of the recommendations of her study was that formal induction

structures needed to be developed and implemented by school districts and professional organizations. This study documented the progress made in this direction.

Another significance of this study is the identification of induction components currently in place in Kansas school districts and, importantly, principal perceptions of the effectiveness of their induction experiences. While there has been some research on principals' satisfaction with induction practices (Hudson, 2009; Jackson, 2010), this study also investigated principals' perceptions of the level of preparation gained from induction programs. This aspect of investigation, having received minimal research attention, added another perspective to the research on effective principal induction programs.

Additionally, little research has been done on the influence of the size of the school district on principal perceptions of induction practices. This research provided additional information regarding the range of induction options provided throughout the state of Kansas and differences of perceptions of principals from different size school districts.

Research Questions

The following research questions were investigated:

1. To what extent do Kansas public school districts provide a formally planned induction program (defined as having a written description of new principal induction goals and activities) for new principals?
2. What components of induction do districts offer to first year Kansas elementary principals, among the following:
 - a. Internship prior to principalship,

- b. Leadership development training prior to principalship,
 - c. District-sponsored orientation prior to or while assuming responsibilities of principalship,
 - d. Building orientation with outgoing principal,
 - e. Formal (trained) mentoring or coaching support,
 - f. Informal mentoring or coaching support,
 - g. Support group or network group with other new principals,
 - h. Topic-specific meetings with district administration during the first year of the principalship,
 - i. Other
3. To what extent are first year Kansas elementary principals satisfied with each component of the induction process in preparing them for the principalship?
 4. Is there a relationship between the availability of a formal induction plan (written description with explicit goals and activities) and Kansas first year principals' perceptions of satisfaction with the overall induction process?
 5. Is there a relationship between the availability of a formal induction plan (written description with explicit goals and activities) and Kansas first year principals' perceptions of preparation for the principalship?
 6. Is there a relationship between the size of the school district (small, medium, or large) and the availability of a formal induction plan (written description with explicit goals and activities)?

7. Is there a relationship between the size of the school district and Kansas first year elementary principals' perceptions of satisfaction with the overall induction process?
8. Is there a relationship between the size of the school district and Kansas first year elementary principals' perceptions of preparation for the principalship?

Delimitations

According to Lunenberg and Irby (2008), delimitations are “the self-imposed boundaries set by the researcher on the purpose and scope of the study” (p. 134). A delimitation of this study was the intent to focus on principals who were new to the elementary principalship during the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic school years in the state of Kansas. Another delimitation was the intent to focus on elementary Kansas principals who had never served as an assistant principal or principal in another district or state.

Assumptions

Lunenburg and Irby (2008) defined assumptions as the “postulates, premises, and propositions that are accepted as operational for purposes of the research” that “provide the basis for formulating research questions or stating hypotheses and for interpreting data resulting from the study” (p. 135). This study included the following assumptions: (a) the volunteer principal participants accurately stated their perceptions of the induction process; (b) the volunteer principal participants accurately understood the language and intent of the questions asked; and (c) the analysis of the data accurately reflected the perceptions of the volunteer principal participants.

Definition of Terms

In order to facilitate a common understanding of the concepts involved in this research, the following definitions are provided for terms used in this study.

Coaching. According to Bloom et al. (2005), coaching involves facilitating professional growth for a novice by a trained coach, an organizational outsider, not necessarily in a job-alike position.

Induction. Sometimes referred to as “onboarding” in business literature (Lee, n.d.), induction is the process of preparing an individual to make the transition from theory to practice, the process of preparing individuals to succeed in a new position (Gergens, 1998; Lee, n.d.). For the purposes of this study, induction refers to all the actions taken by a school district to prepare educators for their new role as an elementary principal.

Formal Induction. For the purposes of this study, formal induction is defined as a principal preparation process with explicitly written goals and activities and outcomes.

Mentoring. Mentoring is defined as the “process of by which an individual with knowledge and skills in a field willingly shares advice and support with a beginner,” (Weingartner, 2009, p. 61) and it is considered to be a one-on-one guided learning process (Crocker & Harris, 2002).

Formal Mentoring. Formal mentoring is defined as having explicitly written goals, activities, and outcomes, as determined by the sponsoring agency or school district, with trained mentors (Gergens, 1998).

Informal Mentoring. Informal mentoring is defined as “a spontaneous pairing of mentor and protégé that is not prompted by program, university, or district, but rather a

relationship formed out of need and respect” (Gergens, 1998, p. 15). For the purposes of this study, informal mentoring does not involve training and does not have explicitly stated goals, activities or outcomes, but proceeds in an informal, unplanned manner.

First Year Elementary School Principal. For the purposes of this study, a first year elementary school principal is one who (1) is in their first year of experience as an elementary school principal, and (2) has not been a school principal or assistant principal in any other district or state.

Small School District. The state of Kansas currently utilizes a school district size ranking system, used in athletics, with 1A and 2A size school districts considered to be “small school districts” for the purposes of this study.

Medium School District. The state of Kansas currently utilizes a school district size ranking system, used in athletics, with 3A and 4A size school districts considered to be “medium school districts” for the purposes of this study.

Large School District. The state of Kansas currently utilizes a school district size ranking system, used in athletics, with 5A and 6A size school districts considered to be “large school districts” for the purposes of this study.

Overview of the Methods of the Study

According to Creswell (2009), the purpose of a quantitative study is to “examine the relationship among variables” (p. 4). The intent of this study was to investigate relationships related to new school principal induction practices by means of a survey. A survey is a type of quantitative research design that provides a “numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population” (Creswell, p. 145). The survey method was deemed an appropriate vehicle for gathering the types of information desired.

Using this research design, the researcher developed two related surveys. Kansas school district superintendents were sent a short electronic survey asking two questions: (1) the availability of a formal induction plan for first year elementary principals, and (2) the components of induction available to first year Kansas elementary principals. The second survey was sent to Kansas elementary principals new to the principalship for the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic school years. Principals were asked to identify what induction experiences they had received and their perceptions of the effectiveness of these experiences in preparing them for the challenges of the principalship. The survey also gathered demographic information to eliminate any principals who held previous experience and to determine the size of the school districts they serve. Chi square analyses were conducted to test the research hypotheses.

Organization of the Study

This dissertation is divided into five chapters. In chapter one, the introduction to the study, the statement of the problem, background information, and the purpose and significance of the study were reviewed. The research questions in this study were identified. Terms were defined for a common understanding of vocabulary, and the methodology used in the study was outlined.

In chapter two, a review of the literature, examining the history and background of principal induction practices, is presented. Chapter two also included a review of the characteristics of effective induction and mentoring practices and a review of prominent induction programs.

The methodology utilized in the study is outlined in chapter three. The research design, sampling method, and survey instrument used are also described. The results of

the data analysis and hypotheses testing are reported in chapter four. The conclusions and significance of the study are reported in chapter five, along with recommendations for action and future study. The restatement of the problem and purpose of the study were also restated in chapter five.

Chapter Two

Review of Literature

Well-known author, speaker, and leadership trainer, John Maxwell, stated that “Everything rises and falls on leadership” (1999, p.xi). Despite earlier neglect of research on the importance of the role of the school principal (Daresh, 2001; Marzano et al, 2005), it has become clear that the school principal’s role is second only to classroom instruction as the most important factor related to student learning (Leithwood & Day, 2008; Marzano, 2005). Yet, principal preparation and induction practices have often been unplanned and neglected (Lyons, 1992; Bloom et al., 2003; NAESP, 2003; Holloway, 2004; Wallace Foundation, 2007). This chapter presents a review of the literature that relates to the induction of new school principals. Topics explored in this chapter include: (a) the changing role of the school principal, (b) challenges of new principals, (c) the need for induction, (d) characteristics of new principal induction, (e) new principal mentoring, and (f) the components of new principal induction.

The Changing Role of the School Principal

The role of the principal has changed dramatically over the last century (Barton, 2009; Harris et.al, 2004). An organized system of American education evolved about 1840 from what had been a strictly private or religious venture (Pulliam & Van Patten, 2003), and by the time that John Dewey published his influential book, *Democracy and Education* in 1916, a free education system had been established in all states (Pulliam & Van Patten, 2003). Following the European education model, principals were originally lead teachers or headmasters, given the responsibilities of teaching classes and supervising other teachers (Barton, 2009). From the 1930s to the 1960s, the principal’s

role became more managerial, with a bureaucratic focus on budget, staffing, reporting, applying laws, and compliance with legal mandates (Macmillan, et.al, 2001). This minimal view of the principalship was in line with the controversial 1966 Coleman Report, which concluded that schools made very little difference in student achievement, relative to family background (Lezotte & Jacoby, 1990).

However, in the 1980s, the effective schools movement, led by Ron Edmonds and others, attempted to challenge the Coleman Report by presenting research that described practices of schools that were considered to be effective in providing equitable learning opportunities for all students (Lezotte & Jacoby, 1990). For the first time, the importance of the role of the principal in school effectiveness was highlighted as one of five (then revised to seven) correlates of effective schools (Lezotte & Jacoby, 1990). The correlates of effective schools were identified as the following (Lezotte & Jacoby, 1990):

- Safe and orderly environment
- Instructional leadership
- Climate of high expectations for success
- Frequent monitoring of students
- Clear and focused mission
- Opportunity to learn and student time on task
- Home-school relations

In the 1980s, the effective schools movement focused on the importance of the role of the principal as instructional leader, with emphasis on curriculum development, instructional effectiveness, and professional development (Macmillan, et.2001). In the 1990s, the “second generation” of effective schools research focused on the principal’s

role as capacity builder, dispersing leadership through a site-based shared leadership model (Lezotte, 1991).

In 1983, a government-appointed commission published *A Nation at Risk*, proclaiming that the American educational system was in crisis. This report launched a national debate on how to reform American education (Wagner, et.al., 2006). State governments took the challenge to improve education by requiring greater accountability through accreditation models and education standards (Thomas & Brady, 2005). By the 1990s, education reform was the top agenda for state governments, and in 2001, the passage of *No Child Left Behind* legislation brought greater federal authority over education, with mandated accountability for all aspects of the educational process (Wagner, et.al., 2006). State and federal mandates increased the principal's accountability as an instructional leader to produce results in student achievement (Barton, 2009; Fullen, 2003).

In 1996, the first standards for educational leaders were published by the Council of Chief State School Officers, in an attempt to describe responsibilities of effective school leaders based on empirical research (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2015). Citing changes in the world context, demographics, economics, and the demands on educational leaders, the standards were revised in 2015. The new Professional Standards for Educational Leaders are intended to reflect a more student-centered, future-oriented perspective, with acknowledgement of the link between leadership and student learners. The new 2015 leadership standards are based on the following principles:

1. Mission, Vision, and Core Values
2. Ethics and Professional Norms
3. Equity and Cultural Responsiveness
4. Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment
5. Community of Care and Support for Students
6. Professional Capacity of School Personnel
7. Professional Community for Teachers and Staff
8. Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community
9. Operations and Management
10. School Improvement

From lead teacher to educational manager to instructional leader to capacity builder, the twenty-first century expectations of a school leader have exploded exponentially, leading some writers to question if it is a “doable job” (Brown, 2015, p.1). When Michael Fullen (2003) asked a group of principals if they thought a principal could effectively fulfill all the responsibilities assigned to the position, 91% of the principals responded “no” (Fullen, 2003, p. 14). Twenty-first century school leaders are described as “transformational leaders” (Marzano, et al., 2005, p. 15), “system leaders” (Fullen, 2003, p. 48), and “change leaders” (Wagner, et al., 2006, p. 97), who are expected to be “instructional leaders, change initiators, managers, personnel directors, problem solvers, and visionaries” (Blasé & Kirby, 2009, p. 156). The school leader’s job has become increasingly complex and demanding, in an ever-changing world, leading to what Fullen (2003) called “role overload and role ambiguity” (p. 22), strongly emphasizing the need for effective leadership preparation practices.

Challenges of a New Principal

Given that new school principals walk into a job that has evolved into “a highly complex and demanding position that requires strong instructional and leadership skills” (Cheney & Davis, 2011, p.1), it is no surprise that novice principals meet significant challenges in their new positions (Burkhart, 2007; Hoerr, 2005; Lashway, 2003; Rooney, 2000; Willer & Recht, 2011). A review of the literature suggests several challenges that new principals face, including task overload, isolation, becoming boss, culturalization, and technical skills. Each of these challenges will be described below.

Task overload. (Daresh, 2006; Fullen, 2003; Lashway, 2003; Rooney, 2000; Superville, 2015). Most new principals move up from the ranks of the classroom teacher where the focus is on meeting the needs of one classroom of children. As a new principal, learning to balance the demands of competing, often conflicting, agendas from multiple constituencies—teachers, students, parents, central office, or the community at large—is not easy (Fullen, 2003). Many principals, working 60-70 hour per week (Superville, 2015), with upwards of 2,000 interactions per day (Fullen, 2003), find the pace relentless and overwhelming (Lashway, 2003). The work never gets done, making it difficult to balance one’s personal life and professional life (Daresh, 2006). This explosion of demands on the principal can decrease one’s sense of efficacy and satisfaction with the job (Fullen, 2003).

Isolation. (Aiken, 2001; Barton, 2009; Daresh, 2001; Daresh, 2006; Lashway, 2003; Rooney, 2000; Walker & Carr-Stewart, 2006). While a classroom teacher is one of many, principals are usually without a peer in the building, making the position seem very lonely (Lashway, 2003). Aiken (2001) observed that, “for some principals, moving

from the collegial context of their classrooms where they felt secure and competent, into new arenas that challenge their most basic beliefs about themselves as school leaders, leaves many feeling isolated, overwhelmed” (p. 145). Although surrounded by people all day long, the principal is the one person in the building who has the school-wide responsibility to make things work. Because of distance and time, it is difficult to bounce ideas off others in a job-alike position; and asking for help can sometimes be seen as a sign of weakness (Daresh, 2001). This sense of being the “Lone Ranger” with a general lack of feedback or help from central office can tend to increase the new principal’s sense of isolation (Daresh, 2006, p.2).

Becoming boss. (Alvy, 2005; Barton, 2009; Daresh, 2006; Ginty, 1995; Hoerr, 2005; Rooney, 2000; Walker & Carr-Stewart, 2006). Walker and Carr-Stewart (2006) noted that “neophyte principals tend to have problems with role clarification,” evidenced by “questioning who they are and what they should be doing” (p. 19). Many new principals are not prepared to find that “once you walk across the principal’s threshold, all relationships change” (Rooney, 2000, p.77). Even leaders promoted within their school find that their former colleagues view them differently as principal (Rooney, 2000). Renegotiating hierarchical relationships, involving supervising and evaluating those who were previously colleagues, and learning to deal with other people’s opinions of every action can be discomfoting to new principals (Daresh, 2006). Being middle management does not make the role clarification any easier, having simultaneous responsibilities to those below and above the principal’s job classification (Hoerr, 2005). Alvy and Robbins (2005) noted that one of the significant difficulties that new principals face is that they are expected to lead while learning to lead.

Culturalization. (Daresh, 2006; Fullen, 2003; Hargreaves, 2005; Rooney, 2000; Walker & Carr-Stewart, 2006). New principals may be surprised to learn that “it is hard to walk into a place that’s had a history” (Daresh, 2006, p.8). Unless the new principal takes the time to learn about his/her new school’s culture, climate, traditions, and history, their work may be hindered from the start (Daresh, 2006). Material icons in the school, cherished ceremonies and rituals may hold meaning that school staff members hold dear (Rooney, 2000). Novice principals need to learn not just how to do things, but how to do things in the new context, with respect to the “invisible heroes” (Daresh, 2006, p.83). Seven out of 10 new principals reported issues with previous principals as a hindrance to their work (Walker & Qian, 2006). New principals need to find ways to learn about and show respect for their new school’s culture and predecessors. Additionally, school district leaders need to find effective ways to plan for leadership succession in order to promote continuity of school improvement (Fullen, 2003).

Technical skills. When Daresh (2006) surveyed experienced principals about the needs of new principals, the principals ranked skill areas in this order: (1) socialization (culturalization), (2) self-awareness and role awareness, and (3) technical skills. In other words, once the new principal finds out where he/she is and who he/she is, then the new principal needs to figure out what he/she is expected to do. Technical skills are defined as “the operational details that provide clear direction and order for a school” (Daresh, 2006, p. 9), or to use a colloquial term, “keeping the trains running on time” (Daresh, 2006, p. 9).

Burkhart (2007) surveyed Missouri principals to determine the most challenging needs of beginning principals. The following skills were identified in rank order as the most challenging for new elementary principals:

1. Assisting teachers in reviewing data
2. Politics
3. Reviewing data for school improvement
4. Developing a vision for the school
5. Managing a building budget
6. Knowledge of school law
7. Facility management
8. Providing effective staff development
9. Walk-through observations
10. Delegating responsibility to appropriate staff
11. Providing support to struggling teachers
12. Managing time
13. Teacher evaluations
14. Creating school master schedule
15. Assisting teachers with curriculum implementation
16. Working with support staff
17. Facilitating staff meetings
18. Developing duty schedules for teachers
19. Assisting teachers with instructional issues
20. Communicating with community

21. Working with students and parents on discipline issues
22. Assisting teachers with classroom management
23. Communicating with parents
24. Communicating with building staff. (Burkhart, 2007, p. 74)

This impressive list of technical skills illustrates the enormity of the tasks that new principals face when they attempt to “adjust their textbook understanding of leadership to the real world of practice” (Lashway, 2003, p.1). An effective induction program can and should help new principals learn to use these skills effectively (Daresh, 2006).

Need for Induction

Because the principal’s role is critical to student learning and school improvement and because the principal’s position is intimidating and overwhelming to a beginner, it stands to reason that providing support for a new principal is an important prerequisite for success (Daresh, 2006; Fullen, 2003; Hall, 2008). Bush (2009) called effective leadership preparation “a moral obligation” (p. 377). Yet, for many years, the needs of beginning principals were not considered very important by educational researchers (Daresh, 2006; Fullen, 2003, Wallace Foundation, 2007). A survey conducted by the National Association of Elementary Principals (NAESP, 2003) found that fewer than half the school superintendents indicated that their districts offered a formal induction program for new principals. Jackson’s (2010) research with new principals in three school districts in Virginia, conducted as recently as 2010, found that few new principals had been given the opportunity to participate in a planned induction process. In contrast, the need for new teacher induction has been recognized for some time. In the early 1990s, 40 percent of new teachers reported being a part of a formal

induction program, and by 2008, almost 90 percent of new teachers were receiving some form of induction support (Wayne, et al., 2005).

A review of the literature suggests three major reasons for implementing new principal induction programs: (1) to accelerate and enhance the new principal's effectiveness, (2) to increase retention in the position, and (3) to increase satisfaction with the position. Each of these reasons will be described below.

Effectiveness. (Bush, 2009; Daresh, 2006; Lashway, 2003; Lee, n.d.; Reiss, 2007). A 2001 study of executive coaching in the business world highlighted the benefits of investing in coaching new leaders, which included: increased productivity, increased quality of work, improved teamwork, and better results (Reiss, 2007). Similarly, educational research supports the thesis that investment in "specific preparation makes a difference to the quality of school leadership" (Bush, 2009, p. 377). Given the rapid changes in the world, the increasing complexity of school leadership roles, and the mandated accountability for results, "requiring individuals to lead schools which are often multi-million dollar businesses, manage staff and care for children, without specific preparation, may be seen as foolish, even reckless, as well as being manifestly unfair for the new incumbent" (Bush, 2009, p. 377). According to Lashway (2003), induction provides a critical bridge into the new administrator's "'organizational socialization' in which the simple abstractions learned in university classrooms must be adapted to the messy realities of real schools" (p. 2). Learning the myriad of technical skills that new principals must instantly engage with requires the guidance and support of someone who has already mastered these skills (Daresh, 2006). Lyons (1992) stated, "Without support,

even the brightest new principals may never reach their potential” (p. 28). New principals need help to become all they can be as leaders.

Retention. (Lee, n.d.; Scherer, 2012; Correll, 2010). In an article about onboarding, or induction practices for new employees in the business world, Lee (n.d.) stated that “an investment in effective onboarding is an investment in employee retention, morale, and productivity” (p.1). His research concluded that employees participating in onboarding experiences are 69 percent more likely to remain in the company past three years than those who did not participate in onboarding programs.

Research also highlights the importance of induction for retaining teachers. Studies indicate that teachers who participated in effective induction programs are 50% less likely to leave the teaching profession and that effective “induction and mentoring programs are the best method of increasing teacher retention” (Education Northwest, 2014, p. 26). Principal job retention is a topic of research interest because frequent turn over has a negative impact on educational progress (Young & Fuller, 2009). Young and Fuller identified these effects of frequent principal turn over: (1) Principal retention is linked to teacher retention; (2) Significant school reform takes time to implement effectively, and turn over disrupts progress; (3) There are financial costs to principal turn over. The Wallace Foundation’s (2012) research indicated that principal positions turn over every three-four years. Lashway (2003) stated that some research indicates that participation in formal induction programs increases retention for new school principals, but direct evidence is lacking and more research is needed.

Satisfaction. (Aycock, 2006; Correll, 2010; Daresh, 2006; Hudson, 2009; Lee, n.d.; Wallace Foundation, 2007). Aycock (2006) studied various issues related to new

principal induction in Kansas, and new principals were asked if they were satisfied with their career choice as a result of their induction experiences. Ninety-three percent of the participants responded in the affirmative. Correll (2010) studied a national database of early career principals participating in various components of induction during the 2003-2004 school year, and found that over 50 percent of early career principals nation-wide participated in some form of induction. Of respondents, 32 percent were more likely to be satisfied with their career choice if they had participated in a principal network, and 24 percent were more likely to be satisfied if they were assigned a mentor. Hudson (2009) studied the perceptions of new principals in South Carolina to four components of the South Carolina principal preparation program, and all four components were deemed to be helpful by participants: (1) technical skills – 89.33 percent, (2) instructional leadership – 77.63 percent, (3) effective schools – 78.66 percent, and (4) mentoring – 61 percent.

Most of the research related to satisfaction with induction or career focused on mentoring—the most common component of new principal induction (Lashway, 2003). The Wallace Foundation (2007) indicated that, in general, their research has found that both mentors and mentees tend to be very satisfied with their mentoring experiences. Daresh (2006) noted that there are strong benefits to the novice principal when mentoring is implemented well. Benefits included higher motivation and job satisfaction, greater self-esteem and productivity, and more confidence.

Characteristics of Effective New Principal Induction

Induction is defined, generically, as the process of preparing individuals to succeed in a new position (Gergens, 1998). For the purposes of this study, induction

refers to all the actions prescribed by a school district to prepare educators for their new role as school principal. There is a strategic need to develop and sustain high quality principals for the education demands of the twenty-first century (Aiken, 2001). Though the importance of the principalship had been ignored for many years (Daresh, 2006; Fullen, 2003; Marzano et al, 2005), there has been a growing trend in the last decade to attend to the need to provide more systematic school leadership development (Bush, 2009, Wallace Foundation, 2012). Now, almost all of the 50 states require some form of induction or mentoring for new principals (Hudson, 2009; Wallace Foundation, 2012).

The challenges that new principals face have been identified earlier: (1) task overload, (2) isolation, (3) becoming boss, (4) culturalization, and (5) technical skills. Effective induction should be designed to help new principals meet these challenges (Burkhart, 2007; Lashway, 2003; Rooney, 2000; Vallani, 2006; Walker & Qian, 2006). In her work with principal induction, Aiken (2002) identified five key needs that principal induction and mentoring processes should attempt to meet:

1. Finding one's voice and vision,
2. Forming networks and relationships,
3. Developing a leadership persona,
4. Finding a balance between maintenance and innovation,
5. Making connections with the community at large.

The induction process does not work by simply throwing information at new principals; it involves crafting experiences that “require considerable skill in the area of effective human relations,” (Daresh, 2001, p. 47) with some acknowledgement of adult

learning needs. According to Daresh (2001), effective induction and mentoring should incorporate these principles of adult learning:

1. The learning activities are relevant to the learner,
2. The learning is related to personal and professional goals,
3. The learner receives usable feedback about progress,
4. The learner experiences success,
5. Motivation comes from within the learner.

Though most new principals are now given the opportunity to participate in some form of new principal induction activities, the nature and quality of the experiences provided to new principals vary considerably (Chadwick & Howley, 2002; Crocker & Harris, 2002; Bloom et al., 2003; Elsberry & Bishop, 1993; Gergens, 1998; NAESP, 2003; Wallace Foundation, 2007). Based on his research into effective induction practices, Lashway (2003) identified three characteristics of good induction programs: (1) Though technical survival skills should be a part of new principal induction, because that is what new principals think they need the most, the focus should also be on helping new principals see the “big picture” (p. 3) by reflecting on their learning process. (2) Effective induction needs to involve more than one-on-one mentoring; it should also involve principal networking, professional development, and finding ways to connect with the larger professional community. (3) Effective induction is most powerful when embedded in the actual work of the district, not tacking on irrelevant extra activities.

New Principal Mentoring

Mentoring is the most common component of new principal induction, with more than half of the states requiring some form of mentoring for new principals,

whether formal or informal (Hudson, 2009; Wallace Foundation, 2012). Kansas requires that new principals participate in district-sponsored mentoring, but KSDE does not define what form the mentoring should take (www.KSDE.org). Mentoring is defined as the “process by which an individual with knowledge and skills in a field willingly shares advice and support to a beginner,” (Weingartner, 2009, p. 61) in a one-on-one guided learning process. Informal mentoring is a spontaneous relationship prompted by the mentee’s need or by informal assignment, without explicitly stated goals, activities or outcomes (Gergens, 1998, p. 15). Formal mentoring, in contrast, is an explicitly defined relationship with a trained mentor, having identified goals, activities, and outcomes, as determined by the school district (Gergens, 1998). Some studies have concluded that there is a place for both informal and formal mentoring in assisting new principals to meet their learning needs (Gergens, 1998; West, 2002).

Phases of Mentoring

In her book on mentoring, Zachary (2000) outlined four phases that take place in mentoring, whether formal or informal. Zachary contended that awareness of each phase is a key factor in maximizing the mentoring process. The four phases are:

1. **Preparing.** The preparing phase of the relationship involves actions on the part of both the mentor and the mentee. Mentor selection and training are critical to the effectiveness of the mentoring process. This phase involves making a compatible match with the mentee, honing mentoring skills, and beginning the initial conversation to make a connection, define roles, and check assumptions.

2. **Negotiating.** The “business phase” (p. 50), this phase is often missing from an informal mentoring process. It involves coming to a shared understanding—even written agreement--about goals, expectations, operational protocols (meeting format, times and frequency), and confidentiality. Goal-setting must be completed before the work begins. “When mentees do not have well-defined goals, goal setting becomes the first priority” (p. 96).
3. **Enabling.** This term does not refer to the derogatory term often used in a conversation; it refers to the process of helping the mentee reach for his/her goals. This is the phase where the mentoring interaction takes place, with the mentor looking for ways to support and challenge the mentee to new learning. Communication skills are paramount here, with the mentor knowing how to listen reflectively, ask questions without telling the mentee what to do, promote reflection, and provide authentic feedback. Training is critical to helping mentors learn to use these facilitative skills effectively (Zachary, 2000; SREB, 2008).
4. **Closure.** This is the time to end the active mentoring phase of the relationship marked—ideally—with evaluation and celebration of the achievement of learning goals. Closure may occur intentionally or unintentionally. During formal mentoring, the best time to determine closure is to plan for it in the agreement. Short of this, the mentor should look for signs that the relationship has fulfilled its mission or that the relationship is no longer meeting the needs of the mentor or the mentee.

Characteristics of Effective Mentoring Programs

Because many mentoring programs are often unplanned “ad hoc” (Hall, 2008, p. 49) relationships, the Wallace Foundation (2007) concluded that “many if not most existing mentoring programs are falling well short of their potential” (p.3). Their research noted that weak mentoring programs suffered from unclear goals, overemphasis on technical skills, insufficient time, lack of data, and lack of funding (p.4). In response to these weaknesses, The Wallace Foundation offered guidelines for quality mentoring programs:

- High-quality mentor training should be a requirement;
- Data should be collected to provide information about what works and does not work;
- The length of the mentoring process should be, minimally, one year, and ideally, 2 or more years;
- Adequate state and local funding should provide for mentor training and participant stipends;
- The goal of the mentoring process should be clear—to help new principals develop the skills to become effective instructional leaders (p.4).

Much of the research literature stresses the importance of planning a formal mentoring program, in order to maximize the program’s full potential (Daresh, 2001; Hopkins-Thompson, 2000; Lashway, 2003; SREB, 2008; Wallace Foundation, 2007; Zachary, 2000). Similar to the Wallace Foundation’s quality guidelines, Hopkins-Thompson (2000) identified five characteristics of effective mentoring programs: (1)

support from the organization, (2) clearly defined goals, (3) careful selection of mentors, (4) strategic mentor training, and (5) a learner-centered focus.

Mentor Selection and Training

Mentoring works best when the mentor is in a similar, job-alike position as the mentee (Daresh, 2001; Bloom et al., 2005); otherwise, the mentee may not believe that the mentor really understands what he/she is going through. In order to provide credible assistance, good mentors must be good principals, but not all good principals are necessarily good mentors (Daresh, 2001). Mentor selection is a critical feature of a well-designed mentoring program, in terms of finding the right person who can facilitate and model the desired outcomes (Daresh, 2001; SREB, 2008; Zachary, 2000).

Daresh (2001) identified these characteristics of effective mentors:

1. Experience as a practicing and effective school leader,
2. Regarded as possessing strong facilitative and leadership skills,
3. Ability to ask questions that promote growth, not quick to give answers,
4. Ability to accept alternative ways of doing things,
5. Desire to see others grow,
6. Models continuous learning and reflection,
7. Awareness of real world realities in at least one school district.

Researchers warn that the quality of mentoring training can influence the quality of outcomes (Bush, 2009; Crocker & Harris, 2002; Villani, 2006). “Knowing how to help novice principals develop a vision of leadership for change implies a level and kind of mentor training that is, as yet, not the norm among existing state or district programs” (Wallace Foundation, 2007, p. 7). Therefore, in addition to selecting the right person to

be a mentor, school districts need to provide training on how to mentor effectively (Crocker & Harris, 2002). In her book, *Creating a Mentoring Culture*, Zachary (2005) provided information on what skills need to be included in effective mentor training:

- Brokering relationships
- Building and maintaining relationships
- Coaching
- Communicating
- Facilitating
- Goal setting
- Guiding
- Managing conflict
- Problem solving
- Providing and receiving feedback
- Reflecting

Although it is helpful for principals to have someone else in a similar role to talk to informally (Doherty, 1999; Gergens, 1998; West, 2002), effective mentoring needs to be more than just having a “buddy” system (Wallace Foundation, 2007, p. 7). “Buddies don’t make a commitment to systematically support and challenge new principals to reflect on their practice” (p.7). Effective mentors need to be strategically selected and trained. Crocker and Harris (2002) concluded from their research that “there is a clear implication that the mentor’s personal and professional skills and knowledge impact a mentor’s ability to serve effectively” (p. 17).

Benefits of Principal Mentoring

When well-designed and effectively implemented, new principal mentoring programs can yield very satisfying results (Daresh, 2001; Lashway, 2003; Hall, 2008; West, 2002; Young, et al., 2009). In her qualitative study of the role of mentoring with 17 novice principals, West (2002) found that effective mentoring helped new principals improve in these areas: role clarification, organization socialization, diminished isolation, and career advancement. Based on their research, the Wallace Foundation (2007) enumerated the positive benefits of mentoring to the mentees, the mentors and to the organizations.

Daresh (2001) also reported these positive outcomes of well-implemented mentoring programs:

- Benefits to mentor: Mentors reported greater job satisfaction, increased peer recognition, enhanced career advancement, and renewed professional enthusiasm.
- Benefits to mentees: Mentees reported more professional confidence, greater sense of competence, enhanced communication skills, improved technical skills, and greater sense of belonging.
- Benefits to school districts: School districts reported that as a result of the principal's mentoring, the school staff functioned with greater effectiveness, demonstrated a greater sense of life-long learning, reported enhanced motivation and job satisfaction, improved self-esteem, and greater productivity.

Mentoring Versus Coaching

The terms “mentor” and “coach” are often confused, and sometimes the terms are used interchangeably (Zachary, 2000). The literature even suggests a difference of opinion among the experts. The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) Mentor Training Resource Manual (2008) defined coaching as “support for technical, skill-related learning” (p. 17) and mentoring as the “all-inclusive description of everything done to support a protégé” (p. 17). Bloom et al., (2005), however, defined a mentor as “an organizational insider who is a senior expert and supports a novice,” (p. 9) with a focus on learning in-district skills. Bloom et al. (2005) defined a coach as an individual outside the organization, not necessarily senior or in a job-alike position, with a focus on leadership skills. According to Bloom et al., “coaching is a professional practice; mentoring is typically voluntary and informal” (p. 10). For the purposes of this current study, a mentor is an organizational insider with a job-alike position, and mentoring may be formal (with training and explicitly stated goals) or informal (without training or explicitly stated goals). A coach is a trained organizational outsider, not necessarily in a job-alike position. In this case, the operational roles of a formal mentor and trained coach may be very difficult to distinguish. Research has indicated that new principals can benefit from having both a mentor and a coach (Bloom et al., 2005; Weingartner, 2009), but the logistics and cost of this approach make it unlikely.

Mentoring is a key aspect of an effective induction program (Wallace Foundation, 2007), but it is not the only component. Instead of receiving a “set of keys and a good luck wish,” Lyons (1992, p.4) recommended that newly appointed principals deserve four opportunities: (1) effective pre-position preparation, (2) a comprehensive induction plan,

(3) feedback, and (4) a professional growth plan. Vallani (2006) stated that a successful induction plan should be “designed to enhance professional effectiveness and to foster continuous growth” (p.19).

Components of Principal Induction

Elsberry and Bishop (1993) conducted a study of 145 first year principals in several southern states, asking respondents to rank induction practices that were considered most effective by the new principals. These are the practices, in rank order, that participants indicated were most helpful:

1. Summer induction conference prior to first year
2. Mentoring with a veteran principal within the school district
3. Internship under another principal
4. Orientation with school district officers
5. Orientation with outgoing principal
6. Development of professional growth plan
7. Inservice workshops
8. Professional needs assessment followed by training
9. Peer group problem solving
10. Mentoring with a veteran principal outside the school district
11. Collegial observation and reflective feedback
12. Structured work load to allow time for induction activities
13. Collegial support groups

Mentoring, whether formal or informal, is the most common component of new principal induction programs, and in many cases, it is the only component of induction

offered (Alsbury, 2006; Aycock, 2006; Crocker & Harris, 2002; Doherty, 1999; Gergens, 1998; Hall, 2008; Holloway, 2004; Malone, 2001; Smith, 2007; Wallace Foundation, 2007). It is the intent of this current research to broaden the concept of induction by including some of the components listed in Elsberry and Bishop's study (1993), in addition to others found in new principal program models. In their recommendations for better leadership training, the Wallace Foundation (2012) stated that districts "must do more" (p.8) to prepare principals for their important role.

Summary

An overview of the changing role of principals from the early 1900s to the present was outlined in chapter two. Also, the challenges that new principals face were shared, in view of the increasing complexity of their roles. Information was shared about the need for and the benefits of new principal induction. Additionally, characteristics of effective new principal induction were discussed, based on the research. Factors concerning new principal mentoring were described, and components of new principal induction were identified. Other studies of new principal induction were also reviewed. Some research has examined the needs of beginning principals (Elsberry & Bishop, 1993; Burkhart, 2007), while other studies have examined the types of induction or mentoring experienced by new principals (Aycock, 2006; Hudson, 2009; Jackson, 2010). Career satisfaction, in relation to induction, has also been researched (Aycock, 2006; Correll, 2010). This research focused on determining the availability of formally planned induction programs to new elementary principals in Kansas, identifying the types of induction components made available to them, and examining new principal satisfaction with their induction experiences. Given the established importance of the principal's

role, new information gained from this study will add to a better understanding of effective induction practices for new principals to help them meet the needs of the twenty-first century. The methodology of the current study is presented in chapter three.

Chapter Three

Methods

The purpose of this study was to determine the availability of formal induction programs for new elementary principals in Kansas. The second purpose of this study was to identify and quantify the types of induction experiences currently used in the state of Kansas and to evaluate first year elementary principals' perceptions of satisfaction with current induction experiences. It was also the purpose of this study to determine if there are differences in the perceptions of satisfaction and preparedness of new elementary principals when categorized by school district size: small, medium, and large. Information about the types of induction experiences afforded to new elementary principals was gathered from public school district superintendents in Kansas through means of a *School District Survey*. Additionally, a *New Principal Survey* was sent to all Kansas elementary principals who were new to the principalship during the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic school years, to examine the types of induction experiences available and the new principals' satisfaction with these induction experiences. The names of first year elementary school principals were requested from the Kansas Department of Education.

The research design selected for this study is summarized in this chapter, as well as the population and sampling procedures. Also discussed are the data collection procedures, data analysis and hypothesis testing. A description of the development of the electronic surveys and a summary of the research methodology is also presented.

Research Design

A quantitative methods research design was utilized in this study. Creswell (2009) defined quantitative methods research as an approach that tests hypotheses by examining relationships among variables. Creswell (2009) identified two research strategies characteristic of quantitative research: survey research and experimental research. Survey research allows the researcher to provide a “numeric description” (Creswell, 2009, p. 12) to the ideas postulated in the hypotheses by determining if relationships exist among research variables. The survey approach was determined to be appropriate for this research.

The independent variables in this research were the availability of formal written induction plans for first year Kansas elementary principals, the components of induction available to new principals, and the size of sponsoring school districts (small, medium, or large). The dependent variables were the Kansas first year elementary principals’ perceptions of satisfaction with the various components of induction experiences and their overall induction process, and their perceptions of preparedness as a result of their induction program.

Population and Sample

The population for this study included all public school superintendents and all elementary school principals. This study included two sample groups: all Kansas public school superintendents and Kansas principals who were new to the elementary principalship during the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic school years. The public school district superintendent sample consisted of 325 superintendents. The principal

sample population consisted of 327 new elementary principals throughout the state of Kansas, representing 169 school districts.

Sampling Procedures

Purposive sampling was used to identify the target samples. Purposive sampling, according to Lunenburg and Irby (2008), is used to select a sample based on clear criteria related to the researcher's topic. There were two target samples in this study: all public school superintendents in Kansas and all elementary principals who were first year principals during the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic school years. The names of superintendents were accessed through the online Kansas Educational Directory, and the names and districts of new elementary principals during the target school years were requested from the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE).

Instrumentation

Based on previous work (Aycock, 2006; Chadwick & Howley, 2002; Elsberry & Bishop, 1993; Hudson, 2009; Jackson, 2010; Kingham, 2009; Piraino, 2008; Shook, 2001), two related surveys were developed by the researcher to collect data on the research topic. The purpose of the *School District Survey* was to determine the frequency and use of a formal induction programs and to identify and quantify the components of induction available to first year elementary principals in Kansas.

The *New Principal Survey* was sent to all first year elementary principals in Kansas during the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic school years. This survey consisted of two sections: demographic information was requested in section one, and questions directly related to principals' perceptions of satisfaction with induction experiences were asked in section two. The questions for the *New Principal Survey* were

developed by determining typical induction components that are commonly in place, using information from other principal induction studies as a reference. None of the questions were taken directly from the other studies (Aycock, 2006; Chadwick & Howley, 2002; Elsberry & Bishop, 1993; Hudson, 2009; Jackson, 2010; Kingham, 2009; Piraino, 2008; Shook, 2001).

Measurement. Two questions were asked in the *School District Survey*. The availability of a formal, planned induction process for new elementary principals was the topic of the first question, utilizing a yes/no response format in the survey. In the second question, school superintendents were asked to check which common induction experiences were available to new elementary principals, choosing from a list of potential components. A complete copy of the *School District Survey* is included in Appendix A.

The *New Principal Survey* consisted of two sections. The first section consisted of multiple choice items to gather demographic information about the new principal respondent and his/her school. The demographic section consisted of questions related to gender (item one), school size classification (item two), school grade level configuration (item three), and current enrollment of the school (item four). Information about the principal respondent's previous experiences was requested in items five through eight. The respondents were asked if they had ever served as an assistant principal (item five) and if they had ever served as principal in another building, district or state (items six, seven, and eight). Principal respondents were asked to confirm if either the 2014-2015 or 2015-2016 academic school years were their first year as an elementary principal in item nine.

Section two of the *New Principal Survey* was designed to gather perceptions from new elementary principals about their induction experiences. A mixture of yes/no questions, checklist responses, and five-point Likert-type scale formats were used in these survey questions. The availability of a formal induction plan (defined as a written plan with explicit goals and activities) was the subject of item 10, and what types of induction components (from a list of common components from previous research) were available to new elementary principals in Kansas were the subject of items 11 through 19. Principal respondents were then asked to rate their level of satisfaction with each induction component provided in items 20 through 26. Respondents used the following Likert scale to rate the level of satisfaction with individual induction components: *VD = very dissatisfied; D = dissatisfied; S = satisfied; VS = very satisfied; N/A = Not applicable or did not experience*. In item 27, principal respondents were asked to rate their perceptions of satisfaction with the overall induction process, using the same Likert-type scale. Principal respondents were asked to rate their perception of preparedness, based on their overall induction experiences in item 28. The following scale was used for this question: *NP = not prepared; SP = somewhat prepared; P = prepared; WP = well prepared*. Refer to a complete copy of the *Principal Survey* in Appendix B.

Validity and reliability. Lunenburg and Irby (2008) defined validity as “the degree to which an instrument measures what it purports to measure” (p. 181). The validity of this survey was established by a review by five experienced, practicing Kansas educators who examined questions on the *School District Survey* and the *New Principal Survey* for clarity and content validity in March 2016. Two of the reviewers were selected because they are current practicing human resource directors, and two of the

reviewers are practicing elementary principals with terminal degrees. One of the reviewers, a district administrator with a terminal degree, served as a final reviewer. The review panel approved the survey for clarity and content validity as written.

Reliability is defined as “the degree to which an instrument consistently measures whatever it is measuring” (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008, p. 182). Lunenburg and Irby suggested several methods of establishing reliability--among them, establishing internal consistency. Cronbach’s Alpha is one method for establishing internal consistency, according to Lunenburg and Irby. Utilizing this method can result in a numeric estimate of internal consistency by determining how items in an instrument relate to other items in the instrument. Since the *New Principal Survey* instrument is new, the internal consistency was unknown. Reliability was established by using Cronbach’s Alpha. The *New Principal Survey* results were reported as reliable by a coefficient of .80. A complete copy of the *New Principal Survey* is included in Appendix B.

Data Collection Procedures

In preparation for this research study, a Proposal for Research was submitted to and approved by the Baker University Institutional Review Board (IRB) in March 2016. A copy of the submitted proposal is included in Appendix C, and the approved proposal request is included in Appendix D. The names and addresses of all Kansas school district superintendents were accessed from the Kansas Educational Directory. A request was submitted to the Kansas Department of Education (KSDE) for permission to access the names of new principals in the state of Kansas during the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic school years. A database of the names of all new Kansas elementary principals

and their districts was provided by KSDE. The researcher sent an electronic copy of the *School District Survey* to the superintendents of all Kansas school districts, and the *New Principal Survey* was sent to new Kansas elementary principals. Survey Monkey was used to collect data for both surveys. Each survey included a short introductory message requesting participation in the study in March 2016. The *School District Survey* and the invitation to participate are included in the Appendix A, and the *New Principal Survey* and message are included in Appendix B. Special attention was paid to the subject line of the emails and to the introductory messages with each survey, with the intent of being as concise and inviting as possible. The introductory messages in the surveys included an estimate of the amount of time that each survey would take, along with the message that participation was voluntary and that individual data would not be maintained. One week after the surveys were sent, the researcher sent an email reminder and another electronic copy of the intended survey to district superintendents and to principals who had not responded. The survey data from both surveys were downloaded by the researcher to an Excel spreadsheet and uploaded to JASP software (Love, et al., 2015) for hypothesis testing.

Data Analysis and Hypothesis Testing

JASP software was used to analyze the survey data to examine the relationship between the availability of formal induction and new elementary principals' perceptions of satisfaction and preparedness. The data were also analyzed to examine the relationship between the size of the school district and new elementary principals' perceptions of satisfaction and preparedness. Additionally, the data were analyzed to examine the

relationship between the availability of induction components and new principals' level of satisfaction.

The following research questions and hypotheses were proposed and tested:

RQ1. To what extent do Kansas public school districts provide a formally planned induction program (defined as having a written description of new principal induction goals and activities) for new elementary principals?

RQ2. What components of induction do Kansas public school districts offer to new elementary school principals, from the following:

- a. Internship prior to principalship
- b. Leadership development training prior to principalship
- c. District-sponsored orientation prior to or while assuming principalship
- d. Building orientation with outgoing principal
- e. Formal (trained) mentoring or coaching support
- f. Informal mentoring or coaching support
- g. Support group or network group with other new principals
- h. Topic-specific meetings with district administration during first year of principalship
- i. Other (describe)

RQ3. To what extent are first year Kansas elementary principals satisfied with each component of the induction process in preparing them for the principalship?

RQ4. Is there a relationship between the availability of a formal induction plan (written description with explicit goals and activities) and Kansas first year elementary principals' perceptions of satisfaction with the overall induction?

H1. New Kansas elementary principals participating in formally planned induction are more satisfied with the overall induction process than first year Kansas elementary principals who do not participate in formally planned induction. .

RQ5. Is there a relationship between the availability of a formal induction plan (written description with explicit goals and activities) and Kansas first year elementary principals' perceptions of preparation for the principalship?

H2. New Kansas elementary principals participating in formally planned induction feel better prepared than first year Kansas elementary principals who do not participate in formally planned induction.

RQ6. Is there a relationship between size of the school district (small, medium, large) and the availability of a formal induction plan (written description with explicit goals and activities)?

H3. Larger Kansas public school districts are more likely to provide formal induction experiences to first year elementary principals than smaller school districts.

RQ7. Is there a relationship between size of the school district (small, medium, large) and the Kansas first year elementary school principals' perceptions of satisfaction with the overall induction process?

H4. There is a difference in the satisfaction level of new Kansas elementary principals in small, medium, or large school districts in regard to their overall induction experiences.

RQ8. Is there a relationship between size of the school district (small, medium, large) and the Kansas first year elementary school principals' perceptions of preparation for the principalship?

H5. There is a difference in the perceptions of preparation of new Kansas elementary principals in small, medium, or large school districts in regard to their overall induction experiences.

An appropriate chi square test of independence was used to determine the relationships among the variables. According to Lunenburg and Irby (2008), a chi-square test is appropriate for comparing actual phenomena with expected phenomena, and a two or three-way test is appropriate with categories of more than one dimension.

For the *School District Survey*, a table was prepared to highlight the intersection between the research questions and the data collected from the survey. In Table 1, the data analysis plan is described.

Table 1

Intersection of Research Questions with School District Survey Items

RQ1: What is availability of a formal principal induction plan in school districts?	Survey Item 1: Percentage of Kansas school districts with formal induction plan
RQ2: What components of induction do Kansas school districts offer?	Survey Items 2-9: Descriptive data listing rank order and quantifying induction components offered

Note. Research questions are shortened for table purposes.

Similarly, Table 2 was prepared to highlight the intersection between the research questions and the data collected from the *Principal Survey*:

Table 2

Intersection of Research Questions with New Principal Survey Items

RQ1: What is availability of a formal principal induction plan in school districts?	Survey Item 10: Percentage of Kansas school districts with formal induction plan
RQ2: What components of induction do Kansas school districts offer?	Survey Items 11-18: Descriptive data of nine yes/no components for percentage and rank order
RQ3: To what extent are new principals satisfied with each component?	Survey Items 20-26: Descriptive data of nine items for percentage of levels of satisfaction
RQ4: Is there a relationship between availability of formal induction and principal satisfaction?	Survey Items 10 and 27: Compare availability of formal induction plan to principals' satisfaction with induction
RQ5: Is there a relationship between availability of formal induction and principal sense of preparation?	Survey Items 10 and 28: Compare availability of formal induction plan to principals' perceptions of preparation
RQ6: Is there a relationship between size of school district and availability of a formal induction plan?	Survey Items 2 and 10: Compare size of school district to availability of a formal induction plan
RQ7: Is there a relationship between size of school district and principal's overall satisfaction with induction?	Survey Items 2 and 27: Compare size of school district to principals' satisfaction with induction
RQ8: Is there a relationship between size of school district and principals' perceptions of preparation?	Survey Items 2 and 28: Compare size of school district to principals' perceptions of preparation

Note. Research questions are shortened for table purposes.

Limitations

According to Lunenburg and Irby (2008), limitations are factors that are not entirely under the researcher's control but may affect the interpretation or outcome of the study. This study had the following limitations:

1. Survey participation was voluntary; therefore the percentage of voluntary respondents may not adequately represent the views of new elementary principals as a whole.

2. Survey responses were self-reported; therefore participants may not have accurately self-reported or fully understood the intent of questions asked. Participants used a yes/no and Likert scale format to respond to the survey questions.
3. The sample of school principals and districts was drawn from a single state, and the results may not be generalizable to other states.

Summary

The research design, sampling procedures, instrumentation, and data collection utilized in the study were presented in chapter three. Measurement, validity, and reliability of the research instrument were described. Data analysis, hypothesis testing and limitations of the study were also outlined. A summary of the descriptive data gathered from the surveys and the results of the hypothesis testing are included in chapter four.

Chapter Four

Results

This chapter includes descriptive statistics of this study, results of the statistical data analyses, and a summary of the hypothesis testing. The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the types of induction opportunities available to new elementary principals in Kansas in the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 school years and the perceptions of new elementary principals toward these experiences. It was also the purpose of this study to examine the differences between the perceptions of new elementary principals from small, medium, and large Kansas school districts. Two electronic surveys were developed to collect data for this quantitative study.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics are the “mathematical procedures for organizing and summarizing numerical data” (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008, p. 63). The availability of formal induction programs and the induction components provided for new elementary principals are described in this section. Also new elementary principals’ levels of satisfaction with induction components are reported. Two surveys were utilized in this study to collect data.

School District Survey (SDS). The first survey was sent electronically to all Kansas public school district superintendents. A total of 325 email addresses were provided by the Kansas Department of Education, and of those, 301 addresses were valid. Survey Monkey was used as the collection vehicle. A total of 93 responses were returned (return rate = 30.56 percent). This is a slightly higher return rate when compared to the 24.8 percent average response rate for email surveys (Response Rate Statistics for Online Surveys, 2014). See Appendix E for the overall summary results from the *SDS*.

The purpose of the *SDS* was to determine how many Kansas school districts provided a planned, formal induction process for new elementary principals (RQ1) and to determine what components of induction were available to new elementary principals (RQ2). When asked if the school district provided a formally planned new elementary principal induction program for new elementary principals, 18.3 percent of the school superintendents indicated that their school district had a formal plan, while 81.7 percent indicated that their school district did not have a formal plan in place. The *SDS* frequency and percentage results for RQ1 are highlighted in Table 3.

Table 3

SDS Responses for Availability of a Formally Planned Elementary Principal Induction Program (RQ1)

Response	Frequency	Percent
No	76	81.7
Yes	17	18.3

The *SDS* responses from school districts for the frequency of induction components (RQ2) are reported in rank order in Table 4. Respondents indicated that informal mentoring or coaching support is the most frequently offered component by districts (93.9 percent), with internship prior to the principalship the least frequent component available (15.9 percent).

Table 4

SDS Affirmative Responses for Each New Elementary Principal Induction Component (RQ2)

Induction Components	Frequency	Percent
Informal mentoring or coaching support	77	93.9
Support group or network with other principals	59	72.8
District sponsored orientation prior to principalship	58	71.6
Topic specific meetings with district administration	58	71.6
Formal mentoring or coaching support	55	67.1
Building orientation with outgoing principal	55	67.1
Leadership development training prior to principalship	29	35.8
Internship prior to principalship	13	15.9

In the last item on the *School District Survey*, school district superintendents were given the option to identify an induction component not listed in the item choices. There were 25 responses to this open-ended question, although some responses were intended as comments, not induction components. Responses were grouped by commonality of content. Ten of the responses referenced the Kansas Educational Leadership Institute program (Augustine-Shaw, 2011), offered by Kansas State University in conjunction with the Kansas Department of Education and other state professional organizations. The second most referenced induction component identified the school district superintendent as a primary support for new principals. The list and frequency of other induction components are provided in Table 5.

Table 5

Frequency of Other Induction Component Responses from School District Survey

Other induction components identified	Frequency
Kansas Educational Leadership Institute program (Augustine-Shaw, 2011)	10
Regular meetings with / mentoring with the superintendent	4
District level professional development	3
Professional organization participation	1
Principal development program	1
ISLLC Standards professional development	1
Outside organization professional development	1

New Principal Survey (NPS). The second survey was sent to all Kansas elementary principals who were new to the principalship during the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic school years, as identified by KSDE. A total of 327 email addresses were provided by the Kansas Department of Education, and of those, 299 addresses were valid. The *NPS* was forwarded electronically using Survey Monkey to identified principals. A total of 100 responses were returned (return rate = 33.44 percent). This return rate is in contrast to the 24.8 percent average response rate for email surveys (Response Rate Statistics for Online Surveys, 2014). See Appendix F for overall summary results from the *NPS*.

The purposes of the *NPS* were to determine the availability of a formal induction plan (RQ1), what components of induction were available to new elementary principals (RQ2), and to examine new principals' perceptions of these components (RQ3). Another

purpose of the survey was to determine if the availability of a formal induction plan influenced new principals' perceptions of satisfaction or preparedness (RQ4-5). An additional purpose was to determine if school district size influenced the availability of a formal induction plan (RQ6) or new principals' perceptions of satisfaction or preparedness (RQ7-8).

The *New Principal Survey* was divided into two sections: demographics and induction questions. Of the 100 new principals participating, 50 percent of the respondents were female, 48 percent were male, and 2 percent did not answer this question. When asked what size school district they represented, 29 percent indicated that they worked in small school districts, 34% indicated that they worked in middle-size school districts, and 31 percent indicated that they worked in large school districts, with 6% not responding to this question. This represented a fairly even distribution of respondents from different sized districts. Participants indicated that they worked in buildings of various grade configurations, with 26 percent of the respondents indicating a K-5 configuration, 11 percent indicating a K-6 configuration, and 63 percent indicating other grade configurations. When asked about previous administrative experience, 6 percent indicated that they had served as principal in another state; 9 percent indicated that they had served as principal in another district; 12 percent indicated that they had served as principal in another building in the district; and 42 percent indicated that they had served as assistant principal. Of responding principals, 31 percent did not report any previous administrative experience.

Summary Responses

The results of summary responses for research questions one through three are presented in this section.

RQ1. To what extent do Kansas public school districts provide a formally planned induction program (defined as having a written description of new principal induction goals and activities) for new elementary principals?

When new elementary principals were asked if their school district provided a formally planned induction program for new elementary principals, 19.0 percent indicated their school district had a formal plan. This is similar to the percentage of school district superintendents' indication that 18.3 percent of districts had a formal induction plan. Of new principals responding, 63 percent reported that their school district did not have a formal plan in place. Some new elementary principals (18.0 percent) were not sure if their districts had a formal process in place. Refer to Table 6 for the results for research question one, comparing principal responses with district responses.

Table 6

Comparing Principal Responses with District Responses (RQ1)

Response	<u>Principal Response</u>		<u>District Response</u>	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
No	63	63.0	76	81.7
Yes	19	19.0	17	18.3
Don't Know	18	18.0	0.0	0.0
Total	100	100.0	93	100.0

RQ2. What components of induction do Kansas public school districts offer to new elementary school principals (from a list of options)?

In Table 7 the percentage of affirmative responses from the *School District Survey* is compared with the percentage of affirmative responses from the *New Principal Survey*. The level of discrepancy indicates the degree of agreement between district and principal responses, with the lowest discrepancy indicating a greater level of agreement. Responses indicated the greatest agreement for support/network groups with other principals (0.9 percent discrepancy) and informal mentoring/coaching (6.4 percent discrepancy), and the least agreement between principal responses and district responses related to internship prior to principalship (26.8 percent discrepancy). Table 7 results are listed in rank order according to level of agreement.

Table 7

Percent Agreement of School District Survey Results with Principal Survey Results

Induction Components	District %	Principal %	Percent Discrepancy
Support group/networking	72.8	71.9	0.9
Informal mentoring or coaching	93.9	87.5	6.4
Topic meetings with district administration	71.6	60.4	11.2
Orientation with outgoing principal	67.1	55.2	11.9
District sponsored orientation	71.6	58.9	12.7
Formal mentoring or coaching support	67.1	49.0	18.1
Leadership development prior to principalship	35.8	58.9	23.1
Internship prior to principalship	15.9	42.7	26.8

RQ3. To what extent are new Kansas elementary principals satisfied with each component of the induction process in preparing them for the principalship?

The results for RQ3 indicate that new elementary principals are generally satisfied with the induction components they experienced, with the percentage of satisfaction (satisfied plus very satisfied ratings) ranging from 78.3 percent (building orientation with outgoing principal) to 93.9 percent (leadership development training prior to principalship). A Likert scale was used to indicate the percentage frequencies for each component response: *VD = Very Dissatisfied; D = Dissatisfied; S = Satisfied; VS = Very Satisfied*. The components in Table 8 are presented in rank order of satisfaction from respondents.

Table 8

New Principal Survey: Percentage of Responses for Each Principal Induction Component Indicating Percentage of Satisfaction Level for Each Component

Induction Components	Dissatisfied %	Satisfied %
Leadership development training prior to principalship	6.1	93.9
Informal mentoring/coaching support	8.2	91.8
Internship prior to principalship	10.2	89.8
Formal mentoring/coaching support	11.9	88.1
Topic specific meetings with district administration	14.5	85.5
District orientation prior to principalship	15.7	83.3
Building orientation with outgoing principalship	21.7	78.3
Support group/network with other principals	None	None

Note: The support/network group component question was mistakenly omitted from the survey sent to new principals; therefore, no satisfaction data are available for this component.

Hypothesis Testing

The results of hypothesis testing for research questions four through eight are presented in this section.

RQ4. Is there a relationship between the availability of a formal induction plan (written description with explicit goals and activities) and Kansas first year elementary principals' perceptions of satisfaction with the overall induction process?

H1. First year elementary principals participating in formally planned induction are more satisfied with the overall induction process than first year Kansas elementary principals who did not participate in a formal induction process.

A 3x3 chi-square test of independence was conducted to address Hypothesis 1. The level of significance was set at .05. The results of the 3x3 χ^2 test of independence, shown in Table 9, did not indicate a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected values, $\chi^2 = 2.733$, $df = 4$, $p = .603$. The results of the χ^2 test did not support the hypothesis that new principals participating in a formal induction process are more satisfied with the overall induction process than those who did not participate in a formal induction process. While a majority of respondents did not indicate their participation in a formal induction process (53 respondents compared with 19 respondents), they indicated a relatively equal level of satisfaction with the induction process. Regardless of availability of formal induction, there was strong satisfaction with the induction process.

Table 9

Comparisons of Availability of Formal Principal Induction Process with Level of Principal Satisfaction

Level of Satisfaction	Don't Know	No	Yes	Total
Dissatisfied	6.3% (1)	15.1% (8)	10.5% (2)	12.5% (11)
Satisfied	87.5% (1)	69.8% (37)	68.4% (13)	72.7% (64)
Very Satisfied	6.3% (1)	15.1% (8)	21.1% (4)	14.8% (13)
Total	100.0% (16)	100.0% (53)	100.0% (19)	100.0% (88)

RQ5. Is there a relationship between the availability of a formal induction plan (written description with explicit goals and activities) and new Kansas elementary principals' perceptions of preparation for the principalship?

H2. New Kansas elementary principals participating in formally planned induction feel better prepared than new elementary principals who did not participate in a formally prepared induction.

A 3x4 chi-square test of independence was conducted to address Hypothesis 2. The level of significance was set at .05. The results of the 3x3 χ^2 test of independence did not indicate a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected values, $\chi^2 = 4.367$, $df = 6$, $p = 0.627$. The results of the χ^2 test did not support the hypothesis that new principals participating in a formal induction process feel better prepared than those who did not participate in a formal induction process. The results for RQ5 are presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Comparisons of Availability of Formal Principal Induction Process with Level of Preparation

Level of Preparation	Don't Know	No	Yes	Total
Not Prepared	0.0% (0)	6.4% (6)	0.0% (0)	6.4% (6)
Somewhat Prepared	56.3% (9)	54.2% (32)	52.6% (10)	54.3% (51)
Prepared	37.5% (6)	28.8% (17)	36.8% (7)	81.9% (30)
Well Prepared	6.3% (1)	6.8% (4)	10.5% (2)	7.4% (7)
Total	100.0% (16)	100.0% (59)	100.0% (19)	100.0% (94)

RQ6. Is there a relationship between the size of the school district (small, medium, large) and the availability of a formal induction plan (written description with explicit goals and activities)?

H3. Larger Kansas public school districts are more likely to provide formal induction experiences to first year elementary principals than smaller schools districts.

A 3x3 chi-square test of independence was conducted to address Hypothesis 3. The level of significance was set at .05. The results of the 3x3 χ^2 test of independence did not indicate a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected values, $\chi^2 = 8.286$, $df = 4$, $p = .082$. The results of the χ^2 test, presented in Table 11, did not support the hypothesis that larger Kansas public school districts are more likely to provide formal induction experiences to first year elementary principals than smaller schools districts. However, these results approached the level of significance at 0.082,

and are worthy of discussion. The results indicated that, though not significant, a higher percentage of middle-sized and larger-sized school districts offer a formal induction plan for new elementary principals than do smaller school districts.

Table 11

Comparisons of District Size with Availability of a Formal Principal Induction Process

Size of District	Don't Know	No	Yes	Total
1-2A	23.5% (4)	39.7% (23)	10.05% (2)	30.9% (29)
3-4A	29.4% (5)	36.2% (21)	42.1% (8)	36.2% (34)
5-6A	47.1% (8)	24.1% (14)	47.4% (9)	33.0% (31)
Total	100.0% (17)	100.0% (58)	100.0% (19)	100.0% (94)

RQ7. Is there a relationship between the size of the school district (small, medium, large) and the Kansas first year elementary school principals' perceptions of satisfaction with the overall induction process?

H4. There is a difference in the satisfaction level of new Kansas elementary principals in small, medium, or large school districts in regard to their overall induction experiences.

A 3x3 chi-square test of independence was conducted to address Hypothesis 4. The level of significance was set at .05. The results of the 3x3 χ^2 test of independence did not indicate a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected values, $\chi^2 = 5.215$, $df = 4$, $p = .266$. The results of the χ^2 test did not support the hypothesis that there is a difference in the satisfaction level of new Kansas elementary principals in small, medium, or large school districts in regard to their overall induction

experiences. The results indicated that while a higher percentage of principals from smaller school districts were dissatisfied with induction, the difference was not significant. The results for RQ7 are presented in table 12.

Table 12

Percentages and Frequencies of Comparisons of District Size with Principal Level of Satisfaction with Overall Induction Process

Level of Satisfaction	1-2A	3-4A	5-6A	Total
Dissatisfied	21.7% (5)	3.1% (1)	14.3% (2)	12.0% (10)
Satisfied	65.2% (15)	84.4% (27)	67.9% (19)	73.5% (61)
Very Satisfied	13.0% (3)	12.5% (4)	17.9% (5)	14.5% (12)
Total	100.0% (23)	100.0% (32)	100.0% (28)	100.0% (83)

RQ8. Is there a relationship between the size of the school district (small, medium, large) and the Kansas first year elementary school principals' perceptions of preparation for the principalship?

H5. There is a difference in the perceptions of preparation of new Kansas elementary principals in small, medium, or large school districts in regard to their overall induction experiences.

A 3x3 chi-square test of independence was conducted to address Hypothesis 5. The level of significance was set at .05. The results of the 3x4 χ^2 test of independence indicated a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected values, $\chi^2 = 21.32$, $df = 6$, $p = .002$. The results of the χ^2 test supported the hypothesis that there is a significant difference in the perceptions of preparation of new Kansas

elementary principals in small, medium, or large school districts in regard to their overall induction experiences. The results for RQ8 are presented in Table 13.

Table 13

Percentages and Frequencies of Comparisons of School District Size with Principal Perceptions of Preparation in Regard to the Overall Induction Process

Level of Preparation	1-2A	3-4A	5-6A	Total
Not Prepared	12/0% (3)	3.0% (1)	6.5% (2)	6.7% (6)
Somewhat Prepared	80.0% (20)	30.3% (10)	58.1% (18)	53.9% (48)
Prepared	4.0% (1)	54.5% (18)	29.0% (9)	31.5% (28)
Well Prepared	4.0% (1)	12.1% (4)	6.5% (2)	7.9% (9)
Total	100.0% (25)	100.0% (33)	100.0% (31)	100.0% (89)

Summary

In chapter four, the results of the research questions in this study are presented. The results of hypothesis testing indicated that there was no significant difference in the principals' perceptions of satisfaction or preparation compared to the availability of a formal induction plan. Additionally no significant relationship was found between the availability of a formal induction plan and principals' satisfaction with induction compared to the size of the school district. However, hypothesis testing demonstrated a significant relationship in the principals' perceptions of preparation for the principalship in comparison to the size of the school district. In chapter five, a summary of the study, an overview of the purpose, and a restatement of the research questions and hypotheses

will be reviewed. The methodology and research findings are also presented. Finally chapter five will conclude with implications and recommendations for future research.

Chapter Five

Interpretation and Recommendations

This researcher investigated the availability of formal induction programs for new Kansas elementary principals and the principals' perceptions of induction experiences. Also the relationship of the size of the school district with induction practices was investigated. While other research has highlighted the need for formally planned induction processes for new principals (Wallace Foundation, 2007), it was the intent of this study to document the existence and effectiveness of principal induction programs in Kansas. The results of this study were presented in chapter four. A summary of the findings and implications for actions and future research are presented in chapter five.

Study Summary

The importance of the school leadership role was documented from the research literature in chapter two, and the importance of leadership preparation was also highlighted. School leadership induction programs for new elementary principals in Kansas were investigated in this study. In this section, an overview of the problem, a restatement of the purpose of the study, a review of the methodology, and findings from the study are presented.

Overview of the problem. The problem investigated in this study is the inconsistent availability and quality of new principal induction practices. Marzano et al. (2005) emphasized the importance of the school principal's role related to the quality of the education provided to students. Leithwood and Day (2008) stated unequivocally that "school leadership is 2nd only to classroom instruction as an influence on pupil learning"

(p.2). Yet, despite the importance of the impact and challenges of the principal's role (Marzano, et al, 2005; Wallace Foundation, 2007; Fullen, 2003), the literature documented a frequent lack of planning to design and implement effective induction practices to prepare new principals for the rigors of the principalship (Wallace Foundation, 2007). While induction programs for classroom teachers have long been recognized as an important part of their introduction to classroom practice (Weiss & Weiss, 1999), the process of preparing new principals for their roles as school leaders has often been characterized as haphazard and ineffective (Wallace Foundation, 2007). The Kansas Department of Education requires new principals to complete a District Administered Mentoring Program, but no formal requirements are specified. In this study, induction programs for new Kansas elementary principals were investigated to determine the availability and effectiveness of these programs.

Purpose statement and research questions. The purpose of this study was to identify and quantify the types of induction experiences available to new elementary principals in Kansas and to examine principals' perceptions of satisfaction and preparation with their induction experiences. It was also the purpose of this study to determine if there were differences in perceptions of satisfaction and preparation from new principals in small, medium, and large school districts in Kansas. The following research questions were established to direct this study:

RQ1. To what extent do Kansas public school districts provide a formally planned induction program (defined as having a written description of new principal induction goals and activities) for new elementary principals?

RQ2. What components of induction do Kansas public school districts offer to new elementary school principals?

RQ3. To what extent are new Kansas elementary principals satisfied with each component of the induction process in preparing them for the principalship?

RQ4. Is there a relationship between the availability of a formal induction plan and Kansas first year elementary principals' perceptions of satisfaction with the overall induction process?

RQ5. Is there a relationship between the availability of a formal induction plan (written description with explicit goals and activities) and new Kansas elementary principals' perceptions of preparation for the principalship?

RQ6. Is there a relationship between the size of the school district (small, medium, large) and the availability of a formal induction plan?

RQ7. Is there a relationship between the size of the school district (small, medium, large) and the Kansas first year elementary school principals' perceptions of satisfaction with the overall induction process?

RQ8. Is there a relationship between the size of the school district (small, medium, large) and the Kansas first year elementary school principals' perceptions of preparation for the principalship?

Review of the methodology. Using a quantitative research design, information about elementary principal induction practices was gathered from Kansas public school district superintendents and from new Kansas elementary principals using two related surveys developed by the researcher. The *School District Survey* was sent to all Kansas public school superintendents, utilizing Survey Monkey as the collection vehicle.

Superintendents were asked to report on the availability of a formal induction process for new elementary principals and to report what components of induction were available to new elementary principals. The *New Principal Survey* was sent to all building leaders who served as new Kansas elementary principals during the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic school years. Utilizing Survey Monkey, new principals were asked to provide demographic information, including the size of their school district, and the availability of a formal induction program, components of induction made available, and their perceptions of their induction experiences. After data were collected, chi square analyses were conducted to test the research hypotheses.

Major findings. Findings for this study are presented in reference to the research questions. Concerning the availability of planned formal induction programs for new elementary principals (RQ1), a majority of Kansas school district superintendents (81.7%) reported not having a formal induction process in place. Also a majority of new elementary principals (63.0%) indicated that their school districts did not have a formal induction plan. Eighteen percent of new principals were not sure.

The intent of the second research question (RQ2) was to ascertain what components of new principal induction were made available to new elementary principals. There was general agreement between the superintendents and principals regarding the induction components available, with informal mentoring/coaching support the most frequent component reported (90.7% average response). An internship prior to the principalship was reported as the least available component of induction (29.3% average response).

In RQ3, new principals were asked for their perceptions of satisfaction with each induction component, and results indicated that they were generally satisfied with the induction components experienced, despite the lack of a formal induction program. The level of satisfaction ranged from 93.9 percent to 78.3 percent. The following components are listed in rank order of satisfaction: (1) Leadership development training prior to principalship 93.9 percent, (2) Informal mentoring or coaching support 91.8 percent, (3) Internship prior to principalship 89.8 percent, (4) Formal mentoring or coaching support 88.1 percent, (5) Topic-specific meetings with district administration 85.5 percent, (6) District-sponsored orientation prior to principalship 83.4 percent, and (7) Building orientation with outgoing principal 78.3 percent.

Findings from the first hypothesis for RQ4 indicated that there was not a significant relationship between the availability of a formal induction plan and principals' level of satisfaction with their overall induction experiences. Of the 19 respondents who had participated in a formal induction plan, 89.5 percent were satisfied with their overall induction experiences. The result was slightly higher than 84.9 percent of the 53 participants who had not participated in a formal induction plan, but were satisfied or very satisfied with their induction experiences. These results suggest that the existence or nonexistence of a formal induction plan did not influence satisfaction with the induction process. This may suggest that new principals are grateful for the assistance they are provided, regardless of the format involved.

Findings from the second hypothesis for RQ5 indicated that there was not a significant relationship between the availability of a formal induction plan and principals' perceptions of preparedness as a result of their overall induction experiences.

Availability of a formal induction plan did not influence principals' sense of preparation. However, it is interesting to note that 60.2 percent of respondents who did not experience a formal induction plan did not feel well prepared for the principalship (not prepared + somewhat prepared), and 52.6 percent of the respondents who participated in a formal induction plan also did not feel well prepared for the principalship. This finding suggests that a majority of new principals did not feel well prepared for the principalship, despite their general level of satisfaction with the induction process. This finding might tend to suggest that, while induction assistance provided to new principals is beneficial, it is incomplete.

Findings from the third hypothesis for RQ6 indicated that there was not a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the availability of a formal induction plan. It was hypothesized that larger school districts were more likely to provide a formal induction plan than smaller school districts. Given that the level of significance was set at .05, it is noted that the *p-value* of this 3x3 chi-squared test was 0.082, indicating that results approached significance. Although not statistically significant, the availability of a formal induction plan is influenced by the size of the school district.

The results from the chi-square test for the fourth hypothesis for RQ7 did not indicate a significant relationship between induction satisfaction levels of new Kansas elementary principals in small, medium, or large school districts. However, it is noted from the results that respondents from middle sized school districts were more satisfied (combining satisfied with very satisfied responses) with their induction experiences

(96.9%) than respondents from small (78.2 percent) or large (85.8 percent) school districts.

Findings from the fifth hypothesis for RQ8 indicated that there was a significant relationship between new principals' perceptions of preparedness and the size of the school district. Ninety-two percent of principals from smaller school districts (1-2A) did not feel well prepared (combined not prepared and somewhat prepared responses) for the principalship, compared with 33.3 percent of principals from middle sized school districts (3-4A) and 64.6% of principals from larger sized school districts (5-6A). This discrepancy suggests that new principals from middle-sized school districts feel better prepared than principals from either small or large school districts.

Findings Related to the Literature

In this section, the current study's findings will be examined in light of other related research on the topic of new principal induction. Five areas of findings will be examined in this section: the availability of formal induction programs for new principals, principal satisfaction with the induction process, availability of mentoring, influence of district size, and principals' perceptions of preparation for the principalship.

Availability of formal induction plans. This study confirmed earlier research that little progress has been made toward making a planned formal induction process available to new elementary principals in Kansas. Over 80 percent of Kansas superintendents and over 60 percent of new elementary principals (with 18 percent unsure) indicated that a formal, planned induction process was not available in their school districts. Aycock's (2006) study focused on principal induction in Kansas and concluded that few school districts have a formally planned induction process in place.

One recommendation from her study was that school districts and professional organizations should work toward developing formal leadership preparation structures. Jackson (2010) conducted a similar study in three large school districts in Virginia, and came to the same conclusion in that state: few new principals were given the opportunity to participate in a formal induction process. In his early study of induction, Lyon (1992) recommended that school districts must provide a comprehensive program of induction to effectively prepare school leaders. An NAESP (2003) survey of school district superintendents across the county indicated that fewer than half of the superintendents reported a formal induction process for principals.

Principal satisfaction with induction. It was surprising to note that, despite the lack of a formal planned induction program, responding principals in the current study were generally satisfied with the components of induction and with the induction process overall. This conclusion confirms earlier research. Correll (2010), in a study of principal satisfaction and retention, concluded that principals were satisfied with induction, particularly if they were involved in mentoring and networking with other principals. Similarly, Kingham (2009) studied principal induction in Louisiana and found that principals were satisfied with the induction process if they participated in mentoring and in networking with other professionals. Hudson (2009) studied the South Carolina principal induction program and concluded that principals were very satisfied with four aspects of the state induction program. In the current study, principal respondents indicated satisfaction with specific induction components, with responses ranging from 93.9 percent (leadership development prior to principalship) to 78.3 percent (building orientation with outgoing principal), and with an overall average satisfaction level of 87.1

percent. The results from the *New Principal Survey* in this study indicated that 81.8 percent of the principal respondents were satisfied with their overall induction process.

Availability of mentoring. Mentoring is the most common principal induction component, with more than half the states (including Kansas) requiring some form of mentoring for new principals (Hudson, 2009; Wallace Foundation, 2012). Most Kansas principal respondents indicated that they had received mentoring support as part of their induction. Eighty-seven percent of principal respondents indicated that they were assigned an informal mentor, while 49 percent reported having a formal mentoring arrangement. This finding is in contrast to Holloway's (2004) study, indicating that fewer than half of the principals reported the availability of a mentoring program. As noted earlier in Correll's (2010) and Kingham's (2009) research, participation in mentoring had an important influence on new principals' level of satisfaction with the induction process. In concert with these findings, the current study indicated that 91.8 percent of principal respondents were satisfied with their informal mentoring experiences while 88.1 percent were satisfied with their formal mentoring experiences.

Influence of district size. Other research has suggested that size of the school district has a relationship to the quality or availability of professional development for new principals. Aiken's (2001) study indicated that rural school districts have more challenges in providing robust professional development due to a scarcity of resources. Chadwick and Howley (2002) concluded that rural principals have more challenges with networking due to geographic isolation. Three research questions in the current study examined the influence of district size on: the availability of a formal induction plan, principals' satisfaction with the induction process, and principals' perception of

preparedness for the principalship. Two of the three hypotheses related to district size were not found to be significant: the relationship to the availability of a formal induction plan and the principals' perceptions of satisfaction with overall induction. However, with a *p-value* of .082, the relationship of district size to availability of a formal induction process approached significance, suggesting that there is a relationship, although not statistically significant. The geographic challenges of smaller, rural school districts might provide an explanation for the lower likelihood of accessing formal professional resources.

Perceptions of preparation. There has been minimal research reporting new principals' perceptions of preparation as a result of induction experiences. However, research referred to earlier concerning the influence of school district size on induction quality and availability could provide some explanation for the lower perceptions of preparedness found in this study from principals in smaller school districts. The third research hypothesis relating to size of school district was found to be significant in this study. Principals in smaller school districts reported a significantly lower sense of preparation for the principalship (8.0 percent) than did principals in middle (66.6 percent) and larger (35.5 percent) school districts. Research on the influence of district size to professional development (Aiken, 2001; Chadwick & Howley, 2002) indicates that smaller school districts have difficulty accessing professional resources due to geographic isolation and scarcity of program availability. This could account for the lower perceptions of preparedness for the principalship from respondents in smaller school districts. Interestingly, respondents from middle sized school districts felt more satisfied

and better prepared than respondents from either larger school districts or smaller school districts.

Conclusions

Conclusions drawn from the current study are presented in this section.

Implications for action, recommendations for future research, and concluding remarks are also provided.

Implications for action. The research findings in this study demonstrated that, despite the importance and challenges of the leadership role in education, few elementary principals in Kansas have the opportunity to experience a well-planned formal induction process. If “specific preparation makes a difference to the quality of school leadership,” (Bush, 2009, p. 377) then it is imperative that school districts take seriously the responsibility to offer new principals a comprehensive induction process designed to meet the specific needs of their role in leadership.

This research indicated that while new Kansas elementary principals seem generally satisfied with their induction experiences, most did not feel well prepared for the principalship in general. The conclusion may be drawn that the induction experiences received were adequate but not complete. This, again, would suggest the importance for school districts to research the needs of new principals and to design an induction program that addresses those needs in a targeted way. These findings also suggest the need for school district leaders to survey beginning principals at the end of their school year on what aspects of their induction program prepared them for the principalship and what aspects might have been missing. School district leaders must be intentional in incorporating components of a comprehensive induction program to fully prepare new principals to meet the expectations of their leadership role.

This research also indicates that new principals in smaller school districts feel less prepared from induction than new principals in middle-sized and larger-sized school districts. The conclusion from this finding suggests that superintendents in smaller school districts may need to actively pursue outside resources through state programs, such as the Kansas Educational Leadership Institute (KELI), or other state professional organizations or service centers to provide a more comprehensive induction and networking experience for their new principals.

Recommendations for future research. The purpose of this research was to determine the availability of formal induction programs to new elementary principals in Kansas and to examine new principals' perceptions of those experiences. The current research benchmarks lack of progress in making comprehensive induction programs available to new elementary principals in Kansas. Future research should be conducted to ascertain whether or not formal induction programs are available to new principals in other states.

The current research found that while most elementary principals were satisfied with their induction experiences, most did not feel well prepared for the principalship. Additional research is needed to determine if this is an existing pattern in other states. It would be helpful to determine what aspects of induction experiences are lacking in fully preparing principals for their leadership roles.

This research indicated that new Kansas elementary principals in smaller school districts felt less prepared for the principalship than principals of middle and larger size school districts. Additional research is needed to determine if there are models of effective induction programs that more successfully meet the needs of new principals in

smaller school districts. The current research also indicated that new principals of middle-size school districts felt more satisfied and more prepared than new principals of either smaller or larger school districts. It is recommended that additional research investigate the induction differences that give advantage to new principals of middle-sized school districts.

Concluding remarks. The purpose of this study was to examine the types of induction experiences offered to new elementary principals in Kansas and their perceptions of these induction practices. It was also the purpose of this study to examine the relationship of school district size to induction practices. The study results demonstrated evidence that few first year elementary principals in Kansas are provided the opportunity to participate in a formal planned induction program, but that most new elementary principals in Kansas, in general, are satisfied with their induction experiences. There was no statistically significant relationship between the availability of a formal induction plan and new principals' level of satisfaction or sense of preparation. There was no statistically significant relationship between the size of the school district and the availability of a formal induction plan or the principals' sense of satisfaction with induction practices. The results of the study indicated, however, that there was a significant difference in the perceptions of preparedness for principals from smaller school districts in comparison with principals from middle and larger sized school districts. The results of this study contributed to the body of work relating to new principal induction. School district boards and superintendents need to be aware of and effectively plan for the needs of new school leaders in the twenty-first century.

References

- Aiken, J. (2001). Supporting and sustaining school principals through a statewide new principal's institute. *Planning & Changing Journal*, 32(3-4), 144-163.
- Aiken, J. (2002). The socialization of new principals: Another perspective on principal retention. *Educational Leadership Review*, 3(1), 32-40.
- Alsbury, T. (2006). Learning from experience: Initial findings of a mentoring/induction program for novice principals and superintendents. *Planning and Changing Journal*, 37(3-4), 169-189.
- Alvy, H., & Robbins, P. (May 2005) Growing into leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 62(8), 50-55. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Augustine-Shaw, D. (2011, October 21). KELI: Kansas Educational Leadership Institute. Presentation at Kansas State Department of Education Conference, Wichita, KS.
- Aycock, M. (2006). *Induction and mentoring of beginning Kansas public school principals* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 3223353)
- Barton, B. (2009). *The journal of mentoring novice principals; A qualitative study of Palm Beach county initiative in mentoring novice principals in low performing schools*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 3368377)
- Blackman, M., & Fenwich, L. (2000, March 29). Looking for leaders in times of change. *Education Week*, 19(29). Retrieved from <http://www.ebsco.com>

- Blase, J. & Kirby, P. (2009). *Bringing out the best in teachers: What effective principals do* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Bloom, G., Castagna, C., & Warren, B. (2003, May/June). More than mentors: Principal coaching. Retrieved from <http://www.coaching4educators.com>
- Bloom, G., Castagna, C., Moir, El, & Warren, B. (2005). *Blended coaching: Skills and strategies to support principal development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Brown, F. (2015, July 2). Is the school principalship a doable job? It depends. *Education Week*. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org>
- Burkart, J. (2007). *Beginning principal induction programs: An analysis of needs of beginning principals*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 328015)
- Bush, T. (2009, November). Leadership development and school improvement: Contemporary issues in leadership development. *Education Review*, 61(4), 375-389.
- Chadwick, K., & Howley, C. (2002). Networking for the Nuts and Bolts: Rural principals. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 17(3), 171-187.
- Cheney, G., & Davis, J. (2011). *Gateways to the principalship: State Power to improve the quality of school leaders*. Washington DC: Center for American Progress.
- Christie, K. (2000, October). Leadership comes round again. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(2), 105-106.
- Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap...and others don't*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers Inc.

- Correll, C. (2010). *Analysis of early career principals' experience with induction program and job satisfaction*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 3412569)
- Creswell, J. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (3rd ed)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Crocker, C., & Harris, S. (2002). Facilitating growth of administrative practitioners as mentors. *Journal of Research for Educational Leaders*, 1(2), 5-20.
- Daresh, J. (1990, May). Formation: The missing ingredient in administrators' preparation. *National Association of Secondary School Principals*, 74(526), 1-5.
- Daresh, J. (2001). *Leaders helping leaders: A practical guide to administrative mentoring*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Daresh, J. (2006). *Beginning the principalship: A practical guide for new school leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(1) 1-44.
- Doherty, T. (1999). *Role of mentors in development of school principals*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://www.thesis.lib.vt.edu>. (ETD No. 030799-163759).
- Education Northwest (2014). *Teacher recruitment, induction, and retention*. Retrieved from <http://nwcc.educationnorthwest.org/2014>.
- Elsberry, C., & Bishop, H. (1993). *Perceptions of 1st year elementary principals in three southeastern states regarding principal induction programs*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov>. (ED No. 369187)

- Fullen, M. (2003). *The moral imperative of school leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Gergens, B. (1998). *The importance of informal mentoring in acquiring the principal and throughout principal induction*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 9902799)
- Ginty, E. (1995, December). Supporting the success of the aspiring and beginning school leader. *National Association of Secondary School Principals*, 79(575), 34-41.
- Hall, P. (2008, February). Building bridges strengthening the principal induction process through intentional mentoring. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89(6), 449-452.
- Hargreaves, A. (2005, Winter). Leadership succession. *Education Forum*, 69 (winter), 163-173.
- Hibert, K. (2000, September). Mentoring leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(1), 449-452.
- Harris, S., Ballenger, J., & Leonard, J. (2004, August). Aspiring principals' perceptions: Are mentor principals modeling standards-based leadership? *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 12(2), 156-172.
- Hoerr, T. (2005). *The art of school leadership*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Holloway, J. (2004, April). Mentoring new leaders. *Educational Leadership*, 61(7), 87-88.
- Hopkins-Thomson, P. (2000, September). Colleagues helping colleagues: Mentoring and coaching. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84(617), 29-36.

- Hudson, J. (2009). *A perceptual analysis of the South Carolina induction program as perceived by program participants*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 3389248)
- Jackson, A. (2010). *Comparing satisfaction, retention, and success for principals who did and did not participate in a mentoring program*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov>. (ED No. 519874)
- Kingham, S. (2009). *The perspectives of first-year principal regarding their experiences with mentors and the mentoring process within the louisiana educational leaders induction program*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 3394742)
- Kansas Department of Education (2015, April). *District Mentor and Induction Program Guide*. Retrieved from: <http://www.KSDE.org>.
- Lashway, L. (2003, August). Inducting school leaders. *ERIC Digest* 170.
- Lee, D. (n.d.). Successful onboarding: How to get your new employees started off right. Retrieved from <http://www.HumanNature@work.com>
- Leithwood, K. & Day, C. (2008, February). The impact of school leadership on pupil outcomes. *School Leadership and Management*, 28(1), 1-4.
- Lezotte, L. (1991, July). Correlates of effective schools: The first and second generation. Presentation at Kansas State Department of Education conference.
- Lezotte, L., & Jacoby, B. (1990). *A guide to the school improvement process based on effective schools research*. Okemus, MI: Effective Schools Products.
- Lipton, L., Wellman, B., & Humbard, C. (2003). *Mentoring matters: A practical guide to learning-focused relationships (2nd ed.)*. Sherman, CT: MiraVia, LLC.

- Love, J., Selker, R., Marsman, M., Jamil, T., Dropmann, D., Verhagen, A. J., Ly, A., Gronau, Q. F., Smira, M., Epskamp, S., Matzke, D., Wild, A., Rouder, J. N., Morey, R. D. & Wagenmakers, E.-J. (2015). JASP (Version 0.7.5 beta).
- Lunenburg, F., & Irby, B. (2008). *Writing a successful thesis or dissertation: Tips and strategies for students in the social and behavioral sciences*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.
- Lyons, J. (1992, May). Competencies of beginning principals: Are they prepared for the role? Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov>.
- Macmillan, R., Meyer, M., & Sherman, A. (2001). *The evolving role of educational administrators*. Retrieved from <http://www.cesc.ca/pceradocs/2001>
- Malone, R. (2001). Principal mentoring. *ERIC Digest 07-2001*.
- Marzano, R., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R., & Waters, T. (2009). *District leadership that works: Striking the right balance*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Maxwell, J. (1999). *21 indispensable qualities of a leader: Becoming the person others will want to follow*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- Maxwell, J. (2008). *Leadership gold: Lessons I've learned from a lifetime of leading*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- Mellinger, S. (2012, October 20). Looking back at Kansas State coach Bill Snyder. *The Kansas City Star*, pp. B1.

- National Association for Elementary School Principals, (2003). *Making the case for principal mentoring*. Alexandria, VA: NAESP.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration, (2015). *Professional standards for educational leaders*. Reston, VA: NPBEA.
- Piraino, C. (2008). *Identifying the needs of beginning elementary principals*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 3350592)
- Pulliam, J., & Van Patten, J. (2003). *History of education in America* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Reiss, K. (2007). *Leadership coaching for educators: Bringing out the best in school administrators*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Response rate for online surveys. (2014, October). Retrieved from <http://www.fluidsurveys.com>
- Rooney, J. (2000, September). Survival skills for the new principal. *Educational Leadership*, 68(1), 77-78.
- Scherer, M. (2012, May). The challenges of supporting new teachers: A conversation with Linda Darling-Hammond. *Educational Leadership*, 69(8), 18-23.
- Shook, M. (2001). *The role of mentoring in developing professional and personal competencies for school administrators*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 3029773)
- Smith, A. (2007, August). Mentoring for experienced school principals: Professional learning in a safe place. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 15(5), 277-291.

- Superville, D. (August 19, 2015). Rookie principals' group sheds light on early-career challenges. *Education Week*, 35(1), 6.
- Southern Region Education Board (2008). *Mentoring School Leaders in Competency-Based Internship and Induction Experiences*. Atlanta, GA: SREB.
- Thomas, J., & Brady, K (2005, January). The elementary and secondary education act at 40. *Review of Research in Education*, 29(1), 51-67.
- Villani, S. (2006). *Mentoring and induction programs that support new principals*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Wagner, T., Kegan, R., Lahey, L., Lemons, R., Garnier, J., Helsing, D., Howell, A., & Rasmussen, H. (2006). *Change leadership: A practical guide to transforming our schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Walker, A. & Qian, H. (2006). Beginning principals: Balancing at the top of the greasy pole. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44(4), 297-309.
- Walker, K., & Carr-Stewart, S. (2006). Beginning principals: Experiences and images of success. *Teachers and Principals: Leadership and Discourse*, 34(3), 17-36.
- Wallace Foundation. (2007). *Getting principal mentoring right*. New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation.
- Wallace Foundation. (2012). *The making of the principal: Five lessons in leadership training*. New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation.
- Watkins, M. (2003). *The first ninety days: Critical success strategies for leaders at all levels*. Boston, MA: Harvard Review Press.
- Wayne, A., Youngs, P., & Fleshman, S. (2005, May). Improving teacher induction. *Educational Leadership*, 62(8), 76-77.

- Weingartner, C. (2009). *Principal mentoring: A safe, simple, and supportive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Weiss E., & Weiss, S. (1999). Beginning teacher induction. Retrieved from <http://www.ied.edu.hk>
- West, P. (2002). *A case study of the formal mentorships of novice principals in one school district*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses *database*. (UMI No. 3117966)
- Willer, C., & Recht, D. (2011). What kinds of support do new principals want? *Association of Curriculum and Development Express*, 7(1), 1-3.
- Wilmore, E. (2004). *Principal induction: A standards-based model for administrator development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Wong, H. (2003, December). *Induction: How to train, support, and retain new teachers*. Paper presented at National Staff Development Council, New Orleans, LA.
- Young, M., & Fuller, E. (2009, April). *Tenure and retention of newly hired principals in Texas*. Retrieved from University Council for Educational Administration website: <http://www.ucea.org>
- Young, P., Sheets, J., & Knight, D. (2005). *Mentoring principals: Frameworks, agendas, tips, and case stories for mentors and mentees*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Zachary, L. (2000). *The mentors guide: Facilitating effective learning relationships*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Zachary, L. (2005). *Creating a mentoring culture: The organization's guide*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Appendices

Appendix A: Elementary Principal Induction Survey

ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL INDUCTION SURVEY

Directions:

The purpose of this survey is to identify and quantify district elementary principal induction practices in Kansas and determine new principal satisfaction with these practices in preparing them for the principalship. I am conducting this survey as part of my doctoral program at Baker University. Your cooperation and participation is greatly appreciated. Please respond to the following statements and log out when finished. You have the right not to participate or to stop at any time. Your participation is entirely voluntary, and participation represents your consent. Your identity will not be recorded; only blinded data will be used for summary analysis. This survey should take less than 5 minutes to complete. Thank you! EM

1. Does your school district have a formally planned elementary principal induction program (defined as having a written description of new principal induction goals and activities) in place?

Yes

No

ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL INDUCTION SURVEY

What components of induction does your district offer?

Please respond to each question.

2. Internship prior to principalship

Yes

No

3. Leadership development training prior to principalship

Yes

No

4. • District-sponsored orientation prior to or while assuming responsibilities of principalship

Yes

No

5. Building orientation with outgoing principal

Yes

No

6. Formal Mentoring or coaching support (with trained mentor & defined goals & activities)

Yes

No

7. Informal Mentoring or coaching support

Yes

No

8. Support group or network group with other new principals

Yes

No

9. Topic-specific meetings with district administration during the first year(s) of principalship

Yes

No

10. Other induction practices? If so, briefly describe:

--

Appendix B: New Principal Induction Survey

NEW PRINCIPAL INDUCTION SURVEY

Directions:

The purpose of this survey is to identify and quantify district elementary principal induction practices in Kansas and to determine your satisfaction with induction practices offered. I am conducting this survey as part of my doctoral program at Baker University. Your cooperation and participation is greatly appreciated. Please respond to the following statements and log out when finished. You have the right not to participate or stop any time. Your participation is entirely voluntary and participation represents your consent. Your identity will not be recorded; only blinded data will be used for summary analysis. This survey should take less than 10 minutes to complete. Thank you! EM

NEW PRINCIPAL INDUCTION SURVEY

Demographic Information

Please respond to each item. You have the right to not answer, but your participation is greatly appreciated.

1. Your gender

- Male
 Female

2. What is your current school district (or high school) classification?

- 1A
 2A
 3A
 4A
 5A
 6A

3. What is your current building grade level configuration?

- K-1
- K-2
- K-3
- K-4
- K-5
- K-6
- Other

4. What is your current building enrollment:

5. Have you ever served as assistant principal in this or another district?

- Yes
- No

6. Have you ever served as principal in: another building?

- Yes
- No

7. Have you ever served as principal in another district?

- Yes
- No

8. Have you ever served as principal in another state?

- Yes
- No

9. Was last school year (2014-2015) or this year (2015-2016) your first school year as principal?

- Yes
- No

10. Does your school district have a formally planned elementary principal induction program (defined as having a written description of new principal induction process) in place?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

NEW PRINCIPAL INDUCTION SURVEY

Induction Process Components

What components of induction and/or mentoring have you experienced as part of your new principal induction process? (Please respond to all.)

11. Internship prior to principalship

- Yes
- No

12. Leadership development training prior to principalship

- Yes
- No

13. District-sponsored orientation prior to or while assuming responsibilities of principalship

- Yes
- No

14. Building orientation with outgoing principal

- Yes
- No

15. Formal Mentoring or coaching support (with trained mentor & defined goals & activities):

- Yes
- No

16. Informal Mentoring or coaching support

- Yes
 No

17. Support group or network group with other new principals

- Yes
 No

18. Topic-specific meetings with district administration during the first year(s) of principalship

- Yes
 No

19. Other induction practices? If so, briefly describe:

NEW PRINCIPAL INDUCTION SURVEY

Component Satisfaction

How satisfied are you with each component of new principal induction that you received in helping you prepared for the principalship?

20. Internship prior to principalship

- Very Dissatisfied
 Dissatisfied
 Satisfied
 Very Satisfied
 Not Applicable –or did not experience

21. Leadership development training prior to principalship

- Very Dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Satisfied
- Very Satisfied
- Not Applicable –or did not experience

22. District-sponsored orientation prior to/while assuming principalship

- Very Dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Satisfied
- Very Satisfied
- Not Applicable –or did not experience

23. Building orientation with outgoing principal

- Very Dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Satisfied
- Very Satisfied
- Not Applicable –or did not experience

24. Formal mentoring or coaching support

- Very Dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Satisfied
- Very Satisfied
- Not Applicable –or did not experience

25. Informal mentoring or coaching support

- Very Dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Satisfied
- Very Satisfied
- Not Applicable –or did not experience

26. Topic-specific meetings with district administration during the first year of principalship

- Very Dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Satisfied
- Very Satisfied
- Not Applicable –or did not experience

27. How satisfied are you with your overall induction, in regard to preparing you for the principalship

- Very Dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Satisfied
- Very Satisfied
- Not Applicable –or did not experience

28. How well did your induction experiences prepare you for the principalship?

- Not prepared
- Somewhat prepared
- Prepared
- Well prepared

Appendix C: Baker University IRB Proposal



Date: March 7, 2016

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
GRADUATE DEPARTMENT
(IR.B USE ONLY)

IR.B PROTOCOL NUMBER _____

IR.B REQUEST
Proposal for Research
Submitted to the Baker University Institutional Review Board

I. Research Investigator(s) Earl A. Martin**Department(s)** School of Education Graduate Department

Name	Signature	
1. Dr. Tes Mehring	_____	Major Advisor
2. Dr. Phillip Messner	_____	Research Analyst
3. Dr. Jim Robins		University Committee Member
4. Dr. Ann Addison		External Committee Member

Principal Investigator: Earl A. Martin
 Phone: 913-782-3533 (home); 913-231-6304 (cell)
 Email: earlamartin@stu.bakeru.edu
 Mailing address: 12159 S. Prairie Creek Pkw, Olathe KS 66061

Faculty sponsor: Dr. Tes Mehring
 Phone: 913-485-9087
 Email: tes.mehring@bakeru.edu
 Expected Category of Review: ___Exempt Expedited ___Full

II: Protocol Title

Inventory of Kansas Principalship Induction Practices and Perceptions of First Year Elementary Principals

Summary

The following summary must accompany the proposal. Be specific about exactly what participants will experience, and about the protections that have been included to safeguard participants from harm. Careful attention to the following may help facilitate the review process:

In a sentence or two, please describe the background and purpose of the research.

This quantitative survey study is being conducted to examine the types of induction experiences offered to first year elementary principals in Kansas and to examine their perceptions of satisfaction and preparedness as a result of their induction. Additionally, the study will determine if there are differences between the perceptions of first year elementary principals in large, medium, and small school districts.

Briefly describe each condition or manipulation to be included within the study.

The study is not an experiment; there is no condition or manipulation in the study.

What measures or observations will be taken in the study? If any questionnaire or other instruments are used, provide a brief description and attach a copy.

(Chap 1 & 3 need to be fairly complete + outline of Chap. 2 & questionnaire approved 1st)

The instruments used in this study consists of two surveys: The first is a two question electronic survey to be administered to all Kansas school district Human Resource directors, and the second is a 28 item electronic survey administered to all first year Kansas elementary principals during the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic school years. The new Principal Survey is divided into two parts. Part one is designed to gather demographic information and part two is designed to gather specific information about the types of induction first year elementary principals experienced and their perception of satisfaction and preparation as a result of induction. Copies of both surveys are attached.

Will the subjects encounter the risk of psychological, social, physical, or legal risk? If so, please describe the nature of the risk and any measures designed to mitigate that risk.

There are no risks involved in the study. Only volunteer adults will participate in the survey.

Will any stress to subjects be involved? If so, please describe.

There is no stress involved in the study.

Will the subjects be deceived or misled in any way? If so, include an outline or script of the debriefing.

No. The surveys clearly state the intent of the surveys. The script of the invitation to participate is attached and participants have the right to withdraw from participation at any time.

Will there be a request for information that subjects might consider to be personal or sensitive? If so, please include a description.

No. Survey questions relate only to school/district demographics and the types of induction experiences received by new elementary principals and their perceptions of these experiences. Individually identifiable data are not collected.

Will the subjects be presented with materials that might be considered to be offensive, threatening, or degrading? If so, please describe.

No. Survey questions relate only to demographics and induction experiences and their perceptions. A copy of each survey is attached.

Approximately how much time will be demanded of each subject?

The school district Human Resource director survey should take less than 5 minutes to complete.

The new elementary principal survey should take less than 10 minutes to complete.

Who will be the subjects in this study? How will they be solicited or contacted? Provide an outline or script of the information which will be provided to subjects prior to their volunteering to participate. Include a copy of any written solicitation as well as an outline of any oral solicitation.

The School District Survey will be sent to the Human Resource directors of all school districts in Kansas, asking 2 questions about the types of induction provided to first year elementary principals. The names of Human Resource directors will be requested from Kansas Department of Education. Participation will be voluntary. A copy of the survey is attached.

The New Principal Survey, to be sent to all individuals who served as first year Kansas elementary principals during the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic school years, asks 28 questions regarding demographic and types of induction information and their perceptions. The names of new elementary principals will be requested from Kansas Department of Education new principal database. Participation will be voluntary. A copy of the survey and participation script is attached.

What steps will be taken to ensure that each subject's participation is voluntary? What if any inducements will be offered to the subjects for their participation?

Participation will be strictly voluntary as indicated in the correspondence sent. No inducements will be offered. The participation script is attached for each survey.

How will you ensure that the subjects give their consent prior to participating? Will a written consent form be used? If so, include the form. If not, explain why not.

Participants will provide consent by voluntary participation, as informed in the survey directions. If they choose not to participate they will not fill out the survey. A copy of the directions for each survey is attached.

Will any aspect of the data be made a part of any permanent record that can be identified with the subject? If so, please explain the necessity.

Responses will not be identifiable as individual respondents. Names are not requested and survey participation is anonymous. Responses are being collected using Survey Monkey and all data are reported in aggregate, not as individual responses.

Will the fact that a subject did or did not participate in a specific experiment or study be made part of any permanent record available to a supervisor, teacher or employer? If so, explain.

No record will be kept of any individual's choice to participate or not to participate.

What steps will be taken to ensure the confidentiality of the data?

Responses will be collected in aggregate, and individual responses will not be identifiable. Data will be collected for the purpose of this study only and will not be stored after the study is completed.

If there are any risks involved in the study, are there any offsetting benefits that might accrue to either the subjects or society?

There are no risks in the study. The benefits of the study will add to the educational literature regarding the importance of formal induction for new elementary principals.

Will any data from files or archival data be used? If so, please describe.

No. The only data used will be from the collected surveys.

Appendix D: Baker University Approval



Baker University Institutional Review Board

March 20, 2016

Dear Earl Martin and Dr. Mehring,

The Baker University IRB has reviewed your research project application and approved this project under Expedited Status Review. As described, the project complies with all the requirements and policies established by the University for protection of human subjects in research. Unless renewed, approval lapses one year after approval date.

Please be aware of the following:

1. Any significant change in the research protocol as described should be reviewed by this Committee prior to altering the project.
2. Notify the IRB about any new investigators not named in original application.
3. When signed consent documents are required, the primary investigator must retain the signed consent documents of the research activity.
4. If this is a funded project, keep a copy of this approval letter with your proposal/grant file.
5. If the results of the research are used to prepare papers for publication or oral presentation at professional conferences, manuscripts or abstracts are requested for IRB as part of the project record.

Please inform this Committee or myself when this project is terminated or completed. As noted above, you must also provide IRB with an annual status report and receive approval for maintaining your status. If you have any questions, please contact me at CTodden@BakerU.edu or 785.594.8440.

Sincerely,

Chris Todden EdD
Chair, Baker University IRB

Baker University IRB Committee
Verneda Edwards EdD
Sara Crump PhD
Erin Morris PhD
Scott Crenshaw

Appendix E: Summary Data for School District Survey

	Does your school district have a formally planned elementary principal induction program (defined as having a written description of new principal induction goals and activities) in place?	Internship prior to principalship	Leadership development training prior to principalship	District-sponsored orientation prior to or while assuming responsibilities of principalship	Building orientation with outgoing principal	Formal Mentoring or coaching support (with trained mentor & defined goals & activities)	Informal Mentoring or coaching support	Support group or network group with other new principals	Topic-specific meetings with district administration during the first year(s) of principalship	Other induction practices? If so, briefly describe:
1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
2	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
3	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	
4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
5	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
6	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	
7	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	I was a part of the initial Kansas Educational Leadership Institute's Principal Mentoring/Induction Program.
8	No									
9	No									
10	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	
11	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
12	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	
13	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	I have a mentor at my fingertips when necessary. She answers my call at any time day or night and is never bothered by the level of question that I might have. I was given four weeks during the summer to familiarize myself with my building and put things into place that would make my year go smoother.
14	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
15	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
16	Yes	No			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
17	No									
18	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	encouragement to participate in professional organizations KAESP, USA
19	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
20	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	We provided for Kansas Educational Leadership Institute membership for our two new elementary principals this year.
21	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
22	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	We utilize new principal induction training through KELI and through SCKESC, our local service center.
23	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	
24	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	The current elementary principal has been here 31 years and we have not had to address this issue.
25	No									
26	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	
27	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	We are a small district and we have ongoing conversations of support between the superintendent and the principal that were not as easy to put into place when I was superintendent in a much larger district.
28	No									
29	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
30	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	
31	No									
32	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
33	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	
34	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Mentoring from KELI at KSU
35	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
36	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	
37	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	we used Kelly from Kstate
38	No									
39	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	My first administration position was in a different, larger district that offered more support. When I returned to the district where I am an administrator now - less support was provide - but perhaps this was due to the fact that I taught (11 years) in this district 6 years prior to becoming an administrator in the district. Support is available here, but more when initiated by the administrator than required.
40	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
41	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	If we were to hire a brand new administrator as an elementary principal, we would work with our local service center to establish a formal mentorship experience for the school year.
42	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	
43	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	
44	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	We are a small rural district. Many of your questions have no application to our situation. We utilize KELI for new principal mntoring.
45	No									Since we do not have a formal induction process, I enlist the services of the KELI mentoring program for such (Kansas Educational Leaders Institute)
46	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
47	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	
48	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	We also use our service center for year long mentoring activities for our principals. The superintendent is also expected to do mentoring throughout the year.
49	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
50	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	We utilize the ISLLC Standards as content topics for ongoing support for beginning principals. New principals also attend beginning principal workshops sponsored by principals' associations and our local service center.

51	No									
52	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
53	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
54	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Veteran administrator assigned as mentor for the first year.
55	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	
56	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
57	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	
58	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
59	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
60	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
61	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Stanton County Schools USD 452 has implemented a Grow Your Own Administrator Program and three excellent teachers will take all their classes together, meet on a monthly basis with the current adm. in the district, and train with the building principals for 2 years to transition to the principalship. They are the best and brightest of our teaching staff and the district is paying for them to gain their master degree in school administration. Districts on the farthest southwest corner of the state have to create pathways for leaders to attain quality administrators.
62	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
63	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
64	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Ongoing and established district leadership team meetings (beyond the scope of question 9), that tie to and related to individual goals and planning for both buildings and individual professional advancement.
65	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
66	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
67	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	
68	No									
69	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		KELI
70	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Until this next year, we have not had an opening for elementary principal for 10 years. So some of these practices are going to be implemented, and some of the available resources and help will be used this next year. We will have two new elementary principals.
71	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
72	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
73	Yes									
74	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	
75	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
76	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes		Yes	
77	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	
78	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
79	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A few of these depends on circumstance...mentoring with old principal may or may not happen. We also provide an internship program and currently have 4 participating this year. However, not all new principals may have gotten this opportunity because it is limited. They have two years to be moved up to a principal. Our buildings are pretty large so we typically would not hire an elementary principal that has not been a principal somewhere, assistant principal or an intern. Time is always a factor and they do attend all administrative meetings plus new principal meetings but they are not as frequent. (3-4 times a year) They do have a principal mentor plus the General Director of Elementary Schools (also will evaluate) work with them. We try to do a lot in August and September with different department heads or people in their department. (eg. business office, nutrition office, ELL, etc.) Good topic.
80	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
81	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Weekly meetings with the superintendent. Working directly with a district consultant on leadership. Membership in the KASB mentor group.
82	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	State programs through the local cooperative or the KELI program.
83	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	
84	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
85	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Our new principals participate in KELI
86	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
87	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Two day beginning of the year in-service. Various leadership professional development opportunities offered at district expense if they chose to attend.
88	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
89	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	
90	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
91	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
92	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	
93	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	

Appendix F: Summary Data for New Principal Survey

66	Male	2A	K-6	171	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	NA/DNE	S	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	VS	VS	S	SP	
67	Female	6A	K-6	435	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	S	S	VS	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	S	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	SP	
68	Female	6A	K-4	249	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	VS	VS	S	VS	S	VS	S	VS	WP	
69	Female	1A	Other	114	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	VS	NA/DNE	VS	NA/DNE	S	SP	
70	Male	2A	Other	122	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	S	S	VS	VS	VS	D	S	SP	
71	Male	6A	K-5	520	N	N	N	Y	DK	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	D	NA/DNE	D	D	S	S	NA/DNE	S	SP	
72	Male	3A	Other	196	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	S	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	S	SP
73	Male	2A	Other		N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	VS	VS	S	NA/DNE	VS	NA/DNE	VS	VS	WP	
74	Female	4A	K-3	650	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	VS	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	VS	NA/DNE	S	SP	
75	Male	1A	Other	121	N	N	N	Y	DK	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	S	S	S	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	VS	NA/DNE	S	SP		
76	Female	6A	Other	560	Y	N	N	N	DK	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	S	S	S	S	S	VD	S	SP	
77	Female	2A	Other	168	N	N	N	Y	DK	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA/DNE	S	S	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	VD	S	S	SP	
78	Female	4A	K-5	315	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	VS	VS	NA/DNE	S	S	VS	VS	S	P	
79	Male	Other			N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	VS	S	VS	NA/DNE	VS	S	VS	VS	P	
80	Female	3A	K-6	371	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	VS	S	VS	S	VS	D	VS	S	P	
81	Male	1A	Other	140	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	S	VS	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	S	S	NA/DNE	S	SP		
82	Male	1A	K-5	90	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	NA/DNE	S	S	D	NA/DNE	S	NA/DNE	S	SP		
83	Male	2A	Other	132	N	N	N	Y	N																						
84	Male	4A	Other	250	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	S	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	D	S	S	SP	
85	Female	4A	K-5	340	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	VS	VS	S	D	S	VS	VS	S	P	
86	Female	2A	Other	147	N	N	N	Y	N																						
87	Female	3A	K-5	300	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	S	VS	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	VS	S	S	P	
88	Male	3A	Other	250	Y	Y	Y	N	DK	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	VS	S	S	S	D	S	NA/DNE	S	P	
89	Female	2A	Other	275	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	VS	VS	VS	NA/DNE	VS	VS	VS	VS	P	
90	Male	2A	Other	145	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	SP	
91	Male	2A	K-6	180	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	S	S	S	SP	
92	Male	5A	Other	441	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	S	NA/DNE	S	SP
93	Male	1A	Other	152	N	N	N	N	DK	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	VS	S	S	S	VS	S	S	SP	
94	Female	3A	Other	137	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	VS	S	VS	NA/DNE	S	VS	S	SP	
95	Male	6A	Other		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	HS prin. not sure.	VS	VS	VS	S	VS	VS	VS	VS	P
96	Female	3A	Other	303	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	VS	VS	NA/DNE	VS	NA/DNE	S	P	
97	Female	4A	K-2	321	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	S	S	D	S	D	S	S	S	SP	
98	Male	1A	Other	236	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	KELI mentoring program	S	NA/DNE	S	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	S	S	D	SP
99	Female	4A	K-4	378	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Help as needed. Monthly informal mtg. with mentor.	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	VS	S	NA/DNE	S	VS	S	P
100	Female	6A	K-5	230	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA/DNE	NA/DNE	S	S	NA/DNE	VD	D	VD	NP	