

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES AMONGST TRADITIONAL PUBLIC AND CHARTER
SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY
DAJUAN M. MAJOR

DISSERTATION ADVISOR: DR. SERENA SALLOUM

BALL STATE UNIVERSITY

MUNCIE, INDIANA

DECEMBER 2019

DEDICATION

All glory be to the one above. This dissertation is a prime example of your love and faith in my abilities and skills. Thank you for strengthening my relationship with you. To my ever-loving family for the times that you have helped me through my frustrations and doubts. Those many Tuesday night dinners have made a huge difference in my mood and spirit. To the patriarch of our family, Wayne, thank you for your wisdom and steady guidance throughout the course of my experience. To my mother Debra, your constant watch over my emotional and physical health and for reminding me to try to have fun with this almost mythical goal. To Todd, your encouraging words and uplifting personality were much appreciated. To Devin, your strong will and independence have served as a testament as to how strong the mind and body truly are. To Deloren, I have always been in awe of your ability to network and have tried to utilize it in the process of working with colleagues on this document.

To my nephews, allow for this document to be one of many representations of our expectations of you in the future. I challenge you to use my example for success and achievement as a foundation to, not only propel your own lives, but to carry our name as a model of great character and compassion towards all others. Finally, to the family members that we have lost prior to and during my doctoral journey. You have always exemplified excellence and honor in every single one of us. We can only hope that you are looking upon all of us leading your continued legacy with pride and joy. Speaking for the family, we love you and miss you dearly. We cannot wait until the day that we are all together with you again.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To my chair, Dr. Serena Salloum, I cannot thank you enough for helping work through this entire document. Some chapters were seemingly easier than others, regardless, your patience and expertise remained constant. To the members of my doctoral committee for recognizing the various stages of growth each time that we met and discussed this dissertation. It truly meant a lot to hear that I was making progress and going in the right direction with my writing. This committee remained patient and diligent with me when I felt lost and unsure about the process. Your ideas and strategies definitely helped to elevate my writing leading to the completion of the final product.

Where would I be without mentioning my friends and numerous colleagues that read, reread, and provided feedback on every single chapter of my writing? You all have helped this dream to become a reality for my family and I. From the support of Dr. Eugene White helping me to decide to attend Ball State University to Mr. Nate Jones for helping me with resources to produce a stronger paper. To my friends and peers, thank you for the hours allowing me to express my thoughts and feelings to you. You were never judgmental nor unavailable to my needs. I greatly appreciated our discussions about the many lessons to be learned from this process, as well as, your trust to share your life lessons. I am deeply honored to be in the position to have you in my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION.....	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	3
LIST OF TABLES.....	7
ABSTRACT	8
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION.....	9
Background	10
Education Challenges	10
Distinctions Between Traditional Public and Charter Schools.....	12
Effective School Leadership	12
Entrepreneurial School Leadership	13
Definition of Terms	14
Intrapreneurship	14
Entrepreneurship	14
Traditional Schools (public)	14
Charter Schools.....	14
Educational Entrepreneur	14
Statement of the Problem... ..	15
Purpose of the Study	15
Significance.....	15
Research Questions	16
Delimitations	16
Summary	16
CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW	18
Policy Context in Education.....	18
Role of the School Administrator.....	23
Evolution of the School Principal.....	23
Instructional Leadership	25
Principals Matter	27
Reform Impact and Principals.....	30
Accountability Pressure and Principals.....	31
Differences between Public and Charter School Leadership	32
Characteristics of Effective School Leadership	34
Entrepreneurial School Leaders	41
Resources	42
Financial Trends.....	44
Political Issues.....	45

Table of Contents- Continued

Trends in Technology.....	45
Culture	46
Contingent Rewards	47
Input	48
Focus	49
Communication	50
Systems of Accountability	51
Effective and Entrepreneurial School Leader Commonalities	53
Vision	54
Values of Relationships.....	55
Communication	55
Proactive Leaders	56
Risk-Takers	56
CHAPTER III. METHODS.....	59
Research Questions	59
Research Design.....	59
Sample.....	60
Instrumentation	65
Analysis.....	65
Trustworthiness.....	66
CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS	68
The Importance of Establishing School Vision and Mission	68
TPS Principals’ Vision and Mission for Societal Contribution and Awareness.....	69
Data Influenced TPS Principals’ Vision for School Improvement.....	71
Public Charter Schools’ Vision and Mission Sets Precedence for Autonomy	73
Staffing Influenced Public Charter Principals’ Vision for School Improvement	75
Methodologies to Capture Data for Monitoring Implementation of New Strategies	77
Traditional Public School Principals Utilized PD for Strategy Implementation	78
Public Charter School Principals Completed Classroom Observations	81
Gauging Culture through Visibility.....	83
School Principals’ Visibility through Classroom Interactions	84
The Need to Delegate Responsibilities in an Effort to Increase Personal Productivity.....	88
Traditional Principals’ Reflection on the Difficulty with Delegation	88
Public Charter Principals Delegate Duties to Build Teacher Leadership	90
CHAPTER V. DISCUSSION	93
Purpose of the Study	97

Table of Contents- Continued

Research Questions	97
Do Practices Exhibited by Principals from Traditional School Districts Differ from those in Public Charter Schools?	98
How do these Practices Compare with Practices of Effective School Leaders?	99
How do these Practices Compare with Practices of Entrepreneurial School Leaders? ...	104
Implications for Policy, Practice, and Future Research.....	106
Implications for Policy	107
Implications for Practice and Principal Preparation	109
Implications for Future Research	111
Concluding Remarks	111
REFERENCES.....	113
APPENDICE A. INTERVIEW PROTOCOL.....	126

LIST OF TABLES

3.1	2015-2016 Demographic Information for Traditional Schools.....	64
3.2	2015-2016 Demographic Information for Public Charter Schools.....	65
3.3	Demographic Profile of Traditional and Charter School Administrators.....	66
5.1	TPS and Charter Principals' Difference.....	95
5.2	TPS and Charter Principals' Commonalities.....	96

ABSTRACT

This dissertation investigates the differences in leadership practices between traditional and public charter school principals in Indiana. The first chapter provides the reader with information regarding societal views on the position and the potential for entrepreneurial school leaders. The chapter also describes the impact that school leaders have on learning and student achievement. The second chapter provides the history of the school principal and how this role has progressed through various reforms and accountability measures. Furthermore, it details effective leadership practices and entrepreneurial leadership practices and the commonalities that they share.

To completely understand various views on leadership practices, the third chapter analyzes the interviews of 15 school principals representing traditional or public charter schools in an effort to compare and contrast practices in school leadership. The next chapter elaborates on the similarities and differences between both sets of school leadership. Differences were found in how the principals implemented their school visions and monitored the implementation of new learning strategies. Commonalities existed in how the principals modeled expectations through visibility and delegation. The final chapter determined that both sets of school principals practiced leadership qualities in effective leadership and/or entrepreneurial leadership practices.

Chapter One: Introduction

America is a nation that has flourished based on innovation. Professionals in medicine, private industry, and nonprofits have embraced innovation as a means of solving age-old issues. Public schools and districts are also faced with the challenge to become more innovative, competitive, and focused on new opportunities. Society expects a great deal from our public schools today because it is considered unacceptable that large proportions of students are unprepared for college or career (Kirtman, 2014). According to the United States Department of Education (n.d.), too many American students in high school are disengaged and are veering away from the path toward college and career success. Based on the 2012 Gallup Student Poll, 76% of elementary school students felt involved and enthusiastic about their schools, 61% of middle school students felt the same, while only 44% of high school students felt involved and/or enthusiastic. Despite the objective value of the lesson or activity, students may not recognize such value or be motivated to expand their efforts in learning. Society's expectations of educational systems have blossomed so that public schools are now expected to serve every student more effectively.

Though attempts have been made to solve various educational issues, the need to improve is still present. No Child Left Behind (NCLB), along with other past reforms, has failed to deliver on promised changes (Zhao, 2012). In the United States, student learning had become more of a passive, lecture-based experience in which students did not have the opportunity to apply the knowledge they had learned (Zhao, 2012). Wagner (2012) argued that learning is often focused on the individual but not on collaboration. He suggested that the cultures of schools in the United States celebrate and reward individual achievement but offer few opportunities for meaningful collaboration.

Zhao (2012) noted that “Current students needed to be able to compete in an intelligent, highly creative marketplace...a well-prepared citizen of the future needs to be creative, entrepreneurial, and globally competent” (p.15). A change in expectations potentially demands innovative approaches (Smith & Petersen, 2006). Innovativeness is the ability and tendency to think “outside the box” and develop novel and realistic ideas related to recognizing opportunities, using resources wisely, and problem solving (Chen, 2007; Gupta, 2004; Rae, 2007).

Opinions vary on the resources and methods necessary to continue to improve schools in America; however, most researchers agree that the principal was one of the most vital players in the undertaking (Heck, Larsen, & Marcoulides, 1990; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Marzano, 2005). In a 2010 survey, building and central office administrators and policymakers felt school administration was one of the most important issues of concern in public school education (The Wallace Foundation, 2013). Elmore (2004), Porter and Soper (2003), and Stronge and Tucker (2000) all supported the notion that school principals needed to create a rich learning environment that provides opportunities for sharing expertise, with a vision of shared responsibility inside and outside of the school building.

Background

Education Challenges

After the Russian launch of Sputnik, the first man-made object to orbit Earth in 1957, along with the eventual release of more efficient cars from Japan and the creation of the world’s best steel mill in South Korea, coinciding with American machine tools being replaced by the preferred German brand tools, many concluded the United States had fallen behind. These examples suggested that the American education system was in a state of unrest due to the fact

that the historically rich education foundation was becoming eroded by declining expectations and quality that threatened its people (Martin, 1996). According to Davis (2006), society as a whole is dissatisfied with the status quo in the educational process as well as with various ways of thinking about leadership development. The most important function of school leaders was creating creativity and individuality in future generations of students in order for them to be prepared for the challenges that lie ahead:

School leaders are expected to stimulate organizational growth and development; not just sporadically or episodically, but as an ongoing and creative process of self-renewal. The most effective leaders treat creative thinking and innovation as cultural norms rather than extraordinary phenomena, as everyday tasks rather than mysterious and ethereal activities. (Stefik & Stefik, 2004, p. 8)

Government officials, as well as society in general, viewed school principals as factors of great importance to schools and held them increasingly accountable for the teaching and success of children (Pont, Nusche, & David, 2008). Both the direct and indirect influence that school leaders had on student progress and achievement can be considerable (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008). “Can be considerable” was stated purposefully due to the fact that the influence that administrators had on school performance depended on their actions. The outcomes of school leaders varied significantly considering their specific leadership style (Robinson, 2010).

However, Kirtman (2014) stated that policy makers in education had created an environment where school administrators of greater need were left behind. Furthermore, learning institutions constantly dealt with limited resources and various other obstacles to accomplishing their goal of student academic achievement.

Distinctions Between Traditional Public and Charter Schools

A current policy issue in education is the debate between traditional public schools and charter schools. Both charter and traditional public schools are government-funded; however, charters can also receive funds from various sponsors. Donations from private individuals and companies help to increase funding at some charter schools by 20% or more (Grabianowski, 2011). Attendance in public schools is mandatory and open to all students living in the surrounding community. Charter schools require an approved application to attend their schools. Public schools are established by the government and are more stable while their counterparts are created by private organizations and individuals, including parents and teachers. Stanford economist Margaret Raymond conducted the Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO) 2009 national study, which attempted to identify differences in student achievement between charter and traditional schools. This study compared nearly half of the charter schools around the nation to similar public schools and concluded that only seventeen percent of the charters got higher scores than their public counterparts.

Effective School Leadership

Regardless of the school type, charter or traditional, effective leadership may lead to the improvement of learning. School administrators not only matter, but they are considered to be second behind classroom teachers among school-related factors impacting student learning (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). Fullan (2004) stated that effective administrators are critical in implementing large-scale, sustainable education reform. Principals must spearhead instruction if they were to effectively lead sustained innovation (Fullan, 2001). Highly effective school leaders had increased the achievement in their respective schools between two to seven months in a single academic year; but on the other hand, less effective

school leaders had lowered achievement between the same time span (Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2013).

Entrepreneurial School Leadership

Regardless of traditional or non-traditional education, Smith and Petersen (2006) suggested that innovative educational leaders may be highly regarded and could be in greater demand in the decades to come. There were minor differences in perspectives as to why entrepreneurs in education could matter. The first reason consisted of the “disruptive technologies” perspective, which meant public education systems need to change so significantly that only a disruptive force of entrepreneurs, who could process logically beyond the established norms, could get there (Smith & Petersen, 2006). Smith and Petersen (2006) explained that entrepreneurs were vital change agents today, necessary to lift society from the established system to a more conducive model constructed for the needs of the current generation.

The other perspective, also based on Smith and Petersen (2006), viewed the importance of entrepreneurs in public education and connected them to a bigger change — a major global alteration away from slow progress requiring small steps to a quickened, dynamic change. School principals needed to learn and practice entrepreneurial leadership characteristics in order to improve their school effectiveness and to direct and lead the process of school innovation that allowed principals to face the complexities and constraints of the school environment such as fast changes, limited resources, the variety of factors affecting student progress and achievement, and the urgent need to prepare students for their highly competitive futures (Eyal & Inba, 2003; Eyal & Karl, 2004; Morris, Coombes, Schindehutte & Allen, 2007; Xaba & Malindi, 2010).

Change in education is easy to suggest, hard to implement with fidelity, and extremely challenging to maintain (Hargraves & Fink, 2006). Hargraves and Fink suggested that

innovations are initially bought in to, but it is harder to persuade skeptical educators to commit to their implementation. Sustaining improvement in learning depends on successful leadership. In addition, high achieving leaders embraced innovation and possessed inquisitive minds eager to learn from their employees, peers, leaders in education, and even other sectors about establishing rich learning environments for staff and students (Kirtman, 2014). Likewise, Tarabishy (2012) suggested that the new style of innovative leadership, called entrepreneurial leadership, was needed to adapt to unforeseen situations in the fast pace of competition. Kirtman (2014) proposed that the educational system may be transformed if varied perspectives are expanded and greater numbers of innovative leaders focused on sustained results are appointed or employed. This suggestion was based on Kirtman's belief that high performing leaders had the curiosity to learn from teachers and other educational leaders the innovative ideas that created improved learning environments for students and staff.

Definitions of Terms Included

Intrapreneurship: active and recurrent process of searching for new possibilities to solve current issues within the organization in which they serve (Harvey & Drolet, 2003).

Entrepreneurship: active and recurrent process of searching for new possibilities to solve current issues outside the organization in which they serve (Harvey & Drolet, 2003).

Traditional Public Schools (TPS): institutions receiving public funds that operate within school districts and typically provide free K-12 education (Tourkin et al., 2010).

Charter Schools: institutions receiving public funds that operate away from the school district structure (Kelly & Loveless, 2012).

Educational entrepreneur: a person who acts on his/her own responsibility; a visionary educational leader who is a discretionary risk-taker and innovates through the utilization of

people, processes, and resources. This person has a strong sense of timing, coupled with the ability to persuade others to act in concert to achieve success. The focus of these actions is to positively enhance the educational process (Zhao, 2012).

Statement of the Problem

Charter schools have been hailed as the cure for public school ills and dysfunction. Since their early beginnings in the 1970's, charter schools have experienced rapid growth with at least 5,700 schools in the country and serving approximately 2,000,000 students (Public Charter Schools Insider, n.d.). Given the increase in the number of charter schools, it is important to understand leadership practices in these environments. Currently, it is unknown what practices both traditional and public charter school principals use in their schools to promote school achievement.

Purpose of Study

America's increasingly global economy is now driven by higher-order skills like symbolic reasoning and analysis. Change of expectations may call upon innovative approaches made by school leaders. The purpose of this study was to discover the practices of successful leaders in both traditional and public charter school settings. A secondary purpose was to learn if such practices align with entrepreneurial characteristics (Brown, 2000) and effective leadership (Marzano, McNulty, & Waters, 2005).

Significance

By the 2000's, charter schools had become so popular that they were receiving additional funding from the presidential administration. In 2006, several requests were made by President George Bush to increase the number of charter schools to solicit \$219 million dollars to support 1,200 charter schools. Furthermore, President Bush also requested an additional \$37 million to

support business owners to lease or buy new school buildings in an effort to open more charter schools across the nation (Public Charter Schools Insider). As of 2017, there are more than 6,900 charter schools with an estimated enrollment of 3.1 million students (National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, n.d.). Charter schools are increasing; therefore, understanding their practices matters.

Research Questions

Do practices exhibited by principals from traditional school districts differ from those in public charter schools?

- a) How do these practices compare with practices of effective school leaders?
- b) How do the practices of these principals compare to expected practices of entrepreneurial leaders?

Delimitations

Participants represented numerous districts in Marion County which serve at least 60 percent minority students. Districts included Lawrence Township, Pike Township, Washington Township, Wayne Township, Indianapolis Public Schools (IPS), and Warren Township. Although many school systems from across the city of Indianapolis were included, other school districts were excluded. Consequently, an element of bias in the findings could exist.

This study is delimited to:

- a) Participants chosen by superintendents representing the Indiana Urban School Association.
- b) A few selected school systems across the state of Indiana.

Summary

Chapter One presented information regarding the potential for innovative school leaders and suggested that there may need to be a narrative describing what entrepreneurs do and how

their leadership practices that may change schools and districts. This chapter also presented the purpose of the study, the research questions, and the delimitations. Chapter Two presents a literature review inclusive of an overview of policy context and the importance of leadership. Characteristics and examples of leadership styles are examined. Additionally, research related to entrepreneurial leadership and student achievement are presented. Chapter Three describes the research methods which include the research questions, design, and analysis. Chapter Four discusses the findings from the 15 participating principals representing both traditional and public charter schools. Chapter Four also identifies the emerging themes between the two sets of principals used for analysis. The final chapter, Chapter Five, reviews and answers the research questions and provides implications for policy, practice, and future research.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

This chapter addresses relevant literature which informed the study. An overview of policy context, the role of the principal, and the transition into instructional leadership is discussed. Next, the significance of principals and the impact that reform and accountability has placed on the position, followed by differences between traditional and charter school leadership, will be weighed. Then, characteristics of effective school leadership and entrepreneurial school leadership will be explained. Finally, commonalities between entrepreneurial leaders and effective administrators are shared.

Policy Context in Education

In 1966, the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare created the Equality of Educational Opportunity Study (EEOS), or what is better known as The Coleman Report. The study assessed the equal educational opportunities made available to students of different race, color, religion, and national origin based on the provisions set forth by the Civil Rights Act of 1964. EEOS relied on test results and responses to questionnaires from students ranging from elementary school to high school. Responses from questionnaires were also obtained from educators and administrators.

Data collected from sample schools around the nation included topics such as gender, socio-economic background, feelings toward education, and career goals. In addition, the results reflected test performance on ability and achievement in verbal and nonverbal skills, comprehension in language arts, and mathematics for students. For the teachers and the school principals, results reflected discipline, salary, educational experience, and feelings toward other races. The Coleman Report indicated that the academic achievement for minorities was a year or two behind their white counterparts in the first grade; the gap in achievement increased three to

five years by senior year in high school. Just as concerning, the report also indicated that school achievement was linked to socio-economics and attending school was not correcting the gap in achievement but widening it (Martin, 1996).

Although discontentment with performance in schools had been decades in the making, the problem heightened with *A Nation at Risk* (Gardner, 1983). *A Nation at Risk* was a report commissioned by the federal government in 1983. The report supported the ever-growing assumption that schools in the United States were failing, leading to waves of local, state, and federal reform efforts. It speculated that schools placed greater focus on reading and computation skills and ignored other skills like analysis, problem solving, and drawing conclusions (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). Furthermore, the report suggested that educational reform should establish learning societies. The premise of such a society would be the commitment to establish a system of education that would encourage learning at every age in an ever-changing world. *A Nation at Risk* also warned that continuing to prepare students inadequately would reduce economic competitiveness amongst industries and contribute to significant malfunction in higher education. Other cautions included an expected increase in cost for services to counteract poverty and the emergence of a society with a high percentage of poorly educated individuals. Furthermore, 75% of workers in America would only qualify for less than half of available jobs, American students were being outperformed by students in both Europe and Asia, while rates of crime, poverty, and teen pregnancy continued to grow (Bullard & Taylor, 1993).

The findings in *A Nation at Risk* alerted people ranging from corporate America to the federal government. The report found that twenty-three million Americans adults were illiterate. In addition, 13% of all 17 year-olds were illiterate. *A Nation at Risk* reported that verbal scores

on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) between 1963 and 1980 decreased by 50 points while mathematics scores dropped by 40 points. Rothstein (2008), however, was skeptical of such findings. He stated that much of the decline in SAT scores from 1963 to 1980 had resulted from the changed composition of test takers. In the early 1960s, the majority of test takers were high school students planning to apply and attend the most selective schools. By 1983, the demographic composition of test takers had steadied and average SAT scores were rising again.

Since publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983, additional books and reports have reinforced its findings. For example, Bullard and Taylor (1993) reported that each year one million students dropped out of school. Almost 40% of children were at risk for academic failure, with that percent being higher for minority populations who were also the fastest growing segment. Bullard and Taylor went on to write that the number of Hispanic, African-American, and other minority groups was expected to increase by 3.5 million students and would represent a high percentage of the economically and socially disadvantaged.

In the 1990s, the national education goals were established by the U.S. Congress. Goals 2000 was the response to the people's call for change in the educational system in the nation. The purpose of Goals 2000 was to support schools in developing and implementing higher standards in their curriculum and instruction. The program provided schools and surrounding communities with the necessities to achieve these standards while encouraging parent involvement through educational partnerships. Furthermore, the program was intended to enhance teacher training and assessment of performance (Department of Education, 1996).

Goals 2000 provided schools with grants to support states and school communities to create their own education reforms with the primary focus to increase student achievement. States choosing to take part in the initiative were expected to raise overall achievement of

students by implementing rigorous academic standards (Department of Education, 1996). Through these rigorous standards, schools were to improve the quality of instruction, take advantage of the use of technology, establish strong relationships among all stakeholders, integrate higher curriculum to match assessments, and create greater accountability for teaching and learning. Furthermore, states agreeing to participate in the program received monies in order to start and sustain implementation of school reform strategies (Department of Education, 1996). Also, Goals 2000 allowed districts to utilize funds for various activities that addressed the needs of their schools. Finally, the program expanded freedom in other federal programs in education by having the U.S. Secretary of Education waive certain rules and laws that interfered with local reform strategies (Department of Education, 1996).

Aside from Goals 2000, the 1990s brought forth other education reforms. One of those reforms included school choice. Chubb and Moe (1990) suggested that businesses practices could improve the quality of education in schools. They also thought that providing parents with opportunities to move their children from poor performing schools to effective schools was the only way to dramatically change the education system in the United States.

Approximately 10 years later, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) came into existence. NCLB was established to support disadvantaged students through Title funds and a standards-based education reform. The act focused on setting high academic expectations along with creating measurable goals in an attempt to enhance academic growth. Furthermore, the goal of the law was for all students to be proficient in both language arts and mathematics by 2014; and, if the states did not meet targets, they became subject to consequences that included district and/or school restructuring. National reform policies such as NCLB have incorporated assumptions about how school leaders affect student progress and performance. NCLB suggested

market-based strategies, including charter schools, to drive improvement, but there was little evidence showing positive differences between charter and traditional schools (Lytle, 2012). The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) compared test scores in language arts and mathematics between traditional schools and charter schools in 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009. In the aggregate, charter schools never outperformed traditional public schools.

In 2009, the Education Recovery Act was created as a part of the American Recovery Act that was signed into law by President Obama. The intent of the act was to support the nation by “jumpstarting” the economy by establishing and/or saving millions of jobs and through expanding educational opportunities. These opportunities included establishing a foundation of education reform by encouraging the adoption of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and assessments, with the intent to turn around failing schools by embracing innovative learning models. Through the Education Recovery Act, President Obama and Arne Duncan, the United States Secretary of Education, established a 4.35 billion dollar incentive known as Race to the Top. The incentive was a contest to spur innovation among states and later districts. Applications were awarded points based on how each state’s application satisfied specific educational policies, such as adopting college and career standards (often CCSS standards), building data systems, turning around failing schools, and lifting caps on charter schools. In addition, the Race to the Top incentive emphasized the importance of attracting and retaining effective teachers and school leaders, designing and implementing rigorous standards and high quality assessments, and using innovation and effective approaches to turn around low performing schools. In 2015, President Obama signed the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), replacing NCLB, which allowed schools to have more control as to how they would account for student achievement and growth, including students identified as special education and limited English (Lee, 2018). The

role of the school administrator changed with these shifts in policy. The next section describes how the role of the principal evolved over time.

Role of the School Administrator

Evolution of the School Principal

In 1647, the state of Massachusetts established a law requiring a grammar school in every town with fifty or more families. Selectmen, or governing officials, were chosen to manage these establishments and became the first representatives of school management. As these schools grew, so did their problems. Therefore, the school managers created committees that were responsible for helping to resolve issues. These committees eventually became known as school boards (Jones, Salisbury, & Spencer, 1969).

During this time period, with the selectmen and the school board maintaining the daily operation of the school, a head master was appointed when a school had more than one school teacher (Jones, 1969). According to Brown and Chi (2010), the principal was initially termed as the lead, master, or principal teacher. As schools became bigger toward the later part of the 18th century, the need for greater organization of the instructional program became vital. Teachers had control over their own classrooms, however, there was no one who had control over the entire school building. The head master, the principal at times, was responsible for managing the opening and closing of the school, class schedules, equipment and school supplies, maintenance of the building, and interactions with the parents and other stakeholders (Anderson & Van Dike, 1963). In addition, the head masters were still responsible for providing a full load of instruction to their own students (Jones, 1969). Studies suggested that school principals did not work directly with the teachers (Dwyer, 1985; Lightfoot, 1983; Lortle, 1983; Metz, 1978; Peterson, 1978; Wolcott, 1973).

Furthermore, the principal served as a liaison between the school board and the teachers, acting as the first superintendent of schools. In 1837 in both Buffalo, New York and Louisville, Kentucky, the superintendent was established as an official position, which resulted in the principal no longer working directly with the school board. With enrollments growing during the 19th century, the complexity of problems for the principal increased, necessitating the role of the school leader to change. Though they were still teaching, the principal's time in the classroom decreased (Pierce, 1935). Their responsibility for routine duties started to decline slowly while their responsibility for the overall management of the school increased. The change was primarily due to the fact that schools were becoming overcrowded and many educators were minimally qualified (Gross & Herriott, 1965). The school principal became more of a supervisor of teachers. Furthermore, principals at the high school level were provided with supervisory responsibilities over many of the principals in the elementary schools in the same districts (Pierce, 1935).

At the beginning of the 20th century, the community board of education and the superintendent decided that the school administrator should have more control over their school (Benden, 1966). Unfortunately, as school administrators had become more responsible for the internal workings of their individual school building, they became increasingly content in the position. From the year of 1895 until the year of 1910, principals were hesitant to attempt new procedures and were seen as conservative in their practice. They maintained the status quo by allowing classroom teachers to manage their own classroom with the exception of a major problem. (Pierce, 1935). By 1958, time allotment regarding the supervision of the instructional program had changed for the school principal. According to Elsbree and McNally (1959), the school leader was spending approximately 35 percent of his or her time supervising the

instructional program while spending roughly 30 percent of his or her time on administrative duties.

Since the 1980s, the role of the school principal has continued to be to manage schools, though their primary responsibility has changed. The accountability movement was a major contributor to the significant shift in the role of the school administrator from a manager of duties to more of an instructional leader.

Instructional Leadership

Goldring, Porter, Murphy, Elliott, and Cravens (2009) defined instructional leadership as a cluster of leadership practices including planning, improvement, coordination, and evaluation of instruction and learning.

Research in leadership had suggested that instructional leadership was the primary function of the role of the principal (Marks & Printy, 2003; Spillane & Seashore, 2002). Furthermore, based on a meta-analysis involving school principals, Robinson (2010) developed detailed leadership dimensions of leading by encouraging and participating in teacher professional development, creating expectations, planning and assessing teaching and the school curriculum. The dimensions also included resourcing strategically and establishing an orderly school environment. In other words, the more the school principals maintained their attention on staff relationships and their own learning of teaching and student learning, the greater impact they would have on student achievement (Robinson, 2008).

The relationship between instructional leadership and student achievement influenced the creation of standards for educational leadership in the nation (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2008). In addition, Spillane and Seashore Louis (2002) claimed that:

Without an understanding of the knowledge necessary for teachers to teach well - content

knowledge, general pedagogical knowledge, content specific pedagogical knowledge, curricular knowledge, and knowledge of learners - school leaders will be unable to perform essential school improvement functions such as monitoring instruction and supporting teacher development. (p. 97)

According to the National Education Association (NEA), researchers had documented the importance of instructional leadership. One study suggested that if schools were going to get better, management issues could not interfere with the principal's role in the curriculum (NEA, 2008). While the consensus among principals was to have fewer managerial responsibilities, they also understood the shift is challenging due to the overabundance of managerial and administrative duties that consumed their time (NEA, 2008).

With the constant focus on test results due to NCLB, Race to the Top, and ESSA, school administrators were not as free to make decisions about what could make schools successful. Lytle (2012) stated:

Principals are coerced into acting against their inclination to lead schools in ways that create the conditions that allow teachers to do good work, engage students and their parents, respond to community contexts, and improve student outcomes. (p. 57)

Although Lortie (2009) concluded that standardized testing had moved school control from the school principal to the central office, he also argued that the standardized assessment(s) provided vital information about the school administrator:

State and federally mandated high-stakes tests can increase the authority and legitimacy of principal decisions, but test data also give those outside schools - such as superintendents, boards, etc.- objective measures of school and principal performance, reducing dependence on less formal evaluation procedures. (p. 55)

On a different note, Honig and Loeb (2010) suggested that the traditional view of the instructional leader was a strong, direct individual who was focused on curriculum. However, they also stated that this model did not support the current needs of many of today's schools. Policymakers critical of NCLB argued that because states created their own goals and assessments, it was possible that some states created assessments that lacked rigor and set low achievement goals in order for their schools and districts to look successful. Some teachers and stakeholders have expressed a dislike with the progress standardization, considering that it demeaned the potential of individuals by enforcing "one size fits all" instead of encouraging individual creativity and thoughts (Honig & Loeb, 2010). The National Education Association's (NEA) position was that, while it supported the NCLB vision, it felt that the negative approach of competition and punishments did not uplift schools toward achieving the goals. Many felt that NCLB made for a "test-taking environment" in the schools, which discouraged creativity from teachers (Wright, 2012) and might have resulted in increased fear by school leaders to take entrepreneurial risks to achieve higher student achievement. Under the ESSA law, schools were provided with the opportunity to create and establish an academic plan that had to include curricular standards, yearly assessments, and even opportunities for parental feedback (Lee, 2018).

Current principals must become leaders who can navigate through changes that may involve the very structure of how education will be delivered for future generations (Brown & Cornwall, 2000).

Principals Matter

Strong leadership was seen as a vital facet, especially in revitalizing failing schools (Branch, Hanushek & Rivkin, 2013). When school districts have effective school administrators,

they have a shared vision that aligns programs and resources at the school for setting the direction for student success (Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson, 2005). Students have the potential to achieve more when effective leadership was provided (Firestone & Riehl, 2005; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; NASSP, 2010; Valentine Maher, Quinn, & Irvin, 1999; Williamson & Johnston, 2005). In reviewing material about leadership in schools, Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004) established three foundational leadership practices. The first of the three included the importance for the school leaders to develop their staff members. It was the role of the principal to provide teachers with intellectual challenges and supports in an effort to improve work quality and production. Secondly, the school leader was responsible for setting the tone for the school building and monitoring the performance of student progress while modeling clear communication among his or her staff. Finally, the principal was responsible for establishing an equitable and productive school culture by using a process of collaboration to deter situations and people that undermine the learning process (Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004).

In 2009, M. Christine Devita, president of The Wallace Foundation, stated that federal officials had increasingly accepted that effective school leadership was necessary if school improvement was going to be successful:

Research we've commissioned has concluded that there are virtually no documented cases of troubled schools being turned around without a powerful leader. One reason is that a good principal is the single most important determinant of whether a school can attract and retain high-quality teachers. The principal is also uniquely positioned to ensure that excellent teaching spreads beyond isolated classrooms in his or her building. The bottom line is that investments in good principals are a particularly cost-effective

way to improve teaching and learning. (p. 3)

More so, Colvin (2009) shared a similar thought regarding the importance of the school principal. He shared that improvement in school leadership must occur in school districts and local education agencies around the United States. Colvin suggested that the federal government demonstrated its understanding of the influence that principals had on schools by contributing significant money to the Department of Education to enhance and aid strong leaders.

Finally, Arne Duncan, U.S. Secretary of Education, argued that schools cannot be good without a great school administrator:

If at the end of the day, our 95,000 schools had a great principal, this thing would take care of itself. Great principals attract great talent. They nurture that great talent and they develop that great talent. Bad principals are the reverse: bad principals don't attract good talent, they run off good talent. They don't find ways to improve those that are trying to get better. They don't engage the community. (p. 21)

School leaders were as important to the functioning of successful schools as other factors of the school. These aspects included the school having a clear vision and mission, maintaining a healthy overall climate in each classroom, facilitating positive attitudes of teachers and their classroom practices, and increasing students' opportunities for academic success (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). Fullan (2001) suggested effective leaders have the ability to alter the school culture and staff in order to get the desired results. Fullan asserted that "Change agents don't live more peacefully, but...they can handle more uncertainty - and conflict - and are better at working through complex issues in ways that energize rather than deplete the commitment of the organizational members" (p. 3).

Marzano and Waters (2005) identified 21 responsibilities as basic procedures school

principals should implement to be considered effective. These responsibilities will be discussed in a later subsection. According to Waters, Marzano, and McNulty (2003), the Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) conducted a study consisting of a sample of approximately 2,900 schools, 14,000 teachers, and roughly one million students where teachers rated school principals. The data from the study indicated that there was a positive correlation between effective administrator leadership and student progress. The results also indicated that effective school principals know what, when, how, and why to make changes that improve student success, and they understand the implications these changes have on both the staff and the community at large. In addition, the researchers concluded that as school leadership became more effective, student achievement improved (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). They identified two variables that indicated whether school leadership had a positive or a negative relationship with student learning: focus of change and understanding the impact of the order of change. Focus of change measured whether or not the school principal could identify the appropriate focus for school and student improvement; and, order of change addressed whether or not the school principal understood the impact of the order of change that they were guiding and if they could adjust accordingly (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003).

Reform Impact and Principals

The role of school administrators dramatically changed in the NCLB era. Principals became responsible for, and consequently more knowledgeable about, assessments and instructional decisions based on school data (Singh & Al-Fadhli, 2011). Principals were also required to have full knowledge of facility and financial management as well as how to foster a rich learning environment in their buildings (Murphy, 2002; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003). The demands of NCLB for schools to make progress with measurable growth had various impacts

determined by the dynamics of the school environment.

Womble (2006) suggested that principals were vital in enabling schools and districts to provide services that are effective. Throughout its existence, NCLB stressed the importance of greater accountability, implementation of standards-based assessments, and increased student growth, which encouraged principals to renew school operations (Singh & Al-Fadhli, 2011).

NCLB had been a moving force for change, however, the defining factors that stood out were vision and leadership (Singh & Al-Fadhli, 2011). An example of such leadership was for school principals to use school achievement data to understand the needs of students and create the appropriate curriculum to enhance student learning with the use of specific content pedagogy (Marzano, 2005; Thomas & Collier, 2002). In the 21st century, it had become imperative that school principals realize that for student growth and achievement to occur and remain, schools had to adopt the capacity for change. Singh and Al-Fadhli (2011) suggested that policymakers must provide school leaders the opportunity to become strong in curriculum and instruction and must effectively facilitate the establishment of better relationships between staff members and stakeholders in the community.

Accountability Pressure and Principals

As states became more influenced by state standards (Common Core for example), assessment, and student achievement, schools have had to give up control to the state to address school accountability (Conley, 2003; Fuhrman & Elmore, 2004). When schools have been unable to meet accountability measures, state takeovers have occurred. Moreover, greater pressures on schools simultaneously spurred parents and businesses to expect improvements in student progress.

Changed expectations in the principalship has led to school leaders being pulled in

various, and sometimes contradictory, directions (Spiri, 2011). Principals were expected to implement new initiatives for change while at the same time balancing demands from the district, state, and nation. Furthermore, principals were also expected to have teachers think creatively so as to foster a richer learning community. Through this balancing act and under increased scrutiny while being held to higher expectations, school leaders have been tasked with ensuring student success (Spiri, 2001).

Leadership in schools was particularly vital in school accountability (Elmore, 2001; Kelley, 1998; Sebring & Bryk, 2000) as it was the leaders' responsibility to understand such policies in order to navigate their staff through school improvement strategies. In an effort to establish change, school principals needed to motivate staff by encouraging commitment through successfully communicating goals for their school (Adams & Kirst, 1999). External and internal factors influenced principals' ability to influence teaching decisions (Knapp, 1997; Lugg, Bulkley, Firestone, & Garner, 2002). Internally, instructional leaders work within issues that occur in their school and/or the school district based on available resources, whether structural or human. Externally, school boards and parent organizations have the opportunity to either support or disrupt the influence of school leaders (Firestone & Shipp, 2003).

Creating and maintaining a culture of renewal is challenging to leaders in all organizations. Similar to the business world, educational leaders have been charged with the renewal of an organization while at the same time facing endless pressure to meet demanding expectations (Mai, 2004).

Differences between Public and Charter School Leadership

Unlike traditional public schools, charter school principals are not typically supported by a district infrastructure. The charter school principal must find school buildings, establish and

maintain a budget and strategic plans, recruit school board members, hire and train new staff, and interact with the governing board, community, and other stakeholders (Vickers, 2014). In 2008, Ilene Berman, Program Director of the National Governors Center for Best Practices, suggested that the majority of principals in public schools adhere to the day-to-day responsibilities in the school while the superintendent was the primary pipeline to the school board.

The study of administration and staff of public and charter schools in 21 schools in four small to mid-size urban areas categorized the following roles of charter school leadership (a) instructional leadership, (b) cultural leadership, (c) managerial leadership, (d) human resource leadership, (e) strategic leadership, (f) external development leadership, and (g) micro-political leadership (Portin, Schneider, DeArmond, & Gundlach, 2003). In addition, Gross and Pochop (2007) examined survey results from Illinois, Ohio, and Wisconsin from the 2003-2004 National Center for Education Statistics Schools and Staffing Survey. The data identified challenges faced by charter school principals that included (a) raising funds or managing finances, (b) engaging parents, (c) getting and maintaining buildings, (d) negotiating with district and public schools, (e) hiring highly-qualified educators, (f) attracting students, (g) maintaining a school mission focus, (h) following and reporting on state and federal law requirements, and (i) conflicting with charter boards or trustees.

Compared to their public school counterparts, charter school principals often deal with increased responsibility in regards to compliance and accountability, typically because they are required to report to a chartering agency, as well as to the local board of directors, various state and federal mandates, and management of operations. In 2012, Gawlik interviewed principals and teachers representing four public schools who reported feeling stress due to accountability. However, the accountability is two-fold. Not only were charter principals accountable to the state

but also to authorizers that placed extra burdens on them as they performed their leadership tasks (p. 217). On the other hand, Farkas (2001) conducted a study that consisted of 853 superintendents and approximately 910 principals and found that former principals of public schools were frustrated and extremely annoyed by the politics and bureaucracy in their districts causing them to relocate to the freedom of charter schools.

The differences in funding between charter and public schools often created a situation that forced charter principals to do more with less. During a national symposium, charter administrators expressed their concerns regarding receiving less money per student compared to public schools (Hill, Rainey, & Rotherham, 2006). State and federal governments expected schools to adopt specific policies and create specific programs without the necessary budget; this resulted in schools ignoring some mandates, risking punitive action, or potentially cutting other programs to meet unfunded mandates, putting even more demands on the school administrator (Kennedy, 2001). Campbell and Gross (2008) found that charters are market-driven entities and must get an adequate number of students to be stable financially. Marketing and promotion of charter schools frequently became the vital responsibility of the principal. Campbell and Gross stated, “What sets the job apart from the traditional public school principalship is that charter school leaders operate without a safety net - no local district supplies teachers or facilities in a pinch, and funding and laws can change abruptly” (p. 28).

Characteristics of Effective School Leadership

Research has indicated that school leaders are important. It may have been assumed that practices in school leadership are based on years of research. This was not the case. Hallinger and Heck (1996) only found 40 case studies in which the relationship between school leadership and student progress and growth were addressed between 1980 and 1995. Furthermore, Marzano

(2005) suggested that research conducted on school leadership did not provide guidance as to what made principals effective in their positions. Marzano and Waters (2005) analyzed 69 studies in an attempt to list characteristics related to school administration and student achievement. The researchers created a list of 21 practices known as “responsibilities.” For example, Wimpleburg, Teddlie, and Stringfield (1989) found that principals shared basic characteristics and specific actions affecting student achievement. Even though the 21 responsibilities did not result in new findings in the realm of educational leadership, they did provide new details describing the nature of principals.

It has been stated at times that if you want to change the world, take a look in the mirror. This notion also goes for school leaders who are looking to change their schools. According to Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2006), administrators needed to hone their practices in many of the twenty-one responsibilities, but with the focus on innovation. Effective principals driving change in their schools must understand the impact of the potential change, comprehend theory of innovation, and evaluate the impact of change throughout. Furthermore, the school leader should become the leading force of the innovation while supporting his or her staff to believe in the vision for change in the school. They asserted that “the nature of a second-order change is one that may disrupt the daily practice of the school and may result in negative perceptions by staff members while the innovation is implemented” (p. 74). While working within the dynamics of school culture, school administrators are tasked with leading new and challenging innovations while inspiring their staff members. They were change agents that challenged traditional practices (Marzano, 2005).

Like Marzano (2005), Fullan (1982) suggested that effective principals were change agents. The principal must take the primary role of the initiation and facilitation of educational

change if school achievement is to be effective. Furthermore, Hord (1987) stated the idea that school leaders were facilitators of change who work directly with those individuals who are expected to change. Hord continued to support principals as change facilitators by suggesting that 21st century principals should interact with members of their staff in personal, compassionate ways in order to nurture encouragement, at times pushing individuals to change and to adopt innovation in their daily work.

Riggio and Orr (2004) identified critical challenges that organizational leaders, including public school leaders, face in their positions. Embracing a more diverse student body in schools is a challenge for many school leaders today. Diversity is defined as various races and different groups of interests (Fullan, 2007). All individuals deserve to have the same opportunities for growth, learning, and participation for the betterment of their lives. Furthermore, effective leaders needed to have the knowledge to be able to identify and welcome diversity in their employees. These leaders understood the vital nature of establishing capacity and empowering others. Fullan (2007) suggested that successful leaders embraced differences of opinions because they realized the possibility of new ideas and breakthroughs.

A 21st century principal has the opportunity to create an environment that encourages, embraces, and establishes partnerships. Knowing that schools need change, effective principals sought partnerships with political figures, district officials, community members, and other stakeholders. Research has supported the notion that creating stronger school-community relationships helps to meet the needs of students and promotes school reform goals. Sergiovanni suggested that when leaders chose to expand their own leadership capacity by sharing it amongst the school community, it strengthened the chance of future academic success of students (Riggio & Orr, 2003).

Henderson and Mapp (2002) completed approximately fifty research studies from 1993 to 2002 focusing on parent and community involvement and their impact on student achievement. Their results indicated that high achieving schools often had adopted the philosophy of having a strong partnership with families and the community. Plus, they also concluded that school principals addressed concerns of communities, established collaborations, and achieved relationships that focused on student improvement.

Along with the challenges facing 21st century school leaders, principals were aware that schools and districts would consistently need financial supports. Riggio and Orr (2003) suggested that principals must go beyond their school districts to find partnerships that would support financial needs. They believed that private corporations were eager to involve themselves with improving schools. Hesselbein, Goldsmith, and Someerville (1999) stated that “The school walls that surround us, protect us, and embrace us can also inhibit movement and change, limit understanding, restrict engagement, and diminish our relevance in the wider world” (p. 2).

Additional resources included additional knowledge, funds, time, and buildings. The 21st century school leader may have the ability to advance their school districts to heightened levels of achievement and promote the positive changes for all those involved. Brown and Cornwall (2000) focused on academics and achievement situations as well as on outside influences, such as societal and financial pressures, that impacted certain practices in schools. They concluded there may be a need for entrepreneurial practices. Some practices may have been worth analyzing, and possible models worth implementing, in order to potentially build successful learning communities.

Brown (2003) contended that leaders in organizations identified as entrepreneurial possess common practices. These specific practices alter a traditional school district into more of an entrepreneurial school district. Case (2006) conducted a study consisting of five high school administrators, 33 school leaders, and 17 community leaders from various school districts. They intentionally used a small sample of principals to facilitate their identification of specific intrapreneurial and entrepreneurial leadership practices demonstrated. A panel of experts participated in the study that included several Ed.D. graduates whose dissertations had focused on charter schools and foundations. Members of the panel nominated schools that received additional resources due to the principal's ability to demonstrate interpreneurship and entrepreneurship practices at that school. Each of the principals in the study sample was a principal at a high school in Southern California and worked with students who were culturally and socioeconomically diverse.

Key findings from the study confirmed the belief that it is important for high school principals to work with the school district and organizational structure to support and implement innovative ideas and programs that meet the diverse needs of students. In addition, they created partnerships with organizations and individuals to acquire more resources, and they established professional working relationships inside the organization with staff and outside the school with community members (Case, 2006).

Additional key findings from the study recognized that the principals built internal and external leadership capacity with community members and stakeholders with the shared focus of student achievement. Principals constantly communicated the vision of the school to reiterate new ways that stakeholders and community members could get involved to achieve their shared vision. Furthermore, they created a process that allowed staff to share creative and innovative

ideas. In addition, school principals ensured that allocation of the additional resources addressed the specific needs of students, was based on the school improvement plan, and built technological structures that supported staff and student work. The principals constantly monitored and evaluated school programs based on the academic needs of students by recording and analyzing student progress as well as their program budgets (Case, 2006).

Significant findings (a) through (f) (described below) focused on practices the high school administrators used to increase their resources to improve student achievement. Three of the first six findings (b, c, and f) were supported by 90 percent or more of the study participants as practices either frequently or very frequently demonstrated by the school administrator. Significant findings (g) through (k) addressed practices used by high school administrators to integrate and focus resources on student success. One key finding (j) was supported by 92 percent of the study participants as a behavior frequently or very frequently demonstrated by the principal.

Case's 2006 study was based on Brown's (2003) characteristics of entrepreneurial and intrapreneurial educators. Entrepreneurial and intrapreneurial educators:

- a) Scanned both the internal and external environments in an effort to find threats that may lead to new opportunities. Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) contended that when opportunities for change occur, either internal or external, entrepreneurial leaders wanted to lead new initiatives despite not knowing the outcomes.
- b) Established a culture promoting intrapreneurship and entrepreneurship. Taylor (1990) found that innovative leaders disregarded standard policies for innovation during a study of intrapreneurship.
- c) Had the ability to create and foster creative potential of individuals around the organization. Leaders constantly stressed the difference between acceptable and

unacceptable risk-taking behaviors. Taking chances, innovation, and creativity should be supported throughout the organizational levels (Cornwall, 1989).

- d) Created a culture of empowerment and cooperation. Dufour (1999) suggested that leaders allowed input from stakeholders in making decisions for the school and encouraged individuals to respond.
- e) Established a plan that was proactive in finding new ways created by change and competition. According to Goodstein (1993), entrepreneurial leaders created plans for the future and developed procedures to ensure the success of that future.
- f) Made sure to provide open, informal communication around the organization. Marzano et al. (2005) stated that such leaders reminded others of their beliefs and vision, maintained focus on established goals, provided staff with new and innovative research and theory, and held discussions about what effective schools look like.
- g) Set up accountability criteria assessing the effectiveness of intrapreneurship and entrepreneurship of the organization. These are leaders who used budgets and business plans to steer entrepreneurialism in the corporation.

According to Marzano, McNulty, and Waters (2003) and Brown (2000), the most powerfully connected practices to student achievement were the following:

1. Communication
2. Contingent Rewards
3. Culture
4. Focus
5. Input
6. Monitoring/Evaluating
7. Resources

These practices are expanded upon in the upcoming subsections.

Entrepreneurial School Leaders

Entrepreneurship was defined as utilizing opportunities to benefit both the stakeholders and organization found outside an organization to support needs (Brown, 2003). This can only be successful if leaders allowed the participation of the community as a whole. Harvey and Drolet (2003) defined intrapreneurship as an active and recurrent process of searching for new possibilities to solve current issues within the organization in which they served. Similarly, De Jong, Parker, Wennekers, and Wei (2011) described intrapreneurship as current employees exhibiting entrepreneurial behaviors by taking initiatives to state something new without being asked to do so. Intrapreneurial strategies actively focused on finding new resources within an organization in order to rectify current problems, avoid potential problems, and take advantage of possibilities that may have emerged (Harvey & Drolet, 2003).

Intrapreneurship involves behaving like an entrepreneur, yet the difference is contextual. Entrepreneurs operate outside of traditional systems while intrapreneurs work within a current system by integrating risk-taking and innovative approaches. For the purpose of this dissertation, the term entrepreneurship is used throughout the literature review.

Traditional schools may need to reconsider how they manage themselves if the trend towards the privatization of public schools continues to increase. This trend is enforced by entrepreneurs who have the desire to demonstrate their ability to better educate students. Business newcomers have become obsessed with bettering the education system since *A Nation at Risk* encouraged bold actions for the revitalization of failing schools in America. The following sections expand on the characteristics developed by Marzano et al. (2005) and Brown (2003) that may help principals become entrepreneurial.

Resources

Rapid changes have occurred in education in the past twenty years. Educators in traditional school districts have been characterized as being more reactive and spent quality time studying problems (Case, 2006). Quite the opposite of their counterparts, entrepreneurial educators were seen as more proactive and were opportunists (Brown, 2003). Using environmental scanning, these individuals identified local, state, and national trends that positively impacted schools and acted accordingly. One example of transforming a threat into an opportunity for education was the development of charter schools. After charters received state aid, these entrepreneurs could function outside of surrounding school districts and not have to be obligated with the same policies. As school districts lost money when students began to attend charters, entrepreneurial leaders saw this threat as an opportunity by establishing a charter school that was operated by the district. Though students attended alternative schools, the students were retained within the district; and therefore, the districts would not lose funding. The parents had the option to choose charter schools rather than the traditional model (Case, 2006).

Harvey and Drolet (2004) suggested that environmental scanning allowed for organizations to see strategic issues. Bryson (1988) believed that internal and external scanning could lead to threats as well as opportunities for corporations. Furthermore, Nanus and Dobbs (1999) stated that entrepreneurial leaders maintained one eye on future challenges while the other eye remained on the potential growth of an organization. The leaders realized that change often offered new possibilities and could provide an innovative guide for development. Blasé and Kirby (2000) identified optimism as an important characteristic for effective school leaders. They believed that the school leader dictated the overall mood of the building, whether good or bad. Kelehear (2003) suggested that effective leaders willingly utilized their optimism at specific

times to encourage change. The responsibility of the school leader as optimizer was to inspire others as new and unique ideas and strategies for the betterment of the school were established.

Entrepreneurial leaders observed the inner working of their organization to make sure that procedures and practices were in order. They realized that new ways of planning and leading change were needed to combat future demands (Hesselbein, 2002). In addition, leaders sought to find the strengths and weaknesses by observing resources, provided student learning strategies, and analyzed performance data on staff and students. Entrepreneurial leaders were also attentive to the gap between school goals and objectives and then decided to cut any strategy, program, or resource that was not effective. Deering, Dilts, and Russell (2003) stated:

To be successful, leaders need to create organizations fluid enough to respond quickly to new circumstances. This involves the alignment of several levels of resources necessary to analyze, plan, and take action in response to opportunities and threats that the future brings. (p. 34)

Effectiveness of school leaders requires the ability to recognize important details and underlying issues that have the potential to alter the mood of the building; once identified, leaders could address current and potential problems in the future. Deering, Dilts, and Russell (2003) explored anticipatory leadership practices and suggested that principals collect bits of information regarding potential opportunities and threats that could emerge. Anticipatory leadership in the organization can improve mental agility and create a stronger foundation for growth.

One option for entrepreneurial leaders to scan the environment internally was to use process data . Price and Burton (2004) described process data as a manner for principals to

understand how teachers produce achievement for students. The information identified instructional strategies, time on-task, classroom management, and use of effective assessments.

Entrepreneurial leaders scanned the environment externally for trends that could affect the organization. Bryson (1988) defined external factors as issues that cannot be controlled by the organization. Such factors included demographics as well as economic, political, and technological issues. An example of demographic trends would include school principals being prepared for increases in the number of students attending school within the next twenty years (Brown, 2003). Furthermore, the student population will increasingly become more diverse. Minorities such as Hispanics will represent a higher percentage of the population in the United States. The increase of students in the school environment who represent diverse cultures, along with rapid changes in technology, law, and society, has exposed schools to greater uncertainties (Hargreaves, 1997).

Financial Trends

In an effort to provide proactive leaders in school districts, entrepreneurial leaders monitor economic trends. Funding issues have been a significant challenge for the educational system for years. Cubberley noted that “one of the most important administrative problems of today is how to properly finance the school system as the question of sufficient revenues lie back of almost every other problem” (pg. 3). This statement which dated back to 1905, is not any less true today. Contemporary school administrators are responsible for changes in schools with less financial support. With state and federal contributions continually dwindling, money to remodel older buildings, build new buildings, hire more staff, and afford daily necessities for instructing children for the 21st century will become even more scarce.

Political Issues

Regardless of less money, principals are still required to achieve lofty accountability expectations. At the time of NCLB, the federal law empowered the state government to enforce accountability goals at every grade-level in almost every school around the nation. Sims and Quatro (2005) stated that schools were expected to make annual performance growth. If schools failed to do so, the school faced penalties such as closures, and principals were subject to losing their positions. Effective leaders realized the importance of being aware of accountability and of analyzing their school data to identify weaknesses of the school so as to achieve the expected levels, whether district or statewide.

Trends in Technology

Entrepreneurial principals also need to understand how their school is impacted by technological advancements. Understanding how to use technology efficiently has become a must in current job opportunities as well as in future opportunities. Principals may need to build their infrastructure to stay ahead of trends in how students will be expected to learn in the future. Entrepreneurial leaders could also become aware of the potential need for both time and money to support staff development on technological skills and knowledge.

In an educational organization, having an entrepreneurial leader may be important. The demographic, financial, political, and technological trends may not be seen as hurdles but as opportunities to make changes to help the organization to grow and lead to the eventual increase in student achievement. According to Riggio and Orr (2003), following up on such trends would aid organizations to better respond to the needs of both the students and the community at large. As a result, the school leader would be in the position to establish initiatives for change leading to the development of entrepreneurial strategies.

Culture

Entrepreneurial school principals establish a culture for innovation by challenging norms and culture. Harper (2001) believed that leaders developed an environment in which staff members viewed situations from a new lens. Entrepreneurial educational leaders assessed the state of their district or school and eliminated anything that was not effective. These leaders promoted experimentation within their school district, with the understanding that errors could be used as teachable moments regarding what was successful and how to correct failures. Based on failures that needed correction, the school administrator would provide the staff with current educational theories and practices for improving teaching and learning that would become a part of the building culture. Supovitz (2002) supported this characteristic by suggesting that the leader should be engaged in meaningful discussions about research and theory with staff. Lashway (2001) linked the change process by explaining that for changes to occur, in-depth learning must take place. The leader must establish teacher learning into daily school culture.

Cornwall and Perlman (1989) argued that organizational values could help to establish a culture for entrepreneurship. The cornerstone of an entrepreneurial culture was values. In this manner, values provided direction for what individuals do along with the choices they made. Furthermore, Harvey and Drolet (2003) stated that entrepreneurial principals were not required to have a single answer to all of the problems in education but instead understood that innovation required patience and practice. In addition, these principals maintained reasonable expectations and kept their focus on small innovations rather than large changes.

Entrepreneurial administrators created internal and external coalitions with the use of informal strategies. Marzano et al. (2005) contended that entrepreneurial principals recognized that details and hidden problems about the function of the school were vital. Having this

information allowed principals to problem-solve current and future issues and thereby helped to strengthen the state of the district. An example would be the establishment of professional working committees with both staff and the community. Another example could also be for educational leaders to participate in open forums in the community to enhance networking.

Contingent Rewards

Entrepreneurial school leaders demonstrated the ability to promote creativity in education by finding ways to incorporate the creative potential of others (Brown, 2003). Nunnelley, Whaley, Mull, and Hott (2003) explained that administration must be proactive in recognizing the strengths, abilities, and skills of their staff. Educational leaders should encourage all stakeholders to be innovative beyond conventional means. Everyone affected by changes could be a part of the innovative process from the very beginning. Entrepreneurial leaders may want to consult the knowledge of others. According to Marzano et al. (2005), effective school leaders were willing to encourage change, consider new and more sufficient ways systematically, and constantly try to operate outside of being at the center. To further this point, Kirtman (2014) contended that the best leaders were not afraid to attempt new ways to achieve results. They even consulted with partners, either public or private, to increase opportunities to make students successful.

In addition, Wheatley (2002) stated that individuals only support what they have established. Entrepreneurial administrators recognized that creativity started when a problem was identified or when the problem was meaningful to a person. According to Harper (2001), the entrepreneurial educator understood that innovation and creativity were not left to chance; however, through collaborative strategic planning and thinking, they emerged. Harper also

contended that when leaders helped staff members with the establishment of objectives and organizational procedures and used rewards, innovation and creativity were enhanced.

Input

Entrepreneurial leaders have the ability to build groups that encourage cooperation and empowerment. Educators practicing entrepreneurship recognized that they had a role in providing meaning, importance, and commitment to the workplace. Providing empowerment to staff and stakeholders by allowing them to share ideas and be a part of the decision-making process occasionally resulted in the feeling of importance because individuals felt that they were making a difference in their organizations and in society as a whole (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Entrepreneurial educational leaders wanted people to share ideas. Harper (2001) believed that school leaders and districts wanting to instruct students successfully for the future needed to learn from different stakeholders.

Principals involved teachers in helping create policies and being influential in making vital decisions. Silinus, Mulford, and Zarins (2002) attested to the importance of this responsibility by noting that a school's effectiveness depended on the extent of teacher participation in the operations of the school, including policy decisions, a shared vision for student success and achievement, encouragement, and communication with stakeholders and other community members.

Brown proposed that entrepreneurial leaders established teams within the organization and beyond the organization. Kirtman (2014) suggested that high performing principals adopted innovation and wanted to learn from their staff, other principals, leaders in education, as well as with various sectors focused on establishing environments conducive to learning.

Focus

Marzano et al. (2005) defined focus as the ability of the administrator to identify goals, but also to develop a distinctive focus as to how to achieve them. Effective implementation of this responsibility provided a safeguard against meaningless resources and improvement initiatives that did not result in student growth or progress. Leithwood and Riehl (2003) suggested that a leader needed to pursue goals with clarity and a tenacious attitude, with awareness that they would be accountable for accomplishment. Bennis (2003) indicated that the cores for effective leadership were strong beliefs and clear, articulate ideals for school success. Youngs and King (2002) viewed beliefs as a subtle force used by school administrators to effect change. Organizations in the midst of change started with a strategic purpose. Their purpose was for schools to provide a learning environment that helped teachers learn about current events and adapted themselves to be able to help future generations learn as well (Gouillart & Kelly, 1995). It may be in the best interest of school leaders to consider how to prepare children for the future. Goodstein, Noloan, and Pfeiffer (1993) suggested that having a vision for the future of schools paved the direction that the school should move and delineated how that move should start. Trend analysis and future-focused research data were used as the foundation for planning strategically. Strong school administrators thought and planned for the future world their students would eventually be a part of once they left the school (Casey, 2005).

Furthermore, school leaders, researchers, and reformers may have realized the need for principals to develop and strengthen districts that will survive after they have departed. Stakeholders sharing the same vision as the school leader would have the ability to replace administrators due to the foundation already established. McFadden (2013) believed that innovative leadership that left a positive legacy would be learned and that school leaders had the

chance to leave legacies that were long-lasting for the benefit of students and stakeholders alike. Strategic planning requires shared leadership. Lambert (1998) asserted that organizations having shared leadership could be sustainable. This action would require a paradigm shift from leaders having individual responsibilities to a practice of shared responsibility. Lambert also suggested that the development of leadership skills should not be limited to several individuals but should be distributed across organizations.

Communication

Principals have the ability to establish a foundation for articulating their goals with teachers and children. The principal serves as the advocate for the school to all stakeholders. Cotton (2003) affirmed the importance of this factor, explaining that the principal should be able to communicate with both the internal and external members supporting the school. Through effective communication, the school leader can establish genuine relationships with stakeholders. Kanter (2002) contended that in order for innovation to occur in organizations, communication must be open. Cornwall and Perlman (1989) believed that part of an entrepreneurial culture consisted of subordinates having access to leaders that had an “open door” policy. This method provides opportunities for direct and honest discussions to take place regarding the development of new ideas. In addition, for internal and external communication of new ideas to be constant, Kouzes and Posner (1997) found in their studies on team building that groups performing highest had abundantly more communication with individuals outside their field of knowledge.

More so, Kouzes and Posner (1997) also found that critical information, along with new ideas, is produced when individuals communicated with various stakeholders both internally and externally. By providing the community with credible, honest, and uplifting communication about schools and children, school principals develop support for the significance of education.

Leaders that take advantage of communication establish stronger relationships with parents, staff, and other stakeholders (Case, 2006).

Systems of Accountability

Organizations in traditional educational systems assessed school effectiveness through their ability to manage a budget and implement organizational procedures (Brown, 2003). Managing a budget was vital in an entrepreneurial organization because it could result in support for future entrepreneurial endeavors (Case, 2006). The purpose for leaders to develop new accountability systems was to assess the appropriateness and implementation success of entrepreneurial strategies.

According to Hesselbein (2002), the financial structure of an organization should allow for a couple of great initiatives which benefit the communities and make significant improvement in the lives and performance of children. Furthermore, Hesselbein asserted that an organization that was capable of building sustainability for the future disregarded old hierarchical structures. Along with this, the school principal observed effective instructional practices and their impact on student progress. An example of building an organization that was fluid would include developing professional learning communities. By doing this, there was minimal leadership from just one person and an increase of shared leadership, leading to more collaborative groups that encouraged internal and external creativity.

Sharma (2001) conducted a study that included four schools to gain information about the innovative strategies utilized in each school. Sharma created a questionnaire for interviewing principals and their staff. Based on the study, the following factors were found to be associated with the effective implementation of innovations of schools with school leadership playing a vital part of the process. First, three of the four schools had extensive networking with

community members and corporate leaders. As the school grew and gained acceptance in the community, the support became easier. Secondly, the staff members from each school felt that the school principal was easily accessible for communication. Each of the four principals not only held regular meetings with teachers, but was also accessible for informal consultations. The principals in all four schools also provided staff to take on various responsibilities, providing the opportunity for team initiatives and for staff to develop their own way to do things. Thirdly, all of the schools created extensive review and monitoring systems which facilitated the management of innovation. Such processes provided adequate autonomy with accountability resulting in smooth implementation of various innovative activities. Fourth was the ease of communication, which flowed upward, downward, and horizontally. The principals effectively communicated that they were approachable and appeared to be one of the staff. This resulted in a reduction of communication barriers often seen in hierarchical structures. Sharma (2001) suggested that leadership was undoubtedly the key element because the leader provided support, encouragement, and direction for innovations to occur.

Most recently, Schimmel (2013) conducted a study on educational entrepreneurs. His study consisted of a population of individuals with experience in education ranging between 22-35 years, individuals with a doctorate degree in education, and individuals who had started innovative strategies in their school buildings. Participants for the study were chosen based on exhibiting entrepreneurial practices such as turning creative and innovative ideas into actions that ultimately supported students in becoming more creative and confident. The study showed that educational entrepreneurs were seen as risk-takers. They risked their reputations, spent extra hours at work, and were financially supported by the school district. Educational entrepreneurs

were also viewed as innovative by starting novel programs and straying away from traditional educational models.

The results from the study concluded that educational entrepreneurs were proactive due to the fact that these individuals sought out opportunities and took advantage of additional innovations after they first proved successful. The final result from the study determined that educational entrepreneurs were seen as collaborators in their school. These principals recognized key members who were vital in founding innovation. Eighty percent of the principals preferred to work with others by sharing ideas (Schimmel, 2013).

Effective and Entrepreneurial School Leader Commonalities

According to Mendez-Morse (1992), leaders exhibited various types of behaviors that made them effective. These types of behaviors were described as initiating structures and consideration. Initiating structures were defined as planning, organizing, and describing tasks of people along with how work was completed in an organization. In addition, consideration focused on the social and emotional well-being of individuals including recognition, work satisfaction, and self-esteem that influenced their performance on the job. Education was increasingly becoming more involved in social challenges, such as mental health and well-being, requiring principals to engage with the complexity of their school (Anderson & White, 2011).

Barnes and Kriger (1986) asserted that past theories of leadership were not sufficient due to their focus on one individual, and not being focused on the entire district. “Deal more with the single leader and multi-follower concept than with organizational leadership in a pluralistic sense” (p. 15). They also suggested that leadership was not found in the traits or skills of individuals, but in the characteristics of the organization as a whole in which “leader roles overlapped, complemented each other, and shifted from time to time from person to

person...implying a more inclusive concept of leadership” (p. 16). This concept of organizational leadership could be referred to as shared leadership, and it will be discussed in a little more detail later in this document. Based on Mendez-Morse (1992), effective and entrepreneurial leaders may have shared some of these characteristics as well:

Vision

Leadership literature frequently characterizes effective leaders as having a strong vision for the school. Duttweiler and Hord (1987) stated:

In addition to being accomplished administrators who develop and implement sound policies, procedures, and practices, effective administrators are also leaders that shape the school’s culture by creating and articulating a vision, winning support for it, and inspiring others to attain it. (p. 65)

According to Manasse (1986), vision was defined as a force that meshed meaning for the individuals of an organization. Successful principals recognized that the responsibility for school improvement and goals did not rely on just one individual. Effective leaders delegated responsibilities among staff, students, and stakeholders (Spillane, 2006). Such leaders established a culture of shared purpose and a learning environment consisting of organizational goals molded by everyone (Putman, 2012).

Value of Relationships

According to Case (2006), leaders comprehended that empowering individuals inspired the feeling of community, a feeling of coming together to share a common purpose. Sense (1990) asserted that leaders had the obligation to build organizations where people constantly expanded their capability to shape their future.

Effective leaders establish an environment promoting individual contributions toward the organization's work. Leaders form and support teams and provide the necessary resources to fulfill the vision. The American Association of School Administrators (1986) suggested that school leaders had the ability to support the district by renewing itself and maintaining the ability to identify ways to utilize the strengths of staff members. Furthermore, Gorton and McIntyre (1978) believed that effective principals had the skills to work with various types of people with different needs, interests, and expectations. In addition, Niece (1989) suggested in his study of school administrators that effective instructional leaders are interactive with their staff and are people-oriented.

Communication

Researchers described the ability to communicate as another characteristic of effective principals (Becker, 1971; Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986; Gorton & McIntyre, 1978; Niece, 1989). Listening skills was deemed another common communication characteristic of effective school administrators (Becker, 1971; Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986; Gorton & McIntyre, 1978). According to Becker (1971), school principals of outstanding schools listened well to students, staff, and parents. To further this point, leaders of change were listeners and communicators. Leadership stressed the vital nature of communication (Foster, 1985). Effective school administrators were, in particular, good at communication and had the skills needed to interact well with students, staff, and other individuals and groups (Mazzarella & Grundy, 1989).

Mendez-Morse (1992) stated that communication and listening skills for school leaders were important characteristics that helped facilitate school changes. Their ability to communicate was the basis to articulate their beliefs and vision for students and schools, create a shared vision amongst their staff, and demonstrate that they had faith in their peers as support systems. For

leaders of change, having the characteristics of an effective communicator and listener were also key ingredients for being proactive and taking risks (Mendez-Morse, 1992).

Proactive Leaders

Effective principals are proactive by taking initiative, recognizing changes in their environment, and identifying possible actions to such changes. Leaders of change in education are proactive in the efforts they make to change and enhance their schools and districts. Mazzarella and Grundy (1989) stated, “they are always testing the limits in an effort to change things that no one else believes can be changed” (p. 23).

Often proactive school leaders are defined as people who do not accept the current rules, regulations, or traditions of schools or districts that are designed to limit change efforts (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; Crowson, 1989; Mazzarella & Grundy, 1989; Pezja, 1985; Schmuck & Schmuck, 1989). Leaders of change are aware of when shifts in the environment occur and then guide others to rethink the vision. Leaders of educational change recognize paradigm shifts in curricula, student needs, and political policies. They scan schools and the community on a consistent basis to determine where changes are needed.

Effective principals were on constant alert for opportunities to make something happen; and when opportunities were not present, these principals created opportunities (Mazzarella & Grundy, 1989). Furthermore, McFadden (2013) stated that innovations and attempts to find opportunities is a state of mind. Entrepreneurialism is ingrained in certain styles of leadership and in how circumstances, relationships, and challenges are viewed.

Risk-Takers

Effective school leaders can be risk-takers. Crowson (1989) defined creative insubordination as a principal who disobeyed the rules when making ethical decisions. His study

suggested that school administrators did not follow district policies that were not in the best interests of their students, staff, or building. Furthermore, principals supported their staff to experiment with different methods of instruction that met the needs of students. According to Kirtman (2014), innovation and leadership have been separate terms for years, as were instruction and leadership. If viewpoints were broadened by hiring innovative leaders who were focused on sustainable results of students, the educational system would be transformed.

Effective principals found it challenging to live within the confines of the bureaucracy. They violated the chain of command frequently and sought solutions for problems from various sources, from wherever possible (Becker, 1971). School administrators and superintendents may take risks, but not carelessly or haphazardly. They also encouraged individuals to be innovative by providing a culture where it was safe to take risks (Mendez-Morge, 1992). In addition, the element of risk is at the heart of any entrepreneurial venture. In public education, principals were trained to manage risk (McFadden, 2013).

This section described how effective school leaders share similar traits that entrepreneurial school leaders possess. Effective school leaders may have had the potential to adopt several more of the practices that entrepreneurial principals possessed, as described by Brown (2000). Entrepreneurial school leaders constantly reflected on how to create opportunities for student success and recognized trends affecting schools and communities. They strove to be proactive and took advantage of opportunities that trends provided (Case, 2006).

The literature review discussed leadership practices deemed necessary for the 21st century. Emerging from the review were several leadership practices that school administrators may need to learn and apply to be effective in gaining additional resources to improve student learning. The problem is that many districts have established a culture based on old ways of

thinking, including education. They were facing backwards not forwards, resulting in many people and organizations having a hard time coping (Robinson, 2011). Innovative leaders in education may provide new ways to educate students. Chapter Three outlines the methods of the study including the research design, sample, and analysis.

Chapter Three: Methods

This chapter describes the research methods used in this study. The research questions, the research design, a description of the sample, instrumentation, and methods of analysis are discussed. The purpose of this study was to understand the leadership practices of principals who act as instructional leaders in traditional public and public charter school settings and to learn how these leadership practices varied. A secondary purpose was to explore the extent to which these leadership practices aligned with entrepreneurial characteristics (Brown, 2000) and effective leadership characteristics (Marzano, McNulty, & Waters, 2005). In an effort to answer these queries, the following research questions emerged.

Research Questions

Do practices of principals from traditional public schools differ from those in public charter schools?

- a) How do these practices compare with practices expected of effective school leaders?
- b) How do the practices of these principals compare to expected practices of entrepreneurial leaders?

Research Design

The research was a qualitative study. As described below, data consisted of interviews with 15 educational principals in the greater Indianapolis area. The interview questions were based on leadership practices that had been identified by previous research as leadership practices related to student achievement at a statistically significant level. The questions were based on the combination of the most powerfully connected areas contributing to student achievement developed by Marzano et al. (2005) and Brown (2000) as practices effective leaders use.

Sample

The data collected consisted of interviews from ten traditional public school principals (TPS) and five public charter school principals in Indianapolis. With the exception of one school, the participants represented various traditional public and public charter schools serving at least 60 percent minority students.

School and district names have been assigned pseudonyms, and principals are identified by type of school and a number to maintain anonymity. Principals in traditional public schools are identified as T1, T2, etc.; principals in public charter schools are identified as C1, C2, etc. Tables 4.1 and 4.2 list demographic information about each principal's school that was provided by the Indiana Department of Education. This information included free/reduced percentages and overall I-STEP passing rates from 2014. For instance, T2 had approximately 86 percent of his student body passing the I-READ assessment in 2014. 10th grade I-STEP scores were used for T3, T8, and T10 for the upper grades due to the transition high schools made to the End of Course Assessment (ECA). Overall, the elementary schools in the sample averaged 74.7% of their third-grade students passing the I-READ reading assessment. Third grade students needed to score at least 446 points out of a possible 650 points to pass. The school T10 was to be the administrator at was set to open during the 2015-2016 school year. No data was available and therefore is represented with (*).

The public charter schools involved in the study included two elementary school, C1 and C2, which served students from kindergarten through grade six.

C3 and C5 served students from kindergarten through high school, and C4 served students from grades nine through twelve. The public charter schools (Table 4.2) were comprised of at least 42% non-White students. With the exception of one elementary public charter, the

students demonstrated an average of 77% academic achievement on the I-STEP standardized assessment in the 2013-2014 school year. Table 4.3 provides information describing the participants. The table represents a total of fifteen administrators who answered interview questions about their practices. Eight women and seven men participated in this research. The traditional school principals had an average of 6.7 years in school leadership experience. The public charter schools had an average of 9 years.

Table 3.1. 2013-2014 Demographic Information for Traditional Schls.

Principal	Free/Reduced %	Minorities %	I-STEP Passing %	I-READ Passing %	Total Students
T1	75.3	71.4	59.8	N/A	620
T2	73.0	76.4	61.1	85.6	568
T3	0	17.9	44.1	N/A	134
T4	65.6	66.1	56.3	N/A	3,598
T5	60.3	60.3	63.8	96.0	587
T6	92.1	94.4	64.1	71.1	302
T7	78.5	93.3	55.1	N/A	875
T8	57.0	86.5	60.3	N/A	3,019
T9	48.9	56.4	68.9	N/A	3,445
T10	*	*	*	*	*

Table 3.2. 2013-2014 Demographic Information for Public Charter Schls.

Charter School	Free/Reduced	Minorities	I-STEP Passing %	I-READ Passing %	Total Students
C1	54.0	64.1	78.5	100.0	189
C2	78.6	82.3	15.3	48.6	527
C3	91.6	66.1	71.0	92.2	645
C4	100.0	97.6	83.4	N/A	218
C5	91.6	66.1	71.0	92.2	645

Table 3.3. Demographic Profile of Traditional and Charter Schl. Administrators

School Type	Gender	Race	Approx. Yrs. Of Leadership
T1	Male	White	8
T2	Male	Black	4
T3	Male	White	9
T4	Female	White	8
T5	Female	White	6
T6	Male	White	8
T7	Female	Hispanic	8
T8	Male	Black	9
T9	Female	Black	N/A
T10	Female	Black	7
C1	Female	Black	6
C2	Female	Black	11
C3	Male	White	12
C4	Female	Black	8
C5	Male	White	8

Instrumentation

Each identified participant was interviewed for the study. The interview sessions were held with a single individual and typically lasted from 60 to 90 minutes, depending on the allotted time scheduled by the individual interviewee. Interviews were conducted in person at the respondent's workplace or in a public location. The interview questions were based on leadership practices identified by previous research that demonstrated a statistically significant relationship with student achievement. The questions were based on the combination of the most powerfully connected areas contributing to student achievement developed by Marzano et al. (2005) and Brown (2000) as practices effective leaders use. The interview protocol is located in Appendix A.

Analysis

Interviews were recorded to provide an accurate record of the interview data, transcribed, and formatted into a usable form. I reviewed the qualitative data from the transcripts of the individual interview sessions and then analyzed the data for patterns or qualitative themes. Then interview responses were categorized based on similar themes captured in the literature as described in Chapter Two. To code the data, I read all of the interview transcripts to form initial codes, or open coding. For instance, I identified that the traditional principals used their data to focus on their school improvement needs. This data-focused theme was identified based on phrases that included "look at whatever data we have," "find other ways to assess your building," "I looked at data from previous years," "let's look at the data," and "what is the data really telling us?".

The next step included another read of the interview transcripts to further identify emerging themes. During that time the data and themes were coded and compared to establish reliability and trustworthiness to the study. This confirmed that codes were being put together theoretically, which is also known as axial coding. Strauss and Corbin (1990) defined axial coding as the re-examination of analysis of categories identified in order to understand how they are connected. In addition, in using axial coding, I determined whether data was sufficient to support an interpretation. An example of my analysis included creating a graphic organizer for each of the questions that displayed the responses provided by the participants. I then highlighted common words and phrases in the responses to identify patterns and themes.

According to Weiss (1994), by piecing together reports from people having similar behaviors, systems can be easier to understand. The dense information gained from a qualitative interview provided a description of how the numerous parts of a complex entity interrelate. Highlighting keywords and phrases and using labels helped identify the main concepts.

Trustworthiness

Maintaining the validity and trustworthiness in the study was the most significant aspect to me. “Study participants should be apprised of the motivation about the purpose of the study” (Creswell, 2007, p. 123). In addition, to help solidify the reliability of the codes and themes identified, I engaged in peer debriefing to check findings. Once initial themes were formed, I reflected with a peer throughout the process and particularly towards the end of the analysis process. Creswell (2000) referred to this step as vital to ensure reliability to a study by stating that “in qualitative research, reliability often refers to the stability of responses to multiple coders of data sets” (p. 210). An experienced researcher and I established dialogue to confirm results and answer questions regarding findings.

Chapter Three has provided an overview of the methods used in this study including the research questions, design, a description of the sample, a discussion of how the interviews were conducted and analyzed for emerging patterns, and various data tables illustrating the passing percentages on state assessments. Chapter Four delves into the findings and elaborates on the results.

Chapter Four: Findings

The purpose of this study was to understand the leadership practices of principals in traditional public and public charter school settings and to understand how these leadership practices varied. A secondary purpose was to learn if these leadership practices aligned with entrepreneurial characteristics (Brown, 2000) and effective leadership characteristics (Marzano, et al., 2005). Data consisted of interviews with fifteen principals in the greater Indianapolis area. The following four themes emerged after data analysis of each interview: (a) the importance of establishing school vision and mission, (b) the methodologies used to capture data when monitoring implementation of new strategies, (c) the ability to develop culture through visibility and communication, and (d) the need to delegate responsibilities in an effort to increase personal productivity.

The Importance of Establishing School Vision and Mission

A leader's vision for school improvement guides a school's trajectory for an academic year. The school leader is responsible for setting the tone, in part, by creating a vision for school improvement based on the current needs of the students served.

All of the principals in this study discussed how their vision for school improvement helped them establish the goals for improving student achievement. Leithwood and Riehl (2003) suggested school leaders developed a vision, knew the goals to achieve, and pursued goals with clarity, a relentless attitude, and accountability for accomplishment. The vision and mission section discusses the TPS principals' focus on societal contribution and awareness, along with using data to drive their visions for school improvement. Furthermore, the section also includes the efforts of the public charter principals to help promote equitable outcomes for students. The public charter principals also strived to find teachers who shared their vision.

TPS Principals' Vision and Mission for Societal Contribution and Awareness

A school vision serves as the dream for what the school leader eventually wants his or her school to be. It becomes a shared vision when it goes beyond the principal to the students, staff, and stakeholders (School Leadership Contributes to Student Achievement, 2016). T2 stated that his mission for his school was not only for the staff to build relationships, but he desired for those relationships to impact society. “If we impact kids, we impact our city, we impact the country. We are very intentional about relationships.” T2 shared his point that if the influence on students remained positive, then the students’ influence on society would be positive as well. In his interview, T3 discussed the impact he wanted his vision to have on the overall community. He said that supporting students to accomplish their dreams would create productive members of society, resulting in overwhelming pride in the community. T3 shared that part of his vision was to encourage pride in his school to “open as many doors for students as possible,” primarily mathematically. His virtual school was in the process of revising the curricular content in mathematics to address the overall lack of achievement and student engagement. In doing so, the virtual school could gear instruction to be reflective of the current living environment of their students and encourage ways that students could heighten the learning environment in the future.

Another TPS principal, T4 stated, “Our vision statement is where a lifelong learner is preparing for a diverse society.” T4 revamped her vision statement to better accommodate the various cultures represented by students and families in her school. At the same time, she hoped to help students understand the importance of becoming life-long learners who would contribute productively to an increasingly diverse society.

At her elementary school, T5 explained her staff was working to engage students to become positive members of society with the focus on respecting peers and teachers. She explained,

We are a welcoming community, growing leaders of tomorrow with respect for our learning, our environment, and each other. That big piece, that respect piece, with that discipline and that respect for their own learning and the adults, that was a big piece.

T5 was attempting to lead by example the school's vision for the life-skill of respect, not only learning instruction. With both her staff and students having respect for one another and themselves, students would learn more academically and socially. Respect is a skill that is necessary for students to find success beyond school.

Lastly, not only did his vision and mission include academic achievement and student responsibility, T8 wanted his students to learn to serve their surrounding community. He stated:

They'll get a chance to go out in the community and go to Wheeler Mission, do coaching for kids, participate in Pennies for Patients, and read to kids in elementary school as part of their learning of what service is.

T8 was teaching his students the value of giving back to the community at large. T8 was also helping his students understand the importance of supporting the well-being of other individuals in society.

Common across several of the TPS principals interviewed was how their vision could prepare students for the world outside of the school walls. In addition to the hope of promoting academic success, the principals also looked to develop the surrounding community and build a stronger, more culturally aware living environment.

Data Analysis Influenced TPS Principals' Vision for School Improvement

The traditional school principals crafted their visions for school improvement with the use of school data. Part of their vision included tracking their progress toward their goals. For example, T1 described that his vision was to utilize various data to better serve his students. “We try to look at whatever data we have...kind of get behind what they're passionate about and work towards affecting change throughout the years.”

This principal focused on finding various ways to measure the needs of his school building. Using multiple data points, T1 triangulated assessment scores that could help identify academic patterns of individual students. T1 explained that he wanted to prepare his students for high school and beyond. By identifying academic patterns, the teachers could better help students explore various courses of interest.

Like T1, T2 relied on data that he said was key to school success. T2 focused his vision for school improvement on raising I-READ scores. In other words, T2 wanted his staff of teachers to know their students' individual academic levels. He reported:

When I came here, our I-READ [Indiana third grade reading test] scores were at the bottom of the district. This year, we were second to highest I-READ scores. When I came here that year they had 153 suspensions... this year 26. Referrals went from 1,300; this year we had 428.

T2 stated that his vision for his school was “each child, each day, a success.” He also described how the use of data had impacted other areas for improvement including dealing with school discipline issues.

T5 shared her first experience as the new principal. In an effort to identify a school vision moving forward, she wanted to learn about the current state of the school. She decided to go into

her classrooms to complete walk-throughs. “Getting in the classrooms, what I realized is the instructional pieces isn't [sic] there so what makes up a good lesson. The district does a lot of the workshop model in reading and writing.” For T5, her initial goal during her first year was to familiarize herself with her new school. The data from the walk-throughs helped her understand the academic challenges of her new school. In evaluating classroom instruction, T5 found lesson structure to be poor and came to realize the observation data suggested the overall student body was not making growth. T5 concluded that her staff and teachers needed support in best practices, primarily in English/Language Arts, to increase student learning during daily lessons.

T6 discussed how his staff of teachers would give students assessments, but they did not analyze the data to identify patterns in student learning. He noted:

I am very data-minded. I love to look for trends and look for improvements. When I first came here, the staff would give assessments...they really would not do anything with it.

We were going through the data looking for any type of deficits, if we needed to reteach, if we needed to remediate, if we needed to enrich.

T6 described his passion for analyzing data and expressed his need to share his joy for data to help his teachers use it to enhance student learning.

In reviewing school improvement goals with her staff, T7 desegregated school data and met with the various subject departments to discuss what they said were the most significant academic goals for the school year. T7 stated:

I think our vision for school improvement, at least from my perspective, less is more. I'm a big person who likes to be driven by staff. I take an active initiative to meet with all departments and say, 'Let's look at the data. What is the data really telling us?'

Finally, in his interview, T8 discussed how he wanted his high school graduation rate to exceed that of the previous school year. He said,

We have a high rate of graduation. [In] 2015, we were right around 92 percent. This year, we're projecting 136 to graduate out of 146. That's even after a more rigorous, hybrid curriculum with direct instruction and online elective courses.

T8 used the school graduation rate as an example of how his vision came to fruition as measured by achievement. The students attending his high school were exposed to a college readiness unit as a part of his vision for achievement.

A principal who clearly shares and sustains a vision that motivates others is not only a successful leader but also promotes greater academic achievement among students (Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Herbert, 2011; Mosley, Boscardin, & Wells, 2014). When discussing the focus for their school improvement plan, the traditional public principals gathered data to understand student needs. These principals tried to adapt school improvement efforts based on the various circumstances that may interfere with student learning. They made a conscious effort to limit their instructional challenge areas so as to improve on their more significant weaknesses. Based on the school improvement plan, a principal's vision could dictate the strategic and decision-making process for eventual goals.

Public Charter Schools' Vision and Mission Sets Precedence for Autonomy

The responses of the public charter principals differed from their TPS peers in regards to wanting their students to be successful in the future by providing their students with essential tools for cultivating self-reliance and independence. C1 passionately stated,

My mission is that our kids become technologically ready for this new century and they become thinkers. We are a thinking school. I think kids are only smart at the strategy that they are given to sort through problems, not only in education but in life.

C1 described how vital her vision was for her students to not only become tech-savvy but also to continuously think about the world that they currently live in.

Next, C2 shared her mission statement, which focused on the long term, to prepare students to achieve beyond the rate of the other high schools on the state-standardized assessment as well as to excel throughout their college careers. She explained her goals were “to make sure that all of our students are outperforming the state average and that’s putting them on the track to get into and through college ... we want our students to be competitive with the state.” C2 thought her mission of having more students passing the state standardized assessment compared to all of the other students in Indiana would lead them to be more successful in post-secondary institutions.

Lastly, C3 explained the importance of the mission for his school to break the poverty cycle common in families of students they served,

Our mission is to take children who live in poverty and to put them on an educational path to break the cycle of poverty, make them contributing members of society. It’s important that they’re going to be contributors, not just the recipients of society. They’ve got to see themselves as a contributor and not as a victim.

C3 was hoping his mission would provide his students with instruction that would give them the necessary knowledge and drive for additional learning. In doing so, his students could better their chances to find successful jobs and break the cycle of poverty.

These public charter school principals discussed their visions as being concentrated on helping their students break away from a lower socio-economic lifestyle. The principals wanted their students to gain the academic skills to excel when compared with their peers on standardized assessments while also gaining an innovative mentality when introduced into the workforce.

Staffing Influenced Public Charter Principals' Vision for School Improvement

Among the public charter school principals interviewed for the study, the focus for school improvement was different from that of TPS. The public charter school principals did not share perspectives that were as focused on learning and instruction as compared to their traditional school counterparts. Three of the five public charter school principals interviewed did not discuss data as their primary focus for school improvement, but rather placed their focus on personnel. C1 described her struggles with school improvement due to high turnover in staff and little buy-in. "We've had so much turnover in our building, it's been very difficult to establish in our school when it comes to school improvement. The hardest thing is to get people to buy in to what we believe." C1 responded that staff stability was vital to her vision for school improvement because it could provide the school the opportunity to build a cultural foundation that included consistent academic language and instruction to promote success.

Likewise, C2 seemingly had similar struggles with school improvement as the primary focus as indicated by the statement, "I've always stepped into a brand new school or it's a turnaround situation and so always in both of those situations is attacking adult culture first so even before we talk about the kids." C2 shared that her first vision at her new school was focused on the adult culture and their attitudes towards students and how students learn. C2 had the challenge of changing such attitudes, where some of the staff did not believe in or care that

all students could learn. Once the staff and students were on one accord in a positive relationship, she could then turn her attention to her vision for school improvement.

However, C5 had a slightly different challenge of figuring out ways to uphold school morale. C5 discussed the impact of teacher burnout as well as celebrating student and staff success,

I think that vision of success breeds success and we're going to celebrate success and we're going to celebrate kids and we're going to celebrate what they did well and really try to build into a teaching staff that's stable. We had a large turnover [of teachers] that first year and now we're having a large turnover in this third year. So it burns them out relatively quickly.

C5 discussed the influence that his teachers had on his vision. He referred to the teachers in his school building as being exhausted by the end of a school year due to the amount of energy they put towards student learning. As a result, the school consistently had to replace employees as they continued their attempt to increase student progress. The public charter school principals described their vision for school improvement as an attempt to find the right staff for their schools. These principals were continuously looking for teachers who could handle the demands of the profession.

The TPS and public charter school principals had varying views on how their vision and/or mission attempted to prepare their students for the future. Both sets of principals wanted their students to have the best preparation for the outside world. The difference between the traditional public school principals and the public charter school principals interviewed was their focus for school improvement. The traditional school principals seemed to rely on using school data to

inform decisions while the public charter school principals attempted to build their staff and then focus on the instructional aspects of school.

The traditional public school principals may have had an edge toward accomplishing their vision for student achievement due to having less staff mobility and a history of longevity and establishment within a school district. Furthermore, the traditional public principals may have had long-term trend data available to use in creating a stronger comprehensive school improvement plan related to their vision for their schools. The public charter school principals interviewed were still in the process of establishing a consistent staff as they attempted to generate solutions to help their families break away from poor living conditions. This could be, in part, due to the fact that all of the charter schools involved in the study had been in existence for less than five years at the time of the interviews.

The area of monitoring instruction is the next section discussed in this chapter. The section explains how new initiatives for the enhancement of teaching and learning were discussed amongst the school principals interviewed.

Methodologies to Capture Data for Monitoring Implementation of New Strategies

In accordance with Marzano et al. (2005), monitoring and evaluating instruction was defined as when the principal assessed school practices and their impact on student achievement. The traditional public school principals tended to limit their direct monitoring, instead favoring professional development meetings and discussions with their instructional coaches, whereas the charter school principals relied on completing classroom walk-throughs to monitor the implementation of new strategies.

Traditional Public Schools Principals Utilized PD for Strategy Implementation

Supovitz (2015) argued that a vision should have an outline of focus that did not just include test scores, but included accountability for all. The traditional public school principals discussed how they implemented academic or social strategies new to the district and/or staff. Some principals enlisted the help of their coaches and committees to monitor the new strategy. T1 described the process that he used during professional development sessions to ensure that the new strategy, Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), was used by the staff. T1 had his teachers to bring relevant student academic data to professional development meetings about the new strategy as one important method of progress monitoring. In his words, “[For] PBIS we have two committees that meet regularly and then we report out. Part of the important piece is how you're using your [behavior] data to address your needs ... committees would work on solutions and re-teach lessons.”

T1 shared how he used PD sessions to implement PBIS in his building. The behavior data collected by teachers supported the needs of the students and was used to inform the teaching of necessary social skills. During the professional development sessions, the faculty analyzed their data to find commonalities and challenges so the PBIS committee could provide the teaching staff with additional ideas, such as re-teaching, as a manner of helping all teachers adapt instruction.

In a similar fashion, T2 described how he went about ensuring that his staff of teachers implemented current strategies. In reference to supporting the more experienced members of his staff with the newly adopted best practice of Teach Like a Champion (2014), T2 stated,

You’ve been teaching for 15 years. But what you were using back then may not be best practices so constantly keeping conversation of what best practices look like and

modeling that, offering time and staff meetings... through Teach Like a Champion...giving them those instructional strategies to help them solidify what they're doing.

T2 reported that some veteran teachers were slower to adapt to the newer pedagogical approaches. T2 reported that he helped teachers who have been teaching for 15-plus years by providing professional development sessions where he frequently discussed how to infuse best practices into their lesson plans for small group instruction.

Due to having an online school, T3 discussed a new strategy called personalized learning. Personalized learning focuses on student-led instruction and provides an opportunity for teachers to reflect on their individual teaching style. T3 provided his staff with webinars and had the teachers act as students so that they could gain a firsthand student experience. "We have a lot of interactions because the teachers are not here. Our professional development are webinars just like they would be interacting with students online."

T4 used committees, along with professional development sessions, to put into effect two new instructional strategies as part of the requirements of a federal grant,

We've done a lot of PD with our teachers on curriculum mapping and personalized learning. We have monthly professional development that goes on. So we just hit and then we monitor through our committees in meetings, areas where we need to go back and reteach our teachers.

During the monthly professional development meetings, T4 discussed providing staff with supports to implement new strategies such as personalized learning. The TPS principal then relied on committee members to provide feedback at subsequent staff meetings where they

brainstormed solutions to support teachers with the strategy. Yager (2012) supported these findings as effective practice when he wrote,

Successful principals establish the work conditions that enable teachers to be better teachers. The ability to share with others and collaborate with them for the purpose of providing instruction that is conducive to enhancing student development is critical given the many demands put upon the system. (p. 2)

T5 used a portion of her professional development sessions to follow-up with her staff on a new strategy, the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP), that her district implemented. The staff had opportunities to discuss the new strategy with colleagues to learn how their peers were implementing the strategy. This also provided T5 the opportunity to assess the progress that her teachers were making in the process. The strategy focused on helping English-language learners gain academic skills as they developed the English language. T5 stated, “The district has started with SIOP, so everyone across the district are doing objectives, everybody across the district were looking at checking for mastery.”

In addition, T7 and her staff narrowed their strategies down to three in an effort to focus on what they deemed was important. “Initially we started off with anywhere from eight to ten [strategies], and narrowed it down to three, with one being Teach Like a Champion. And so we provided PD on them.” T7 explained that she aided her staff of teachers in choosing three strategies to implement for the school year. Once identified, T7 provided the staff with professional development, allowing the staff sufficient time to attempt the strategies and report back regarding their thoughts in later professional development sessions. As a staff they generated potential solutions and ideas to improve their teaching.

Finally, T10 described the importance of professional development when implementing blended learning in her school,

So professional development last year was crucial, which is why we did all the visitations to the other schools. And then we met with the software company that designed our software and we had, I think it was, two eight-hour intensive training sessions with them about how to create blended classrooms.

T10 described the sense of urgency in making certain that the Blended Learning model would be implemented with fidelity, including observing implementation at various other schools. She used additional staff meetings to follow-up with teacher progress on implementation, usage, and problem-solving.

The traditional public school principals described how they implemented new academic or social strategies at their school through the use of professional development programs. The principals mentioned how they relied on other school personnel, such as the academic coach, to report back to them. The principals then used that feedback to determine the next steps for the strategy. In contrast, the public charter school principals utilized walk-throughs to monitor the new strategies.

Public Charter School Principals Completed Classroom Observations

The public charter school principals discussed monitoring the execution of a new strategy by observing classrooms. C1 referenced observing a new teacher enacting whole group instruction in his classroom. Though the strategy may have not been new to the entire staff, it was new to teachers starting their careers. The principal discussed how the lesson plans of teachers should be a blueprint of what she observes and records when she is observing teacher instruction and student learning. She stated,

I do walkthroughs and I try to get them in as frequent as possible and not threatening. I've already spoken with a teacher this year and told him that next week, I would do a walkthrough just to look at his whole group. I just want to look at the whole group and see what he's doing, how things are going.

C4 not only completed walkthroughs on teachers' instruction, but she also held conversations with students in order to support their understanding of a focus wall. She stated, "I talked to a student, and I look at them and say 'What can you use to help you with it?' Then I'll say, 'Oh, did your teacher ever talk to you about the focus wall?'" The focus wall represents numerous progression points for each student using their individual assessment scores to aid students in understanding their own growth as well as to create goals to improve their learning. C4 also engaged students in discussion in an effort to determine student interpretations and how well teachers were teaching the concept.

C5 recently implemented student-led curriculum in which the students led academic discussions more than the classroom teacher. The principal then discussed how the school chose to monitor the strategy. "This year was the move from teacher-driven to student-driven. We're looking for student-directed instruction. We have coaches and administration that do walkthroughs and provide feedback. So we try to capture a lot in walkthroughs." C5 discussed administration and instructional coaches completing walk-throughs in order to monitor student-led instruction. The administrators and coaches could then brainstorm ways to help teachers elevate strategies to encourage student-led instruction. Furthermore, observations informed the school administration and coaches on what additional strategies and resources the teachers could utilize to ensure that student-led instruction was successful.

The public charter school principals discussed getting into the classrooms in their buildings. This practice enabled the public charter principals the chance to observe interactions between teachers and students and to witness how the daily operations within the classroom supported a safe, productive learning environment.

Based on the definition for monitoring and evaluating established by Marzano et al. (2005), the public charter schools may have exhibited greater understanding of effective school practices in terms of monitoring the implementation of new strategies. The traditional public school principals mentioned that they used professional development sessions to aid teachers with feedback, to provide opportunities for teachers to share their thoughts and ideas, and to review progress through data. The public charter school principals mainly relied on the use of walkthroughs to monitor the fidelity in how a new strategy was being implemented. The public charter principals may have a better understanding of initial successes and challenges during the implementation stage. Furthermore, the public charter principals may be better positioned to provide support for instruction moving forward.

The next area discussed in this chapter is culture. In this section, both sets of principals discussed the roles that visibility and delegation play as part of the school culture. Though both sets of principals rely on delegation, the TPS principals had a different mindset than that of the public charter principals.

Gauging Culture through Visibility

Marzano et al. (2005) defined the responsibility of culture as the extent to which the leader fostered shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperate among staff. The principal's visibility could contribute to school culture. Per Marzano et al. (2005), visibility was characterized by consistent principal visits to and frequent contact with students and staff.

According to Holloway (2013), not only is it important for the leader to have frequent contact, but visibility needed to be sincere and authentic so that employees felt that the leader truly wanted to be with them by providing clarity for expectations. Furthermore, this type of collaboration with the leader influenced employees to want to increase their performance because they sensed that the leader was invested in the work that they were producing.

Participants reported that visibility was key to their success. By maintaining visibility, they were able to maintain order, procedures, and policies. Principals who were visible in their schools also reported understanding the culture they were working hard to promote and build. To enable visibility, principals need to consider how they spend their time. Rather than focusing on bureaucratic demands (e.g., paperwork and e-mails), time might be better spent walking the school.

School Principals' Visibility through Classroom Interactions

Staff and students were influenced by the competence of the school leader. That influence could change depending on the actions of the principal (Grobler, 2012). Staff and students wanted a principal who seized the chance to bond with them as well (O'Malley, Meagan, Vioght, Renshaw, & Fklund, 2015). Both traditional and public charter principals strived to support learning in their schools by observing and working in classrooms. Acknowledging that it takes a great deal of energy, T1 shared that it is important to build relationships with his students. He stated,

I try to be approachable, I try to be visible. I try to model what my expectations are as far as how I treat students when I'm out there. It's constant work. It takes a lot of time and energy to keep that collaboration going or that sense of collaboration going.

T1 was hoping to foster a culture of a nurturing community with the students attending his school. T1 wanted his students to understand that he genuinely cared for them and discussed the amount of energy it took to be visible to build and maintain relationships. T1 also wanted to help his students realize and that they could trust him to address their concerns and share their thoughts without judgment.

Another example included when T2 said that one of the best ways to interact with students was to denounce that the school office was just a negative place for misbehaved students. T2 shared,

I think I make the impact, I know my kids. I don't want my students just to associate the office with the bad stuff. To my kids, I am funny and crazy and I want them to see that. If I connect with the kids, they'll go home and explain my vision.

T2 shared that though his students may not know his vision for the school, they would still be able to articulate it to their parents based on his interactions with them.

T5 shared that she not only attempted to try her best to be visible in classrooms at her school, but she also tried to model appropriate interactions with students in front of her staff of teachers though there were times she fell short,

I try to be visible, getting into classrooms...when I work with kids, I model how I expect them [teachers] to do it. I'm not going to lie. I've lost my composure card where I've raised my voice. Then I always go back to that student and then I go back to that teacher and say, 'You saw me yelling at them, but I want you to know that I went back to the student and we processed some more.'

T5 explained the importance of apologizing to the students to resolve issues and rebuild relationships.

Furthermore, T6 discussed his style of visibility that included a series of school duties. “I try to lead by example. I’ve done everything from lesson planning to shoveling snow on the front sidewalks.” In addition, T6 stressed the significance of building relationships with students and stakeholders by saying, “It’s building relationships. Being personable with your staff and your students and certainly the parents.” T6 emphasized utilizing several responsibilities around the school in combination with being personable with the school community to show how much he cared for student learning.

Along the same lines, T8 discussed going into her classrooms for co-teaching sessions in order to gain a detailed experience of how her students were learning and how teachers were teaching. In her words visibility was achieved by:

just being there. There's never a service project that we go on where I'm not there. There's never a college visit that we go on or extended learning opportunity that we have that takes place where I'm not there. I'm always showing that I'm very serious about this with my participation. I co-teach with teachers.

T8 expressed being visible and participating in various school events to prove to staff and stakeholders to demonstrate the value she placed on education and student achievement in her building.

Finally, through her classroom instruction and participation in college tours with her students, T10 shared her thoughts of how she interacted with her students daily. “I’m actually doing a course in the morning. I’m taking my kids to the YMCA. I’m actually physically going with my kids to freshman orientation to college.” T10 expressed her need to use a hands-on approach to getting to know her students to support their academic growth.

Much like the TPS principals, the charter school principals desired to be accessible to their staff of teachers and visible to the students in their school buildings as a way to help promote an effective learning community.

The first example for the public charter school was by C1. She said that the best way for her to be accessible and visible was to visit classrooms and not be behind her desk in her office. C1 shared,

My role is more than, to be expected, is no longer in the office behind the desk. I'm in the classroom whether I'm not the teacher, I'm still in the classroom and we're all a part of that team...we come in and we work together, we teach together.

C1 shared that she attempted to show her staff the value of working together as a team.

The next example included when C2 stated,

I think one, trying to be very interactive with students and teachers during the day so there are lots of times where I set up a desk in the hallway so that I just have my eyes on what's happening and can model for teachers and students what their expectations are.

Meanwhile, C4 described her interactions with her staff as transformational in regards to guiding them to change into the type of professional she could see them becoming. "I can see something, a gift in someone, and I will mentor and coach just to get it out of them. Just so they can produce that." C4 was referring to her observing teachers to recognize their strengths and to help them learn to use those strengths to become better teachers in the classroom.

The TPS and the public charter school principals stressed the impact of how being visible around the school and classrooms affected the culture in their school buildings. The principals saw this as an opportunity for the students to build a relationship with them in addition to students seeing them as resources for guidance and support. Furthermore, both sets of principals

thought to demonstrate their visibility by interacting in school events and teaching classes to help instill to stakeholders how important education was to them. In doing so, the principals could better determine how closely the culture of their schools aligned with the vision for their schools.

The Need to Delegate Responsibilities in an Effort to Increase Personal Productivity

As specified by Wilhelm (2015), successful delegation was important to a principal's effectiveness because sole leadership in instruction and assessment was no longer a productive model for 21st century learning. Additionally, to prevent frustration and dissatisfaction, the principal needed to identify staff who had specific skills, background, and interests. Challenged with a never-ending list of responsibilities, a leader's ability to delegate responsibilities to other staff members could likely contribute to professional productivity. According to Victor (2017), the leadership effectiveness of a school principal can be assessed, in part, by delegating tasks to others appropriately. For school leaders, such delegation may include allowing other individuals to complete assessment schedules, organize data reports, complete discipline referrals, and plan events. Through delegation of such responsibilities, the leader may find additional time to focus on academic and overall school performance. Both sets of principals delegated responsibilities and roles to staff members, and some even admitted to having a more difficult time relinquishing power and control as compared to the other administrators in the study.

Traditional Principals' Reflection on the Difficulty with Delegation

The traditional public school principals interviewed for the study indicated that they would not be as successful if they did not delegate responsibilities to their faculty. Despite the necessity of delegation, some participants admitted that they encountered challenges in delegating tasks. T4 initially struggled with giving up control of some of her administrative

obligations because she said they were her responsibility. “Initially, I was the type – me, I’m thinking ‘My name on the line.’ I’m dealing with all of this on my own.”

T5 found it very difficult to delegate responsibilities to others, especially during the first several years at her school. Prior to being able to delegate responsibilities to her staff, T5 needed to model her expectations for how she wanted staff members to work on certain tasks. She stated,

[Delegation] is very hard for me...I found that I can’t do it all and I truly can’t. I think it hurts the morale of the building too if they see you as not trusting them. I do think that the first year and even some of the second, I had to model what my expectations were.

T5 also expressed the lack of trust that could have developed within her school if she did not share some of her responsibilities with staff members.

Also, T6 shared that he identified teachers who enjoyed doing certain things and who had specific talents to delegate tasks to. “I have a lot of great teachers who are leaders in different ways.... the more work I get, the more district puts on us, I got to the point where I had to start delegating.” In the process of delegation, T6 also recognized the importance of letting go of a personal preference when allowing others to complete responsibilities.

Like the other traditional principals, T8 struggled with delegating his responsibilities because he liked having tasks done his way. However, T8 also indicated that by allowing others to take some of his responsibilities, it gave them a chance to grow and learn from their mistakes. He said,

It’s something that I didn’t like doing because I know I like my stuff done a certain way. I learned that sometimes you do have to let people do things. Even if they make mistakes, just understand it’s going to help them grow.

T10 admitted that it was easier to delegate in her school principal role,

This has been the year of this (delegation) for me. That I do not have to be in control of everything. I will say that I feel like I need to be in charge. But in this setting, I have had to take a step back.

T10 described delegating responsibilities to other staff members mainly due to having a small staff and many leadership responsibilities. She said that though she had always been accustomed to completing leadership tasks, she said that, at this school, delegation was a necessity.

The TPS principals in the study indicated that giving up some of their administrative power and control was not easy. However, in doing so, they were able to rely on staff capable of accomplishing tasks. This allowed the principals to put more energy into more significant administrative responsibilities.

Public Charter Principals Delegate Duties to Build Teacher Leadership

Staff members could help model the school vision if empowered by the school principal, thereby impacting staff morale and the school community. C1 shared that she never had an issue with delegation,

I've always been a delegator. So I've always believed that everyone, at their own team, they bring a strength to the team, and the key is to get them to feel comfortable enough to share that and not feel threatened by sharing it.

C1 discussed fostering leadership in her school building by identifying strengths of individual staff members. She expressed wanting her teachers to feel comfortable taking chances to share their strengths by becoming leaders in that area of expertise in order to maximize the learning environment for students. C2 described using a delegation chart as a way to build leadership in teachers, including an example of a teacher being in charge of the summer school program. C2 stated, "I have roles and responsibilities chart for everyone. [Ashley] was a teacher

leader and now the program director [for summer advantage]. I see this as a huge opportunity for her growth and leadership career.”

Plus, C3 discussed providing parameters for teachers to whom he delegated responsibilities. He also shared that the teachers had the flexibility and freedom to work within those parameters to develop their own leadership styles. C3 explained,

I mean you got to get out of people’s way...we want all of our [teacher] leaders to operate in that same kind of mindset and that we’re going to set guard rails up...you get a lot of freedom. I’m trusting you to be the leader.

C4 stressed how important it was for her to delegate responsibilities so that she could help build other leaders in her school building. “As a leader, to me, you’re not a great leader unless you can look back and you built another leader.” C4 said that if she developed staff members into leaders she would be recognized as a great leader. Furthermore, she also discussed the expectation that she could leave her school and it would function the same without her.

Very similar to C1, C5 discussed an experience regarding his delegation of assessment responsibilities to two different departments in his school building. In response to the question asking how he had delegated responsibilities, C5 commented,

Oh, gosh! All the time. For example, all of our testing, the two department heads split up the ECA and the STEM. They're the folks that are in charge of -- they're the coordinator. This is your baby. I'm here to help. So they've done a really good job on that.

C5 explained giving assessment duties to two teacher leaders in the school. C5 delegated to these two individual teachers because they exhibited leadership qualities in each of their academic departments. By providing more leadership responsibilities, the teachers had an opportunity to evolve their leadership skills. C5 provided them with full control of scheduling

and giving specific assessments to students and provided the teachers with whatever support they needed. C5 not only appreciated their assistance but wanted to help foster leadership skills in his teachers.

The public charter school principals interviewed did not report the same difficulty in letting go of some of their power as the TPS principals reported they had with delegation. Instead, the public charter school principals were attempting to build teacher leaders. Public charter principals may have delegated leadership responsibilities to their staff of teachers due to having some district-level responsibilities.

Chapter Five: Discussion

Chapter Four discussed prominent similarities and differences among the traditional public and public charter school principals who participated in this study. The TPS principals reported having a more comprehensive school improvement plan. This may have been due in part to being in an established district with more infrastructure and capacity; it is possible that greater capacity facilitated their ability to analyze student data, allowing teachers to focus their efforts. The public charter schools, on the other hand, seemed to still be in the process of building their staff and many were in the beginning stages of trying to turn their school around by uplifting students from the poverty cycle. The focus on lack of socio-economic resources and high staff turnover may have impeded their ability to analyze school data to identify student needs and challenges for school improvement purposes.

Although both sets of principals implemented new strategies in their school buildings, it seemed that the public charter school principals may have had a different understanding of the implementation process by not relying solely on their instructional coaches. These principals relied on completing their own observations in the classrooms and talking with students to help determine the effectiveness of the strategy. However, the traditional public school principals utilized professional development meetings and observations of instructional coaches.

This chapter also described the commonalities amongst the two sets of principals. Both the TPS and the public charter principals said like they were visible in their schools in an effort to promote culture. Principals discussed using social interactions, including co-teaching with teachers, to gain a better understanding of the type of instruction students were receiving in the classrooms. The principals shared the importance of being around their students and teachers.

Finally, the principals discussed the importance of delegation. They shared how relinquishing some administrative roles and duties helped to cultivate staff morale and helped them maintain their focus on student achievement and success. The public charter school principals indicated that effective delegation has supported them. These principals may have had no choice but to delegate duties due to having to be responsible for deadlines that are typically met at the district level in the traditional schools. Some principals interviewed responding that learning to delegate roles and responsibilities helped them to realize that they were not a leader until they created a leader.

The final chapter of this dissertation summarizes how the findings relate to the extant literature. Table 5.1. illustrates the differences between the TPS principals and public charter school principals; whereas Table 5.2. illustrates the commonalities between the TPS principals and public charter school principals associated with this study.

Table 5.1. TPS and Public Charter Principals' Differences

Practice	Traditional (TPS)	Public Charter
Vision	Students were to become positive contributors to society; principals utilized data to support school improvement	Students were to become independent future thinkers; principals said they were still in the process of hiring effective teachers to support vision for school improvement
Monitoring/Evaluation	Utilized instructional coaches to observe classrooms; provided professional development to assess teacher needs	Completed own evaluations and utilized instructional coaches to evaluate teacher needs

Table 5.2. TPS and Public Charter Principals' Commonalities

Practice	Traditional (TPS)	Public Charter
Visibility	Walked school hallways and classrooms; attended school events	Walked school hallways and classrooms; attended school events
Delegation	Hesitant to delegate responsibilities but, saw the benefits	Delegated without hesitancy potentially due to lack of district infrastructure

Background

America's increasingly global economy is now driven by higher-order skills like symbolic reasoning and analysis. This paradigm shift has forced schools to evolve teaching practices to prepare students for the global economy. Such a change in expectations calls for innovative approaches by school leaders. According to Davis (2006), society as a whole was dissatisfied with the status quo in the educational process along with various ways of thinking about leadership development. The most important function of school leaders was cultivating creativity and individuality in future generations of students in order for them to be prepared for challenges that lie ahead.

Learning institutions constantly deal with limited resources and various other obstacles in accomplishing their goal of progressive academic achievement by their students. Due to being unable to meet the demands for 100 percent proficiency, there has been a perception that traditional schools have been unsuccessful in improving student growth.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to discover leadership practices of successful leaders in both traditional and public school settings. A secondary purpose was to learn if such practices aligned with entrepreneurial characteristics (Brown, 2000) and effective leadership (Marzano et al., 2005).

Research Questions

This study was designed to respond to the following research questions.

Do practices exhibited by principals from traditional school districts differ from those from public charter schools?

- a) How do these practices compare with practices of effective school leaders?

b) How do these practices compare with practices of entrepreneurial leaders?

The data collected consisted of interviews from 10 traditional public school principals (TPS) and five public charter school principals. Participants represented numerous districts and charter schools in Marion County serving at least 60 percent minority students. The leaders served in schools that represented high percentages of urban, low socio-economic students in the city of Indianapolis.

The first research question, do practices exhibited by principals from traditional school districts differ from those in public charter schools, will be the first area discussed in this chapter. The section will summarize the difference between traditional school principals and public charter school principals. The following sections will examine the extant literature in relation to the study findings, analyzing how both sets of principals compared with practices of effective school leaders and entrepreneurial leaders.

Do Practices Exhibited by Principals from Traditional School Districts Differ from those in Public Charter Schools?

The traditional and public charter school principals described a vision and/or mission for their individual schools. All of the school principals interviewed for the study established a vision that would support their students in becoming productive members of society. Though both sets of principals had a vision, they differed in their approach. The traditional school principals described using their school data to inform the academic needs of the students they served whereas the public charter principals were attempting to pinpoint and hire highly effective teachers.

Based on the interview question regarding new initiatives, the majority of the school principals started new initiatives during the school year in an effort to improve upon some of

their school challenges. The principals also reported on how they evaluated the success of these initiatives. The traditional school principals promoted new strategies in their schools to increase learning and student achievement. From the implementation of such strategies as Teach Like A Champion that provide environmental techniques that make it safe for students to take chances in the classroom (Lemov, 2014), to the Blended Learning model that incorporates traditional pedagogical learning strategies with web-based content (Zook, 2018), the traditional principals relied on their professional development meetings to monitor and assess the effectiveness of the new strategy.

Conversely, the public charter school principals interviewed for the study reported a different approach regarding the implementation of new strategies. The public charter school principals relied on completing classroom walk-throughs to monitor implementation of new strategies. The public charter school principals discussed going into classrooms to record successes and challenges in an effort to better support the learning process for the new strategy. The charter principals provided themselves with a firsthand perspective of what their staff were experiencing in the classroom during the implementation of the new strategy.

Equally important in the study was that the public charter principals, unlike the traditional school principals, were less hesitant to delegate to teachers. Because they do not have a district infrastructure, it is plausible that the public charter principals delegated more of their responsibilities due to the numerous additional duties they have compared to the TPS principals.

How do these Practices Compare with Practices of Effective School Leaders?

School leaders are important to the functioning of a successful school. These aspects included the school having a clear vision and mission, the overall climate in each classroom, the attitudes of teachers and their classroom practices, and students' opportunities for academic

success (Marzano et al., 2005). In this study, the traditional school principals could track the progress of either individual or groups of students towards that vision. They could identify patterns of academic growth throughout the course of the school year along with disaggregated academic data based on race, socio-economic, gender, etc. to recommend the eventual instructional needs for the students. School principals analyzed school achievement data to understand the needs of students and created the appropriate curriculum to enhance student learning with the use of specific content pedagogy (Marzano et al., 2005; Thomas & Collier, 2002).

The school vision represents where a school is headed in the future. Riehl (2003) suggested that an effective leader follows a vision, knows the goals that they need to achieve, and pursues these goals with clarity and a tenacious attitude, while remaining accountable for accomplishments. Furthermore, the traditional school principals utilized teacher classroom data to help understand teacher instructional needs and student academic needs. By doing so, the traditional school principals located specific areas for improvement for specific teachers to enhance their teaching skills and resources. Marzano et al. (2005) stated that such leaders remind others of their beliefs and vision, maintain focus on established goals, provide staff with new and innovative research and theory, and hold discussions about what effective schools look like. The public charter school principals were focused on supporting their students in becoming academically and socially independent thinkers. The public charter principals wanted their students to excel beyond their current living environments and expectations, to break the cycle of poverty.

Different than their counterparts, the public charter principals in this study were not as poised to analyze their school data. The public charter school principals interviewed said that they were still in the process of hiring and retaining effective teachers annually to even create a

learning culture within their school buildings. Instead, the public charter principals brainstormed ways for efficient teachers to remain at the school. Several of the charter school principals associated with this study shared their challenges with retaining staff for various reasons including teacher burn-out. This resembles national patterns. According to the New York Times, Achievement First, a network of charter schools on the east coast, had an average teacher retention of only 2.3 years during the 2012-2013 school year (Rich, 2013). In the same school year, the KIPP schools lost a third of their teachers (Monahan, 2014). This is not much different from what traditional schools had experience over the years. According to Gracia and Weiss (2019), 13.8 percent of public school educators in the nation were leaving their school or the profession. As a result, schools had been unable to fill vacancies to replace the teachers. The failure to hire replacements had actually tripled from the 2011-2012 school year to the 2015-2016 school year (increasing from 3.1 to 9.4 percent). The difficulty had also been impacted by the dwindling number of applicants to the profession. The participants from public charter schools described their strategy for school improvement as an attempt to find the right staff for their schools. The charter principals described their difficulty in improving teaching and learning, per their vision, because they did not feel that they had the staff capacity that would help change the culture for academic growth and achievement.

The school leader is responsible for setting the tone for the school building and monitoring the performance of student progress while modeling clear communication among his or her staff. Once the staff buy into the vision, they can start to help the principal carry out the remainder of the vision. In 2007, researchers Gross and Pochop analyzed data from the National Center for Education Statistics Schools and Staffing Survey. The 2003-2004 data, compiled from Midwest states including Illinois and Ohio, implied that charter school principals had challenges

upholding their focus on the school's mission compared to traditional school principals. Furthermore, Gross and Pochop identified challenges faced by charter school principals that included hiring highly qualified educators. Mark Fusco (2017), author of *Burnout Factories: The Challenge of Retaining Great Teachers in Charter Schools*, discussed his experiences as a teacher at Hyde Leadership Charter School in New York. He reported that by the start of his second year at the school, almost half of the teachers had left the school due to rigorous scheduling, lack of discipline, and a need for new challenges. This supports the findings in this dissertation of the interviews from the public charter principals. This example could also occur in challenging school districts. The largest urban school district in the state of Indiana employs approximately 400 teachers annually.

In implementing new initiatives, the traditional school principals used professional development meetings to provide their staff with the chance to share ideas and suggestions with their peers along with the principals to gauge the implementation process. According to Marzano et al. (2005), administrators needed to hone their schools in many of the twenty-one responsibilities, but with the focus on the innovation. Effective principals driving change in their schools must understand the potential impact of the change, comprehend the theory of innovation, and evaluate the impact of change throughout. The traditional public principals utilized their data to establish improvement plans to address academic challenges. Marzano et al. (2005) stated that not only do administrators need to identify goals, but they need to develop a distinctive focus for how to achieve them. Kirtman (2014) suggested that high performing principals adopted innovation and wanted to learn from their staff, other principals and leaders in education, along with various sectors focused on establishing environments conducive to learning. The traditional public school principals allowed for their teachers to discuss and

brainstorm ways to implement a new strategy in their classrooms. Teachers needed more than a few lessons to change their practice successfully. In order to maintain change, they need a community to share with as well as necessary resources to support learning (Stanulis, Cooper, Dean, Johnston, & Richard-Todd, 2016).

Both sets of school principals delegated to members of their staff. Marzano et al. (2005) reported that effective school leaders were willing to encourage change, consider new and more efficient ways of systematic change, and try constantly to operate outside of the center. Furthermore, Marzano and colleagues suggested that school principals needed to interact with collaborative staff teams on a consistent basis to achieve optimal school function and to improve delegation of school responsibilities. As found in this study, allowing their teachers to take on roles, the public charter principals may have established opportunities to relieve several leadership responsibilities and obligations. One reason for leaders to delegate responsibilities to their subordinates is to build leadership qualities in teachers. Effective leaders delegated responsibilities among staff, students, and stakeholders (Spillane, 2006). According to the National Association of Secondary School Principals (2018), charter principals delegated instructional leadership responsibilities to assistant principals as well as to teachers identified with leadership skills so that that they could maintain focus their responsibilities on hiring staff and managing the school budget. This could be the result of the fact that public charter principals do not have a district administration to support them with these responsibilities. In 2008, Ilene Berman, Program Director of the National Governors Center for Best Practices, suggested that the majority of principals in traditional public schools adhered to the day-to-day responsibilities in the school while the superintendent was the primary pipeline to the school board. The charter school principal, however, often does both. As stated in Chapter Two, unlike traditional public

schools, charter school principals are not typically supported by a district infrastructure.

Furthermore, charter principals must locate school buildings, establish and maintain a budget and strategic plans, recruit school board members, hire and train new staff, and interact with the governing board, community, and other stakeholders (Vickers, 2014). Because they are required to report to their chartering agency as well as to their local board of directors, various state and federal mandates, and operations management, charter principals often deal with increased responsibilities in regards to compliance and accountability compared to their public school counterparts.

How do the Practices of these Principals Compare with Expected Practices of Entrepreneurial Leaders?

To understand the progress that the teachers were making towards student achievement, the traditional public school principals provided their teachers the opportunity to share their successes and challenges in implementing the new strategy with their cohort. Entrepreneurial leaders have the ability to build groups that encourage cooperation and empowerment. Providing empowerment to staff and stakeholders, by allowing them to share ideas and play a part in the decision-making process occasionally, resulted in the feeling of importance because individuals felt that they were making a difference in their organizations and in society as a whole (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). At the same time that the traditional principals monitored and evaluated using their instructional coaches, the analysis of the research indicated that the traditional school principals did not complete their own observations of implementation. According to Harper (2001), entrepreneurial educators understand that innovation and creativity should not be left to chance; however, through collaborative strategic planning and thinking, they emerge. Harper also contended that when leaders help staff members with the establishment of objectives, the

development of organizational procedures, and use of rewards, innovation and creativity are enhanced. The public charter schools relied on their observations to support teaching and learning in the classrooms. A study conducted by Donaldson and Peske (2010) concluded that several charter schools aligned their teacher evaluations to student achievement by observing classrooms often and providing feedback using structured observations.

Another compelling finding in the study was that some of the traditional school principals, compared to the public charter principals, had difficulty with sharing their responsibilities. The traditional principals responded they had to control every aspect of their schools because it was their responsibility to do so. Several of the TPS principals admitted that they could not trust staff to complete tasks the same way that they would. These principals said as if they had to allow staff members to help manage specific tasks, programs, and/or school events at the school. In doing so, the principals began to share some of their leadership responsibilities. Dufour (1999) suggested that good leaders sought input from stakeholders in making decisions for the school and encouraged individuals to respond.

Some traditional school principals started to realize that they did not have to control every aspect of their school. In letting go of some control, the traditional school principals could be freer to maximize their time with other aspects, including building relationships with staff, students, and stakeholders and participating in school events. Marzano (2012) and colleagues suggested that the school principal needed to interact with collaborative staff teams on a consistent basis to allow for input for optimal school function and delegation of school responsibilities. The traditional public school principals allowed for their instructional coaches to walk into the classrooms to observe implementation of the new strategy in order to have an additional perspective during the professional development meetings. Brown (2000) proposed

that entrepreneurial leaders should establish teams within the organization and beyond the organization.

With the attention to visibility, both sets of principals interviewed for the study stressed the importance of being seen in their school buildings. The principals said that being in the hallways and in the classrooms provided them with a better idea of what was occurring around the building among the students and the staff. The principals were a part of parent conferences and interacted with students in an effort to show how much they cared about their families and to nurture a caring learning environment. Some principals even co-taught in classrooms with their teachers so that the classroom teachers could have a model along with reflection about the lesson; in this way, their skills could develop or be refined for future lessons. Hord (1987) stated that school leaders should be facilitators of change and should work directly with the individuals who are expected to change.

Furthermore, principals establish clearer procedures and protocols for their schools through classroom observations and their interactions with teachers and students. Entrepreneurial leaders observe the inner workings of their organization to make sure that procedures and practices are in order. They realized that new ways of planning and leading change were needed to combat future demands (Hesselbein, 2002). For example, being visible around the school building may result in the principal recognizing the efficacy of classroom and school-wide management and how it impacts the overall safety of all.

Implications for Policy, Practice, and Future Research

Based on the data collected and analyzed, there are important considerations for policy, practice, and future research.

Implications for Policy

The findings in this study have several policy implications. As stated previously, both traditional and public charter school principals established vision and mission statements for their respective schools. School districts may be able to support school leaders by having an annual discussion prior to the start of the school year about school data, personnel needs, and district non-negotiables so that the principal can start development of his/her vision for their school. Goodstein, Noloan, and Pfeiffer (1993) suggested that having a vision for the future of schools allowed for direction that the school should move. In association with their staff, the traditional principal then creates his/her vision for their school, which is implemented and shared with students and stakeholders throughout the school year. According to Meador (2017), the principal should desire that all stakeholders are thinking about the future while working on “the now.” By refreshing their vision annually, traditional school principals remain current on the needs of their students and staff and make progress towards district improvement plans.

States may need to incorporate leadership standards for charter school principals. Some individuals who hold the leadership position in charter schools may not have the educational background needed to improve student achievement. School leaders need professional standards to maneuver effectively in an ever-changing and diverse society of learners. According to the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2015), the global economy has altered the 21st century workplace for which schools must prepare students. At the same time, such a challenge provides educational leaders the opportunity to innovate strategies to improve schools by prompting student learning. Given this, school principals need standards that result in productivity beneficial to students to guide their practice.

In addition, state educational agencies could better support public charter principals in

their visions by investigating reasons for their challenge of recruiting highly qualified educators for their schools. Based on the research provided, the public charter principals in the study struggled with sustaining effective staff due to burnout and low yearly salary; and such challenges have prevented the public charter principals from achieving their visions and have impacted their overall student achievement. Silinus, Mulford, and Zarins (2002) attested that a school's effectiveness depended on the extent of teacher participation in the operations of the school that included student success and achievement. Once the state investigates challenges such as these and implements corrective provisions, public charter principals may be better positioned to fulfill their vision for school improvement.

In a like manner, states may need to generate additional sources of funding to adequately promote the implementation of new strategies. Kirtman (2014) stated that policy makers in education have created an environment where school administrators with greater need are left behind. Learning institutions constantly deal with limited resources and various other obstacles that impede the accomplishment of their goal of progressive academic achievement by their students.

States could provide funding corresponding to strategies developed by school districts and public charter schools want to implement to support academic and social needs of all students. Such funding may establish states as revolutionizing education and revitalizing its importance as the nation continues to compete worldwide. Brown and Cornwall (2000) focused student achievement situations as well as on outside influences, such as societal pressures, that cause certain behaviors in schools, therefore concluding that there may be a need for entrepreneurial practices. Some practices including community relations may be worth analyzing and possible models used in order to potentially build successful learning communities and

school districts.

Implications for Practice and Principal Preparation

This study also has implications for practice. Referencing back to school vision, traditional school principals need time to develop vision and mission statements for their schools that reflect their current surroundings and cultures. Leithwood and Riehl (2005) stated that school leaders helped to promote changes in their schools so that the numerous cultures that students bring are valued and are incorporated into culturally-responsive academics. School leaders are one of the essential components in the functioning of successful schools. Another essential aspect is for the school to have a clear vision and mission (Marzano et al., 2005). Fullan (2001) suggested that effective leaders have the ability to alter the school culture and staff in order to get the desired results. In addition to meeting with their school districts about their vision, the traditional public school principal may need to consider developing a vision that mirrors their current clientele of students. In doing so, the students attending the school may exhibit more pride in the school as the vision resonates who they are. School leaders need to work with their communities to establish trust and to reduce vulnerability amongst the school and families while developing new beliefs about students (Adams, Forsyth, & Mitchell, 2009).

Together with using state funding, traditional and public charter school principals should be able to hire experts in various educational fields, including classroom management and specific subject area instruction, to model and articulate strategies. Hiring experts would potentially eliminate meaningless guesswork and agitation for school leaders and teachers.

Colleges and universities should study the impact of organizations fostering an entrepreneurial culture so that graduate students could learn how they could be innovative leaders in schools. This approach may re-invigorate attitudes regarding entrepreneurship. Past

studies have suggested that entrepreneurship is teachable (Hannon, 2006) and is needed at all levels of education (Gibb, 2006). Considering the seemingly endless pressures from the government and other stakeholders concerned about the lack of progress compared to other countries, school principals may need to adopt entrepreneurial efforts from the business profession. Principals can learn valuable lessons from business entrepreneurs about being innovative (Lynch, 2016).

Moreover, the traditional and public charter school principals interviewed for the study discussed delegation. The principals shared the importance of allowing staff to take control of some of their responsibilities. The public charter school principals discussed seeking out staff members with specific skillsets to take charge of certain assessments and programs around the school. Principals who delegate may promote increased staff buy-in that leads to improved school culture. Marzano et al. (2005) discussed the connection between school culture, leadership, and student growth. They stated, “fostering school culture that indirectly affects student achievement is a strong theme within the literature on principal leadership” (p. 47). They discussed two significant components of leadership behaviors that enhance school culture: (a) promotion of cohesion among all staff, and (b) promotion of a sense of well-being among staff. With this intention in mind, colleges and universities should consider researching various shared leadership practices to incorporate into their leadership programs, including educational leadership. States may also need to consider making it a requirement that charter school principals participate in leadership programs to better ensure adequate training. Preparing eventual leaders, specifically principals, with the tools for delegation may support genuine rapport among school leadership and staff at the initial stage of forming a school culture.

Furthermore, school leadership and teachers have a higher probability of developing a concise vision for the school when they are all invested in promoting school achievement.

Not only could the practice of delegation promote the culture of a school, but the school principals also stressed the vital sense of visibility. School principals should routinely interact with students and staff in an effort to observe and assess the culture of the school building. These interactions provide principals with greater awareness of occurrences with stakeholders around the building and school environment as well as increase accountability for staff and students. Not only do such interactions promote a nurturing learning environment, but they also help maintain high expectations for all involved in the education of children and young adults.

Implications for Future Research

Future research may need to analyze several of the powerfully connected practices to student achievement noted by Marzano et al. (2005) and Brown (2000) to ensure that they positively impact student learning and achievement as well as school leadership. Regarding school vision, researchers could trace the process of how a vision is created and implemented by both the traditional and public charter principals. Researchers could compare and contrast the differences in the process principals take, and more importantly, assess the impact that school visions have on staff and students moving forward. In addition, researchers could further examine if distributed leadership is different between traditional and public charter school principals. The study of this practice could uncover efficient practices for delegation, as well as improve understanding of the challenges associated with delegating leadership responsibilities among their staff and teachers.

Concluding Remarks

This dissertation provided insight on some of the similarities and differences in leadership of traditional public principals and public charter principals. Though their beliefs for

their school visions may have been different, both the traditional and public charter principals conveyed wanting to prepare students to be their best academically and/or socially. Both sets of principals sought to implement new strategies to better support learning in the classroom.

The principals strived to share their responsibilities with their staff members to build morale and develop future school leaders, which resulted in an enhanced learning environment for students. Finally, the principals made it an absolute necessity to move about the school and community to convey a sense of urgency for the importance of a productive school experience. Despite their similarities and differences, all leaders interviewed for the study were champions for their students first.

References

- Ahlstrand, B., Lampel, J., & Mintzberg, H. (2014). *Strategy safari: A guided tour through the wilds of strategic management*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Allen, K., Kern, M. L., Vella-Brodrick, D., & Waters, L. (2018). Understanding the priorities of Australian secondary schools through an analysis of their mission and vision statements. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *54*, 249-274. doi:10.1177/0013161x18758655
- Anderson, M., & White, S. (2011). Resourcing change in small schools. *Australian Journal of Education*, *55*(1), 50-61.
- Anthes, K. (2002). *School and district leadership. No Child Left Behind policy brief*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED468186>
- Anyon, Y., Nicotera, N., & Veeh, C. A. (2016). Contextual influences on the implementation of a schoolwide intervention to promote students' social, emotional, and academic learning. *Children & Schools*, *38*, 81-88. doi:10.1093/cs/cdw008
- Barger, R. (n.d.). *Goals 2000: The Clinton administration education program*. Retrieved from <http://www3.nd.edu/~rbarger/www7/goals200.html>
- Bednarzik, R. (2000). The role of entrepreneurship in U.S. and European job growth. *Monthly Labor Review*, *123*(7), 3-16. Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2000/07/art1full.pdf>
- Bhaskarabhatla, A., & Hegde, D. (2014). An organizational perspective on patenting and open innovation. *Organization Science*, *25*, 1744-1763. doi:10.1287/orsc.2014.0911
- Botha, R. (2012). Evolving leadership required in South African schools. *Research in Education*, *88*, 40-49.

- Bound, M. (2011). *Qualitative method of research: Grounded theory research* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/1526814/Qualitative_Research_Grounded_Theory_Methodology
- Branch, G. F., Hanushek, E. A., & Rivkin, S. G. (2013). School leaders matter. *Education Next*, 13(1). Retrieved from <http://educationnext.org/school-leaders-matter/>
- Brown, R. J., & Cornwall, J. R. (2000). *The entrepreneurial educator*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Bryson, J. (2011). *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations: A guide to strengthening and sustaining organizational achievement* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Buckner, K. G. (2002). *School principal - The role of elementary and secondary school principals, principal duties and responsibilities, principal qualifications - Schools, public, private, and students*. Retrieved from <http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/2333/Principal-School.html>
- Case, T. E. (2006). *Expanding resources: Intrapreneurial and entrepreneurial leadership behaviors of selected secondary principals* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (3234468)
- Chen, C. (2014). Entrepreneurship, economic, growth, & employment: A case study of Taiwan. *Hitotsubashi Journal of Economics*, 55(1), 71-88. Retrieved from <http://hermes-ir.lib.hit-u.ac.jp/rs/bitstream/10086/26817/1/HJeco0550100710.pdf>
- Cho, V. (2017). Vision, mission, and technology implementation: Going one-to-one in a Catholic school. *Journal of Catholic Education*, 20, 177-198. doi:10.15365/joce.2002082017

- Coleman, J. S. (1966). *Equality of Educational Opportunity (COLEMAN) Study (EEOS)*. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research.
doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR06389.v3
- Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology*, 13(1), 3-21. doi:10.1007/bf00988593
- Cornwall, J. R., & Perlman, B. (1990). *Organizational entrepreneurship*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Cubberley, E. P. (2009). *School funds and their apportionment: A consideration of the subject with reference to a more general equalization of both the burdens and the advantages of education*. New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Davis, S. H. (2006). Unleashing creativity on your schools. *Leadership*, 36(2), 8-10, 34, 36-38.
Retrieved from http://www.acsa.org/publications/pub_leadership.cfm
- DaVita, M. C. (2010). *Education leadership: An agenda for school improvement*. Washington, DC: The Wallace Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Pages/education-leadership-an-agenda-for-school-improvement.aspx>
- Duffee, L. G. (1991, June). *The principal: Leader or manager?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Kinston, Ontario. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED339109.pdf>
- Dufour, R. P. (1999). Help wanted: Principals who can lead professional learning communities. *Nassp Bulletin*, 83(604), 12-17. doi:10.1177/019263659908360403
- Ermisch, J. F., & Francesconi, M. (2001). Family structure and children's achievements. *Journal of Population Economics*, 14, 249-270. doi:10.1007/s001480000028

- Eyal, O., & Kark, R. (2004). How do transformational leaders transform organizations? A study of the relationship between leadership and entrepreneurship. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 3*, 211-235. doi:10.1080/15700760490503715
- Finnigan, K. S. (2012). Principal leadership in low-performing schools: A closer look through the eyes of teachers. *Education and Urban Society, 44*, 183-202.
doi:10.1177/0013124511431570
- Fullan, M. (2002, May). The change leader. *Educational Leadership, 59*(8), 16-21. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/may02/vol59/num08/The-Change-Leader.aspx>
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fusco, M. (2018, October 8). Burnout factories: The challenge of retaining great teachers in charter schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 98*(8), 26-30. Retrieved from <https://www.kappanonline.org/burnout-factories-challenge-retaining-great-teachers-charter-schools/>
- Garcia, E., & Weiss, E. (2019). *U.S. schools struggle to hire and retain teachers: The second report in 'the perfect Storm in the teacher labor market' series*. Retrieved from <https://www.epi.org/publication/u-s-schools-struggle-to-hire-and-retain-teachers-the-second-report-in-the-perfect-storm-in-the-teacher-labor-market-series/>
- Gardner, D. (1983). *A Nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform: An open letter to the American people: A report to the nation and the secretary of education, United States Department of Education*. Washington, DC: National Commission on Excellence in Education. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED226006>

- Goodstein, L. D., Nolan, T. M., & Pfeiffer, J. W. (1990). *Applied strategic planning: How to develop a plan that really works*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Gouillart, F. J., & Kelly, J. N. (1995). *Transforming the organization*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Grissom, J. A., Loeb, S., & Master, B. (2012). *What is effective instructional leadership? Longitudinal evidence from observations of principals*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Education Policy Analysis. Retrieved from <http://cepa.stanford.edu/content/what-effective-instructional-leadership-longitudinal-evidence-observations-principals>
- Harper, S. C. (2001). *The forward-focused organization: Visionary thinking and breakthrough leadership to create your company's future*. New York, NY: AMACOM.
- Henderson, A., & Mapp, K. (2002). *A new wave of evidence*. Austin, TX: National Center for Family and Community Connections with Schools.
- Hesselbein, F. (2002). *Hesselbein on leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hesselbein, F., Goldsmith, M., & Somerville, I. (Eds.). (1999). *Leading beyond the walls*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED457600>
- Holloway, M. (2013, May 28). Visibility as a leader [Web log post]. Retrieved from <https://courageousleaders.com.au/visibility-leader/>
- Hord, S. M., Rutherford, W. L., Huling-Austin, L., & Hall, G. E. (1987). *Taking charge of change*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED282876.pdf>
- Kanter, R. M. (2002). Creating the culture for innovation. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, & I. Somerville (Eds.), *Leading for innovation and organizing for results* (pp. 73-86). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Kelly, A. P., & Loveless, T. (2012). Comparing new school effects in charter and traditional public schools. *American Journal of Education*, 118, 427-453. doi:10.1086/666370
- Kirtman, L. (2014, May 11). *Innovation Leadership* [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://getttingsmart.com/2014/05/innovation-leadership/>
- Kising'u, T. M. (2014). Strategic determinants of intrapreneurship of education institutions in Kenya. *International Journal of Humanities, Social Sciences, and Education*, 1(8), 48-62. Retrieved from www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijhsse/v1-i8/7.pdf
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2012). *The leadership challenge: How to make extraordinary things happen in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lambert, L. (1998). *Building leadership capacity in schools*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Lee, A. M. I. (2018). Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA): What you need to know [Web log post]. Retrieved from <https://www.understood.org/en/school-learning/your-childs-rights/basics-about-childs-rights/every-student-succeeds-act-essa-what-you-need-to-know>
- Lemov, D. (2014). *Teach like a champion 2.0: 62 techniques that put students on the path to college*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lynch, M. (2016, April 21). Entrepreneurial leadership: What schools can learn from business leaders [Web log post]. Retrieved from <https://www.theedadvocate.org/entrepreneurial-leadership-what-schools-can-learn-from-business-leaders/>
- Lytle, J. H. (2010). Where is leadership heading? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 93(8), 54-57. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F003172171209300813>

- Mai, R. (2004). Leadership for school improvement: Cues from organizational learning and renewal efforts. *The Educational Forum*, 68, 211-221. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131720408984633>
- Manimala, M. J., Jose, P. D., & Thomas, K. R. (2007). Organizational support systems for innovation and intrapreneurship: A comparative analysis of innovation cases from R&D centres and operating departments of large corporations. *Industry & Higher Education*, 21(1), 59-72. doi:10.5367/000000007780222778
- Marks, H. M., & Nance, J. P. (2007). Contexts of accountability under systemic reform: Implications for principal influence on instruction and supervision. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(1), 3-37. doi:10.1177/0013161X06291414
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- McFadden, B. W. (2013). Entrepreneurship in public education. *Leadership*, 42(5), 22-24. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1005293>
- Meador, D. (2017, May 4). An educational leadership philosophy for school leaders [Web log post]. Retrieved from <https://www.thoughtco.com/educational-leadership-philosophy-for-school-leaders-3194580>
- Mendez-Morse, S. (1992). *Leadership characteristics that facilitate school change*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED370215>

- Molina, C., & Callahan, J. L. (2009). Fostering organizational performance: The role of learning and intrapreneurship. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 33, 388-400.
doi:10.1108/03090590910966553
- Essays, UK. (2018, November). *School leadership contributes to student achievement education essay*. Retrieved from <https://www.ukessays.com/essays/education/school-leadership-contributes-to-student-achievement-education-essay.php>
- Nanus, B., & Dobbs, S. M. (1999). *Leaders who make a difference: Essential strategies for meeting the nonprofit challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. (2017). *Estimated charter public school enrollment, 2016-2017*. Retrieved from http://www.publiccharters.org/sites/default/files/migrated/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/EER_Report_V5.pdf
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. (2018). *Charter schools*. Reston, VA: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.nassp.org/policy-advocacy-center/nassp-position-statements/charter-schools/>
- National Education Association. (2008). *The changing role of school leadership*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/PB09_Leadership08.pdf
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2015). *Professional standards for educational leaders 2015*. Reston, VA: Author. Retrieved from http://npbea.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Professional-Standards-for-Educational-Leaders_2015.pdf
- Olson, L. (2000). School-age 'millenni-boom' predicted for next 100 years. *Education Week*, 20(4), 32-33. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2000/09/27/04centgrow.h20.html>

- Orr, S. S., Kravis, L. I., & Riggio, R. (2004). *Improving leadership in nonprofit organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Wiley.
- Pellicer, L., Allen, C., Tonnsen, S., & Surratt, T. (1981). *The evolution and training of school principals*. Columbia, SC: South Carolina University. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED218707.pdf>
- Pitman, L. A. (2012). *Using shared leadership to achieve school improvement goals: One school's journey* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1681&context=doctoral>
- Porche, M., Zaff, J. F., & Pan, J. (2017). *Barriers to success: Moving towards a deeper understanding of adversity's effect on adolescents*. Washington, DC: America's Promise Alliance. Retrieved from <https://www.americaspromise.org/sites/default/files/d8/2017-03/FINALAdversityReport03.27.pdf>
- Quast, L. (2011, June 12). The skills necessary to be a successful 'intrapreneur' (corporate entrepreneur). *Forbes*. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/lisaquast/2011/06/20/do-you-have-the-skills-to-be-a-successful-intrapreneur-corporate-entrepreneur/>
- Ravitch, D. (2011). Dictating to the schools: A look at the effect of the Bush and Obama administration on schools. *Education Digest: Essential Readings Condensed for Quick Review*, 76(8), 4-9. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ919558>
- Robinson, V. (2010, January 21). *Connie Kamm*. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760903026748>
- Rothstein, R. (2008). Leaving "No Child Left Behind" behind. *The American Prospect*, 19(1). Retrieved from <http://prospect.org/article/leaving-no-child-left-behind-behind>

- Rothstein, R. (2008, April 7). A nation at risk twenty-five years later [web log post]. Retrieved from <http://www.cato-unbound.org/2008/04/07/richard-rothstein/nation-risk-twenty-five-years-later>
- Schimmel, I. (2013). *Entrepreneurial educators: A narrative study examining entrepreneurial educators in launching innovative practices for k-12 schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (3595863)
- Sharma, R. (2005). Identifying a framework for initiating, sustaining and managing innovations in schools. *Psychology & Developing Societies, 17*(1), 51-80.
doi:10.1177/097133360501700104
- Simon, M. K. (2006). *Dissertation and scholarly research: Recipes for success; A practical guide to start and complete your dissertation, thesis, or formal research project*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Pub. Co.
- Sims, R. R., & Quatro, S. A. (2005). *Leadership: Succeeding in the private, public, and not-for-profit sectors*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Singh, M., & Al-Fadhli, H. (2011). Does school leadership matter in the NCLB era? *Journal of Black Studies, 42*, 751-767. doi:10.1177/0021934710372895
- Slater, L. (2013, December). *Building high-performing and improving education systems*. Leadership. Review. CfBT Education Trust. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED546807.pdf>
- Smith, J., Gusz, N., & Borden, R. (2014, August 15). Intrapreneurship for higher education reform. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. Retrieved from http://www.ssireview.org/blog/entry/intrapreneurship_for_higher_education_reform

- Spicer, F. V. (2016). *School culture, school climate, and the role of the principal* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1174&=&context=eps_diss
- Spiri, M. H. (2001). *School leadership and reform: Case studies of Philadelphia principals. Occasional paper*. New York, NY: Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED477653>
- Stanulis, R. N., Cooper, K. S., Dear, B., Johnston, A. M., & Richard-Todd, R. R. (2016). Teacher-led reforms have a big advantage - Teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 97(7), 53-57. doi:10.1177/0031721716641650
- Tourkin, T., Thomas, T., Swaim, N., Cox, S., Parmer, R., Jackson, B., ... Zhang, B. (2010). *Documentation for the 2007-08 schools and staffing survey. NCES 2010-332*. U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED565839.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2013). *High schools and career readiness: Strengthening the pipeline to the middle class*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.ed.gov/sites/default/files/high-school-overview.pdf>
- U. S. National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC; Author. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED226006>
- Vander Ark, T. (2014, May 9). Innovation leadership. *Education Week*. Retrieved from http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/on_innovation/2014/05/innovation_leadership.html

- Vickers, J. R. (2014). *A comparison of charter public and traditional public school principals: Who they are and how they function* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1267&context=dissertations>
- Victor, A. A. (2017). Time management strategies as a panacea for principals' administrative effectiveness in secondary schools in Enugu State, Nigeria. *Journal for Studies in Management and Planning*, 3(9), 22-31. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED577707.pdf>
- Wahed, M. E. (2012). *Effective communication of urban and rural school leaders* (Master's thesis). The American University of Cairo, Egypt, Africa. Retrieved from <http://dar.aucegypt.edu/bitstream/handle/10526/3097/TABLE%20OF%20CONTENTS.pdf?sequence=3>
- Waters, T., Marzano, R., & McNulty, B. (2004). Leadership that sparks learning. *Educational Leadership*, 61(7), 48-51. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ716739>
- Wei, X., Patel, D., & Young, V. (2014). Opening the "black box": Organizational differences between charter schools and traditional public schools. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 22(3), 1-35. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1018832.pdf>
- Weiss, R. S. (1995). *Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative interview studies*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Westerberg, M., Nilsson, K., & Fältholm, Y. (2011, June 21). *Using internal contracts to promote intrapreneurship in the public school system: Hopeless half-measure or promising hybrid?* Paper presented at the ICSB World Conference 15/06/2011 - 18/06/2011. Retrieved from <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:ltu:diva-38403>

- Wilhelm, T. (2015, November 24). PD for principals: Defining the difference between delegation and shared leadership [web log post]. Retrieved from <https://education.cu-portland.edu/blog/leaders-link/effective-delegation/>
- Williamson, R. (2011, January 9). The importance of the school principal. *Education Partnerships Incorporation*. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED538828.pdf>
- Yemini, M., Addi-Racah, A., & Katarivas, K. (2014). I have a dream: School principals as entrepreneurs. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 43, 526-540. doi:10.1177/1741143214523018
- Zook, C. (2018, November 15). What is blended learning? [Web log post]. Retrieved from <https://www.aeseducation.com/blog/what-is-blended-learning>

Appendix A: Interview Protocol

Introductory Comments to School Leaders

The purpose of the interview session is to understand your leadership practices. I am going to ask about your work and would like for you to specifically think about your beliefs and experiences as a school administrator when you are answering the questions. With your permission, I will be recording your responses for analysis. Your interview will be confidential as individual names and contacts will be kept secured. Are there any questions about the interview process prior to starting?

Building Relationship with School Leaders

I'd like to start by asking you some initial questions about your leadership. Please attempt to be as detailed as possible.

- 1) Please share your educational background.
- 2) Describe how your career led to a school leadership position.
- 3) I would like for you to take a little time and describe the demographics of your school.
- 4) What does a typical day for _____ look like?
- 5) How would you describe your leadership style?

Leadership Culture Questions

- 7) Explain your vision for school improvement. How has it gone from vision to reality?
- 8) How do you model your vision in daily practice?
- 9) What is the mission of the school?
- 10) How would you describe the overall success of the school? Overall challenges?
- 11) What makes your school different from surrounding schools in regards to teaching and learning?

Leadership Input Questions

- 12) Have you started any new initiatives during the school year in an attempt to improve upon school challenges?
 - a. What did the process look like for buy in from the staff?
 - b. Is it working?
 - c. How do you know?

Leadership Monitoring/Evaluation Questions

- 13) Have you implemented a new teaching strategy for teachers?
 - a. Could you please describe it for me?
 - b. How did you learn about the strategy?
 - c. How did you go about implementing the strategy?
 - d. What steps are in place to ensure that teachers are implementing the strategy with fidelity?
- 14) What procedures are in place to ensure effective daily operations at the school?

- 15) Describe a committee that you have created within the school.
- Why was it necessary?
 - What strategies were used?

Leadership Contingent Rewards Questions

In reference to Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005), school leaders are willing to encourage change, consider new and more sufficient ways systematically, and constantly try to operate outside of being at the center and allowing staff members to exhibit leadership skills.

- 16) Have you developed leadership capacity within the school?
- If so, provide an example of how you've delegated responsibilities to members of your staff?
 - What did you learn from the experience?

Leadership Communication Questions

- 17) Have you established partnerships beyond the school?
- If so, please provide several partnerships that have been established.
 - In what ways have you engaged them?
 - What benefits have been developed for the school community?

Leadership Resource Questions

- 18) If possible, give an example as to how you've resolved funding/budget restraints.
- What was the result?
- 19) If such restraints did not exist, what resources would you like to have for the school?

In closing, I'd like to ask you a follow-up question in an effort to elaborate on your leadership perspective.

Leadership Follow-Up Questions

- 20) Describe what innovation in education means to you. Do you feel your leadership style is innovative? If so, how?

Is there anything else that you would like to add to any of your responses?