

Principal Desirability for Professional Development

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the Curry School of Education

University of Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

Deanna Lyn Keith

B.A., Lynchburg College
M.Ed., Lynchburg College
Ed.S., University of Virginia


May, 2008


© Copyright by
Deanna Lyn Keith
All Rights Reserved
May, 2008


Administration and Supervision
Curry School of Education
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia

APPROVAL OF THE DISSERTATION

This dissertation, Principal Desirability for Professional Development, has been approved by the Graduate Faculty of the Curry School of Education in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.


Cheryl B. Henig, Advisor


James P. Esposito


Harold J. Burbach

April 2, 2008 Date

Dissertation Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of Virginia public school principals as to their desirability for professional development training in order to meet current accountability measures. Specifically, this study was designed to determine the following: (a) Given a list of professional development statements relating to current accountability measures, how do principals rate their desirability level? (b) Given a list of professional development statements relating to current accountability measures, how do principals rank their desirability level? (c) Are there differences in principal's perceptions of their desirability for professional development based upon their experience level, level of school (elementary, middle or high school), the percentage of minority children, children with IEPs, children with limited English proficiency, children in poverty within the school's population, Title 1 status and AYP accreditation.

The data were collected were collected using a researcher-developed survey. The survey was mailed to randomly selected principals of elementary, middle and high

schools within Virginia. The survey response rate was 60.7%. The data was analyzed descriptively and analytically, using frequency, percentages, means, F-values and ANOVA. Qualitative information by principals was also summarized.

The results of this study indicated that in fourteen of the twenty statements of desirability, principals indicated some level of desirability toward professional development training. The three statements in which principals had the greatest desirability for professional training both in rating and ranking their desirability were (1) Ensuring their teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods, (2) Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities, and (3) Raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty. Results further indicated a statistically significance difference at the .05 level among principal subgroups based on principal's experience level, the percent of poverty children with their total school population, and principals level of Title funding.

These results have implications for school systems within the Commonwealth of Virginia to determine principal needs and provide the necessary training to meet current federal and state mandates. Additionally, this information

would allow advocacy and outreach professional organizations for school principals to design workshops that focus their efforts on the highest need professional development areas.

To Erica and Samantha,

You are the beat of my heart and inspire me to be the best that I can be for you.

With all of my heart, I love you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation study is an accomplishment made possible by my family, friends, and colleagues. I begin with my sincerest and deepest gratitude for my mother's love and support throughout this endeavor. I could not have a better friend and mother. You sat next to me during many midnight hours to offer such amazing support. I can not express in words what you mean to me. I would not have completed this journey had it not been for you, Mom. To my father, I thank you for giving me the confidence to believe in myself. I would not have begun this journey had it not been for your encouragement. It was worth every challenging moment, just to see you smile with pride, Dad. No daughter will ever love, admire, and respect her mother and father more than I do. To my brothers, Eric, Jason, and Joshua, your love and encouragement have been priceless. It is my privilege to be your sister.

I wish to thank my friends and colleagues who have given me support and advice. To Jay Sales, your friendship and professional support have been a source of strength. To my best friend, Val, I cherish our

friendship. You have remained by my side through the good and bad times. You have always been there for me and my family. It is your ability to make me laugh that carries me through. Special appreciation goes to Pastor Larry Brodie for his unwavering support, confidence, professionalism, and mentorship. His encouragement and faith in me, I hold dear.

My sincerest appreciation goes to my advisor, Dr. Cheryl Henig, for her willingness to "adopt" me and walk beside me during this research study. There are no words to express my appreciation for all that she has done for me. I would like to thank Dr. Hal Burbach and Dr. Jim Esposito for serving on my dissertation committee. I thank you both for your expertise as analysts and the meaningful insights you both provided.

Most importantly, I reserve my utmost gratitude to my daughters, Erica and Samantha. I am very blessed to be your mother. Thank you for your unconditional love and support. I strive to make you proud to call me Mom. I love you both so very much.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgments	v
List of Tables	xi
Chapter 1: Introduction	
Statement of Problem	5
Purpose of Study	6
Research Questions	6
Importance of Study	7
Limitations	9
Definitions of Terms	10
Organization of the Study	14
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature	16
Assessments and the Current Accountability System	16
The Era of Principal Accountability	23
The Role of the Principal	27
Subgroup Expectations	34
Implications for Professional Development	38
Chapter 3: Research Design and Methodology	41

Introduction	41
Design	43
Instrumentation	44
Population	45
Data Collection	46
Data Analysis	46
Validity and Reliability	47
Analysis	52
Chapter 4: Findings	56
Demographic and Descriptive Data	57
Principal Desirability Rating	63
Chapter 5: Summary and Conclusions	102
Primary Research Questions	104
Research Design and Methods	106
Findings	107
Discussion of Major Findings	113
Recommendations for Action	124
Recommendations for Further Study	125
References	128
Appendices	139
A. Professional Development Statements	

- B. Cover Letter for Pilot Test
- C. Section D & E for Pilot Test
- D. Letter of Permission to Virginia Superintendents
- E. Cover Letter for Principal Survey
- F. Survey to Principals
- G. Principal Desirability Rating
- H. Summary of Principal Desirability Rating
- I. Survey Item Justification
- J. Differences in Principal Perceptions by School Level
- K. Post-Hoc Differences in Principal's Perception by School Level
- L. Differences in Principal Perceptions by Experience Level
- M. Post-Hoc Differences in Principal's Perceptions by Experience Level
- N. Differences in Principal Perceptions by Percent of Minority Children from Total School's Population
- O. Differences in Principal Perceptions by Percent of Children with IEP's from Total School's Population
- P. Difference in Principal Perceptions by Percent of Children with Limited English Proficiency from Total School's Population
- Q. Differences in Principal Perceptions by

Percent of Poverty Children from total
School's Population

- R. Post-Hoc Differences in Principal's
Perceptions as a Function of the Percent
of Poverty Children from the Total School's
Population
- S. Differences in Principal Perceptions by
Current Title 1 Funding Status
- T. Post-Hoc Differences in Principal's
Perceptions as a Function of the School's
Current Title 1 Funding Status
- U. Differences in Principal Perceptions by
Current Accreditation Status
- V. Post-Hoc Differences in Principal's
Perceptions as a Function of the School's
Current Accreditation Status
- W. Test of Relative Outputs
- X. IRB Approval

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Content Validity	48
2. Principals' School Levels	58
3. Level of Experience as a Principal in Years	59
4. Minority Children	59
5. Children with IEPs	60
6. Children with Limited English Proficiency	61
7. Children in Poverty	61
8. Title 1 Status of Funding	62
9. School's Current Accreditation Status	62
10. Rank-Ordered Statements by Level of Desirability Means	67
11. Test of Relative Importance	69
12. Differences in Principal Perceptions by School Level	72
13. Post-Hoc Differences in Principal's Perception by School Level	74
14. Differences in Principal Perceptions by Experience Level	78
15. Post-Hoc Differences in Principal's Perceptions by Experience Level	80

16.	Differences in Principal Perceptions by Percent of Minority Children from Total School's Population	84
17.	Differences in Principal Perceptions by Percent of Children with IEPs from Total School's Population	85
18.	Difference in Principal Perceptions by Percent of Children with Limited English Proficiency from Total School's Population	86
19.	Differences in Principal Perceptions by Percent of Poverty Children from total School's Population	88
20.	Post-Hoc Differences in Principal's Perceptions as a Function of the Percent of Poverty Children from the Total School's Population	90
21.	Differences in Principal Perceptions by Current Title 1 Funding Status	94
22.	Post-Hoc Differences in Principal's Perceptions as a Function of the School's Current Title 1 Funding Status	96
23.	Differences in Principal Perceptions by Current Accreditation Status	98
24.	Rank-ordered by Principal's top ten Statements of Desirability	100

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Today's American educational system is facing a revolutionary change involving high-stakes testing designed to raise student achievement. The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) is potentially the most significant educational initiative to have been enacted in decades (Simpson, LaCava, & Graner, 2004), and NCLB affects virtually every person employed in the public school system (Heath, 2006). This legislation is unprecedented in its expectation that all students, regardless of disability, native language, race, socioeconomic status, or ethnicity, meet the standards in English and mathematics. Verified by Albrecht and Joles (2003), the NCLB serves as the most rigorous and exacting of standards-based strategies yet enacted for reforming schools because of its mandate that all schools demonstrate yearly progress.

All schools must make detailed annual reports on the progress of all children, as well as report the progress of four subgroups: minority children, children with disabilities, children with limited English proficiency, and children from low-income families (Heath, 2006).

While schools that meet adequate yearly progress receive financial rewards, public recognition, and accolades, those schools that do not meet minimum performance standards receive sanctions and are at risk of the state taking control of their school for state initiated improvement.

Public school accountability now affects everyone employed within a school district. Suzanne Heath (2006) outlines how student test results will affect everyone employed by the school district, from teachers to school administration.

K-3 teachers must teach all children to read. These teachers must learn how to assess children and how to use assessment results to plan effective instruction...Teachers who teach upper elementary grades must teach math, reading, and science at higher levels of skill. These teachers must have the skills to teach many levels of students...Middle school and high school teachers must meet the new "highly qualified" standard in the subjects they teach. Teachers in higher grades are responsible for gains made by their students. These teachers will be responsible for educating students who transfer into their schools without the level of instruction they should have had.

Speech pathologists, occupational therapists, physical therapists and guidance counselors may have to work

academics into their therapies to make up for the child's time out of the classroom...Special education teachers must teach students to the level of proficiency. If a special education teacher teaches a core subject, she must meet the standard of a highly qualified teacher in that subject.

Principals must redesign their schools, implement research-based curricula, ensure that teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods, and provide core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college. Principals who increase their school's effectiveness must prepare for sudden increases in student population.

Superintendents must oversee and evaluate training for personnel in research-based methods and curricula...Superintendents must deal with student populations that fluctuate annually as school choice options change.

School board members must hire administrators who have the expertise to improve student learning and make the district successful. School board members must become knowledgeable about effective teaching methods and research-based curricula. (P.2-4)

The NCLB rigorous standards and accountability standards are undeniable. Its effects are far-reaching and every individual within each school community has a vested interest in this era that demands that all children achieve the high standards, regardless of race, language, socioeconomic status, or disability. Without question, the No Child Left Behind Act reinforces a change in the way school leadership is perceived in the United States. The Institute for Educational Leadership (2002) offers the following:

Even as communities shine a public spotlight on principals when their schools' test scores are released and prescribe stiff penalties for many when their schools perform below expectations, current principals find very little in their professional preparation or ongoing professional development that equip them for this new role. Nor are they supported in this leadership role by their school districts, which, for decades, have expected principals to do little more than follow orders, oversee school staff and contain conflict. So instead, principals mainly stick with what they know, struggling to juggle the multiplying demands of running a school in a sea of rising expectations, complex student needs, enhanced accountability, expanding diversity, record enrollments and staff shortfalls. In short, the demands placed on principals have changed, but the profession has not changed to meet those demands. (p.2-3)

The impact of the NCLB on the role of the principal is daunting and complicated by the notion that many principals are learning how to cope with accountability pressures while they juggle other responsibilities. The Institute for Educational Leadership (2002) references a recent survey of K - 8 principals in which 97.2% rated on-the-job experience as having the most value to their success as principals. In addition, this report noted that principals generally have few opportunities for networking or coaching, which would provide a vehicle for peer support, sharing information and learning best practices.

The Institute for Educational Leadership argues (2002), "There is no alternative. Communities around the

country must 'reinvent the principalship' to enable principals to meet the challenges of the 21st century, and to guarantee the leaders for student learning that communities need to guide their schools and children to success (p.3-4)."

Statement of Problem

At one time, school leaders were assessed using a variety of indicators that reflected the complexity of their job, yet now they find that their effectiveness is determined in much narrower terms (McGhee, Nelson, 2005). According to Thune (1997), principals are being forced to operate educational programs under a growing number of federal and state mandates for which they have limited knowledge and available resources. In the NCLB era of high stakes testing, school administrators are facing their toughest challenge ever. They are being held accountable for the performance of their schools, yet current systems in public education typically fail to provide them with appropriate tools to manage effectively (Hershberg, Simon, Kruger, 2004). It is a growing concern that, while regulations and policies continue to change, principals are not provided with continued on-going training during their

principal tenure to remain current with both Virginia and federal mandates.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of Virginia principals as to their desirability for professional development as it relates to the high stakes accountability in terms of current legislation.

Specifically, principals rated and ranked their desirability for professional development according to specific accountability measures. Additionally, experience level of principal, level of school (elementary, middle and high), Title 1 status and AYP accreditation will also be examined through survey methodology.

Research Questions

This study was designed to answer three research questions:

1. How do principals rate their desirability for professional development as it relates to meeting the high stakes accountability of the No Child Left Behind Act?

2. Are differences in a principal's desirability of professional development related to differences in experience level of the principal, school level (elementary, middle or high school), the percentage of minority children, the percentage of children with disabilities, the percentage of children with limited English proficiency, the percentage of children in poverty within the school's population, the school's current Title 1 funding status and the school's current AYP accreditation.
3. How do principals rank their desirability for professional development as it relates to meeting the high stakes accountability of the No Child Left Behind Act?

Importance of Study

During a meeting of school administrators convened by the Annenberg Institute of School Reform, principals reported that they want their schools to be accountable (DeBlois, 2001). However, principals maintained that they want accountability, but one dilemma became clear: Previous levels of pre-service and in-service training to assess student performance had not prepared them for the high

stakes testing environment. Principals struggled with ways to provide strong leadership while simultaneously assessing and addressing the impact that standardized testing is having communitywide? (Bennett, 2002).

According to Lashway (2000), Accountability is not just another task added to the already formidable list of the principal's responsibilities. It requires new roles and new forms of leadership carried out under careful public scrutiny while simultaneously trying to keep day-to-day management on an even keel. (p.13)

It is necessary to determine what principals perceive as their current professional development needs in order to meet the current high stakes accountability demands set forth by NCLB.

The results of this study may be beneficial to school leaders to provide professional development opportunities specific to the strongest desirability needs expressed by principals. Leader preparation programs may benefit as well as by ensuring that courses prepare principals to meet today's accountability standards through course knowledge and program preparation. Additionally, policy makers can ensure that federal education funding keeps pace to meet the professional needs of building administrators. In order for professional development to be successful, one

necessary attribute is for staff members to have a common, coherent set of goals and objectives which they help formulate, reflecting high expectations of themselves and their students (Sparks and Louck-Horsley et al.(1987)). The results of this study allows school systems within the Commonwealth of Virginia to determine principal needs and provide the necessary training to meet current federal and state mandates. Additionally, this information allows advocacy and outreach professional organizations for school principals to design workshops that focus their efforts on the highest need professional development areas.

Limitations

The following are limitations of this study:

1. The subjects are limited to principals of elementary, middle and high schools within the Commonwealth of Virginia employed during the 2007-2008 school year. Their perceptions may not be congruent with perceptions of other principals.
2. The instrument is limited to questions related to high stakes accountability as it relates to the No Child Left Behind Act. This study did not solicit

perceptions of staff development needs relating to other accountability measures.

3. Bias can be introduced through the responses received. The researcher cannot know the principal's reasons for not responding to specific questions.

Definitions of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following operational definitions are presented to clarify and provide specific vocabulary for administrators.

1. Academic Standards: Statements of expectations for student learning and achievement. Academic standards are composed of both academic content standards and student academic achievement standards.

(<http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/nclb/standassguidance03.pdf>).
2. Accountability System: Each state sets academic standards for what every child should know and learn. Student academic achievement is measured for every child, every year. The results of these annual tests are reported to the public.

(<http://www.ed.gov/nclb/index/az/glossary.html>).

3. Achievement Levels: Labels for the levels of student achievement that convey the degree of student achievement in a given content area. Each achievement level encompasses a range of student achievement.
(<http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/nclb/standassguidance03.pdf>).
4. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP): An individual state's measure of yearly progress toward achieving state academic standards. Adequate Yearly Progress is the minimum level of improvement that states, school districts, and schools must achieve each year.
(<http://www.ed.gov/nclb/index/az/glossary.html>).
5. Annual goals: a required component of an Individual Educational Plan (IEP). Goals are written for the individual student and can be for a maximum of one year. (<http://www.disabilityrights.org/glossary.htm>).
6. Assessment: Another word for "test." Under NCLB, tests are aligned with academic standards. Beginning in the 2002-03 school year, schools were required to administer tests in each of three grade spans: grades 3-5, grades 6-9, and grades 10-12, in all schools. Beginning in the 2005-06 school year, tests were required to be administered every year in grades 3 through 8 in math and reading. Beginning in the 2007-

08 school year, science achievement must also be tested.

7. Corrective Action: when a school or school district does not make yearly progress, the state will place it under a "Corrective Action Plan." The plan will include resources to improve teaching, administration, and/or curriculum. If a school continues to be identified as in need of improvement, then the state has increased authority to make any additional changes necessary to ensure improvement.

(<http://www.ed.gov/nclb/index/az/glossary.html>).

8. Disaggregated Data: "Disaggregate" means to separate a whole into its parts. In education, this term means that test results are sorted into groups of students who are economically disadvantaged, from racial and ethnic minority groups, have disabilities, or have limited English fluency. This practice allows parents and teachers to see more than just the average score for their child's school. Instead, parents and teachers can see how each student group is performing.

(<http://www.ed.gov/nclb/index/az/glossary.html>).

9. Distinguished Schools: Awards granted to schools when they make major gains in achievement.

(<http://www.ed.gov/nclb/index/az/glossary.html>).

10. High Stakes Testing: Any assessment used for accountability that has significant consequences (Lewis, 2000).
11. Professional Development: Any professional learning activity that has the potential to enable teachers and principals to perform their work more effectively, including traditional services (e.g., workshops, institutes, university coursework) and informal learning opportunities (e.g., teacher or principal networks, study groups, mentoring, collaborative projects with colleagues, independent study) (Bruce & Fabiano, 2001).
12. Student Academic Achievement Standards: Explicit definitions of what students must know and be able to do to demonstrate proficiency. Achievement standards further define content standards by connecting them to information that describes how well students are acquiring the knowledge and skills contained in academic content standards. Thus, it is essential that a State's achievement standards be aligned with its content standards.

(<http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/nclb/standassguidance03.pdf>).

13. Supplemental Services: Students from low-income families who are attending schools that have been identified as in need of improvement for two years will be eligible to receive outside tutoring or academic assistance. Parents can choose the appropriate services for their child from a list of approved providers. The school district will purchase the services.

<http://www.ed.gov/nclb/index/az/glossary.html>).

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 of the dissertation included an introduction to current accountability measures and the definition of the problem. The statements of professional development topics are based upon the literature review. (See Appendix D)

Chapter 2 presents a review of the literature that serves as a foundation for this study. Topics include Assessments and the New Accountability System, The Era of Principal Accountability, and Professional Development for Principals.

Chapter 3 contains a summary of the methodology used. The design of this study is quantitative; principals

throughout Virginia were surveyed. Surveys were sent to 168 schools within the Commonwealth of Virginia. The survey was addressed to the principal for each school.

Chapter 4 contains an analysis of the data about principals' perceptions. Using descriptive statistics and inferential statistics, possible differences in perceived staff development needs were examined. Qualitative techniques were used to analyze the open-ended comments from principals pertaining to each Statement of Desirability.

Chapter 5 includes a summary of the findings and a discussion. Recommendations for practice are made. Recommendations for further studies conclude the chapter.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this chapter relevant research is presented to provide a thorough understanding of accountability systems and their impact on the role of the principal. The chapter begins with a broad examination of assessments and accountability systems, then presents an examination of the role of principals in light of such accountability measures. The review concludes with a concise focus on current knowledge of the role of the principal in terms of student achievement.

Assessments and the Current Accountability System

Over the last decade, an increasingly strong movement toward school accountability has emerged. According to Moe (2003), its message is a simple one: public schools should

have strong academic standards, tests should be administered to determine what students are learning, and students, as well as the adults responsible for teaching them, should be held accountable for meeting the standards.

Thus, educational systems have been forced to shift their focus from educating the more financially advantaged and easier to teach children to educating all children, including those who are more difficult to teach due to difference, disadvantage, or disability (Allington & McGill-Franzen, 1995). It can be argued that educational systems have developed and matured as a result of the federal regulations which are currently being aligned with Virginia's accountability system.

President George W. Bush signed into law No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 on January 8, 2002, as the reauthorization of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act. NCLB set forth new requirements for public schools across the United States to show evidence that all students are learning and making adequate yearly progress. Set by states, academic standards directed that schools be held accountable for results, and increased resources and flexibility would be offered by the federal government (U.S. Department of Education, 2007). President Bush described this new law as "the cornerstone of my

administration," and during his first week in office in January, 2001, he stated, "These reforms express my deep belief in our public schools and their mission to build the mind and character of every child, from every background, in every part of America" (U.S. Department of Education, February 2004, p. 1).

Certainly, the notion of accountability is not a new one, as one form of accountability or another has always been present in American public schooling (Sirotnik, 2004). President Bush, however, put the full force of federal authority behind standards-based reform (Cuban, 2004). The central justification for this legislation was that schools and teachers are leaving children behind (Gerstl-Pepin, 2006). The legislation demands more of states and school districts than any previous federal education law (Jennings & Kober, 2004). Former U.S. Secretary of Education, Rod Paige, (June, 2002) acknowledged that, while federal policy has had a significant impact on America's schools and children since the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965, many American students continued to lag behind.

Initially, many civil rights advocates hailed the Bush administration's education bill as a step forward in the battle to improve education for those children

traditionally left behind in American schools-in particular, minority students, those living in poverty, new English language learners, and students with disabilities (Darling-Hammond, 2004). As Darling-Hammond explained, the broad scope of NCLB is to raise the achievement levels of all students, especially underperforming groups, and to close the achievement gap that parallels race and class distinctions. This bill intended to change this by focusing schools' attention on improving test scores for all groups of students, providing parents with more educational choices, and ensuring better qualified teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2004).

Under NCLB, schools were to ensure that 100% of students achieve at levels identified as "proficient" by the year 2014, and to make mandated progress toward this goal each year. NCLB has far-reaching implications for those who work in public education. NCLB was different from other initiatives in that its main thrust was to promote high standards by holding schools and students accountable for outcomes rather than inputs or regularizations (Heinecke, Curry-Conrcoran, & Moon, 2003).

The "heartbeat" of NCLB was its requirement that each state make adequate yearly progress. According to Imas

(2004), states must determine adequate yearly progress, as defined by each state and measured by the following:

- Students' progress toward full proficiency, as measured by statewide tests,
 - Progress of subgroups of students (racial/ethnic, low income, students with disabilities, and those with limited proficiency in English) toward proficiency on those tests,
 - 95% participation of each subgroup in tests,
 - Students' progress on indicators, including high school graduation rates and a state-determined indicator for elementary and middle schools
- (Source: The Education Commission of the States 2004).

The U.S. Department of Education (March, 2005, p. 2) outlines the following in defining adequate yearly progress:

...each state sets the minimum levels of improvement-measurable in terms of student performance—that school districts and schools must achieve within time frames specified in the law. In general, it works like this: Each state begins by setting a "starting point" that is based on the performance of its lowest-achieving demographic group or of the lowest achieving schools in the state, whichever is higher. The state then sets the barrow level of student achievement that a school must attain after two years in order to continue to show adequate

yearly progress. Subsequent thresholds must be raised at least once every three years, until at the end of twelve years, all students in the state are achieving at the proficient level on state assessments in reading, language arts and math.

The NCLB demands that, as of the 2005-2006 school year, states must do the following:

- Administer annual reading and math assessments for grades 3-8,
- Administer reading and math assessments once during grades 10-12,
- Administer assessments to at least 100% of each subgroup (racial/ethnic, low income, students with disabilities and limited proficiency in English) as well as the entire student population.

The NCLB lays out the following action plan and timetable for steps to be taken when a Title I school fails to improve:

- A Title I school that has not made adequate yearly progress, as defined by the state, for two consecutive school years will be identified by the district before the beginning of the next school year as *needing improvement*. School officials will develop a two-year plan to

implement a school improvement plan. The local education agency will ensure that the school receives needed technical assistance as it develops and implements its improvement plan. Students must be offered the option of transferring to another public school in the district, which may include a public charter school that has not been identified as needing school improvement.

- If the school does not make adequate yearly progress for three years, the school remains in school-improvement status, and the district must continue to offer public school choice to all students. In addition, students from low-income families are eligible to receive supplemental educational services, such as tutoring or remedial classes, from a state-approved provider.
- If the school fails to make adequate progress for four years, the district must implement certain *corrective actions* to improve the school, such as replacing certain staff or fully implementing a new curriculum, while continuing to offer public school choice and supplemental educational services for low-income students.

- If a school fails to make adequate yearly progress for a fifth year, the school district must initiate plans for *restructuring* the school. This may include reopening the school as a charter school, replacing all or most of the school staff, or turning over school operations either to the state or to a private company with a demonstrated record of effectiveness. (U.S. Department of Education, March 2005, p. 2)

The Era of Principal Accountability

Principals face a dual challenge: acquiring the knowledge they need to understand data-driven decision making to the extent that their pre-service and in-service training may not have prepared them, and guiding their learning communities through the changes in attitude and behavior that the high stakes accountability environment demands (Bennett, 2002). According to Lashway (2000), "Accountability is not just another task added to the already formidable list of the principal's responsibilities. It requires new roles and new forms of leadership carried out under careful public scrutiny while

simultaneously trying to keep day-to-day management on an even keel"(p. 13). Additionally, accountability, by definition, is about a school's obligation to society, so it will never be just an internal matter...The principal is the point person in responding to community concerns and at the same time proactively telling the school's story (p. 13). Although past accountability standards provided a less complicated and less public approach, this is not the case in an era of present high stakes testing. Comparisons of scores are inevitable in this environment, and test-driven decisions have a ripple effect on the community. Accountability must be shared among all participants because far-ranging results depend on cooperation and collaboration (Bennett, 2002), and the primary responsibility for meeting outcomes belongs to the principal.

According to Lewis (2000), high stakes testing includes the following characteristics:

- Any assessment used for accountability with significant consequences. For students, that means test results that lead to very important decisions-promotion/retention, access to specific programs, or qualification for a high school diploma (and/or special honors diplomas).

- Any assessment, that, when applied to schools and/or districts, determines which are to receive awards for high performance or extra investments because of low scores. In the case of low scores, schools stand to lose accreditation, be reconstituted, or even closed.
- Any assessment that uses test scores to hold teachers and principals accountable. Such accountability is rare, but is increasingly discussed in policy circles.

Lewis (2000) refers to an analysis completed by Susan E. Phillips in which she suggests that the following characteristics of high-stakes testing produce a high level of anxiety:

- public scrutiny of individually identifiable results,
- a significant gain in money, property, or prestige for those with positive results,
- considerable pressure on individuals or institutions to perform well or to raise scores,
- a perception that significant individual decisions are being made based on a single

imperfect piece of data over which the affected entity has no input or control, and

- complex and costly security procedures designed to ensure maximum fairness for all who are assessed.

Regarding the increased public scrutiny in high stakes environment, Cohen(2001) stated,

Increasingly, accountability has become the mantra of a skeptical public. Politicians and citizens are requiring that schools, as the recipients of taxpayer dollars, be accountable for results. This has often translated into state accountability policies centered on high stakes standardized tests. In many places test scores are published in local newspapers, and low or declining test performance can cause multiple negative consequences-affecting real estate values, threatening school autonomy in the case of district or state intervention, and triggering sanctions against teachers and students. To deal with the pressure of such a high stakes environment, a principal must have skills in the areas of public engagement, interpreting and managing data, and political savvy.

Even the severest critics of high stakes testing acknowledge that assessments are necessary for a variety of purposes-public accountability, diagnosis of student strengths and weaknesses, and evidence for teachers and parents that students are learning what they should (Lewis, 2000). Where they disagree about assessment, however, is when a single test is used to make major decisions about a student, such as high school graduation or promotion, and

when that test becomes the basis of decisions that significantly affect the academic outcomes to a student in school.

Consequences for students include whether they pass or fail, whether they qualify for a diploma, and/or whether they are granted access to specific programs. The implications for high stakes testing are further reaching, as the resulting consequences extend as well to teachers, principals, schools, and school districts. Consequences for schools and districts include which ones receive awards for high performance, and which ones are granted additional funding to try to improve low scores. For low-scoring schools, consequences include loss of accreditation, reconstitution, or closure.

The Role of the Principal

It is apparent that the role of the principal has changed given today's high stakes accountability. It is the expectation of the public that principals deliver results; however, such high stakes testing and resulting accountability is an intense stress added to a principal's workload.

Cohen (2001) notes that the operational demands that principals have always faced—school safety, keeping the buses running on schedule, contending with mounds of paperwork, disciplining students, mediating adult interrelationships, and handling central office requests and requirements, etc. have not gone away. However, the principal also needs special capabilities for leadership in order to be an instructional leader: recruiting teachers loyal to the common task of teaching a specific group of children, knowing individual teachers well enough to suggest specific improvements, and creating a culture in which deep knowledge of instruction and learning serves as the foundation for an interdependent professional community (Fink & Resnick, 2001). The Institute for Educational Leadership's (IEL) Task Force on the Principalship (2000) verified the notion,

Being an effective building manager used to be good enough. For the past century, principals mostly were expected to comply with district-level edicts, address personnel issues, order supplies, balance program budgets, keep hallways and playgrounds safe, put out fires that threatened tranquil public relations, and make sure that busing and meal services were operating smoothly. And principals still need to do all those things. But now they must do more. (p.2)

Principals currently are held accountable for the progress of their students, yet most principals spend relatively little time in classrooms and even less time

analyzing instruction with teachers (Fink and Resnick, 2001). Fink and Resnick (2001) explain,

The idea that principals should serve as instructional leaders, not as generic managers, is widely subscribed to among educators. In practice, though, only few principals actually serve as instructional leaders. Their days are filled with the activities of management: scheduling, reporting, handling relations with parents and the community, and dealing with the multiple crises and special situation that are inevitable in schools. Most principals spend relatively little time classrooms and even less time analyzing instruction with teachers. They may arrange time for teachers' meetings and professional development, but they rarely provide intellectual leadership for growth in teaching skill. (p.598)

Not surprisingly, the Virginia Board of Education Resolution dated December 16, 1997 stated: "Role of the Principal: that the principal shall seek to ensure that all students are provided the opportunity to learn." Cohen (2001) states the following,

If principals have, to varying degrees, always been instructional leaders, that role has reached a new height of demand and complexity since standards and accountability have become the watchwords in public education. The principal is expected to lead in the design of a curriculum that meets the learning needs of all students and is aligned with state and local standards, to know what constitutes good instructional practice, and to coach and otherwise guide teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice.

Principals increasingly indicate the job is simply not doable (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2002). Among many professional development needs, perhaps none is more

critical in the high stakes accountability environment than the need to understand and analyze data in order to align assessments, standards, curriculum, and instruction

(Bennett, 2002). Cromeey (2000) explains,

When assessments are not aligned with each other, the curriculum, or the standards prescribed by the state or district, there is no sense that they are working together to provide an overall picture of student achievement. Teachers find themselves giving more than one test covering the same material. Students are asked to take tests on material that has not yet been covered in class. (p. 5)

Stacy Scott, from the Center for Understanding Equity (American Teacher, 2006, p. 6) stated, "Decisions about curriculum and instruction have to be driven by data, no matter whether it's analyzing the curriculum to see if it's challenging and rigorous or making changes in a program based on student achievement results." It is critical that principals be able to understand how to interpret research findings and evaluate data as districts and schools move toward increasingly data-driven systems (Miller, 2003).

Principals must be able to make the appropriate data-driven decisions and know how to prioritize among many daily challenges. This notion is validated by Lipsitz, Mizell, Jackson, & Austin (1997), who maintain that data-driven decision making is a necessary element of reform.

Bennett (2002) specifically outlines that principals should take the following actions in regards to data:

- Develop a strategy for the continuous collection, analysis, and reporting of data,
- Share results with teachers, parents, and students,
- Use the results to develop and revise curriculum,
- Use data to add to the understanding of the results of standardized achievement tests,
- Articulate the relationship between school-based data and standardized tests,
- Work with parents and other members of the community as an advocate for a broader system of school indicators,
- Provide students with incentives that increase their interest and use of performance feedback to enhance their learning experiences.

Not only must the principal understand and engage in data-driven decision making, but must involve stakeholders. Distributed leadership and decision sharing make the principal's job both more manageable and more complex (Cohen, 2001). When principals engage parents and teachers in the decision-making process, they are employing a

strategy for arriving at better decisions. In the past, school accountability was much less complicated and less public.

If principals determined the needs of their specific learning community and met them, this approach was feasible. But in a learning community driven by high stakes testing, it is not. In a high stakes accountability environment, comparisons of scores to other schools are inevitable and test-driven decision have a ripple effect on the community. Accountability must be shared among all participants because far-ranging results depend on cooperation and collaboration. (Bennett, 2002, p.4)

Bennett (2002) asserts the following,

High stakes accountability poses both a formidable challenge and an exciting opportunity. It both requires new learning and opens the door to new learning among members of its learning community. It demands and also empowers principals to mirror those attitudes and actions they hope to instill. (p. 4)

The engagement of parents in decision making translates to increasing parental involvement, which continues to top the list of priorities for school improvement. However, as educators focus more on reading and mathematics instruction in preparation for high stakes tests, the opportunity to create structured time for parent involvement may be diminished (Lefkowitz & Miller, 2003). "Accountability, by definition is about a school's obligation to society, so it will never be just an internal matter...The principal is the point person in responding to

community concerns and at the same time proactively telling the school's story" (Lashway, 2000, p.13).

Not only are principals expected to engage parents and teachers in the decision-making process, but principals are also expected to take the lead in engaging other citizens in supporting student achievement and school improvement (Cohen, 2001). Education leaders are encouraged by Lefkowitz and Miller (2003) to find time to effectively reach out to the public and to engage the public in their school reform efforts, and respond to the concerns expressed, or run the risk of having their accountability policies become irrelevant to the very people the policies are intended to reassure. In the high stakes accountability environment, the school principal must simultaneously visualize the future of the learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of those he leads (Bennett, 2002, p.4).

Lashway (2000) offers, "It seems that principals of improving schools send out a two-part message. The first part says, 'We will have a common vision of student learning and we will live up to it' (p.12). The second part says, 'We will work together to determine what that vision should be and how it will change what we do' (p.12)."

Heath (2006) emphasizes the overall impact NCLB has to the community as a whole by stating the following,

Detailed information about the performance of schools in the district and subgroups of children must be readily available to anyone who wants this information. Real estate agents will use these reports to answer customer questions about school districts and neighborhoods. Teachers will examine this information before deciding to apply for a position in a school, district, or state. Superintendents will use this information to determine which principals are running successful schools and which are not. School boards will use this information to evaluate superintendents. Voters will use this information to evaluate school boards. Industry will use state report cards to make decisions about where to locate new facilities. (p.1)

Heath (2006) goes on to ask the following questions:

What company wants to locate a new factory in a state with a high dropout rate? Who wants to buy a house in a neighborhood where the schools are not successful? Who will apply for a teaching job in an unsuccessful school? (p.1)

Subgroup Expectations

In compliance with NCLB, states have adopted new academic standards and assessments designed to hold all schools and all students accountable for academic achievement (Noguera, 2004). In an effort to address the participation of students with disabilities in the assessment component of Virginia's accountability system,

Superintendent's Memo No. 140 included Attachment B which states,

It is the intent of the Commonwealth of Virginia to include all students with disabilities in the assessment component of Virginia's accountability system. The federal regulations under *Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973*, as amended, and state regulations under the *Virginians with Disabilities Act*, Section 51.5-40 et seq. of the Code of Virginia, require that individuals with disabilities be given equal opportunity to participate in and benefit from the policies and procedures customarily granted to all individuals. The *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*, P.L. 105-17, regulations require that all students with disabilities participate in the state's accountability system. Additionally the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, P.L. 107-110, requires that at least 95% of students with disabilities participate in assessments that measure adequate yearly progress of schools, school divisions, and the Commonwealth of Virginia. (Virginia Department of Education, October 2002, p.1)

Historically, most students with disabilities have been excluded from state-mandated testing based on their level of disability. Many such students have individual educational plans (IEP) which outline curriculum deficit based goals and objectives and have allowed comparable assessments for charting their progress towards criteria mastery. However, in the current era of accountability, NCLB limits such an option. It is the responsibility of the building level administrator to not only understand the

federal and state-mandated provisions for children with disabilities but to successfully meet outcome expectations within their school to ensure that all students succeed.

It is the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) which currently outlines the regulations with which we access students receiving special education services. It is IDEA which guides the proper implementation of special education programs and services. According to the Special Education Report of January 2005,

...interpreting and implementing the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act will dominate the special education agenda in 2005. Also of importance in the special education community in the year ahead are efforts to continue aligning IDEA and NCLB Act, shape other legislation related to special education, and mark IDEA's 30th anniversary. (p.13)

A panel of attorneys and educators at LRP Publications' National Institute on Legal Issues of Education of Individuals with Disabilities issued a warning in June of 2004 stating that districts and states will face legal and policy challenges trying to comply with NCLB Act and the IDEA (Special Education Report, June 2004). In unison, attorneys and educators offer warnings that special education mandates and current policy changes cannot successfully be connected, yet that is exactly what is being asked of school leaders. It is the expectation that 1) principals provide the necessary leadership to make

successful changes, and 2) requires school leaders to potentially make special education decisions in the absence of the necessary knowledge base and/or technical expertise to meet the intent of the law (Ysseldyke and Algozzine, 1982). While it has always been an integral part of principals' training to ensure that principals have, at minimum, a limited knowledge of special education law, guidelines, terminology, and methods, the passing of NCLB now demands that a more comprehensive knowledge of special education, best practices, and school programming is expected of principals. They must not only be knowledgeable of special education, but also understand the consequences when compliance in meeting these regulations is not met within their building. Verified by Hoy (1994), they often experience tension and frustration in managing special education because principals are often caught between their limited knowledge in their interpretation of special education law and the demands of parent and advocacy groups when making educational decisions for their students with disabilities. Hoy also suggests that when school-based decisions are not in alignment with mandates, mediation, and judicial proceedings, the consequences are costly for school administrations and the local school systems.

Implications for Professional Development

During a meeting of school administrators convened by the Annenberg Institute of School Reform, principals reported that they want their schools to be accountable (DeBlois, 2001). However, although principals maintained that they wanted accountability, they did not feel prepared for the high stakes testing environment, and questioned how they would provide strong leadership while simultaneously assessing and addressing the impact that standardized testing is having communitywide (Bennett, 2002).

Bennett argues (2002), "The requirements of No Child Left Behind impact every level of every school community. In this light, professional development takes on a new urgency" (p.5).

The need for professional development has been well documented and is certainly not a recent phenomenon. Evidence continues to demonstrate that principals are becoming increasingly more frustrated about the effects of mandated testing for high stakes accountability (Jones, Jones, Hardin, Chapman, Yarbrough, & Davis, 1999). Bostingl (2000) argues, "Capable, dedicated educators, victims of the new American plague of high stakes testing,

are losing their careers or are personally dispirited, lying low, and awaiting retirement" (p. 8).

The implementation of the accountability system within Virginia dictates that, with the ongoing changes and legal ramifications, principals are receiving insufficient training. This undeniably is an impacting issue that must be addressed if schools are to meet this statute. Waters, Marzano and McNulty (2003) emphasize that just as leaders can have a positive impact on achievement, they also can have a marginal, or worse, a negative impact on achievement.

The urgency of NCLB federal and state mandates has unarguably changed the principalship, as a principal's responsibility now goes beyond managing the day-to-day operations of a school. Principals need core knowledge, as well as management skills, to inform, lead, and change (Miller, 2003). In the past, school administrators determined their professional development needs based on factors such as the demographics of the their school system, the pre-service training of their staff, and/or the needs of their school for specific teaching expertise (Bennett, 2002). However, professional learning opportunities have the greatest impact when they engage principals in learning activities that are directly related

to their work and that help them solve problems that they confront (Corcoran, 1995).

As the principal plays a critical role in creating conditions for school improvement, professional development invariably makes a difference. The fact that expectations for today's principals and superintendents extend beyond general management functions to instructional leadership, has substantial implications for professional development.

CHAPTER 3

THE RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research design, methodology, and data collection and analysis procedures in this study. The chapter is divided into five sections. Section one provides the introduction, section two describes the design, section three describes the population and sample, section four contains data collection procedures, and section five contains data analysis procedures.

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of Virginia principals regarding their desirability for professional development as it related to meeting accountability standards. The following factors, which are currently aligned or determined by NCLB will be

investigated: minority children, children with disabilities, children with limited English proficiency, children in poverty, Title 1 status and AYP accreditation. Hertting and Phenix-Bourke have suggested that there are differences and similarities in the needs of new and veteran principals (2007), so the experience level of the principals was examined. Furthermore, the level of school (elementary, middle and high) was investigated based on findings from Schlueter and Walker (2008) which recommend that districts examine the differences in roles and responsibilities of both elementary and secondary principals, as both levels require different criteria for school leaders.

This study was designed to address the following specific questions, given the No Child Left Behind rigorous standards and high stakes accountability. The research questions guiding this study include,

1. How do principals rate their desirability for professional development as it relates to meeting the high stakes accountability of the No Child Left Behind Act?
2. Are differences in a principal's desirability of professional development related to differences in experience level of the principal, school level

(elementary, middle or high school), the percentage of minority children, the percentage of children with disabilities, the percentage of children with limited English proficiency, the percentage of children in poverty within the school's population, the school's current Title 1 funding status and the school's current AYP accreditation.

3. How do principals rank their desirability for professional development as it relates to meeting the high stakes accountability of the No Child Left Behind Act?

Design

This study solicited principals' perceptions of their desirability for professional development as it related to the high stakes accountability in terms of current legislation.

The design of this study was exploratory and descriptive. According to Salkind (2003), descriptive research describes the current state of affairs at the time of the study. Educational problems are often examined by using descriptive research methods (Gay, 1996). Typical descriptive studies are concerned with the assessment of

attitudes, opinions, demographic information, conditions and procedures, and can measure only what already exists (Gay, 1987). Since the researcher was seeking principals' perceptions about their need for professional development, the exploratory and descriptive research design was the appropriate method of study. This study utilized survey methodology.

Instrumentation

The survey consisted of three parts. Part A focused on demographic information in order to answer Research Question #3; Part B focused on specific research questions in which principals indicated their level of desirability for principal professional development training; and Part C asked principals to rank those statements in order of their desirability and importance. Research Question #1 was answered by Part B, and Research Question #2 was answered by Part C. The content of the survey was validated through the research, as every question asked within this survey was linked to specific research. Additionally, the survey was piloted for clarity and readability. Part A demographics used ANOVA to determine differences between groups, and Part B (professional development desirability

ratings) and Part C (professional development desirability ranking) utilized descriptive statistics to analyze the mean responses of each question, as well as the mean ranking of each question.

Population

The population for this study was composed of Virginia principals randomly selected from school divisions. A letter along with the principal survey was sent to all school divisions within Virginia asking for the Superintendent's permission to distribute surveys to principals within their school division. (See Appendix D) The population for this study was drawn from 67 school divisions upon permission from those Superintendents. Using a stratified random numbers table, a sample size of 30% was taken from 332 elementary, 114 middle and 112 high schools within the Commonwealth of Virginia, so that surveys were randomly selected and sent to 100 elementary schools, 34 middle schools and 34 high schools. Only those schools in participating divisions were in the final sample.

According to Gay (1996), when conducting descriptive research, typical sample sizes will be 10-20% of the population. A larger sample size of 30% was used in an effort to ensure an appropriate response rate.

Data Collection

A survey, along with a cover letter explaining the instructions for completion, was mailed to each principal. (See Appendix E and Appendix F) The principal was asked to complete the survey and return it in a self-addressed return envelope.

Data Analysis

Once all of the surveys were returned, they were examined for completion. Inadequate surveys were eliminated. Quantitative statistical methods were used to answer Section A demographic questions 1-8. Descriptive statistics including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were utilized.

In Section B, survey questions 9-28 asked principals to rate their desirability for the 20 statements of

professional development as it relates to the high stakes accountability in meeting the No Child Left Behind Act. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized, with a post-hoc t-test to determine differences between groups if the one-way analysis of variance produced statistically significant F.

In Section C, principals were asked to rank their top 10 statements of professional development desirability as it relates to the high stakes accountability in meeting the No Child Left Behind Act. Statements were ranked ordered by means utilizing descriptive statistics.

Validity and Reliability

The survey consisted of four pages using a Likert 4-point scale with easily readable instructions. In order to establish content validity, each survey item was directly linked to expert opinion found within the literature review. Salkind (2000) describes content validity as the extent to which a test represents the universe of items from which it is drawn, and recommends expert opinion to establish content validity. Table 1 outlines the content validity as established within this study.

Table 1Content Validity

#	Survey Item	Justification in Literature
1	To what degree do Virginia principals desire professional development as it relates to redesigning their school in order to increase their school's effectiveness?	Heath, p. 3
2	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to implementing research-based curricula?	Heath, p. 3
3	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to ensuring that teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods?	Heath, p. 3
4	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to providing core reading knowledge to novice (elementary) teachers who did not get this training in college?	Heath, p. 3
5	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to implications for preparing for sudden increases in student population for principals who increase their school's effectiveness?	Heath, p. 3
6	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to juggling the demands of running a school in a sea of rising expectations, complex student needs, enhanced accountability, expanding diversity, record enrollments and staff shortfalls?	Institute for Leadership, p. 5
7	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to raising the achievement levels of minority students?	Jennings, Rentner, & Kober, p.19; Darling-Hammond, p. 19
8	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty?	Jennings, Rentner, & Kober, p. 19; Darling-Hammond, p. 19
9	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to raising the achievement levels of new English learners?	Jennings, Rentner, & Kober, p. 19; Darling-Hammond, p. 19
10	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities?	Jennings, Rentner, & Kober, p. 19; Dealing-Hammond, p. 19
11	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to understanding the data-driven decision making?	Bennett, p. 24
12	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to guiding their learning community through the changes in attitude and behavior the high stakes accountability environment demands?	Bennett, p. 24
13	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to designing curriculum that meets the learning needs of all students and is aligned with state and local standards?	Cohen, p. 31
14	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to knowing what constitutes good instructional practice?	Cohen, p. 31
15	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice?	Cohen, p. 31
16	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to understanding the foundations of effective special education?	McLaughlin and Nolet, p. 36
17	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to understanding and analyzing data in order to align assessment, standards, curriculum, and instruction?	Bennett, p. 38
18	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data?	Miller, p. 39
19	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to engaging the public in their school reform efforts?	Lefkowitz and Miller, p. 42
20	To what Degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to visualizing the future of their specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of the community he leads?	Bennett, p. 42

Content validity was further established through a pilot study. "Content validity refers to the degree to which a test measures the content is purported to measure. To argue that a test is valid for a particular testing purpose, it must be shown that the items and tasks composing the test are representative of the targeted content domain" (Sireci, 1998, p.299). Hence, it was necessary that all questionnaires be subjected to pilot testing before being used (Krathwohl, 1998). Twenty test respondents who had past experience as principals or assistant principals were chosen to serve as Subject Matter Experts (SME). According to Sireci (1998), the SMEs' content classifications are used to derive item-objective congruence indices for test items, as well as overall congruence indices for each content area.

The pilot group of past principals located within the Commonwealth of Virginia was sent a cover letter asking each of them to review the questionnaire and give the researcher critical feedback. (See Appendix B) Pilot participants received the Principal survey, however, a fourth section referred to as "Section D: Domain Evaluation" was added later in which participants were asked to validate the questions within this study by grouping each survey item into one of four domains: (a)

Leadership Behaviors and Dispositions, (b) Student Achievement Outcomes, (c) Teacher Knowledge and Pedagogy, and (d) Curricula. (See Appendix C) Participants were also given a fifth section referred to as "Survey Evaluation" for principals to note any additional comments or suggestions in regards to the survey. (See Appendix C)

The proportion of SME's who matched an item to its domain provided an index of item-objective congruence (Sireci, 1998). From 20 surveys which were sent to participants, 14 surveys were returned. Of these 14 surveys, item-objective congruence for each item ranged from 90-100%. Sireci (1998) suggested an item-objective index of .70 or greater as a criterion for considering an item to be congruent with its objective. Based on this criterion, content validity was established for each survey item used within the survey.

Based on the feedback given in Sections A, B and C which asked participants for any critical feedback, the researcher made two revisions to the questionnaire. Wording was changed within the survey to reflect the following: Statement 15: Raising the achievement levels of students of color was changed to Raising the achievement levels of minority students. Additionally, the researcher originally had requested that all 20 desirability

statements were ranked in order from #1-20 in Part C. Four respondents suggested that ranking 20 desirability statements was too many, and Part C was adjusted to ask principals to rank their top 10 statements in the order they would most desire professional development training.

Part A of the survey identified the following demographic factors: school level (elementary, middle and high), principal's years of experience, school's percentage of minority children, school's percentage of children with disabilities, school's percentage of children with limited English proficiency, school's percent of poverty children, school's current Title 1 status (Schoolwide, Title 1, No funding) and school's current status in meeting accreditation (fully accredited, accredited with warning, accreditation denied, and conditionally accredited). The information solicited in Part A focused on demographic information in order to answer Research Question #2.

Part B contained a list of 20 statements related to the principal's desirability for professional development training as outlined in the literature regarding current high stakes accountability and demands of NCLB. For each item, respondents were asked to use a 1 to 4 Likert scale to rate the degree to which they desired professional

development from "strong" (desirability) (1), to "none" (desirability) (4).

Section C asked principals to rank-order the importance of the professional development statements from Section B in order.

Analysis

A summary of percentages was made for the responses from the descriptive and demographic data collected about each principal. The level and ranking of desirability for professional development was determined. The first major research question asked, "How do principals rate their desirability for professional development as it relates to meeting the high stakes accountability of No Child Left Behind Act?" The data about principal's desirability rating was converted to a scaled value, with "strong" being assigned a numeric value of 1, with increasing numeration to a value of 4 for "no desirability." Principal responses were analyzed using descriptive statistics, and included frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations for each of the 11 categories. Scaled responses were converted from the Likert scale, using the numeric values included in the survey. The summary of the data was

rank-ordered to demonstrate the list of the desirability statements from the highest to lowest principal desirability for professional development. After each survey item, a space was included for "Additional information" to offer principals the opportunity to add open-ended comments specific to each desirability statements.

The second major research question examined the differences in principal desirability for professional development with various demographic and descriptive data collected. To answer this question, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. The research question, "Does the following factor affect principal's perception of their desirability for staff development?" was broken down into the following eight specific sub-questions. They were,

- 2.1 experience level of the principal,
- 2.2 level of school (elementary, middle or high school),
- 2.3 the percentage of minority children in the school's total student population,
- 2.4 the percentage of children with disabilities in the school's total student population,
- 2.5 the percentage of children with limited English proficiency in the school's total student population,

- 2.6 the percentage of children in poverty within the school's total student population,
- 2.7 the school's current Title 1 funding status, and
- 2.8 the school's current AYP accreditation.

Research Question 3 asked, "How do principals rank their desirability for professional development as it relates to meeting the high stakes accountability of the No Child Left Behind Act?" This question was analyzed using descriptive statistics of the mean for each of the desirability statements. Principal professional development preferences were rank-ordered. An examination of these data resulted in identification of the strongest preferences for professional development among the desirability statements.

This chapter outlined the survey methodology to be used in this study. The survey was created by the researcher and construct validity was established through a pilot study. Content validity was established by linking each survey item directly to expert authors found within the literature review. After revisions were made to the survey, it was mailed to randomly selected principals within the Commonwealth of Virginia. Data were analyzed according to three specific research questions looking at principal desirability for professional development for

meeting current high stakes accountability, such as NCLB. Chapter 4 summarize the data about principal desirability. The demographics for principals and their schools is reported using descriptive data. An analysis of variance explores relationships among the demographic data and principal desirability, and is summarized in table form. Chapter 5 offers a discussion of major findings and recommendations for further studies.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to solicit the perceptions of Virginia principals as to their desirability for professional development relating to the high stakes accountability in terms of current accountability legislation. The research questions guiding this study include:

1. How do principals rate their desirability for professional development as it relates to meeting the high stakes accountability of the No Child Left Behind Act?
2. Are differences in a principal's desirability of professional development related to differences in experience level of the principal, school level (elementary, middle or high school), the percentage of minority children, the percentage of children

with disabilities, the percentage of children with limited English proficiency, the percentage of children in poverty within the school's population, the school's current Title 1 funding status and the school's current AYP accreditation.

3. How do principals *rank* their desirability for professional development as it relates to meeting the high stakes accountability of No Child Left Behind Act?

To answer these questions, a survey (Appendix F) was developed, based upon 20 desirability statements as supported by research for principal professional development training. All principals were randomly selected from 67 school divisions within Virginia. Surveys were sent to 67 school divisions, specifically 100 elementary schools, 34 middle schools and 34 high schools within the Commonwealth of Virginia. SPSS 15.0, a statistical software package, was used for all calculations.

Demographic and Descriptive Data

Various descriptive and demographic data were collected about the principals and their schools. Using a

stratified random numbers table, a sample size of 30% was taken from the population. Some 102 surveys were returned; 52 surveys were returned from elementary schools, 25 surveys were returned from middle schools and 25 surveys were returned from high schools. The overall response rate was 62.2%. The data were summarized using frequencies and percentages for the total number of principals (102) responding to the survey. The missing data points were also reported under the category of "No Response."

Table 2

Principals' School Levels

	Elementary	Middle	High
Frequency	52	25	25
%	51.0	24.5	24.5

Over half (51.0%) the principals were elementary school principals, one quarter (24.5%) of the principals were middle school principals and one quarter (24.5%) of the principals were high school principals.

Table 3

Level of Experience as a Principal in Years

	1-5 years	6-10 years	11-20 years	20+ years
Frequency	54	26	17	5
%	52.9	25.5	16.7	4.9

Over half (52.9%) of the total number of principals were novice principals having five or less years experience as principal. Over twenty-five percent (25.5%) had principal experience within the 6-10 year category. Within the 11-20 year category, 17 (16.7%) principals responded, and less than 5% of principals have 20+ years of experience.

Table 4

Minority Children as a Percentage of Total School Population

	0-25%	26-49%	50-74%	75-100%	No Response
Frequency	75	19	7	0	1
%	73.5	18.6	6.9	0	1.0

Seventy three and a half percent of the principals reported 0-25% minority children from their total school population. The remaining one quarter was divided between

26-49% category with 19 (18.6%) responses, and schools with 50-74% minority children with 7 (6.9%) schools with minority population. There were no schools reporting over 74% minority population.

Table 5

Children with IEPs as a Percentage of Total School Population

	0-25%	26-49%	50-74%	75-100%	No Response
Frequency	91	6	4	0	1
Percent	89.2	5.9	3.9	0	1.0

When asked the percent of children with IEPs from the total student population, 91 (89.2%) principals reported 0-25% category, 6 (5.9%) principals reported 26-49%, and 4 (3.9%) principals reported 50-75% category. There were no reports from any school to reflect over 74% of students with IEPs.

Table 6

Children with Limited English Proficiency as a Percentage of the Total School Population

	0-25%	26-49%	50-74%	75-100%
Frequency	96	6	0	0
%	94.1	5.9	0	0

The combined percentage of students with limited English proficiency from the total school population was reported under 50%, with 96 (94.1%) principals responding in the 0-25% category, and 6 (5.9%) principals responding in the 26-49% category.

Table 7

Children in Poverty as a Percentage of Total School Population

	0-25%	26-49%	50-74%	75-100%
Frequency	41	37	17	7
%	40.2	36.3	16.7	6.9

Children in poverty in the 0-25% category was reported by 41 (40.2%) principals, the 26-49% category was reported by 37 (36.3%) principals, the 50-74% category was reported

by 17 (16.7%) principals, and the 75-100% category was reported by 7 (6.9%) principals.

Table 8

Title 1 Status of Funding

	Schoolwide			
	Title 1 Funding	Title 1 Funding	No Title 1 Funding	No Response
Frequency	17	34	48	3
%	16.7	33.3	47.1	2.9

Almost half (47.1%) of the principals responded that they received no Title 1 funding at all, with 17 (16.7%) principals reporting that they receive Schoolwide Title 1 funding, and 34 (33.3%) principals responded that they received Title 1 funding. Three (2.9%) principals did not respond to this survey item.

Table 9

School's Current Accreditation Status

	Accredited			
	Fully Accredited	With Warning	Accreditation Denied	Conditionally Accredited
Frequency	88	10	2	2
%	86.3	9.8	2.0	2.0

The majority of schools were fully accredited, 10 (9.8%) schools accredited with warning, and two (2.0%) conditionally accredited. Two (2.0%) schools were denied accreditation.

Principal Desirability Rating

The survey consisted of 20 statements seeking principal perceptions about desirability for specific professional development training. These statements were referred to as "Statements of Desirability." The 20 "Statements of Desirability" are as follows:

1. Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness
2. Implementing research-based curricula
3. Ensuring that my teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods
4. Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college
5. Preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my school's effectiveness increases
6. Juggling the demands of running a school in a sea of rising expectations, complex student needs, enhanced accountability, expanding diversity, record enrollments and staff shortfalls
7. Raising the achievement levels of minority students
8. Raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty

9. Raising the achievement levels of new English learners (ESL)
10. Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities
11. Understanding data-driven decision making
12. Guiding my learning community through the changes in attitude and behavior that high stakes accountability environment demands
13. Designing curriculum that meets the learning needs of all students and is aligned with state and local standards
14. Knowing what constitutes good instructional practice
15. Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice
16. Understanding the foundations of effective special education
17. Understanding and analyzing data in order to align assessment, standards, curriculum, and instruction
18. Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data
19. Engaging the school community in my school reform efforts
20. Visualizing the future of my specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of my community

Research Question 1

The first research question asked principals to assess their desirability for professional development as it relates to meeting high stakes accountability.

Specifically, the statement read, "The following indicates my level of desirability for professional development training as it relates to: each of the 20 "Statements of Desirability." A Likert scale was provided, with a range from "Strong" (1) "Moderate" (2) "Little" (3) and "None" (4). Surveys which were returned with blank data were included in the "No Response" category. (See Appendix H)

The principals assessed their overall desirability for professional development training in the twenty categories to be high to moderate. To further summarize the data, the number of principals with "strong desirability" (response 1) and "no desirability" (response 4) were again aggregated and compared. (See Appendix I)

The data suggest desirability for principal professional development training. It should be noted that there were only six statements of desirability in which one or more principals noted they had "No Desirability." Those statements were (1) redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness, (2) providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college, (3) preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my school's effectiveness increases, (4) raising the achievement levels of minority students, (5) raising the achievement levels of students

living in poverty, and (6) raising the achievement levels of new English learners (ESL).

Using the mean of each of the 20 Statements of Desirability, these were ranked-ordered from the lowest mean (greatest level of desirability) to the highest mean (lowest level of desirability). The rank-ordered mean for each of these 28 "Statements of Desirability" was also calculated and reported in Table 10.

Table 10

Rank-Ordered Statements by Level of Desirability Means

Rank Order	Statement Number	Statement	Mean
1	3	Ensuring that my teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods	1.26
2	10	Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities	1.30
3	8	Raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty	1.32
4	15	Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice	1.37
5	2	Implementing research-based curricula	1.47
6	14	Knowing what constitutes good instructional practice	1.48
	16	Understanding the foundations of effective special education	1.48
7	4	Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college	1.51
8	13	Designing curriculum that meets the learning needs of all students and is aligned with state and local standards	1.58
9	7	Raising the achievement levels of minority students	1.59
10	17	Understanding and analyzing data in order to align assessment, standards, curriculum, and instruction	1.63
11	12	Guiding my learning community through the changes and attitude and behavior that high stakes accountability environment demands	1.64
12	11	Understanding data-driven decision making	1.71
13	18	Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data	1.73
14	6	Juggling the demands of running a school in a sea of rising expectations, complex student needs, enhanced accountability, expanding diversity, record enrollment, and staff shortfalls	1.75
15	19	Engaging the school community in my school reform efforts	1.79
16	9	Raising the achievement levels of new English learners	1.87
17	20	Visualizing the future of my specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of my community	1.90
18	1	Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness	2.10
19	5	Preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my school's effectiveness increases	2.31

Those statements with the highest desirability (lowest mean) for professional development training included areas of ensuring teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods and raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities and students living in poverty. Those statements with the lowest desirability (highest

mean) for professional development training included visualizing the future needs of the school's learning community, redesigning the school in order to increase the school's effectiveness, and preparing for sudden increases in student population.

It should be noted that some means were so similar that there may be limited practical differences between them. To further differentiate, a Test of Relative Importance (Table 11) was calculated based on desirability statement means, using a one-sample t-test. The Test of Relative Importance used the rank-ordered desirability statements to find statements of the same level of importance relative to each other.

Table 11

Test of Relative Importance

Rank Order	Statement Number	Statement	Mean
Cluster of Relative Importance #1			
1	3	Ensuring that my teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods	1.26
2	10	Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities	1.30
3	8	Raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty	1.32
Cluster of Relative Importance #2			
4	15	Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice	1.37
5	2	Implementing research-based curricula	1.47
6	14	Knowing what constitutes good instructional practice	1.48
	16	Understanding the foundations of effective special education	1.48
Cluster of Relative Importance #3			
7	4	Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college	1.51
8	13	Designing curriculum that meets the learning needs of all students and is aligned with state and local standards	1.58
9	7	Raising the achievement levels of minority students	1.59
10	17	Understanding and analyzing data in order to align assessment, standards, curriculum, and instruction.	1.63
Cluster of Relative Importance #4			
11	12	Guiding my learning community through the changes and attitude and behavior that high stakes accountability environment demands	1.64
12	11	Understanding data-driven decision making	1.71
13	18	Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data	1.73
14	6	Juggling the demands of running a school in a sea of rising expectations, complex student needs, enhanced accountability, expanding diversity, record enrollment, and staff shortfalls	1.75
Cluster of Relative Importance #5			
15	19	Engaging the school community in my school reform efforts	1.79
16	9	Raising the achievement levels of new English learners	1.87
17	20	Visualizing the future of my specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of my community	1.90
Cluster of Relative Importance #6			
18	1	Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness	2.10
19	5	Preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my school's effectiveness increases	2.31

Research Question 2

Research Question 2 asked, "Are differences in principal's desirability concerning professional development related to the following differences: Experience level of the principal, level of school (elementary, middle or high school), the percentage of minority children, the percentage of children with disabilities, the percentage of children with limited English proficiency, the percentage of children in poverty within the school's population, the school's current Title 1 status, and the school's current AYP accreditation.

In order to answer this research question, the following eight sub-questions answered:

Research Question 2.1

Sub-question 2.1: Are differences in principal's desirability concerning professional development related to the school level of the principal.

In order to answer this question, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized. When differences among school levels were determined to be statistically significant, the post-hoc Scheffe test was utilized to determine differences between the subgroups. For the purpose of this study, the principals' experience level was

divided into three levels: Level 1-Elementary, Level 2-Middle School and Level 3-High School. The results are summarized in Table 12.

Table 12

Differences in Principal Perceptions by School Level (Elementary, Middle and High)

			N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F- value	Sig
1	Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness	Elementary	52	1.94	.938	4.491	.014*
		Middle	25	1.96	.790		
		High	25	2.56	.870		
4	Providing core reading knowledge to elementary teachers who did not get this training in college	Elementary	52	1.42	.605	3.244	.043*
		Middle	25	1.40	.500		
		High	25	1.80	.866		
5	Preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my school's effectiveness increases	Elementary	52	2.13	.841	4.358	.015*
		Middle	25	2.28	.843		
		High	25	2.72	.737		
10	Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities	Elementary	52	1.42	.499	4.196	.018*
		Middle	25	1.12	.332		
		High	25	1.24	.436		
11	Understanding data-driven decision making	Elementary	52	1.73	.660	3.154	.047*
		Middle	25	1.44	.651		
		High	25	1.92	.759		
		Middle	25	1.32	.557		
		High	25	1.40	.500		
20	Visualizing the future of my specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of my community	Elementary	52	1.96	.791	4.193	.018*
		Middle	25	1.56	.583		
		High	25	2.12	.666		

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of ≤ 0.05

As observed in Table 12, the analysis of variance revealed six factors statistically significant as a function of school level. Those factors are as follows:

- 1 - Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness,
- 4 - Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college,
- 5 - Preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my school's effectiveness increases,
- 10 - Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities,
- 11 - Understanding data-driven decision making, and
- 20 - Visualizing the future of my specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of my community.

In order to determine where differences occurred between groups, a post-hoc Scheffe test was utilized. The data are presented in Table 13.

Table 13

Post-Hoc Differences in Principal's Perceptions by School Level

Statement		Comparisons by School Level		Mean Difference	Sig
1	Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness	Elementary	Middle	-.018	.997
			High	-.618(*)	.020*
		Middle	Elementary	.018	.997
			High	-.600	.062
		High	Elementary	.618(*)	.020*
			Middle	.600	.062
5	Preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my school's effectiveness increases	Elementary	Middle	-.145	.766
			High	-.585(*)	.016*
		Middle	Elementary	.145	.766
			High	-.440	.169
		High	Elementary	.585(*)	.016*
			Middle	.440	.169
10	Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities	Elementary	Middle	.303(*)	.024*
			High	.183	.249
		Middle	Elementary	-.303(*)	.024*
			High	-.120	.640
		High	Elementary	-.183	.249
			Middle	.120	.640
11	Understanding data-driven decision making	Elementary	Middle	.291	.222
			High	-.189	.526
		Middle	Elementary	-.291	.222
			High	-.480	.050*
		High	Elementary	.189	.526
			Middle	.480	.050*
20	Visualizing the future of my specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of my community	Elementary	Middle	.402	.075
			High	-.158	.662
		Middle	Elementary	-.402	.075
			High	-.560(*)	.025*
		High	Elementary	.158	.662
			Middle	.560(*)	.025*

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of $\leq .05$

As revealed in Table 13, differences were found among the desirability levels:

1 - Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness were attributed to differences between principals at the elementary and high school levels. This was significant at the $p = .020$ level. Principals at the elementary level indicated a stronger desirability for professional development training in this area than did principals at the high school level. There was no significance between elementary and middle school levels or middle and high school levels.

4 - Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college. Post-hoc testing showed no statistically significance.

5 - Preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my school's effectiveness increases. Differences were found between elementary and middle school levels with a significance found at the $p = .016$ level. Principals at the elementary school level indicated stronger desirability for professional development training in this area than at the high school level. There was no significant difference between elementary and middle or middle and high school level principals.

10 - Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities. Differences were found between elementary and middle school levels with a significance found at the $p = .024$ level. Principals at the middle school level indicated stronger desirability for professional development training in this area than at the elementary school level. There was no significant difference between elementary and high or middle and high school level principals.

11 - Understanding data-driven decision making. Differences were found between middle and high school levels with a significance found at the $p = .50$ level. Principals at the middle school level indicated stronger desirability for professional development training in this area than at the high school level. There was no significant difference between elementary and middle or elementary and high school level principals.

20 - Visualizing the future of my specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of my community found differences between middle and high school levels with a significance found at the $p = .025$ level. Principals at the middle school level indicated stronger desirability for professional development training in this area than at the high school level. There was no

significant difference between elementary and middle or middle and high school level principals.

Research Question 2.2

Sub-question 2.2: Are differences in a principal's desirability concerning professional development related to the level of experience as a principal?

In order to answer this question, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized. When differences among school levels were determined to be statistically significant, the post-hoc Scheffe test was utilized to determine differences between the subgroups. For the purpose of this study, principals' experience level was divided into four levels: Level 1 = 1-5 years, Level 2 = 6-10 years, Level 3 = 11-20 years, and Level 4 = 20+ years.

Table 14

Differences in Principal Perceptions by Experience Level
(1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-20 years, and 20+ years)

	Years	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F- value	Sig
4 Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college	1-5	54	1.67	.727	3.520	.018*
	6-10	26	1.50	.583		
	11-20	17	1.12	.485		
	20+	5	1.20	.447		
7 Raising the achievement levels of minority students	1-5	54	1.78	.904	2.785	.045*
	6-10	26	1.46	.706		
	11-20	17	1.18	.529		
	20+	5	1.60	.548		
10 Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities	1-5	54	1.41	.496	3.694	.014*
	6-10	26	1.15	.368		
	11-20	17	1.12	.332		
	20+	5	1.60	.548		
15 Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice	1-5	54	1.31	.469	4.278	.007*
	6-10	26	1.50	.648		
	11-20	17	1.18	.393		
	20+	5	2.00	.000		
19 Engaging the school community in my school reform efforts	1-5	54	1.76	.699	4.829	.004*
	6-10	26	1.96	.720		
	11-20	17	1.41	.507		
	20+	5	2.60	.548		

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of ≤ 0.05

As indicated in Table 14, the analysis of variance revealed five factors statistically significant as a function of school level. Those factors were,

- 4 - Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college,
- 7 - Raising the achievement level of students of minority,
- 10 - Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities,
- 15 - Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice, and
- 19 - Engaging the school community in my school reform efforts.

In order to determine where differences occurred between groups, a post-hoc Scheffe test was utilized. The data are presented in Table 15.

Table 15
Post-Hoc Differences in Principal's Perceptions by
Experience Level

		Comparisons by Years of Experience		Mean Difference	Sig
4	Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college	1-5	6-10	.167	.762
			11-20	.549(*)	.030*
			20+	.467	.501
		6-10	1-5	-.167	.762
			11-20	.382	.316
			20+	.300	.825
		11-20	1-5	-.549(*)	.030*
			6-10	-.382	.316
			20+	-.082	.996
		20+	1-5	-.467	.501
			6-10	-.300	.825
			11-20	.082	.996
15	Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice	1-5	6-10	-.185	.498
			11-20	.138	.805
			20+	-.685(*)	.041*
		6-10	1-5	.185	.498
			11-20	.324	.239
			20+	-.500	.250
		11-20	1-5	-.138	.805
			6-10	-.324	.239
			20+	-.824(*)	.019*
		20+	1-5	.685(*)	.041*
			6-10	.500	.250
			11-20	.824(*)	.019*
19	Engaging the school community in my school reform efforts	1-5	6-10	-.202	.662
			11-20	.347	.331
			20+	-.841	.073
		6-10	1-5	.202	.662
			11-20	.550	.082
			20+	-.638	.291
		11-20	1-5	-.347	.331
			6-10	-.550	.082
			20+	-1.188(*)	.009*
		20+	1-5	.841	.073
			6-10	.638	.291
			11-20	1.188(*)	.009*

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of ≤ 0.05

As presented in Table 15, differences were found among the desirability levels:

4 - Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college were attributed to differences between principals with 1-5 years of experience and principals with 11-20 years of experience. This was significant at the .030 confidence level. Principals with 11-20 years of experience indicated a stronger desirability for professional development training in this area than did principals with 1-5 years of experience. There was no significance between the other levels of experience in principals.

7 - Raising the achievement levels of minority students
Post hoc testing showed no statistical significance.

10 - Raising the achievement level of students with disabilities. Post-hoc testing showed no statistical significance.

11 - Understanding data driven decision making
Post-hoc testing showed no statistical significance.

15 - Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice
Differences were found between principals with 1-5 years of experience and principals with 20+ years or experience.

This was significant at the .041 confidence level.

Principals with 1-5 years of experience indicated stronger desirability for professional development training in this area than did those principals with 20+ years of experience. Differences were also statistically significant between principals with 11-20 years of experience and principals with 20+ years of experience.

This was significant at the .019 confidence level. Again, there was a stronger desirability indicated from principals with 11-20 years of experience than those principals with 20+ years of experience. There was no statistical significance between the other levels of experience in principals.

19 - Engaging the public in my school reform efforts.

Differences were attributed to principals with 11-20 years of experience and principals with 20+ years or experience. This was significance at the .009 confidence level.

Principals with 11-20 years of experience indicated stronger desirability for professional development training in this area than did those principals with 20+ years of experience. There was no statistical significance between the other levels of experience in principals.

Research Question 2.3

Sub-question 2.3 is stated: Are differences in a principal's desirability concerning professional development related to the percentage of minority children from the student population?

In order to answer this question, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized. When differences among school levels were determined to be statistically significant, the post-hoc Scheffe test was utilized to determine differences between the subgroups. For the purpose of this study, school population levels were divided into four levels: Level 1 = 0-25%, Level 2 = 26-49% years, Level 3 = 50-74% years, and Level 4 = 75-100%.

Table 16

Differences in a Principal's Perceptions by Percentage of Minority Children from Total School's Population (0-25%, 26-49%, 50-74%, and 75-100%)

		% Population	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F- value	Sig
7	Raising the achievement levels of minority students	0-25	75	1.73	.859	3.440	.020*
		26-49	19	1.26	.562		
		50-74	7	1.00	.000		
10	Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities	0-25	75	1.36	.483	2.708	.049*
		26-49	19	1.11	.315		
		50-74	7	1.14	.378		

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of ≤ 0.05

Post-hoc tests were performed for raising minority and raising disability because at least one group had too few cases.

Research Question 2.4

Sub-question 2.4: Are differences in a principal's desirability concerning professional development related to the percentage of children with IEPs from the student population?

In order to answer this question, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized. When differences among school levels were determined to be statistically significant, the post-hoc Scheffe test was utilized to

determine differences between the sub-groups. For the purpose of this study, school IEP levels were divided into four levels: Level 1 = 0-25% population, Level 2 = 26-49% population, Level 3 = 50-74% population, and Level 4 = 75-100% population.

Table 17

Differences in Principal Perceptions by Percent of Children with IEPs from Total School's Population (0-25%, 26-49%, 50-74%, and 75-100%)

		% Population	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F- value	Sig
11	Understanding data-driven decision making	0-25	91	1.74	.697	2.897	.039*
		26-49	6	1.50	.548		
		50-74	4	1.00	.000		

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of ≤ 0.05

As observed in Table 17, the analysis of variance revealed only one statement which showed statistical significance:

11 - Understanding data-driven decision making statistically significant as a function of the percent of children with IEPs from the total school population.

The Scheffe post-hoc test could not be performed because at least one group had too few cases.

Research Question 2.5

Sub-question 2.5: Are differences in a principal's desirability concerning professional development related to the percentage of children with limited English proficiency from the student population?

In order to answer this question, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized. When differences among percent of children with limited English proficiency was determined to be statistically significant, the post-hoc Scheffe test was utilized to determine differences between the sub-groups. For the purpose of this study, limited English proficiency levels were divided into four levels: Level 1 = 0-25% years, Level 2 = 26-49% years, Level 3 = 50-74% years and Level 4 = 75-100% years.

Table 18

Differences in Principal Perceptions by Percent of Children with Limited English Proficiency from Total School Population (0-25%, 26-49%, 50-74%, and 75-100%)

		% Limited English	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F- Value	Sig
3	Ensuring that my teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods	0-25	96	1.24	.453	4.513	.036*
		26-49	6	1.67	.816		

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of < 0.05

As observed in Table 18, the analysis of variance revealed the following statement:

3 - Ensuring that my teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods as being statistically significant as a function of the percentage of children with limited English from the total school population.

The Scheffe Post-hoc test could not be performed for 4 because at least one group had fewer than two cases.

Research Question 2.6

Sub-question 2.6: Are differences in a principal's desirability concerning professional development related to the percentage of poverty children from the student population?

In order to answer this question, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized. When differences among the percentage of poverty children were determined to be statistically significant, the post-hoc Scheffe test was utilized to determine differences between the sub-groups. For the purpose of this study, the percentage of poverty children levels were divided into four levels: Level 1 = 0-25%, Level 2 = 26-49%, Level 3 = 50-74% and Level 4 = 75-100%.

Table 19

Differences in Principal Perceptions by Percent of Poverty Children from Total School's Population (0-25%, 26-49%, 50-74%, and 75-100%)

		% Poverty Children	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F- value	Sig
1	Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness	0-25	41	2.17	.771	4.314	.007*
		26-49	37	2.27	.902		
		50-74	17	2.00	1.173		
		75-100	7	1.00	.000		
7	Raising the achievement levels of minority students	0-25	41	1.46	.636	7.796	.000*
		26-49	37	1.59	.896		
		50-74	17	1.35	.702		
		75-100	7	2.86	.378		
10	Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities	0-25	41	1.39	.494	6.879	.000*
		26-49	37	1.22	.417		
		50-74	17	1.06	.243		
		75-100	7	1.86	.378		

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of < 0.05

As presented in Table 19, the analysis of variance revealed four factors which were found to be statistically significant as a function of the percentage of poverty children from the total school's population. Those factors were:

1 - Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness,

- 7 - Raising the achievement levels of minority students,
- 9 - Raising the achievement levels of new English learners,
- 10 - Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities.

In order to determine where differences occurred between groups, a post-hoc Scheffe test was utilized. The data are presented in Table 20.

Table 20

Post-Hoc Differences as a Function of the Percentage of Poverty Children from the Total School's Population

		Comparisons by % Poverty Children		Mean Difference	Sig
		0-25	26-49		
1	Redesigning my school to increase my school's effectiveness			-.100	.969
			50-74	.171	.928
			75-100	1.171(*)	.017*
		26-49	0-25	.100	.969
			50-74	.270	.775
			75-100	1.270(*)	.008*
		50-74	0-25	-.171	.928
			26-49	-.270	.775
			75-100	1.000	.098
		75-100	0-25	-1.171(*)	.017*
			26-49	-1.270(*)	.008*
			50-74	-1.000	.098
7	Raising the achievement levels of minority students	0-25	26-49	-.131	.894
			50-74	.110	.966
			75-100	-1.394(*)	.000*
		26-49	0-25	.131	.894
			50-74	.242	.744
			75-100	-1.263(*)	.001*
		50-74	0-25	-.110	.966
			26-49	-.242	.744
			75-100	-1.504(*)	.000*
		75-100	0-25	1.394(*)	.000*
			26-49	1.263(*)	.001*
			50-74	1.504(*)	.000*
9	Raising the achievement levels of new English learners (ESL)	0-25	26-49	-.290	.604
			50-74	-.023	1.000
			75-100	-1.174(*)	.029*
		26-49	0-25	.290	.604
			50-74	.267	.815
			75-100	-.884	.163
		50-74	0-25	.023	1.000
			26-49	-.267	.815
			75-100	-1.151	.065
		75-100	0-25	1.174(*)	.029*
			26-49	.884	.163
			50-74	1.151	.065
10	Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities	0-25	26-49	.174	.361
			50-74	.331	.071
			75-100	-.467	.073
		26-49	0-25	-.174	.361
			50-74	.157	.664
			75-100	-.641(*)	.006*
		50-74	0-25	-.331	.071
			26-49	-.157	.664
			75-100	-.798(*)	.001*
		75-100	0-25	.467	.073
			26-49	.641(*)	.006*
			50-74	.798(*)	.001*

As revealed in Table 20, differences were found among the desirability levels,

1 - Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness. Differences were attributed to groups reporting between 0-25% poverty children and 75-100% poverty children. This was significant at the .017 confidence level. Principals from schools with 75-100% poverty children indicated a significantly stronger desirability for professional development training in 1 statement than principals with 1-25% poverty children. Additionally, differences were attributed to groups reporting between 26-49% poverty children and 75-100% poverty children. This was significant at the .008 confidence level. Principals again showed stronger desirability from schools with poverty children at the 75-100% than principals with 26-49% poverty children. There was no statistical significance between the other children poverty levels of schools.

7 - Raising the achievement levels of minority students. Differences were attributed to groups reporting between 75-100% poverty children and every other poverty children population level. Statistical significance was found between 75-100% poverty children and 0-25% poverty level at the .000 confidence level. Statistical significance was

found between 75-100% poverty children and 26-49% poverty level at the .001 confidence level. Statistical significance was found between 75-100% poverty children and 50-74% poverty level at the .000 confidence level. Consistently, principals from schools with 75-100% poverty children indicated a lower desirability for professional development training.

9 - Raising the achievement levels of new English learners. Differences were attributed to groups reporting between desirability of principals with 75-100% poverty children and 0-25% poverty children population level. Statistical significance was found at the .029 confidence level. Principals from schools with 1-25% poverty children indicated a stronger desirability for professional development to raise the achievement levels of new English learners than the other poverty population levels. There was no statistical significance between the other children poverty levels of schools.

10 - Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities. Differences were attributed to groups reporting between desirability of principals with 75-100% poverty children and 26-49% poverty children as well as 50-74% population level. Statistical significance was found at the .006 confidence level between 26-49% and 75-100%.

Statistical significance was found at the .001 confidence level between 50-74% and 75-100%. Principals from schools with 26-49% and 50-74% poverty children indicated a stronger desirability than other poverty population levels. There was no statistical significance between the other children poverty levels of schools.

Research Question 2.7

Sub-question 2.7: Are differences in a principal's desirability concerning professional development related to the school's current Title 1 Status?

In order to answer this question, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized. When differences among the percentage of children with limited English proficiency was determined to be statistically significant, the post-hoc Scheffe test was utilized to determine differences between the subgroups. For the purpose of this study, Title 1 Status levels were divided into three levels: Level 1 - Schoolwide Title 1 funding, Level 2 - Title 1 funding, Level 3 - No Title 1 funding.

Table 21

Differences in Principal Perceptions by Current Title 1 Funding Status (Schoolwide Funding, Title 1 Funding, and No Title 1 Funding)

		Title 1 Funding	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F value	Sig
7	Raising the achievement levels of minority students	Schoolwide	17	1.47	.624	2.988	.035*
		Title 1	34	1.91	.866		
		None	48	1.40	.792		
12	Guiding my learning community through the changes in attitude and behavior that high stakes accountability environment demands	Schoolwide	17	1.24	.437	5.507	.002*
		Title 1	34	1.88	.478		
		None	48	1.60	.610		
15	Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice	Schoolwide	17	1.12	.332	3.029	.033*
		Title 1	34	1.56	.504		
		None	48	1.33	.559		
17	Understanding and analyzing data in order to align assessment, standards, curriculum, and instruction	Schoolwide	17	1.29	.470	3.746	.014*
		Title 1	34	1.88	.640		
		None	48	1.56	.649		

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of <0.05

As observed in Table 21, the analysis of variance revealed four factors statistically significantly different as a function of Title 1 status. Those factors were,

- 7 - Raising the achievement levels of minority students,
- 12 - Guiding my learning community through the changes in attitude and behavior that high stakes accountability environment demands,
- 15 - Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice, 17
- 17 - Understanding and analyzing data in order to align assessment, standards, curriculum, and instruction.

In order to determine where differences occurred between groups, a post-hoc Scheffe test was utilized. The data are presented in Table 22.

Table 22

Post-Hoc Differences as a Function of the School's Current
Title 1 Funding Status

		Comparisons by Title 1 Funding		Mean Difference	Sig
7	Raising the achievement levels of minority students	Schoolwide	Title 1	-.441	.322
			None	.075	.990
		Title 1	Schoolwide	.441	.322
			None	.516(*)	.042*
		None	Schoolwide	-.075	.990
12	Guiding my learning community through the changes in attitude and behavior that high stakes accountability environment demands		Title 1	-.516(*)	.042*
		Schoolwide	Title 1		
				-.647(*)	.002*
			None	-.369	.128
		Title 1	Schoolwide	.647(*)	.002*
			None	.278	.162
		None	Schoolwide	.369	.128
			Title 1	-.278	.162

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of ≤ 0.05

As revealed in Table 22, differences were found among
the desirability levels:

7 - Raising achievement levels of minority students.

Differences were attributed to groups reporting between
desirability of principals receiving Title 1 funding and
those principals receiving no Title 1 funding. Statistical
significance was found at the .042 confidence level with
principals that receive no funding indicating a stronger
desirability for professional development training in this
area. There was no statistical significance between the
other funding levels.

12 - Guiding my learning community through the changes in attitude and behavior that high stakes accountability environment demands. Statistical significance was found at the $p = .002$ level between principals receiving Schoolwide Title funding and principals who receive only Title 1 funding. Principals from schools receiving Schoolwide Title 1 funding showed stronger desirability for professional development training than schools receiving only funding. There was no statistical significance between the other funding levels.

Research Question 2.8

Sub-question 2.8: Are differences in a principal's desirability concerning professional development related to the school's current status in meeting AYP?

In order to answer this question, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized. When differences among the percentage of children with limited English proficiency was determined to be statistically significant, the post-hoc Scheffe test was utilized to determine differences between the sub-groups. For the purpose of this study, Title 1 Status levels were divided into four levels: Level 1 - Fully Accredited, Level 2 - Accredited with Warning, Level

3 - Accreditation Denied, and Level 4 - Conditionally Accredited.

Table 23

Differences in Principal Perceptions by Current Accreditation Status

		Accreditation Status	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F value	Sig
16	Understanding the foundations of effective special education	Full	88	1.55	.585	2.917	.038*
		Warning	10	1.10	.316		
		Denied	2	1.00	.000		
		Conditional	2	1.00	.000		
20	Visualizing the future of my specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of my community	Full	88	1.98	.742	2.331	.079
		Warning	10	1.40	.516		
		Denied	2	1.50	.707		
		Conditional	2	1.50	.707		

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of ≤ 0.05

As observed in Table 23, the analysis of variance revealed the following as statistically significant:
10 - Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities.

In order to determine where differences occurred between groups, a post-hoc Scheffe test was utilized. There was no statistical significance within groups for current accreditation status. This means that differences could not be attributed to groups based on a pair-wise comparison. The relationships between the levels of the

variables is too complex to be analyzed by the Scheffe test.

Research Question 3

How do principals rank their desirability for professional development as it relates to meeting the high stakes accountability of the No Child Left Behind Act?

Table 24

Rank-ordered by principals' top ten Statements of Desirability

Rank Order	Statement Number	Statement	Mean
1	10	Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities	5.72
2	3	Ensuring that my teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods	5.55
3	8	Raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty	4.86
4	7	Raising the achievement levels of minority students	4.06
5	14	Knowing what constitutes good instructional practice	3.36
6	15	Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice	3.35
7	2	Implementing research-based curricula	2.87
8	4	Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college	2.77
	16	Understanding the foundations of effective special education	2.77
9	13	Designing curriculum that meets the learning needs of all students and is aligned with state and local standards	2.67
10	11	Understanding data-driven decision making	2.51

Using the mean of each of the 20 desirability statements, they were rank-ordered from the highest mean desirability preference to lowest mean desirability preference. Those

statements rated with the highest desirability fell into the principal desirability to raise the achievement scores of students with disabilities and students living in poverty, as well as ensuring that teachers are trained in research-based curriculum.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to present a summary of both the study and its conclusions. These conclusions include perceptions by Virginia principals regarding their desirability for professional development training as it relates to meeting accountability standards. Through this research, the data advances the theoretical and practical knowledge about current professional development for principals. These professional development preferences and needs are especially important because Virginia principals are held accountable, through the Virginia Standards of Learning testing, for student performance. This chapter reviews the rationale and purpose of this study, the research findings and discussion of the results of the study. This chapter concludes with both recommendations for action and for further study.

Today, expectations for principals extend well beyond master scheduling and making sure that buses run on time. Principals are expected to "understand effective instructional strategies, regularly observe and coach classroom teachers, and be able to analyze student achievement data to make more effective instructional decisions" (Anthes, 2002, p. 3). In this era of accountability, there is more pressure than ever that public educators increase student achievement for every student. Principals are held accountable for ensuring that all groups of students-economically disadvantage, racial or ethnic minorities, students with disabilities and English language learners-make state-defined "annual yearly progress" targets (Anthes, 2002). However, according to Thune (1997), principals are being forced to operate educational programs under a growing number of federal and state mandates with limited knowledge and available resources.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of Virginia principals regarding their desirability for professional development as it relates to the high stakes accountability.

Primary Research Questions

This research study surveyed principals in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Principals were asked to rate their desirability levels (strong, moderate, little and none) for professional development training as it related to 20 Statements of Desirability. Each Statement of Desirability was supported by the literature review. Additionally, principals were asked to rank in order from one (strongest desirability) to ten (weakest desirability) their top ten levels of desirability for professional development training.

The study asked three primary research questions:

1. How do principals rate their desirability for professional development as it relates to meeting the high stakes accountability of the No Child Left Behind Act?
2. Are differences in a principal's desirability of professional development related to differences in experience level of the principal, school level (elementary, middle or high school), the percentage of minority children, the percentage of children with disabilities, the percentage of children with limited English proficiency, the percentage of

children in poverty within the school's population, the school's current Title 1 funding status and the school's current AYP accreditation.

3. How do principals rank their desirability for professional development as it relates to meeting the high stakes accountability of the No Child Left Behind Act?

A review of the literature revealed that in an era of accountability, school administrators are facing their toughest challenge. Schools that are unable to meet the state-defined "annual yearly progress" targets are required to offer families other school choices, give additional support services to low-income families, replace school staff, decrease management authority at the school level, implement new curricula or change the school's governance structure (Anthes, 2002). Principals are being held accountable for the performance of their schools, yet current systems in public education typically fail to provide them with appropriate tools to manage effectively (Hershberg, Simon & Kruger, 2004). This possible lack of professional development opportunities hinders principals from remaining current with both state and federal mandates.

Research Design and Methods

A survey (See Appendix F) was developed, based upon 20 desirability statements as supported by research for principal professional development training. Surveys were sent to 67 school divisions, specifically 100 elementary schools, 34 middle schools and 34 high schools within the Commonwealth of Virginia. The surveys were mailed to the principal at each school, as names were available from the Department of Education database. In addition to professional development preferences, principals were asked for demographic and descriptive data. Each desirability statement in Section B on the survey (See Appendix F) solicited further open-ended input.

Mailings included the initial survey and a follow-up reminder post card. A total of 168 surveys were mailed; 102 surveys (60.7%) were returned. In order that credible generalizations could be made, Dillman (2000) emphasizes that a reasonable return rate of 62.2% is essential. The return rate for this study suggests that principals are interested in receiving professional development training in order to better meet the demands of the No Child Left Behind Act.

Research Question 2 was divided into sub-questions based upon assessing the demographic factors to determine if such factors affected a principal's perception of their desirability for professional development. From the survey research, quantitative analysis, including frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations, and rank-order, were calculated. When comparisons were made, the use of analysis of variance were used, along with the Scheffe post-hoc test when appropriate. For all calculations, statistical significance was reported. A $p \leq 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

Findings

This study revealed important information about principals' professional development desires for training in order to better meet the No Child Left Behind Act.

These findings include,

1. The principals' mean assessment of their desirability in each of the 20 desirability statements was greater than Level 3 - Little Desirability and Level 4 - No Desirability. The highest mean desirability was in 3 (Ensuring that my teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods), and the lowest mean was

in 5 (Preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my school's effectiveness increases).

(See Table 10)

2. Principals rated their desirability for training in raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities) as either Level 1 - Strong Desirability, or Level 2 - Moderate Desirability. This is the only statement of desirability which did not receive any Level 3 - Little Desirability or Level 4 - No Desirability responses. (See Table 10)
3. Principals rated only six statements of desirability in which there was Level 4 - No Desirability indicated. Principals indicated no desirability to receive professional development training in the following areas: (See Table 10)
 - a. 1 - Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness
 - b. 4 - Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college
 - c. 5 - Preparing for sudden increases in my Student population as my school's effectiveness increases
 - d. 7 - Raising the achievement levels of minority

Students

e. 8 - Raising the achievement levels of students
living in poverty

f. 9 - Raising the achievement levels of new
English learners (ESL)

4. Statistical differences were found in principals' perceptions relative to school level. Principals at the elementary level indicated a stronger desirability for professional development training in the areas of 1 - Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness, and 5 - Preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my schools effectiveness increases. Principals at the middle school level indicated a stronger desirability for professional development training in the areas of 10 - Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities, 11 - Understanding data-driven decision making, and 20 - Visualizing the future of my specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of my community. (See Table 12)

5. Statistical differences were found in principals' perceptions relative to experience level. Principals with 11-20 years of experience indicated a stronger desirability than principals with 1-5 years of

experience for professional development training in #4 - Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college. However, principals with 1-5 years of experience indicated stronger desirability for professional development training in #15 - Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice, than did those principals with 20+ years of experience. Additionally, there was stronger desirability indicated from principals with 11-20 years of experience than from those principals with 20+ years of experience. In regard to #19 - Engaging the public in my school reform efforts, differences were attributed between principals with 11-20 years of experience and principals with 20+ years of experience. Principals with 11-20 years of experience indicated a stronger desirability for professional development training in this area than did those principals with 20+ years of experience. (See Table 14)

6. Statistical differences were found in principals' perceptions relative to the percentage of poverty children from school's total population. Principals from schools reporting 75-100% poverty children

indicated a stronger desirability for professional development training in #1 - Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness, and #9 - Raising the achievement levels of new English learners, than principals reporting schools with 1-25% poverty children. Principals again showed stronger desirability in #1 - Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness, from schools with poverty children at the 75-100% than principals with 26-49% poverty children. In regard to #7 - Raising the achievement levels of minority students, principals from schools with 75-100% poverty children indicated a lower desirability for professional development training than the other levels of poverty children populations. Question #10 - Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities, attributed differences in which principals from schools with 26-49% and 50-74% poverty children indicated a stronger desirability for training than other levels. (See Table 19)

7. Statistical differences were found in principals' perceptions relative to current Title 1 status. Principals from schools receiving Title 1 funding indicated a stronger desirability for professional

development training in #7 - Raising the achievement levels of minority students, than those principals receiving no Title 1 funding. Additionally, principals receiving Schoolwide Title 1 funding showed a stronger desirability than those principals receiving only Title 1 funding in #12 - Guiding my learning community through the changes in attitude and behavior that high stakes accountability environment demands. (See Table 21)

8. No statistical differences were found when desirability preferences were correlated with the following:
 - a. Percentage of minority children from school's total student population (See Table 16)
 - b. Percentage of children with IEPs from school's total student population (See Table 17)
 - c. Percentage of children with limited English proficiency from your school's total student population (See Table 18)
 - d. Current status in meeting accreditation (See Table 23)
9. Teachers ranked their top ten preferences for professional development with the three highest preferences being 10 - Raising the achievement levels

of students with disabilities, 3 - Ensuring that my teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods, and 8 - Raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty. (See Table 24)

Discussion of Major Findings

Virginia principals are held accountable for their school's level of student achievement. In order to remain current with state and federal legislation, principals must receive professional development which meets their needs as leaders.

Professional Development Preferences

In 14 of the 20 statements of desirability, principals indicated some level of desirability toward professional development training. (See Table 10) Overall, the principals clearly assessed their overall desirability for professional development training to be moderate to high. (See Table 10)

The three statements in which principals had the greatest desire for training both in Section A rating of desirability and Section C ranking of desirability were: #3 - Ensuring that my teachers are trained in research-

based instructional methods, #10 - Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities, and #8 - Raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty. The fact that these three categories matched in both rating of desirability and ranking of desirability for professional development clearly shows that these three topics are essential components in any principal professional development program.

It is not surprising that principals desire more professional development in such categories. The growing focus on testing requires that principals have teachers within their building who are trained in research-based instructional methods. The NCLB Act recognizes the use of proven, research-based instructional methods as one factor which makes a difference in providing children with a quality education (U.S. Department of Education, 2007). "Teachers must be equipped with the most current, research-based instructional tools to help them do their job" (U.S. Department of Education, 2007). A primary focus of this law is the requirement that school districts and individual schools use effective research-based remediation programs (Wright & Wright, 2007). This is consistent with the current accountability demands that in this study, 77% of Virginia principals responded with a strong desirability

for professional development to ensure that teachers are trained in research-based curricula. Consequently, Virginia school leaders who hire inadequately prepared teachers must be ready to provide in-service professional development targeted for specific research-based curricula, instructional methods and programs.

The Institute for Educational Leadership (2000) includes principals working with teachers to strengthen their teaching skills as being crucial in the role principals can play in improving teaching and learning. It is important that principals understand the instructional programs of their school division well enough to effectively guide teachers. Awareness of the school and teacher practices that impact student achievement is critical, but without effective leadership, there is less of a possibility that schools and districts will address these variables in a coherent and meaningful way (Miller, 2003).

Raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty is notably an area of strong desirability for professional development for Virginia principals in this study. According to Secretary Margaret Spellings of the U.S. Department of Education (2007), "We must reward teachers and principals who make the greatest progress in

improving student performance and closing the achievement gap. This is especially important in high-poverty schools, where students are less likely to be taught by a credentialed teacher" (p. 8). In this study, principals responded with the same type of desirability for increasing student performance for children in poverty as Secretary Margaret Spellings. Gerstl-Pepin (2006) states, "An equal society begins with equally excellent schools, but we know our schools today are not equal" (p. 143). Poverty is considered to be an important factor in school failure (Rothstein, 2004). Principals in this survey ranked-order raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty as the third highest professional development priority. Additionally, 78% of Virginia principals in my survey noted a strong desirability for professional development in raising achievement levels of students living in poverty, which supports the assertion that principals understand the significance of this NCLB subgroup of students. It is important that the principal investigate how economic inequities might be hindering student success and shaping their student's lives (Gerstl-Pepin, 2006). Therefore, professional development workshops on the culture of poverty must be provided to assist principals in increasing student success in spite of

such economic imbalance. As one teacher noted after participating in workshops on poverty, "It helped me realize that our school was operating through a middle-class lens and that our kids didn't necessarily recognize that lens" (Gerstl-Pepin, 2006, p.151).

Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities was noted by 71% of Virginia principals in this study as being an area of importance for professional development. Additionally, raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities was rank-ordered by Virginia principals as having their highest level of desirability for professional development. Such findings from the survey are consistent with the fact that "across the country, students with disabilities have made progress on state assessment, however, many schools are not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) because of the overall academic performance of the special education subgroup measured against the set standard established by each state for all of its students" (Cole, 2006, p.1).

While the expectation of any building level principal is that the building leader must be ready to face the daily challenges specific to special education programming, it is less expected that the principal receive ongoing training and preparation in special education and knowledge in order

to meet this requirement. Thus, there is a basic lack of training which predicates a lack of continued professional development in this area.

Thune (1997) states that it is critical for a school system to employ principals who have a basic knowledge and understanding of special education in order to meet the federal and state audits for special education. McLaughlin and Nolet (2004) offer the following:

A building principal, who is a school leader, is critical to creating effective special education services. In today's climate of high standards and high stakes accountability, every school principal needs to understand the foundations of effective special education. Principals need to know about special education because they are responsible for ensuring that students with disabilities perform well on assessments. More important, when special education is working, when parents and families feel confident about their child's education, it is because a strong, supportive, and informed building principal has created a school that values educating every child.

Since current mandates assure that the programs and services for children with disabilities are in absolute compliance with the law, it is essential that the building principals be knowledgeable and prepared to supervise the array of special education services within their school and to make decisions regarding best practices. Students with disabilities now have access to the same curriculum and high standards as all students. With such access comes the

responsibility by principals to ensure that students with disabilities continue to experience an increase in student achievement levels.

While principals suggested strong desirability for professional development in the above noted areas, it is just as interesting to view desirability statements that principals least desired. When principals were asked to rank 20 desirability statements, principals rated visualizing the future of their specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of their community, redesigning their school in order to increase their school's effectiveness, and preparing for sudden increases in student population as their school's effectiveness increases as having the least desirability for professional development. As all three statements speak to professional learning communities, it is noteworthy that principals ranked these as having little desirability. Interestingly, DuFour (2001) contends that while educators are not typically against creating a professional learning community, it may be that they just don't know where to begin given all the demands on them. He contends that to create a professional learning community, it is essential to focus on learning rather than teaching (2004), yet this is in direct conflict with NCLB which places its thrust of

impact on ensuring that teachers meet "highly qualified" standards in the content areas they are assigned to teach. Teachers are responsible for the gains made by their students and must focus their efforts on perfecting their teaching skills. Professional learning communities require that every professional within the school must work with their colleagues to ensure that students learn, to achieve a culture of collaboration, and to judge their effectiveness on the basis of student achievement results (DuFour, 2004). There is solid research to support that the concepts found within professional learning communities should drive school districts today (DuFour, 2003). Professional learning communities have been shown to have positive influence on student achievement (Dufour, 2001). The results from this study support further investigation as to why principals noted such non-desirability for professional development in this area.

Professional Development Differences

Professional desirability differences were found among principals based on their experience level. Overall, principals with 11-20 years of experience demonstrated a stronger desire for professional development than less veteran principals or principals having 20+ years of

experience. Interestingly enough, research often tends to focus on the novice principal rather than the veteran principal as needing professional development. In fact, research often supports a more veteran principal, such as those principals having 11-20 years of building experience, serving as mentor principals and offering to mold prospective principals (Fleck, 2008). However, consistent with these findings, current accountability demands make it challenging to succeed and sustain longevity as a principal (Fleck, 2008), and principals beyond the beginner principal still demonstrate a desirability for professional development. Hence, every Virginia school district should remain committed to continued professional growth opportunities for principals at all experience levels.

Professional desirability differences were found by principals based on their percentage of poverty children within their total school population. Principals reporting groups of 75-100% poverty children reflected a stronger desirability for professional development in order to redesign their school to increase their school's effectiveness, raising the achievement levels of students with English as second language, and raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities. This supports the assertion made by Brooks (2004) that economic

factors are critical to understanding achievement inequalities. Although the public system alone is often held responsible for achievement gaps between children living in poverty and children from affluent families (Gerstl-Pepin, 2006), these findings support that principals are looking at "the bigger picture" to acknowledge this group of children and focus on professional development that will support them in closing such achievement gaps. School districts should focus on professional development for principals which will enhance understanding of economic inequities and their impact to student achievement.

Professional desirability differences were found between principals receiving Title 1 funding and those principals either receiving Schoolwide Title 1 funding or not receiving Title 1 funding at all. Title 1 funding concerns influence principal desirability for professional development as funding is a significant issue when addressing local responsibility under NCLB the ever increasing demands placed on schools under this legislation. A 2006 report from the Center on Education Policy (American Teacher, 2006) warned that for schools struggling to meet higher AYP targets, "funds provided by NCLB to help...are often simply not there" (p. 6). In order

for principals to be able to meet ongoing and increasing accountability demands, Congress must look at funding bills which will stabilize the underfunding and cuts in funding of Title 1 funds.

Implications for Practice

Even though desirability statements were rank-ordered based on their mean, a comparison of the means was conducted to determine clusters of relative importance. Six clusters were identified, and should provide practical significance when leaders consider implementing desirability preferences into professional development practices. Practically speaking, when considering professional development, the first three desirability statements were found to have equal importance. Hence, principals' greatest levels of desirability reveal that professional development should focus on the following cluster of professional topics, rather than just the highest rank-ordered statement of desirability: Ensuring that teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods, raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities, and students living on poverty.

This has implications for school divisions and professional organizations when determining funding for

professional development workshops. Practically speaking, rather than funding professional development for one single area of desirability, it is equally important to offer funding to include the highest ranked cluster of principal desirability for professional development.

Recommendations for Action

This study supports the following actions:

1. Whenever possible, teachers should be trained in research-based instructional methods.
2. Professional development workshops on poverty must be provided to assist principals in increasing student success in spite of economic imbalance.
3. Educational leaders within the Commonwealth of Virginia should examine current research-based instructional methods content taught at the college level to determine if college course requirements should increase or incorporate a stronger emphasis specific to research-based instructional methods.
4. Educational leaders within the Commonwealth of Virginia should ensure that professional

development training programs for principals are designed and available which focus on raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities and minority students. Educational leaders need to provide programs which provide the desired content.

Recommendations for Further Study

The findings of this study suggest the following recommendations be considered for further study:

1. Do differences in principals' desirability for professional development training exist based on the school's level of funding received for professional development training?
2. Do differences in principals' desirability for professional development training exist based on the professional development training principals receive within their district?
3. Do differences in principals' desirability for professional development training exist based on the support principals' perceive they receive from Central Office Administration?

4. Do differences in principals' desirability for professional development training exist based on the principal's demographic location (e.g. urban, suburban, rural)?
5. Do differences in principals' desirability for professional development training exist based on their current AYP status?
6. Does the principals' previous training, experiences or level of education influence their desirability for professional development training?
7. What other factors might principals suggest as having a strong influence on student academic achievement?
8. What other factors might principals suggest to having a strong desirability for professional development training?
9. Why do statistically significant differences in principals' desirability exist as related to their school level, years of experience, percentage of poverty children in total school population, and current Title 1 status?
10. What factors might explain areas of "0" desirability?
11. What factors might explain the low desirability rating for professional development focused on building professional learning communities?

Chapter 5 summarized findings, discussed major findings and offered recommendations for further studies.

References

- Albrecht, S.E., & Joles, C. (2003). Accountability and access to opportunity: mutually exclusive tenets under a high-stakes testing mandate. *Preventing School Failure*, 47(2), 86-91.
- Alexander, K. (2003). *The law of schools, students and teachers in a nutshell* (3rd ed.). St Paul, MN: West Publishing Co.
- Allington, R.L., & McGill-Franzen, A. (1995). Individualized planning. In M.C. Wang, M.C. Reynolds, & H.J. Walberg. (Eds.), *Handbook of special and remedial education: Research and practice* (2nd ed.). Great Britain: BPC Wheatons Ltd.
- American Source (2006). *News & Trends*. American Source, 91(2), 6.
- Anthes, K. (2002). *School and district leadership. No child left behind policy brief*. (Report No. ECS-GP-02-02). Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EA031877).
- Baron, D. (2008). *Imagine: Professional development that changes practice*. *Principal Leadership*, 8(5), 56-58.
- Bateman, D., & Bateman, C.F. (2001). *A principal's guide to special education*. Arlington, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Bennett, A. (2002). Critical Issue: Guiding principals- Addressing accountability challenges. *North Central Regional Education Laboratory*. Retrieved October 8, 2005 from <http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/educatrs/leadrs hip/le600.htm>
- Bensky, J.M., Shaw, S.F., Gouse, A.S., Bates, H.L., Dixon,

- B., & Beane, W.E. Public Law 94-142 and stress; A problem for educators. *Exceptional Children*, 1980, 47, 24-29.
- Bostingl, J. (2001, January). Are the stakes too high? *Principal Leadership*, 1(5), 8-14.
- Boyer, E.L. (1983). *A report on secondary education in America*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Bruce, H.M, & Fabiano, L. (2001) *A comprehensive review of professional development in South Carolina* (Report No. SP040570). Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED464027).
- Clarke, J.B., & Gless, M.E. (2003). *Individuals with disabilities education law report, special report no. 33: A legal overview of burden of proof in special education disputes*. Horsham, PA: LRP Publications.
- Cohen, G.S. (2001, February). The school leadership challenge [Electronic Version]. *Strategies*, 8. Retrieved March 23, 2006, from <http://www.aasa.org/publications/strategies/index.htm>
- Corcoran, T.B. (1995). *Transforming professional development for teachers: A guide for state policy makers*. Washington, DC: National Governance Association.
- Council for Exception Children (1998). *IDEA 1997: Let's make it work*. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Cuban, L. (2004). Looking through the rearview mirror at school accountability. In K.A. Sirotnik (Eds.), *Holding accountability accountable: What ought to matter in public education*. (pp. 1-34). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Department of Education (March 10, 2003). *NCLB standards and assessments; Non-regulatory draft guidance*. Retrieved April 4, 2006 from <http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/nclb/standassguidance03.pdf>
- Davis, S.H. (1998). Taking aim at effective leadership.

Educational Leadership, 28(2).

- Darling-Hammond, L. (2004). From "Separate but equal" to "No child left behind": The collision of new standards and old inequalities. In Meier, D., Kohn, A., Darling-Hammond, L., Sizer, T.R., & Wood, G. (Eds). *Many children left behind* (pp. 3-32). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Dillman, D.A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method*. New York: Wiley.
- Drake, T.L., & Roe, W.H. (2003). *The principalship* (6th ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- DuFour, R.P. (1991), *The principal as staff developer*. Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service. Retrieved May 3, 2006 from www.nes.org
- Elmore, R. & Rothman, R (Eds.). (1999). *Testing, teaching, and learning: A guide for states and school districts*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Fink, E. & Resnick, L. (April 2001). *Developing principals as instructional leaders*. Phi Delta Kappan 82(8), 598.
- Fleck, F. (2008). *The balanced principal: Joining theory and practical knowledge*. *Education Digest* 73(5), 27-31.
- Gay, L.R. (1996). *Education Research: Competencies for analysis and application* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Gerstl-Pepin, C.I. (2006). *The paradox of poverty narratives: Educators struggling with children left behind*. *Educational Policy* 20(1), 143-162. Retrieved March 2, 2008 from <http://epx.sagepub.com>.
- Glatthorn, A.A. (2000). *Principal as curriculum leader: Shaping what is taught and tested* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Goldring, E., & Greenfield, W. (2002). Understanding the evolving concept of leadership in education: Roles, expectation, and dilemmas. In J. Murphy, *The educational leadership challenge; Redefining*

leadership for the 21st century (pp 1-20). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Hallenbeck, B.A., & Kauffman, J.M. (1994). United States. In K. Mazurek, & M.A. Winzer (Eds.), *Comparative studies in special education*. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.

Hayes, W. (2004). *So you want to be a principal?* Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Education.

Heath, S. (2006). No child left behind act: What teachers, principals & school administrators need to know. *Wrightslaw*. Retrieved April 4, 2006 from <http://www.wrightslaw.com/info/nclb.teachers.admins.pdf>

Hertting, M. Phenis-Bourke, N. Experienced principals need mentors, too. *Principal*. 86(5). PP 36-39.

Hershberg, T., Simon, V.A., & Kruger, B.L. (2004). An assessment model that measures student growth in ways that NCLB fails to do. *The School Administrator*. Retrieved November 9, 2005 from <http://www.aasa.org/publications/saarticledetail.cfm?ItemNumber=1060>.

Hord, S.M., & Hall, G.E. (1983). *Three images: What principals do in curriculum implementation*. Austin: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Hoy, W.K. (1994). Foundations of education administration: Traditional and emerging perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30(2), 178-198.

Hudgins, H.C., & Vacca, R.S. (1995). Law and education: *Contemporary issues and court decisions* (4th ed.). Charlottesville, VA: Michie Law Publishers.

Huefner, D.S. (1994). The mainstreaming cases: Tensions and trends for school administrators. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30, 27-55.

Institute for Educational Leadership (2000, October). Leadership for student learning: Reinventing the principalship [Electronic Version]. *A Report on the*

Tack Force on the Principalship. Retrieved March 23, 2006, from www.iel.org

Jaeger, R.M. (1997). Survey research methods in education. In R.M. Jaeger (Ed.) *Methods for research in education*. (pp. 449-478). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Jennings, J. & Kober, N. (2004). Council on Educational Policy. *Talk tough, but...put the money where your mouth is*. Retrieved July 21, 2005 from <http://www,ceo-dc.org>.

Jennings, J. & Rentner, D.S., Kober, N. (2002). Council on Educational Policy. *A new federal role in education*. Retrieved July 21, 2005 from <http://www,ceo-dc.org>.

Jones, M.G., Jones, B.D., Hardin, B., Chapman, T.Y., Yarbrough, T., & Davis, M. (1999). The impact of high-stakes testing on teachers and student in North Carolina. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81(3), 199-203.

Joyce, B. (Ed.). (1990). *Changing school culture through professional development, the 1990 ASCD yearbook*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Krathwohl, D. (1998). *Methods of educational and social science research*. Long Grove, Waveland Press.

LaMorte, M.W. (2002). *School law cases and concepts* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Lashway, L. (2000), *Leading with Vision*, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, Eugene, Oregon.

Lefkowitz, L., & Miller, K. (2003). Fulfilling the promise of the standards movement. *Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning*. Retrieved April 24, 2005, from <http://www.mcrel.org/topics/productDetail.asp?productID=85>

Lewis, A. (2000). High-stakes testing: Trends and issues. *Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning*. Retrieved October 24, 2005, from

<http://www.mcrel.org/topics/productDetail.asp?productID=85>

- Lipsitz, J., Mizell, M.H., Jackson, A.W., & Austin, L.M. (1997). Speaking with one voice: A manifesto for middle-grades reform. *Phi Delta Kappan* 18, 533-540.
- Loucks-Horsley, S., Harding, C., Arbuckle, M., Murray, L., Dubea, Cl, & Williams, M. (1987). *Continuing to learn: A guidebook for teacher development*. Andover, MA; Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands/National Staff Development Council.
- Miller, K. (November, 2003). School, teacher, leadership impacts on student achievement. *Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning*. Retrieved April 24, 2006, from <http://www.mcrel.org>
- Moe, T.M. (2003). Politics, control, and the future of school accountability. In P.E. Peterson & M.R. West (Eds.), *No child left behind? The politics and practice of school accountability*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- McLaughlin, M.J., & Nolet, V. (2004). *What every principal needs to know about special education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Nelson, J.L., Palonsky, S.B., McCarthy, M.R. (2004). *Critical issues in education: Dialogue and Dialectics* (5th ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Noguera, P.A., & Brown, E. (2002, September 24). Educating the new majority. *Boston Globe*, p.21.
- Noguera, P.A. (2004). Standards for what? Accountability for whom? Rethinking standards-based reform in public education. In K.A. Sirotnik (Eds.), *Holding accountability accountable: What ought to matter in public education*. (pp. 66-81). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Norlin, J.W. *Individuals with disabilities education law report: The year in review 2001*. Horsham, PA: LRP Publications.

- Norlin, J.W. *Individuals with disabilities education law report: The year in review 2002*. Horsham, PA: LRP Publications.
- Norlin, J.W. *Individuals with disabilities education law report: The year in review 2003*. Horsham, PA: LRP Publications.
- Norlin, J.W. *Individuals with disabilities education law report: The year in review 2004*. Horsham, PA: LRP Publications.
- Obi, S.O., & Rotatori, A.F. (1999). Directions for the future: Empowering the culturally diverse exceptional learner. In F.E. Obiakor, J.O. Schwenn, & A.F. Rotatori (Eds.), *Advances in Special Education* Volume 12. (pp. 233-242). Stamford: Jai Press Inc.
- Oliva, P.F. (1984). *Supervision for today's schools* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman Inc.
- Ontario Principal's Council. (2005). *The Suick reference handbook for school leaders: A practical guide for principals*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Paige, R. (2002, June). *Key policy letters signed by the education secretary or deputy secretary*. Retrieved October 2, 2005, from <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/secletter/020614.html>
- Paige, R. (2002, September). *No child left behind: A desktop reference*. Retrieved July 19, 2005, from <http://www.ed.gov/print/admins/lead/account/nclbreferece/page.html>
- Petersen, G.J., & Young, M.D. (2004). No Child Left Behind Act and its influence on current and future district leaders. *Journal of Law & Education*, 33, 343-363.
- Podemski, R.S., Marsh, G.E., Smith, T.E.C., & Price, B.J. (1995). *Comprehensive administration of special education* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Prater, L., & Ivarie, J. (1999). Empowering culturally diverse parents in special education programs. In F.E. Obiakor, J.O. Schwenn, & A.F. Rotatori (Eds.),

Advances in Special Education Volume 12. (pp. 149-181). Stamford: Jai Press Inc.

Rothstein, L. (1995). *Special education law*. New York: Longman Publishers.

Rothstein, R. (2004). *Class and schools: Using social, economic, and educational reform to close the Black-White achievement gap*. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.

Salkind, N. (2003). *Exploring Research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Schlueter, K. & Walker, J. (2008). *Selection of school leaders: A critical component for change*. NASSP Bulletin, Volume 9, No. 1, 5-18.

Seyfarth, J.T. (1999). *The principal: New leadership for new challenges*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Sireci, S.G. (1998). *Gathering and analyzing content validity data*. Educational Assessment. 5:4, 299-321. Retrieved March 4, 2008, from <http://ejsccontent.ebsco.com/ContentServer.Net/ContentServer.aspx?target=http%3A%2F%2Fwww%2Einformaworld%2Ecom%2Fsmpp%2Fftinterface%3Fcontent%3Da784397809%26format%3Dpdf%26magic%3Debscohostejs%7C%7CAA3D3EFB68C36A3B40C78D54581474B7%26ft%3D%2Epdf>

Smith, J.D. (2004). The historical contexts of special education: Framing our understanding of contemporary issues. In Sorrells, A.M., Rieth, H.J., & Sindelar, P.T., *Critical issues in special education: Access, diversity and accountability* (pp.1-15). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Shoop, R.J., & Dunklee, D.R. (1992). *School law for the principal: A handbook for practitioners*. Boston, MA: Simon & Schuster, Inc.

Simpson, R.L., LaCava, P.G., & Graner, P.S. (2004). The No Child Left Behind Act: challenges and implications for educators. *Intervention in School & Clinic*, 40(2), 67-73.

- Sirotnik, K.A. (2004). Conclusion: Holding accountability accountable-Hope for the future? In K.A. Sirotnik (Eds.), *Holding accountability accountable: What ought to matter in public education*. (pp. 148-169). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Stein, S.J., & Gewirtman, L. (2003). *Principal training on the ground: Ensuring highly Qualified leadership*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Publishing.
- Strickland, B.B., & Turnball, A.P. (1999). *Developing and implementing individualized education programs* (3rd ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Co.
- Sybouts, W. & Wendel, F.C. (1994). *The training and development of school principals: A handbook*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Thune, G.R. (1997). Was that a red flag? *The School Administrator*, 54 (10), 12-15.
- Tucker, P.D., & Heinecke, W.F. *Educational leadership in an age of accountability: The Virginia experience* (pp. 7-35). Albany, NY: New York Press.
- Tuckman, B.W. (1972). *Conducting educational research*. NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Tonnisen, S. (2000). *What principals should know about...A primer on school subjects*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.
- Underwood, J., & Mead, J. (1995). *Legal aspects of special education and pupil services*. Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2004). *No Child Left Behind Executive Summary Archived Information*. Retrieved February 17, 2008, from <http://www.ed.gov/nclb/overview/intro/execsumm.html>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2005). *Questions and Answers on No Child Left Behind*. Retrieved March 16, 2005, from <http://www.ed.gov/nclb/accountability/schools/accountability.html>

- U.S. Department of Education (2007). *Building on results: A blueprint for strengthening the no child left behind act*. Retrieved March 3, 2008, from <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/nclb/buildingonresults.pdf>
- Virginia Department of Education. (2001). *A parent's guide to special education*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Virginia Department of Education (1997). *Interpreting the role of the principal; Standards of accreditation regulations*. Retrieved April 4, 2006, from <http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/VA>
- Virginia Department of Education. (2002). *Regulations governing special education programs for children with disabilities in Virginia*. Richmond: Virginia Department of Education.
- Virginia Department of Education. (2002). VDOE procedures for participation of students with disabilities in the assessment component of Virginia's accountability system. Retrieved November 10, 2005, from www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/suptsmemos/2007
- Virginia Department of Education. (December 17, 2004). *School leaders licensure assessment (SLLA) requirements in Virginia: Questions and answers*. Retrieved November 10, 2005 from <http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/teachereducation/slla/faS.pdf>
- Virginia Department of Education. (1998). *Virginia licensure regulations for school personnel*. Richmond: Virginia Department of Education.
- Waters, T., Marzano, R.J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning. Retrieved April 15, 2006 from www.mcrel.org.
- Weisenstein, G.R., & Peiz, R. (1986). *Administrator's desk reference on special education*. Rockville, MD: Aspen Publishers.

Wright, P.W.D., & Wright, P. (2007). *Research-based instruction*. Wrightslaw. Retrieved March 3, 2008 from <http://www.wrightslaw.com/nclb/rbi.htm>

Yell, M. (1998). *The law and special education*. NJ: Prentice Hall.

Yell, M.L., Drasgow, E., Bradley, R., & Justesen, T. (2004). *Contemporary legal issues in special education*. In Sorrells, A.M., Rieth, H.J., & Sindelar, P.T. (Eds.), *Critical issues in special education*. (pp. 16-37). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Young, M.D. et al. (Michelle D) The complexity of substantive reform: A call for interdependence among key stakeholders, 38 *Education Administration Quarterly* 137 (2002).

Ysseldyke, J.E. & Algozzine, B. (1982). *Critical issues in special and remedial education*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Appendices

Appendix A

Professional Development Statements

Survey Item #	Professional Development Statement
1	To what degree do Virginia principals desire professional development as it relates to redesigning their school in order to increase their school's effectiveness?
2	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to implementing research-based curricula?
3	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to ensuring that teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods?
4	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to providing core reading knowledge to novice (elementary) teachers who did not get this training in college?
5	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to implications for preparing for sudden increases in student population for principals who increase their school's effectiveness?
6	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to juggling the demands of running a school in a sea of rising expectations, complex student needs, enhanced accountability, expanding diversity, record enrollments and staff shortfalls?
7	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to raising the achievement levels of minority students?
8	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty?
9	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to raising the achievement levels of new English learners?
10	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities?
11	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to understanding the data-driven decision making?
12	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to guiding their learning community through the changes in attitude and behavior the high stakes accountability environment demands?
13	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to designing curriculum that meets the learning needs of all students and is aligned with state and local standards?
14	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to knowing what constitutes good instructional practice?
15	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice?
16	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to understanding the foundations of effective special education?
17	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to understanding and analyzing data in order to align assessment, standards, curriculum, and instruction?
18	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data?
19	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to engaging the public in their school reform efforts?
20	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to visualizing the future of their specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of the community he leads?

Appendix B

Cover Letter for Pilot Test

1046 Club Terrace
Forest, Virginia 24551
December 31, 2007

Dear Administrator,

As a doctorate student at the University of Virginia, I am conducting a research study entitled, "Perceptions of Virginia Principals as to Their Desirability for Staff Development as it Relates to High Stakes Accountability in Meeting the No Child Left Behind Act". In order to establish validity for the survey which will be used in this study, it is necessary that the questionnaire be subjected to pilot testing.

Your help is needed in providing information concerning this survey. Please take a few moments to review this questionnaire and provide any critical feedback. Please read the survey for clarity and understanding, and make any changes directly to the survey which you feel will improve this survey. In addition, please complete Section A "Domain Evaluation" and Section B "Survey Evaluation" and return these forms along with the edited survey in the self-addressed stamped envelope by Friday, January 11, 2008, or as soon as possible.

I sincerely appreciate your participation in this survey review. Please do not hesitate to contact me at (434) 525-8882 should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Deanna K. Hall
Doctoral Candidate
University of Virginia

Appendix C

Section D and Section E for Pilot Test

Section D: Domain Evaluation

The following statements are used within the principal survey to ask about principal desirability for staff development training as it relates to the high stakes accountability in meeting No Child Left Behind. In order to validate the questions within this study, please sort each statement into one of the domains listed below. Please choose only one domain and write the corresponding letter in the box to the left of each question.

Statement of Desirability

1. Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness
 a) Leadership Behaviors and Dispositions
b) Student Achievement Outcomes
c) Teacher Knowledge and Pedagogy
d) Curricula
2. Implementing research-based curricula
 a) Leadership Behaviors and Dispositions
b) Student Achievement Outcomes
c) Teacher Knowledge and Pedagogy
d) Curricula
3. Ensuring that my teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods
 a) Leadership Behaviors and Dispositions
b) Student Achievement Outcomes
c) Teacher Knowledge and Pedagogy
d) Curricula
4. Providing core reading knowledge to elementary teachers who did not get this training in college
 a) Leadership Behaviors and Dispositions
b) Student Achievement Outcomes
c) Teacher Knowledge and Pedagogy
d) Curricula
5. Implications for preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my school's effectiveness increases
 a) Leadership Behaviors and Dispositions
b) Student Achievement Outcomes
c) Teacher Knowledge and Pedagogy
d) Curricula
6. Juggling the demands of running a school in a sea of rising expectations, complex student needs, enhanced accountability, expanding diversity, record enrollments and staff shortfalls
 a) Leadership Behaviors and Dispositions
b) Student Achievement Outcomes
c) Teacher Knowledge and Pedagogy
d) Curricula

7. Raising the achievement levels of students of color

☐

- a) Leadership Behaviors and Dispositions
- b) Student Achievement Outcomes
- c) Teacher Knowledge and Pedagogy
- d) Curricula

8. Raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty

☐

- a) Leadership Behaviors and Dispositions
- b) Student Achievement Outcomes
- c) Teacher Knowledge and Pedagogy
- d) Curricula

9. Raising the achievement levels of new English learners

☐

- a) Leadership Behaviors and Dispositions
- b) Student Achievement Outcomes
- c) Teacher Knowledge and Pedagogy
- d) Curricula

10. Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities

☐

- a) Leadership Behaviors and Dispositions
- b) Student Achievement Outcomes
- c) Teacher Knowledge and Pedagogy
- d) Curricula

11. Understanding the data-driven decision making

☐

- a) Leadership Behaviors and Dispositions
- b) Student Achievement Outcomes
- c) Teacher Knowledge and Pedagogy
- d) Curricula

12. Guiding my learning community through the changes in attitude and behavior that high-stakes accountability environment demands

☐

- a) Leadership Behaviors and Dispositions
- b) Student Achievement Outcomes
- c) Teacher Knowledge and Pedagogy
- d) Curricula

13. Designing curriculum that meets the learning needs of all students and is aligned with state and local standards

☐

- a) Leadership Behaviors and Dispositions
- b) Student Achievement Outcomes
- c) Teacher Knowledge and Pedagogy
- d) Curricula

14. Knowing what constitutes good instructional practice

☐

- a) Leadership Behaviors and Dispositions
- b) Student Achievement Outcomes
- c) Teacher Knowledge and Pedagogy
- d) Curricula

15. Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice

☐

- a) Leadership Behaviors and Dispositions
- b) Student Achievement Outcomes
- c) Teacher Knowledge and Pedagogy
- d) Curricula

16. Understanding the foundations of effective special education

☐

- a) Leadership Behaviors and Dispositions
- b) Student Achievement Outcomes
- c) Teacher Knowledge and Pedagogy
- d) Curricula

17. Understanding and analyzing data in order to align assessment, standards, curriculum, and instruction

☐

- a) Leadership Behaviors and Dispositions
- b) Student Achievement Outcomes
- c) Teacher Knowledge and Pedagogy
- d) Curricula

18. Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data

☐

- a) Leadership Behaviors and Dispositions
- b) Student Achievement Outcomes
- c) Teacher Knowledge and Pedagogy
- d) Curricula

19. Engaging the public in my school reform efforts

☐

- a) Leadership Behaviors and Dispositions
- b) Student Achievement Outcomes
- c) Teacher Knowledge and Pedagogy
- d) Curricula

20. Visualizing the future of my specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of my community

☐

- a) Leadership Behaviors and Dispositions
- b) Student Achievement Outcomes
- c) Teacher Knowledge and Pedagogy
- d) Curricula

Section E: Survey Evaluation

Please provide any additional thoughts, suggestions or feedback regarding this survey in the space provided below or on the back of this page. Thank you.

Appendix D

Letter of Permission to Virginia Superintendents

1046 Club Terrace
Forest, Virginia 24551
December 31, 2007

Dear Superintendent:

I am requesting your support of a doctoral dissertation study I am conducting at the University of Virginia. As this survey is intended to include information representative of all Virginia principals, it is necessary that principals from different areas and with different backgrounds be included in the final analyses of information. For that reason, I would like to ask that your school division be one of the school divisions within the Commonwealth of Virginia to participate in this study.

Principals will be asked to complete a questionnaire regarding their desirability for staff development as it relates to meeting the No Child Left Behind act. The questionnaire also consists of a section where principals are asked to provide limited personal and demographic information. A sample copy of the cover letter and the survey are enclosed for your review.

Confidentiality will be maintained at all times through this process. All participants will remain anonymous, as there will be no coding system utilized to match the survey responses to the participant in this study. Questions specific to background and experience are for assessment purposes only. The questionnaire survey should take less than fifteen minutes to complete. A self-addressed stamped envelope will be provided for principals to return the questionnaire to the researcher. The results of this study will be made available to you upon request.

Please complete the following information at the bottom of this letter and return this letter in the self-addressed stamped envelope by Friday, January 11, 2008. I sincerely appreciate your support of this request. If you have any questions, please contact me directly at (434) 525-8882.

Sincerely,

Deanna K. Hall
Doctoral Candidate
University of Virginia

I give permission for the principals within my school division to participate in this study.

School Division: _____

Superintendent's Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix E
Cover Letter for Principal Survey

1046 Club Terrace
Forest, Virginia 24551
February 1, 2008

Dear Principal:

Enclosed you will find a survey which will be used to determine your level of desirability for staff development as it relates to meeting the No Child Left Behind Act. Your assistance is needed in providing information concerning the staff development needs that public school principals in Virginia believe will influence student academic achievement. I believe this research will provide information for future studies in educational leadership.

Participation in this survey is voluntary. In consideration of your busy schedules, completion of this survey should only take no more than 10 – 15 minutes. As this survey is intended to include information representative of all Virginia principals, it is necessary that principals from different areas and with different backgrounds be included in the final analyses of information. For that reason, your participation is essential and greatly appreciated.

Results are anonymous and will not be connected to school names. Questions specific to background and experience are for assessment purposes only. Completion and submission of this survey will constitute consent to participate. There are no known risks to participation. Aggregated results may be provided to your school system.

Please complete the survey and return it in the enclosed envelope no later than February 15, 2008. If you have any questions, please contact me directly at (434) 525-8882. Thank you for your participation in this survey. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Deanna K. Hall
Doctoral Candidate
University of Virginia
dkt8n@virginia.edu

Appendix F
Survey to Principals

Virginia Principals' Perceptions as to Their Desirability for Staff Development as it Relates to the High Stakes Accountability of Meeting the No Child Left Behind Act.

Please answer the following questions by circling the appropriate answer.

- | | | | | |
|----|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. | I am principal of a/an: | | | |
| | Elementary School | Middle School | High School | |
| 2. | Level of experience as a principal: | | | |
| | 1-5 years | 6-10 years | 11-20 years | 20 + years |
| 3. | The following is representative of the percent of minority children from your school's total student population: | | | |
| | 0 – 25 % | 26 – 49 % | 50 – 74 % | 75 -100 % |
| 4. | The following is representative of the percent of children with IEP's from your school's total student population: | | | |
| | 0 – 25 % | 26 – 49 % | 50 – 74 % | 75 -100 % |
| 5. | The following is representative of the percent of children with limited English proficiency from your school's total student population: | | | |
| | 0 – 25 % | 26 – 49 % | 50 – 74 % | 75 -100 % |
| 6. | The following is representative of the percent of children in poverty from your school's total student population: | | | |
| | 0 – 25 % | 26 – 49 % | 50 – 74 % | 75 -100 % |
| 7. | The following is representative of your current Title 1 Status: | | | |
| | Schoolwide Title 1 funding | Receive Title 1 funding | Receive no Title 1 funding | |
| 8. | The following is representative of your current status in meeting accreditation: | | | |
| | Fully Accredited | Accredited with Warning | Accreditation Denied | Conditionally Accredited |

Part B: Your Professional Development Desirability

The following statements ask about your desirability for staff development training as it relates to the high stakes accountability in meeting No Child Left Behind. An additional line is included below each question for any specific information you would like to share about the content of each question. Please use the scale below to circle your answer choice:

1-Strong Desirability 2-Moderate Desirability 3-Little Desirability 4-No Desirability

The following indicates my level of desirability for staff development training as it relates to:

9. Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness.

1	2	3	4
Strong	Moderate	Little	None

Additional information: _____

10. Implementing research-based curricula.

1	2	3	4
Strong	Moderate	Little	None

Additional information: _____

11. Ensuring that my teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods.

1	2	3	4
Strong	Moderate	Little	None

Additional information: _____

12. Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college.

1	2	3	4
Strong	Moderate	Little	None

Additional information: _____

13. Preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my school's effectiveness increases.

1	2	3	4
Strong	Moderate	Little	None

Additional information: _____

1-Strong Desirability 2-Moderate Desirability 3-Little Desirability 4-No Desirability

14. Juggling the demands of running a school in a sea of rising expectations, complex student needs, enhanced accountability, expanding diversity, record enrollments and staff shortfalls.

1	2	3	4
Strong	Moderate	Little	None

Additional information: _____

15. Raising the achievement levels of minority students.

1	2	3	4
Strong	Moderate	Little	None

Additional information: _____

16. Raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty.

1	2	3	4
Strong	Moderate	Little	None

Additional information: _____

17. Raising the achievement levels of new English learners (ESL).

1	2	3	4
Strong	Moderate	Little	None

Additional information: _____

18. Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities.

1	2	3	4
Strong	Moderate	Little	None

Additional information: _____

19. Understanding the data-driven decision making.

1	2	3	4
Strong	Moderate	Little	None

Additional information: _____

1-Strong Desirability 2-Moderate Desirability 3-Little Desirability 4-No Desirability

20. Guiding my learning community through the changes in attitude and behavior that high-stakes accountability environment demands.

1	2	3	4
Strong	Moderate	Little	None

Additional information: _____

21. Designing curriculum that meets the learning needs of all students and is aligned with state and local standards.

1	2	3	4
Strong	Moderate	Little	None

Additional information: _____

22. Knowing what constitutes good instructional practice.

1	2	3	4
Strong	Moderate	Little	None

Additional information: _____

23. Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice.

1	2	3	4
Strong	Moderate	Little	None

Additional information: _____

24. Understanding the foundations of effective special education.

1	2	3	4
Strong	Moderate	Little	None

Additional information: _____

25. Understanding and analyzing data in order to align assessment, standards, curriculum, and instruction.

1	2	3	4
Strong	Moderate	Little	None

Additional information: _____

1-Strong Desirability 2-Moderate Desirability 3-Little Desirability 4-No Desirability

26. Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data.

1	2	3	4
Strong	Moderate	Little	None

Additional information: _____

27. Engaging the school community in my school reform efforts.

1	2	3	4
Strong	Moderate	Little	None

Additional information: _____

28. Visualizing the future of my specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of my community.

1	2	3	4
Strong	Moderate	Little	None

Additional information: _____

Part C: Your Professional Development Desirability Ranking

Please rank the top ten following statements from Part B in the order that you would most desire staff development training as it relates to the high stakes accountability in meeting No Child Left Behind. Please begin ranking from 1 (most desirable) to 10 (least desirable).

The following ranking indicates my level of desirability for staff development training as it relates to:

#	Statement of Desirability
	Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness
	Implementing research-based curricula
	Ensuring that my teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods
	Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college
	Implications for preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my school's effectiveness increases
	Juggling the demands of running a school in a sea of rising expectations, complex student needs, enhanced accountability, expanding diversity, record enrollments and staff shortfalls
	Raising the achievement levels of minority students
	Raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty
	Raising the achievement levels of new English learners (ESL)
	Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities
	Understanding the data-driven decision making
	Guiding my learning community through the changes in attitude and behavior that high-stakes accountability environment demands
	Designing curriculum that meets the learning needs of all students and is aligned with state and local standards
	Knowing what constitutes good instructional practice
	Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice
	Understanding the foundations of effective special education
	Understanding and analyzing data in order to align assessment, standards, curriculum, and instruction
	Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data
	Engaging the school community in my school reform efforts
	Visualizing the future of my specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of my community

Appendix G
Principal Desirability Rating

	Statement	1	2	3	4	No R	Mean
1	Redesigning my school to increase my school's effectiveness	29	37	29	6	1	2.10
		28.4%	36.3%	28.4%	5.9%	1.0%	
2	Implementing research-based curricula	59	38	5	0	0	1.47
		57.8%	37.3%	4.9%	0.0%	0.0%	
3	Ensuring that my teachers are trained in research-based methods	77	23	2	0	0	1.26
		75.5%	22.5%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
4	Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college	56	38	6	1	1	1.51
		54.9%	37.3%	5.9%	1.0%	1.0%	
5	Preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my school's effectiveness increases	17	44	33	8	0	2.31
		16.7%	43.1%	32.4%	7.8%	0.0%	
6	Juggling the demands of running a school in a sea of rising expectations...	37	54	11	0	0	1.75
		36.3%	52.9%	10.8%	0.0%	0.0%	
7	Raising achievement levels of minority students	61	24	15	2	0	1.59
		59.8%	23.5%	14.7%	2.0%	0.0%	
8	Raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty	78	17	5	2	0	1.32
		76.5%	16.7%	4.9%	2.0%	0.0%	
9 ^t	Raising the achievement levels of new English learners (ESL)	44	26	25	5	2	1.87
		43.1%	25.5%	24.5%	4.9%	2.0	
10	Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities	71	31	0	0	0	1.30
		69.6%	30.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
11 ^t	Understanding data-driven decision making	44	44	14	0	0	1.71
		43.1%	43.1%	13.7%	0.0%	0.0%	
12	Guiding my learning community through the changes in attitude and behavior that high stakes accountability environment demands	42	55	5	0	0	1.64
		41.2%	53.9%	4.9%	0.0%	0.0%	
13	Designing curriculum that meets the learning needs of all students and is aligned with state and local standards	52	41	9	0	0	1.58
		51.0%	40.2%	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%	
14	Knowing what constitutes good instructional practice	59	37	6	0	0	1.48
		57.8%	36.3%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	
15	Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice	66	34	2	0	0	1.37
		64.7%	33.3%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
16	Understanding the foundations of effective special education	57	41	4	0	0	1.48
		55.9%	40.2%	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%	
17	Understanding and analyzing data in order to align assessment, standards, curriculum, and	47	46	9	0	0	1.63

	instruction						
		46.1	45.1	8.8	0.0%	0.0%	
18	Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data	41	48	13	0	0	1.73
		40.2%	47.1%	12.7%	0.0%	0.0%	
19	Engaging the school community in my school reform efforts	38	47	17	0	0	1.79
		37.3%	46.1%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	
20	Visualizing the future of my specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of my community	30	49	22	1	0	1.90
		29.4%	48.0%	21.6%	1.0%	0.0%	

Appendix H
Summary of Principal Desirability Rating

	Statement	Strong Desire (1)	No Desire (4)	Mean	Std. Dev.	Var.	Min	Max
1	Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness	29	6	2.10	.917	.842	1	4
2	Implementing research-based curricula	59	0	1.47	.592	.351	1	3
3	Ensuring that my teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods	77	0	1.26	.486	.236	1	3
4	Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college	56	1	1.51	.671	.450	1	4
5	Preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my school's effectiveness increases	17	8	2.31	.844	.712	1	4
6	Juggling the demands of running a school in a sea of rising expectations, complex student needs, enhanced accountability, expanding diversity, record enrollments and staff shortfalls	37	0	1.75	.640	.410	1	3
7	Raising the achievement levels of minority students	61	2	1.59	.813	.660	1	4
8	Raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty	78	2	1.32	.662	.439	1	4
9	Raising the achievement levels of new English learners (ESL)	44	5	1.87	.972	.944	1	4
10	Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities	71	0	1.30	.462	.214	1	2
11	Understanding data-driven decision making	44	0	1.71	.698	.487	1	3
12	Guiding my learning community through the changes in attitude and behavior that high stakes accountability environment demands	42	0	1.64	.577	.332	1	3
13	Designing curriculum that meets the learning needs of all students and is aligned with state and local standards	52	0	1.58	.652	.424	1	3
14	Knowing what constitutes good instructional practice	59	0	1.48	.609	.371	1	3
15	Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice	66	0	1.37	.525	.276	1	3
16	Understanding the foundations of effective special education	57	0	1.48	.576	.331	1	3
17	Understanding and analyzing data in order to align assessment, standards, curriculum, and instruction	47	0	1.63	.644	.414	1	3

18	Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data	41	0	1.73	.677	.459	1	3
19	Engaging the school community in my school reform efforts	38	0	1.79	.708	.502	1	3
20	Visualizing the future of my specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of my community	30	0	1.90	.738	.545	1	3

Appendix I
Survey Item Justification

#	Survey Item	Justification in Literature
1	To what degree do Virginia principals desire professional development as it relates to redesigning their school in order to increase their school's effectiveness?	Heath
2	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to implementing research-based curricula?	Heath
3	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to ensuring that teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods?	Heath
4	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to providing core reading knowledge to novice (elementary) teachers who did not get this training in college?	Heath
5	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to implications for preparing for sudden increases in student population for principals who increase their school's effectiveness?	Heath
6	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to juggling the demands of running a school in a sea of rising expectations, complex student needs, enhanced accountability, expanding diversity, record enrollments and staff shortfalls?	Institute for Leadership
7	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to raising the achievement levels of minority students?	Jennings, Rentner, & Kober; Darling-Hammond
8	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty?	Jennings, Rentner, & Kober; Darling-Hammond
9	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to raising the achievement levels of new English learners?	Jennings, Rentner, & Kober; Darling-Hammond
10	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities?	Jennings, Rentner, & Kober; Darling-Hammond
11	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to understanding the data-driven decision making?	Bennett
12	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to guiding their learning community through the changes in attitude and behavior the high stakes accountability environment demands?	Bennett
13	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to designing curriculum that meets the learning needs of all students and is aligned with state and local standards?	Cohen
14	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to knowing what constitutes good instructional practice?	Cohen

15	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice?	Cohen
16	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to understanding the foundations of effective special education?	McLaughlin and Nolet
17	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to understanding and analyzing data in order to align assessment, standards, curriculum, and instruction?	Bennett
18	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data?	Miller
19	To what degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to engaging the public in their school reform efforts?	Lefkowitz and Miller
20	To what Degree do Virginia principals desire staff development as it relates to visualizing the future of their specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of the community he leads?	Bennett

Appendix J
Differences in Principal Perceptions by School Level
(Elementary, Middle and High)

			N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F-value	Significance
1	Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness	Elementary	52	1.94	.938	4.491	.014*
		Middle	25	1.96	.790		
		High	25	2.56	.870		
2	Implementing research-based curricula	Elementary	52	1.40	.603	.698	.500
		Middle	25	1.52	.586		
		High	25	1.56	.583		
3	Ensuring that my teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods	Elementary	52	1.25	.480	1.591	.209
		Middle	25	1.16	.473		
		High	25	1.40	.500		
4	Providing core reading knowledge to elementary teachers who did not get this training in college	Elementary	52	1.42	.605	3.244	.043*
		Middle	25	1.40	.500		
		High	25	1.80	.866		
5	Preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my school's effectiveness increases	Elementary	52	2.13	.841	4.358	.015*
		Middle	25	2.28	.843		
		High	25	2.72	.737		
6	Juggling the demands of running a school in a sea of rising expectations, complex student needs, enhanced accountability, expanding diversity, record enrollments and staff shortfalls	Elementary	52	1.73	.660	2.543	.084
		Middle	25	1.56	.651		
		High	25	1.96	.539		
7	Raising the achievement levels of minority students	Elementary	52	1.73	.819	2.230	.113
		Middle	25	1.32	.557		
		High	25	1.56	.961		
8	Raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty	Elementary	52	1.31	.579	1.910	.154
		Middle	25	1.16	.374		
		High	25	1.52	.963		
9	Raising the achievement levels of new English learners	Elementary	52	2.08	1.007	2.700	.072
		Middle	25	1.56	.821		
		High	25	1.76	.970		
10	Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities	Elementary	52	1.42	.499	4.196	.018*

		Middle	25	1.12	.332		
		High	25	1.24	.436		
11	Understanding data-driven decision making	Elementary	52	1.73	.660	3.154	.047*
		Middle	25	1.44	.651		
		High	25	1.92	.759		
12	Guiding my learning community through the changes in attitude and behavior that high stakes accountability environment demands	Elementary	52	1.60	.569	2.249	.111
		Middle	25	1.52	.586		
		High	25	1.84	.554		
13	Designing curriculum that meets the learning needs of all students and is aligned with state and local standards	Elementary	52	1.56	.669	.426	.654
		Middle	25	1.52	.653		
		High	25	1.68	.627		
14	Knowing what constitutes good instructional practice	Elementary	52	1.44	.608	.311	.733
		Middle	25	1.48	.653		
		High	25	1.56	.583		
15	Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice	Elementary	52	1.37	.486	.045	.956
		Middle	25	1.40	.645		
		High	25	1.36	.490		
16	Understanding the foundations of effective special education	Elementary	52	1.60	.603	2.326	.103
		Middle	25	1.32	.557		
		High	25	1.40	.500		
17	Understanding and analyzing data in order to align assessment, standards, curriculum, and instruction	Elementary	52	1.69	.673	.630	.534
		Middle	25	1.52	.653		
		High	25	1.60	.577		
18	Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data.	Elementary	52	1.81	.715	1.134	.326
		Middle	25	1.56	.712		
		High	25	1.72	.542		
19	Engaging the school community in my school reform efforts	Elementary	52	1.73	.717	2.945	.057
		Middle	25	1.64	.490		
		High	25	2.08	.812		

20	Visualizing the future of my specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of my community	Elementary	52	1.96	.791	4.193	.018*
		Middle	25	1.56	.583		
		High	25	2.12	.666		

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of ≤ 0.05

Appendix K
Post-Hoc Differences in Principal's Perceptions by School
Level

Statement		Comparisons by School Level		Mean Difference	Sig.
1	Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness	Elementary	Middle	-.018	.997
			High	-.618(*)	.020*
		Middle	Elementary	.018	.997
			High	-.600	.062
		High	Elementary	.618(*)	.020*
			Middle	.600	.062
4	Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college	Elementary	Middle	.023	.990
			High	-.377	.067
		Middle	Elementary	-.023	.990
			High	-.400	.104
		High	Elementary	.377	.067
			Middle	.400	.104
5	Preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my school's effectiveness increases	Elementary	Middle	-.145	.766
			High	-.585(*)	.016*
		Middle	Elementary	.145	.766
			High	-.440	.169
		High	Elementary	.585(*)	.016*
			Middle	.440	.169
10	Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities	Elementary	Middle	.303(*)	.024*
			High	.183	.249
		Middle	Elementary	-.303(*)	.024*
			High	-.120	.640
		High	Elementary	-.183	.249
			Middle	.120	.640
11	Understanding data-driven decision making	Elementary	Middle	.291	.222
			High	-.189	.526
		Middle	Elementary	-.291	.222
			High	-.480	.050*
		High	Elementary	.189	.526
			Middle	.480	.050*
20	Visualizing the future of my specific learning community while meeting the adjustment	Elementary	Middle	.402	.075

needs of my community				
		High	-.158	.662
	Middle	Elementary	-.402	.075
		High	-.560(*)	.025*
	High	Elementary	.158	.662
		Middle	.560(*)	.025*

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of ≤ 0.05

needs of my community				
		High	-.158	.662
	Middle	Elementary	-.402	.075
		High	-.560(*)	.025*
	High	Elementary	.158	.662
		Middle	.560(*)	.025*

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of ≤ 0.05

Appendix L

Differences in Principal Perceptions by Experience Level
(1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-20 years, and 20+ years)

		Years	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F value	Significance
1	Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness	1-5	54	2.06	.920	.157	.925
		6-10	26	2.19	.849		
		11-20	17	2.06	1.144		
		20+	5	2.20	.447		
2	Implementing research-based curricula	1-5	54	1.46	.573	.481	.696
		6-10	26	1.38	.571		
		11-20	17	1.59	.618		
		20+	5	1.60	.894		
3	Ensuring that my teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods	1-5	54	1.30	.537	2.083	.107
		6-10	26	1.08	.272		
		11-20	17	1.41	.507		
		20+	5	1.40	.548		
4	Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college	1-5	54	1.67	.727	3.520	.018*
		6-10	26	1.50	.583		
		11-20	17	1.12	.485		
		20+	5	1.20	.447		
5	Preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my school's effectiveness increases	1-5	54	2.35	.894	.395	.757
		6-10	26	2.27	.778		
		11-20	17	2.18	.883		
		20+	5	2.60	.548		
6	Juggling the demands of running a school in a sea of rising expectations, complex student needs, enhanced accountability, expanding diversity, record enrolments and staff shortfalls	1-5	54	1.76	.642	1.050	.374
		6-10	26	1.65	.629		
		11-20	17	1.71	.686		
		20+	5	2.20	.447		
7	Raising the achievement levels of minority students	1-5	54	1.78	.904	2.785	.045*
		6-10	26	1.46	.706		
		11-20	17	1.18	.529		
		20+	5	1.60	.548		
8	Raising the achievement levels of	1-5	54	1.41	.790	1.308	.276

students living in poverty							
		6-10	26	1.23	.514		
		11-20	17	1.12	.332		
		20+	5	1.60	.548		
9	Raising the achievement levels of new English learners	1-5	54	2.00	1.028	2.506	.064
		6-10	26	1.73	.919		
		11-20	17	1.47	.800		
		20+	5	2.60	.548		
10	Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities	1-5	54	1.41	.496	3.694	.014*
		6-10	26	1.15	.368		
		11-20	17	1.12	.332		
		20+	5	1.60	.548		
11	Understanding data-driven decision making	1-5	54	1.69	.609	.753	.523
		6-10	26	1.85	.881		
		11-20	17	1.53	.717		
		20+	5	1.80	.447		
12	Guiding my learning community through the changes in attitude and behavior that high stakes accountability environment demands	1-5	54	1.70	.603	1.658	.181
		6-10	26	1.54	.508		
		11-20	17	1.47	.624		
		20+	5	2.00	.000		
13	Designing curriculum that meets the learning needs of all students and is aligned with state and local standards	1-5	54	1.50	.575	2.143	.100
		6-10	26	1.77	.710		
		11-20	17	1.41	.618		
		20+	5	2.00	1.000		
14	Knowing what constitutes good instructional practice	1-5	54	1.44	.572	2.586	.057
		6-10	26	1.46	.706		
		11-20	17	1.41	.507		
		20+	5	2.20	.447		
15	Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice	1-5	54	1.31	.469	4.278	.007*
		6-10	26	1.50	.648		
		11-20	17	1.18	.393		
		20+	5	2.00	.000		

16	Understanding the foundations of effective special education	1-5	54	1.56	.604	.942	.423
		6-10	26	1.38	.571		
		11-20	17	1.47	.514		
		20+	5	1.20	.447		
17	Understanding and analyzing data in order to align assessment, standards, curriculum, and instruction	1-5	54	1.59	.533	.696	.557
		6-10	26	1.77	.765		
		11-20	17	1.59	.795		
		20+	5	1.40	.548		
18	Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data	1-5	54	1.74	.650	.428	.734
		6-10	26	1.77	.710		
		11-20	17	1.71	.772		
		20+	5	1.40	.548		
19	Engaging the school community in my school reform efforts	1-5	54	1.76	.699	4.829	.004*
		6-10	26	1.96	.720		
		11-20	17	1.41	.507		
		20+	5	2.60	.548		
20	Visualizing the future of my specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of my community	1-5	54	1.93	.640	2.273	.085
		6-10	26	1.88	.864		
		11-20	17	1.65	.786		
		20+	5	2.60	.548		

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of ≤ 0.05

Appendix M

Post-Hoc Differences in Principal's Perceptions by Experience Level

		Comparisons by Years of Experience		Mean Difference	Significance
4	Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college	1-5	6-10	.167	.762
			11-20	.549(*)	.030*
			20+	.467	.501
		6-10	1-5	-.167	.762
			11-20	.382	.316
			20+	.300	.825
		11-20	1-5	-.549(*)	.030*
			6-10	-.382	.316
			20+	-.082	.996
		20+	1-5	-.467	.501
			6-10	-.300	.825
			11-20	.082	.996
7	Raising the achievement levels of minority students	1-5	6-10	.316	.428
			11-20	.601	.065
			20+	.178	.972
		6-10	1-5	-.316	.428
			11-20	.285	.722
			20+	-.138	.988
		11-20	1-5	-.601	.065
			6-10	-.285	.722
			20+	-.424	.776
		20+	1-5	-.178	.972
			6-10	.138	.988
			11-20	.424	.776
10	Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities	1-5	6-10	.254	.134
			11-20	.290	.147
			20+	-.193	.835
		6-10	1-5	-.254	.134
			11-20	.036	.995
			20+	-.446	.245
		11-20	1-5	-.290	.147
			6-10	-.036	.995
			20+	-.482	.215
		20+	1-5	.193	.835
			6-10	.446	.245
			11-20	.482	.215

15	Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice	1-5	6-10		
				-.185	.498
		6-10	11-20	.138	.805
			20+	-.685(*)	.041*
		11-20	1-5	.185	.498
			6-10	.324	.239
		20+	1-5	-.500	.250
			6-10	-.138	.805
		11-20	1-5	-.324	.239
			6-10	-.824(*)	.019*
		20+	1-5	.685(*)	.041*
			6-10	.500	.250
		11-20	1-5	.824(*)	.019*
			6-10		
19	Engaging the school community in my school reform efforts	1-5	6-10	-.202	.662
		6-10	11-20	.347	.331
			20+	-.841	.073
		11-20	1-5	.202	.662
			6-10	.550	.082
		20+	1-5	-.638	.291
			6-10	-.347	.331
		11-20	1-5	-.550	.082
			6-10	-1.188(*)	.009*
		20+	1-5	.841	.073
			6-10	.638	.291
		11-20	1-5	1.188(*)	.009*
			6-10		

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of ≤ 0.05

Appendix N

**Differences in Principal Perceptions
by Percent of Minority Children from Total School's
Population
(0-25%, 26-49%, 50-74%, and 75-100%)**

		% Population	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F value	Significance
1	Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness	0-25	75	2.01	.908	2.111	.104
		26-49	19	2.21	.855		
		50-74	7	2.43	.976		
2	Implementing research-based curricula	0-25	75	1.43	.574	1.191	3.17
		26-49	19	1.68	.671		
		50-74	7	1.43	.535		
3	Ensuring that my teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods	0-25	75	1.25	.468	.371	.774
		26-49	19	1.26	.452		
		50-74	7	1.43	.787		
4	Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college	0-25	75	1.53	.664	.480	.697
		26-49	19	1.53	.772		
		50-74	7	1.29	.488		
5	Preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my school's effectiveness increases	0-25	75	2.36	.880	.333	.802
		26-49	19	2.16	.765		
		50-74	7	2.29	.756		
6	Juggling the demands of running a school in a sea of rising expectations, complex student needs, enhanced accountability, expanding diversity, record enrolments and staff shortfalls	0-25	75	1.73	.622	1.437	.237
		26-49	19	1.68	.749		
		50-74	7	1.86	.378		
7	Raising the achievement levels of minority students	0-25	75	1.73	.859	3.440	.020*
		26-49	19	1.26	.562		
		50-74	7	1.00	.000		
8	Raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty	0-25	75	1.31	.592	.587	.625
		26-49	19	1.47	.964		
		50-74	7	1.14	.378		

9	Raising the achievement levels of new English learners	0-25	75	1.95	.999	.606	.613
		26-49	19	1.68	.820		
		50-74	7	1.57	1.134		
10	Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities	0-25	75	1.36	.483	2.708	.049*
		26-49	19	1.11	.315		
		50-74	7	1.14	.378		
11	Understanding data-driven decision making	0-25	75	1.75	.718	1.990	.120
		26-49	19	1.47	.513		
		50-74	7	1.71	.756		
12	Guiding my learning community through the changes in attitude and behavior that high stakes accountability environment demands	0-25	75	1.63	.588	.178	.911
		26-49	19	1.63	.597		
		50-74	7	1.71	.488		
13	Designing curriculum that meets the learning needs of all students and is aligned with state and local standards	0-25	75	1.57	.661	.726	.539
		26-49	19	1.53	.697		
		50-74	7	1.86	.378		
14	Knowing what constitutes good instructional practice	0-25	75	1.41	.572	1.291	.282
		26-49	19	1.63	.761		
		50-74	7	1.71	.488		
15	Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice	0-25	75	1.36	.536	.510	.676
		26-49	19	1.37	.496		
		50-74	7	1.43	.535		
16	Understanding the foundations of effective special education	0-25	75	1.55	.576	1.815	.149
		26-49	19	1.26	.562		
		50-74	7	1.29	.488		
17	Understanding and analyzing data in order to align assessment, standards, curriculum, and instruction	0-25	75	1.65	.668	1.992	.120
		26-49	19	1.53	.513		

		50-74	7	1.43	.535		
18	Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data	0-25	75	1.75	.680	1.468	.228
		26-49	19	1.63	.597		
		50-74	7	1.57	.787		
19	Engaging the school community in my school reform efforts	0-25	75	1.83	.724	.696	.556
		26-49	19	1.79	.631		
		50-74	7	1.57	.787		
20	Visualizing the future of my specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of my community	0-25	75	1.93	.794	1.084	.360
		26-49	19	1.79	.419		
		50-74	7	1.71	.756		

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of ≤ 0.05

Appendix O

**Differences in Principal Perceptions
by Percent of Children with IEP's from Total School's Population
(0-25%, 26-49%, 50-74%, and 75-100%)**

		% Population	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F value	Significance
1	Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness	0-25	91	2.08	.957	.412	.745
		26-49	6	2.50	.548		
		50-74	4	2.00	.000		
2	Implementing research-based curricula	0-25	91	1.46	.583	.671	.572
		26-49	6	1.67	.816		
		50-74	4	1.25	.500		
3	Ensuring that my teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods	0-25	91	1.24	.456	1.190	.318
		26-49	6	1.33	.516		
		50-74	4	1.50	1.000		
4	Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college	0-25	91	1.49	.673	2.028	.315
		26-49	6	1.67	.516		
		50-74	4	1.25	.500		
5	Preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my school's effectiveness increases	0-25	91	2.35	.848	1.117	.346
		26-49	6	1.83	.753		
		50-74	4	2.00	.816		
6	Juggling the demands of running a school in a sea of rising expectations, complex student needs, enhanced accountability, expanding diversity, record enrolments and staff shortfalls	0-25	91	1.71	.620	1.631	.187
		26-49	6	1.83	.753		
		50-74	4	2.00	.816		
7	Raising the achievement levels of minority students	0-25	91	1.63	.825	2.406	.072
		26-49	6	1.17	.408		
		50-74	4	1.00	.000		
8	Raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty	0-25	91	1.33	.684	.096	.962
		26-49	6	1.33	.516		
		50-74	4	1.25	.500		

9	Raising the achievement levels of new English learners	0-25	91	1.92	.980	1.826	.147
		26-49	6	1.17	.753		
		50-74	4	1.50	.577		
10	Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities	0-25	91	1.31	.464	.168	.918
		26-49	6	1.33	.516		
		50-74	4	1.25	.500		
11	Understanding data-driven decision making	0-25	91	1.74	.697	2.897	.039*
		26-49	6	1.50	.548		
		50-74	4	1.00	.000		
12	Guiding my learning community through the changes in attitude and behavior that high stakes accountability environment demands	0-25	91	1.64	.587	.208	.891
		26-49	6	1.67	.516		
		50-74	4	1.50	.577		
13	Designing curriculum that meets the learning needs of all students and is aligned with state and local standards	0-25	91	1.55	.619	2.322	.080
		26-49	6	1.50	.837		
		50-74	4	2.00	.816		
14	Knowing what constitutes good instructional practice	0-25	91	1.45	.601	1.300	.279
		26-49	6	1.50	.548		
		50-74	4	2.00	.816		
15	Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice	0-25	91	1.35	.524	.714	.546
		26-49	6	1.50	.548		
		50-74	4	1.50	.577		
16	Understanding the foundations of effective special education	0-25	91	1.51	.584	1.405	.246
		26-49	6	1.33	.516		
		50-74	4	1.00	.000		
17	Understanding and analyzing data in order to align assessment, standards, curriculum, and instruction	0-25	91	1.67	.651	1.769	.158

		26-49	6	1.17	.408		
		50-74	4	1.25	.500		
18	Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data	0-25	91	1.76	.689	1.005	.394
		26-49	6	1.50	.548		
		50-74	4	1.25	.500		
19	Engaging the school community in my school reform efforts	0-25	91	1.79	.707	1.038	.379
		26-49	6	1.67	.816		
		50-74	4	1.75	.500		
20	Visualizing the future of my specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of my community	0-25	91	1.90	.746	.807	.493
		26-49	6	1.83	.753		
		50-74	4	1.75	.500		

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of ≤ 0.05

Appendix P

**Differences in Principal Perceptions
by Percent of Children with Limited English Proficiency
from Total School's Population
(0-25%, 26-49%, 50-74%, and 75-100%)**

		% Limited English	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Significance
1	Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness	0-25	96	2.11	.928	.528	.469
		26-49	6	1.83	.753		
2	Implementing research-based curricula	0-25	96	1.47	.597	.016	.901
		26-49	6	1.50	.548		
3	Ensuring that my teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods	0-25	96	1.24	.453	4.513	.036*
		26-49	6	1.67	.816		
4	Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college	0-25	96	1.51	.680	.001	.971
		26-49	6	1.50	.548		
5	Preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my school's effectiveness increases	0-25	96	2.35	.833	3.852	.052
		26-49	6	1.67	.816		
6	Juggling the demands of running a school in a sea of rising expectations, complex student needs, enhanced accountability, expanding diversity, record enrollments and staff shortfalls	0-25	96	1.75	.632	.095	.759
		26-49	6	1.67	.816		
7	Raising the achievement levels of minority students	0-25	96	1.63	.824	3.420	.067
		26-49	6	1.00	.000		
8	Raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty	0-25	96	1.33	.675	.355	.553
		26-49	6	1.17	.408		
9	Raising the achievement levels of new English learners	0-25	96	1.91	.985	1.983	.162
		26-49	6	1.33	.516		
10	Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities	0-25	96	1.31	.466	.560	.456
		26-49	6	1.17	.408		
11	Understanding data-driven decision making	0-25	96	1.73	.688	1.832	.179
		26-49	6	1.33	.816		
12	Guiding my learning community through the changes in attitude and behavior that high stakes accountability environment demands	0-25	96	1.66	.577	1.785	.185
		26-49	6	1.33	.516		
13	Designing curriculum that meets the learning needs of all students and is aligned with state and local standards	0-25	96	1.56	.646	.976	.326

		26-49	6	1.83	.753		
14	Knowing what constitutes good instructional practice	0-25	96	1.46	.597	2.166	.144
		26-49	6	1.83	.753		
15	Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice	0-25	96	1.35	.523	2.021	.158
		26-49	6	1.67	.516		
16	Understanding the foundations of effective special education	0-25	96	1.50	.580	1.911	.170
		26-49	6	1.17	.408		
17	Understanding and analyzing data in order to align assessment, standards, curriculum, and instruction	0-25	96	1.65	.649	1.336	.251
		26-49	6	1.33	.516		
18	Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data	0-25	96	1.75	.681	2.163	.145
		26-49	6	1.33	.516		
19	Engaging the school community in my reform efforts	0-25	96	1.82	.711	2.744	.101
		26-49	6	1.33	.516		
20	Visualizing the future of my specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of my community	0-25	96	1.93	.743	1.908	.170
		26-49	6	1.50	.548		

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of ≤ 0.05

Appendix Q

**Differences in Principal Perceptions
by Percent of Poverty Children from Total School's Population
(0-25%, 26-49%, 50-74%, and 75-100%)**

		% Poverty Children	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F value	Significance
1	Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness	0-25	41	2.17	.771	4.314	.007*
		26-49	37	2.27	.902		
		50-74	17	2.00	1.173		
		75-100	7	1.00	.000		
2	Implementing research-based curricula	0-25	41	1.56	.709	1.907	.133
		26-49	37	1.49	.507		
		50-74	17	1.41	.507		
		75-100	7	1.00	.000		
3	Ensuring that my teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods	0-25	41	1.34	.530	1.081	.361
		26-49	37	1.24	.435		
		50-74	17	1.24	.562		
		75-100	7	1.00	.000		
4	Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college	0-25	41	1.61	.628	2.004	.118
		26-49	37	1.46	.803		
		50-74	17	1.24	.437		
		75-100	7	1.86	.378		
5	Preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my school's effectiveness increases	0-25	41	2.32	.687	.608	.612
		26-49	37	2.24	1.038		
		50-74	17	2.29	.772		
		75-100	7	2.71	.756		
6	Juggling the demands of running a school in a sea of rising expectations, complex student needs, enhanced accountability, expanding diversity, record enrolments and staff shortfalls	0-25	41	1.76	.663	2.112	.104
		26-49	37	1.86	.631		
		50-74	17	1.41	.618		
		75-100	7	1.86	.378		
7	Raising the achievement levels of minority students	0-25	41	1.46	.636	7.796	.000*
		26-49	37	1.59	.896		
		50-74	17	1.35	.702		
		75-100	7	2.86	.378		
8	Raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty	0-25	41	1.46	.809	1.361	.259
		26-49	37	1.27	.608		
		50-74	17	1.24	.437		
		75-100	7	1.00	.000		

9	Raising the achievement levels of new English learners	0-25	41	1.68	.850	3.449	.020
		26-49	37	1.97	1.093		
		50-74	17	1.71	.920		
		75-100	7	2.86	.378		
10	Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities	0-25	41	1.39	.494	6.879	.000*
		26-49	37	1.22	.417		
		50-74	17	1.06	.243		
		75-100	7	1.86	.378		
11	Understanding data-driven decision making	0-25	41	1.83	.803	1.275	.287
		26-49	37	1.65	.588		
		50-74	17	1.47	.717		
		75-100	7	1.86	.378		
12	Guiding my learning community through the changes in attitude and behavior that high stakes accountability environment demands	0-25	41	1.61	.542	.409	.747
		26-49	37	1.65	.588		
		50-74	17	1.59	.712		
		75-100	7	1.86	.378		
13	Designing curriculum that meets the learning needs of all students and is aligned with state and local standards	0-25	41	1.51	.553	2.409	.072
		26-49	37	1.73	.769		
		50-74	17	1.29	.588		
		75-100	7	1.86	.378		
14	Knowing what constitutes good instructional practice	0-25	41	1.46	.596	1.793	.153
		26-49	37	1.57	.647		
		50-74	17	1.53	.624		
		75-100	7	1.00	.000		
15	Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice	0-25	41	1.39	.586	1.688	.174
		26-49	37	1.46	.505		
		50-74	17	1.29	.470		
		75-100	7	1.00	.000		
16	Understanding the foundations of effective special education	0-25	41	1.51	.506	1.345	.264
		26-49	37	1.41	.599		
		50-74	17	1.41	.712		
		75-100	7	1.86	.378		
17	Understanding and analyzing data	0-25	41	1.71	.642	.949	.420

Appendix R

**Post-Hoc Differences in Principal's Perceptions
as a Function of the Percent of Poverty Children from the Total
School's Population**

		Comparisons by % Poverty Children		Mean Difference	Significance
		0-25	26-49		
1	Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness				
			50-74	.171	.928
			75-100	1.171(*)	.017*
		26-49	0-25	.100	.969
			50-74	.270	.775
			75-100	1.270(*)	.008*
		50-74	0-25	-.171	.928
			26-49	-.270	.775
			75-100	1.000	.098
		75-100	0-25	-1.171(*)	.017*
			26-49	-1.270(*)	.008*
			50-74	-1.000	.098
7	Raising the achievement levels of minority students				
			26-49	-.131	.894
			50-74	.110	.966
			75-100	-1.394(*)	.000*
		26-49	0-25	.131	.894
			50-74	.242	.744
			75-100	-1.263(*)	.001*
		50-74	0-25	-.110	.966
			26-49	-.242	.744
			75-100	-1.504(*)	.000*
		75-100	0-25	1.394(*)	.000*
			26-49	1.263(*)	.001*
			50-74	1.504(*)	.000*
9	Raising the achievement levels of new English learners (ESL)				
			26-49	-.290	.604
			50-74	-.023	1.000
			75-100	-1.174(*)	.029*
		26-49	0-25	.290	.604
			50-74	.267	.815
			75-100	-.884	.163
		50-74	0-25	.023	1.000
			26-49	-.267	.815
			75-100	-1.151	.065
		75-100	0-25	1.174(*)	.029*
			26-49	.884	.163
			50-74	1.151	.065
10	Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities				
			26-49	.174	.361
			50-74	.331	.071
			75-100	-.467	.073
		26-49	0-25	-.174	.361
			50-74	.157	.664
			75-100	-.641(*)	.006*
		50-74	0-25	-.331	.071
			26-49	-.157	.664
			75-100	-.798(*)	.001*

75-100	0-25	.467	.073
	26-49	.641(*)	.006*
	50-74	.798(*)	.001*

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of ≤ 0.05

Appendix S

**Differences in Principal Perceptions
by Current Title 1 Funding Status
(Schoolwide Funding, Title 1 Funding, and No Title 1 Funding)**

		Title 1 Funding	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F value	Significance
1	Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness	Schoolwide	17	1.88	.993	1.240	.299
		Title 1	34	2.00	.816		
		None	48	2.27	.962		
2	Implementing research-based curricula	Schoolwide	17	1.41	.712	.196	.899
		Title 1	34	1.50	.615		
		None	48	1.46	.544		
3	Ensuring that my teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods	Schoolwide	17	1.12	.332	1.400	.247
		Title 1	34	1.32	.535		
		None	48	1.25	.484		
4	Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college	Schoolwide	17	1.35	.493	.530	.663
		Title 1	34	1.59	.657		
		None	48	1.52	.743		
5	Preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my school's effectiveness increases	Schoolwide	17	2.06	.748	.747	.527
		Title 1	34	2.35	.734		
		None	48	2.35	.934		
6	Juggling the demands of running a school in a sea of rising expectations, complex student needs, enhanced accountability, expanding diversity, record enrolments and staff shortfalls	Schoolwide	17	1.65	.606	1.162	.328
		Title 1	34	1.91	.712		
		None	48	1.67	.595		
7	Raising the achievement levels of minority students	Schoolwide	17	1.47	.624	2.988	.035*
		Title 1	34	1.91	.866		
		None	48	1.40	.792		
8	Raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty	Schoolwide	17	1.29	.588	.066	.978
		Title 1	34	1.29	.524		
		None	48	1.35	.785		
9	Raising the achievement	Schoolwide	17	1.94	1.088	1.868	.140

	levels of new English learners						
		Title 1	34	2.15	.857		
		None	48	1.65	.978		
10	Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities	Schoolwide	17	1.29	.470	1.727	.167
		Title 1	34	1.44	.504		
		None	48	1.21	.410		
11	Understanding data-driven decision making	Schoolwide	17	1.47	.514	.843	.474
		Title 1	34	1.79	.687		
		None	48	1.73	.765		
12	Guiding my learning community through the changes in attitude and behavior that high stakes accountability environment demands	Schoolwide	17	1.24	.437	5.507	.002*
		Title 1	34	1.88	.478		
		None	48	1.60	.610		
13	Designing curriculum that meets the learning needs of all students and is aligned with state and local standards	Schoolwide	17	1.29	.588	2.145	.099
		Title 1	34	1.76	.699		
		None	48	1.54	.617		
14	Knowing what constitutes good instructional practice	Schoolwide	17	1.24	.437	2.464	.067
		Title 1	34	1.68	.684		
		None	48	1.42	.577		
15	Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice	Schoolwide	17	1.12	.332	3.029	.033*
		Title 1	34	1.56	.504		
		None	48	1.33	.559		
16	Understanding the foundations of effective special education	Schoolwide	17	1.47	.717	1.059	.370
		Title 1	34	1.62	.551		
		None	48	1.40	.536		
17	Understanding and analyzing data in order to align assessment, standards, curriculum, and instruction	Schoolwide	17	1.29	.470	3.746	.014*
		Title 1	34	1.88	.640		
		None	48	1.56	.649		

18	Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data	Schoolwide	17	1.53	.717	2.219	.091
		Title 1	34	1.94	.649		
		None	48	1.63	.640		
19	Engaging the school community in my school reform efforts	Schoolwide	17	1.59	.795	.714	.546
		Title 1	34	1.79	.641		
		None	48	1.88	.733		
20	Visualizing the future of my specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of my community	Schoolwide	17	1.88	.781	.575	.633
		Title 1	34	2.03	.717		
		None	48	1.83	.753		

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of ≤ 0.05

Appendix T

**Post-Hoc Differences in Principal's Perceptions as a Function of
the School's Current Title 1 Funding Status**

		Comparisons by Title 1 Funding		Mean Difference	Significance
7	Raising the achievement levels of minority students	Schoolwide	2	-.441	.322
			3	.075	.990
		Title 1	1	.441	.322
			3	.516(*)	.042*
		None	1	-.075	.990
			2	-.516(*)	.042*
12	Guiding my learning community through the changes in attitude and behavior that high stakes accountability environment demands	Schoolwide	2	-.647(*)	.002*
			3	-.369	.128
		Title 1	1	.647(*)	.002*
			3	.278	.162
		None	1	.369	.128
			2	-.278	.162

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of ≤ 0.05

Appendix U

Differences in Principal Perceptions by Current Accreditation Status

		Accreditation Status	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F value	Significance
1	Redesigning my school in order to increase my school's effectiveness	Full	88	2.17	.925	1.816	.149
		Warning	10	1.70	.675		
		Denied	2	1.00	.000		
		Conditional	2	2.00	1.414		
2	Implementing research-based curricula	Full	88	1.48	.587	.427	.734
		Warning	10	1.50	.707		
		Denied	2	1.00	.000		
		Conditional	2	1.50	.707		
3	Ensuring that my teachers are trained in research-based instructional methods	Full	88	1.31	.511	1.635	.186
		Warning	10	1.00	.000		
		Denied	2	1.00	.000		
		Conditional	2	1.00	.000		
4	Providing core reading knowledge to novice teachers who did not get this training in college	Full	88	1.55	.693	.788	.503
		Warning	10	1.30	.483		
		Denied	2	1.00	.000		
		Conditional	2	1.50	.707		
5	Preparing for sudden increases in my student population as my school's effectiveness increases	Full	88	2.36	.805	1.029	.383
		Warning	10	2.10	1.197		
		Denied	2	1.50	.707		
		Conditional	2	2.00	.000		
6	Juggling the demands of running a school in a sea of rising expectations, complex student needs, enhanced accountability, expanding diversity, record enrolments and staff shortfalls	Full	88	1.77	.638	.741	.530
		Warning	10	1.50	.707		
		Denied	2	1.50	.707		
		Conditional	2	2.00	.000		
7	Raising the achievement levels of minority students	Full	88	1.60	.838	.360	.782
		Warning	10	1.60	.699		
		Denied	2	1.50	.707		
		Conditional	2	1.00	.000		
8	Raising the achievement levels of students living in poverty	Full	88	1.36	.698	.800	.497
		Warning	10	1.10	.316		

		Denied	2	1.00	.000		
		Conditional	2	1.00	.000		
9	Raising the achievement levels of new English learners	Full	88	1.89	.988	.550	.649
		Warning	10	1.90	.876		
		Denied	2	2.00	1.414		
		Conditional	2	1.00	.000		
10	Raising the achievement levels of students with disabilities	Full	88	1.32	.468	.597	.618
		Warning	10	1.20	.422		
		Denied	2	1.50	.707		
		Conditional	2	1.00	.000		
11	Understanding data-driven decision making	Full	88	1.76	.711	2.189	.094
		Warning	10	1.20	.422		
		Denied	2	1.50	.707		
		Conditional	2	2.00	.000		
12	Guiding my learning community through the changes in attitude and behavior that high stakes accountability environment demands	Full	88	1.69	.575	2.360	.076
		Warning	10	1.30	.483		
		Denied	2	1.00	.000		
		Conditional	2	1.50	.707		
13	Designing curriculum that meets the learning needs of all students and is aligned with state and local standards	Full	88	1.59	.655	.860	.465
		Warning	10	1.50	.707		
		Denied	2	1.00	.000		
		Conditional	2	2.00	.000		
14	Knowing what constitutes good instructional practice	Full	88	1.51	.606	.962	.414
		Warning	10	1.40	.699		
		Denied	2	1.00	.000		
		Conditional	2	1.00	.000		
15	Coaching and guiding teachers in the continual improvement of their educational knowledge and practice	Full	88	1.38	.532	.865	.462
		Warning	10	1.50	.527		
		Denied	2	1.00	.000		
		Conditional	2	1.00	.000		
16	Understanding the foundations of effective	Full	88	1.55	.585	2.917	.038*

special education							
	Warning	10	1.10	.316			
	Denied	2	1.00	.000			
	Conditional	2	1.00	.000			
17	Understanding and analyzing data in order to align assessment, standards, curriculum, and instruction	Full	88	1.68	.653	2.661	.052
	Warning	10	1.20	.422			
	Denied	2	1.00	.000			
	Conditional	2	2.00	.000			
18	Understanding how to interpret research findings and evaluate data	Full	88	1.75	.699	.584	.627
	Warning	10	1.50	.527			
	Denied	2	1.50	.707			
	Conditional	2	2.00	.000			
19	Engaging the school community in my school reform efforts	Full	88	1.84	.725	.931	.429
	Warning	10	1.50	.527			
	Denied	2	1.50	.707			
	Conditional	2	1.50	.707			
20	Visualizing the future of my specific learning community while meeting the adjustment needs of my community	Full	88	1.98	.742	2.331	.079
	Warning	10	1.40	.516			
	Denied	2	1.50	.707			
	Conditional	2	1.50	.707			

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of ≤ 0.05

Appendix V

**Post-Hoc Differences in Principal's Perceptions as a Function of
the School's Current Accreditation Status**

		Comparisons by Accreditation Status		Mean Difference	Significance
16	Understanding the foundations of effective special education	Full	Warning	.445	.135
			Denied	.545	.605
			Conditional	.545	.605
		Warning	Full	-.445	.135
			Denied	.100	.997
			Conditional	.100	.997
		Denied	Full	-.545	.605
			Warning	-.100	.997
			Conditional	.000	1.000
		Conditional	Full	-.545	.605
			Warning	-.100	.997
			Denied	.000	1.000

Note: Those with a bold asterisk have statistical difference at the alpha of ≤ 0.05

Appendix W

TEST OF RELATIVE OUTPUTS

T-TEST
 /TESTVAL = 1.26
 /MISSING = ANALYSIS
 /VARIABLES = raisingdis
 /CRITERIA = CI(.95) .

T-Test

[DataSet1] F:\DISSERTATION SPSS DATA.FEBRUARY.sav

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
raisingdis	102	1.30	.462	.046

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.26			
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
raisingdis	.960	101	.340	.044

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.26	
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Lower	Upper
raisingdis	-.05	.13

T-TEST
 /TESTVAL = 1.26
 /MISSING = ANALYSIS
 /VARIABLES = raisingpov
 /CRITERIA = CI(.95) .

T-Test

[DataSet1] F:\DISSERTATION SPSS DATA.FEBRUARY.sav

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
raisingpov	102	1.32	.662	.066

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.26			
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
raisingpov	.969	101	.335	.064

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.26	
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Lower	Upper
raisingpov	-.07	.19

T-TEST
 /TESTVAL = 1.26
 /MISSING = ANALYSIS
 /VARIABLES = coaching
 /CRITERIA = CI(.95) .

T-Test

[DataSet1] F:\DISSERTATION SPSS DATA.FEBRUARY.sav

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
coaching	102	1.37	.525	.052

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.26			
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
coaching	2.165	101	.033	.113

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.26	
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Lower	Upper
coaching	.01	.22

T-TEST
 /TESTVAL = 1.37
 /MISSING = ANALYSIS
 /VARIABLES = implementing
 /CRITERIA = CI(.95) .

T-Test

[DataSet1] F:\DISSERTATION SPSS DATA\FEBRUARY.sav

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
implementing	102	1.47	.592	.059

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.37			
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
implementing	1.716	101	.089	.101

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.37	
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Lower	Upper
implementing	-.02	.22

T-TEST

```

/TESTVAL = 1.37
/MISSING = ANALYSIS
/VARIABLES = knowing
/CRITERIA = CI(.95) .

```

T-Test

[DataSet1] F:\DISSERTATION SPSS DATA.FEBRUARY.sav

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
knowing	102	1.48	.609	.060

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.37					
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Lower	Upper
knowing	1.831	101	.070	.110	-.01	.23

T-TEST

```

/TESTVAL = 1.37
/MISSING = ANALYSIS
/VARIABLES = understandsped
/CRITERIA = CI(.95) .

```

T-Test

[DataSet1] F:\DISSERTATION SPSS DATA.FEBRUARY.sav

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
understandsped	102	1.48	.576	.057

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.37			
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
understandsped	1.937	101	.056	.110

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.37	
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Lower	Upper
understandsped	.00	.22

T-TEST

```

/TESTVAL = 1.37
/MISSING = ANALYSIS
/VARIABLES = providing
/CRITERIA = CI(.95) .

```

T-Test

[DataSet1] F:\DISSERTATION SPSS DATA.FEBRUARY.sav

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
providing	102	1.51	.671	.066

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.37			
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
providing	2.104	101	.038	.140

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.37	
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Lower	Upper
providing	.01	.27

T-TEST

/TESTVAL = 1.51

/MISSING = ANALYSIS

/VARIABLES = designing

/CRITERIA = CI(.95) .

T-Test

[DataSet1] F:\DISSERTATION SPSS DATA.FEBRUARY.sav

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
designing	102	1.58	.652	.065

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.51			
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
	1.061	101	.291	.068

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.51	
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Lower	Upper
designing	-.06	.20

T-TEST

/TESTVAL = 1.51

/MISSING = ANALYSIS


```

/VARIABLES = raisingminority
/CRITERIA = CI(.95) .

```

T-Test

[DataSet1] F:\DISSERTATION SPSS DATA.FEBRUARY.sav

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
raisingminority	102	1.59	.813	.080

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.51			
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
raisingminority	.972	101	.333	.078

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.51	
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Lower	Upper
raisingminority	-.08	.24

```

T-TEST
/TESTVAL = 1.51
/MISSING = ANALYSIS
/VARIABLES = UNDERTDATA
/CRITERIA = CI(.95) .

```

T-Test

[DataSet1] F:\DISSERTATION SPSS DATA.FEBRUARY.sav

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
UNDERTDATA	102	1.63	.644	.064

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.51			
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
UNDERTDATA	1.843	101	.068	.117

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.51	
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Lower	Upper
UNDERTDATA	-.01	.24

T-TEST

```

/TESTVAL = 1.51
/MISSING = ANALYSIS
/VARIABLES = GUIDING
/CRITERIA = CI(.95) .

```

T-Test

[DataSet1] F:\DISSERTATION SPSS DATA.FEBRUARY.sav

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
GUIDING	102	1.64	.577	.057

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.51			
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
GUIDING	2.229	101	.028	.127

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.51	
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Lower	Upper
GUIDING	.01	.24

T-TEST

/TESTVAL = 1.64
 /MISSING = ANALYSIS
 /VARIABLES = understanding
 /CRITERIA = CI(.95) .

T-Test

[DataSet1] F:\DISSERTATION SPSS DATA.FEBRUARY.sav

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
understanding	102	1.71	.698	.069

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.64			
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
understanding	.954	101	.343	.066

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.64	
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Lower	Upper
understanding	-.07	.20

T-TEST
 /TESTVAL = 1.64
 /MISSING = ANALYSIS
 /VARIABLES = underevaldata
 /CRITERIA = CI(.95) .

T-Test

[DataSet1] F:\DISSERTATION SPSS DATA.FEBRUARY.sav

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
underevaldata	102	1.73	.677	.067

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.64			
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
	1.275	101	.205	.085

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.64	
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Lower	Upper
underevaldata	-.05	.22

T-TEST
 /TESTVAL = 1.64
 /MISSING = ANALYSIS

```

/VARIABLES = JUGGLING
/CRITERIA = CI(.95) .

```

T-Test

[DataSet1] F:\DISSERTATION SPSS DATA.FEBRUARY.sav

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
JUGGLING	102	1.75	.640	.063

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.64			
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
JUGGLING	1.658	101	.100	.105

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.64	
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Lower	Upper
JUGGLING	-.02	.23

```

T-TEST
/TESTVAL = 1.64
/MISSING = ANALYSIS
/VARIABLES = engaging
/CRITERIA = CI(.95) .

```

T-Test

[DataSet1] F:\DISSERTATION SPSS DATA.FEBRUARY.sav

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
engaging	102	1.79	.708	.070

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.64			
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
engaging	2.197	101	.030	.154

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.64	
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Lower	Upper
engaging	.01	.29

T-TEST

```

/TESTVAL = 1.79
/MISSING = ANALYSIS
/VARIABLES = raisingesl
/CRITERIA = CI(.95) .

```

T-Test

[DataSet1] F:\DISSERTATION SPSS DATA.FEBRUARY.sav

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
raisingesl	102	1.87	.972	.096

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.79			
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
raisingesi	.858	101	.393	.083

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.79	
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Lower	Upper
raisingesi	-.11	.27

T-TEST
 /TESTVAL = 1.79
 /MISSING = ANALYSIS
 /VARIABLES = visualizing
 /CRITERIA = CI(.95) .

T-Test

[DataSet1] F:\DISSERTATION SPSS DATA.FEBRUARY.sav

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
visualizing	102	1.90	.738	.073

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.79			
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
visualizing	1.532	101	.129	.112

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.79	
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Lower	Upper
visualizing	-.03	.26

T-TEST

```

/TESTVAL = 1.79
/MISSING = ANALYSIS
/VARIABLES = REDESIGN
/CRITERIA = CI(.95) .

```

T-Test

[DataSet1] F:\DISSERTATION SPSS DATA.FEBRUARY.sav

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
REDESIGN	102	2.10	.917	.091

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.79			
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
REDESIGN	3.391	101	.001	.308

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 1.79	
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Lower	Upper
REDESIGN	.13	.49

T-TEST

```

/TESTVAL = 2.10
/MISSING = ANALYSIS

```



```

/VARIABLES = implications
/CRITERIA = CI(.95) .

```

T-Test

[DataSet1] F:\DISSERTATION SPSS DATA.FEBRUARY.sav

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
implications	102	2.31	.844	.084

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 2.10			
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
implications	2.557	101	.012	.214

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 2.10	
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Lower	Upper
implications	.05	.38

Appendix X

IRB Approval



Office of the Vice President for
RESEARCH and GRADUATE STUDIES
Institutional Review Board for the Social and Behavioral Sciences

In reply, please refer to: Project # 2007-0410-00

January 22, 2008

Deanna Hall
Cheryl Henig
Leadership, Foundations & Policy
1046 Club Terrace
Forest, VA 24551

Dear Deanna Hall and Cheryl Henig:

The Institutional Review Board for the Behavioral Sciences has approved your research project entitled "Perceptions of Virginia Principals as to their Desirability for Staff Development as it Relates to High Stakes Accountability in Meeting the No Child Left Behind Act." You may proceed with this study.

This project # 2007-0410-00 has been approved for the period January 21, 2008 to January 20, 2009. If the study continues beyond the approval period, you will need to submit a continuation request to the Review Board. If you make changes in the study, you will need to notify the Board of the changes.

Sincerely,

Tonya R. Moon, Ph.D.
Chair, Institutional Review Board for the Social and Behavioral Sciences