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Because of the importance of developing highly skilled urban school leaders, statewide assessments of 248 urban Texas public school administrators were analyzed to determine principal confidence levels in leadership skill domains identified by the National Policy Board of Educational Administration (NPBEA). Important findings indicate differences exist between urban principal skill sets in relation to campus student academic achievement as measured by state accountability ratings. Leadership skills of urban principals from schools with the state’s highest student academic ratings differed from principals at lower rated urban schools.
URBAN PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP SKILL PROFICIENCY  
AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT  

Introduction  

Literature related to the urban principalship focuses on four challenges: low SES/high minority population, inexperienced teachers, increasing numbers of dropouts and loss of students (and related revenue) to charter schools. Thus, there is a pronounced need for effective, skilled leaders in urban schools. Urban schools produce overwhelming challenges for public school principals: student enrollment is primarily minority and low-income (Nevarez & Wood, 2007; Talbert-Johnson, 2006; Dittman, 2004; Orfield & Lee, 2004; Porter & Soper, 2003; Lippam, 1996); academic achievement is lower for minority and low-income students (Council of the Great City Schools, 2008), and dropout rates are higher (Laird, DeBell, Kienzl, & Chapman, 2007). Furthermore, diversity in urban schools is reflected in varying student languages, religions, customs, and traditions as well as social behavior patterns and attitudes (Ryan, 2003). In addition, urban public school students are taught by greater numbers of inexperienced and under-certified teachers in schools that are more likely to be classified as underperforming (Humphrey, Koppich, & Hough 2005; Cortney & Coble, 2005; Marnie, 2002). Although recent demographic data suggests a growth in the number of women and minorities hired as principals in urban schools, veteran public school administrators (those with 10 or more years of experience) are predominantly White and male (“The Changing Face Of Principals”, 2008; Tillman, 2003).  

As if the complexity of administering diverse urban schools is not challenging enough, the school choice movement adds disproportionate pressure on urban school administrators to maintain student enrollment in failing schools (May, 2007). Two thirds of the charter school
student population come from urban public schools (Jewell, 2004) and, in the nation’s largest urban districts, the number of students who opted to enroll in charter schools tripled between 2002 and 2004 (Lewis, 2004). The unintended consequence of transfers from public to charter school is reduction in funding for failing urban schools at time when budgets are already stretched (Lasley & Binbirdge, 2001).

If urban public schools are to succeed, one critical requirement is quality school leadership (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Lesotte, 1992, 1991; Reynolds, 1990; Edmonds, 1979). Twenty five years of education research confirms that school leadership is second only to classroom instruction in influencing student achievement (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). Furthermore, countries worldwide have recognized that as school administrator responsibilities continue to increase, a growing need for developing effective school leadership is requisite (Olson, 2008). Consequently, it is essential to identify effective leadership skills for urban principals and determine the extent to which acting principals possess these skills. Targeting specific leadership skills related to student achievement might provide university principal preparation programs and public school district staff development programs with a focus for future development of effective leaders. Ultimately, this may improve student achievement and school performance in urban schools.

Because of urgency for developing highly skilled urban school leaders, this study attempted to identify the leadership skills of practicing urban administrators and determine whether these skills were related to student achievement.

Review of Literature

Principal Effect on Student Achievement
Studies in the U.S. from the last 40 years overwhelmingly support the premise that when schools have an effective principal, students are more likely to achieve academically (Cotton, 1995; Lezotte, 1992). A review of world-wide studies (Hallinger & Heck, 1996) found similar results. Furthermore, a definitive review of thirty years of research by Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) established both a practical and statistical significance in the relationship between student achievement and the quality of school leadership.

Less formally, the importance of effective leadership is also recognized within the public school community, in spite of the difficulty in identifying and assessing the composite required skills. According to Rammer’s (2007) findings, superintendents acknowledge the crucial role effective principals play in the development of schools even though they have no effective means of assessing those skills in potential administrative candidates. Likewise, Hallinger, Bickman, and Davis (1996) report that parents and teachers believe principals make a difference in the achievement of students and the learning environment.

Findings from these studies suggest that even when it is difficult to discern which skills are requisite to effective leadership, there is little doubt among researchers or stakeholders that effective leadership positively affects student achievement.

Principal Assessment

Research confirms that principal effectiveness is important, yet there is no consistent or formalized method for identifying the most highly skilled principals. As noted in Rammer’s (2007) study for example, superintendents’ belief in the value of particular leadership characteristics does not guarantee their ability to correctly assess these skills in potential employees. Adding to the complexity of assessment, findings from a study of new principals (Daresh, 2007) suggest they do not consider critical instructional issues until they first become
comfortable with managing school, further hindering chances for academic improvement. Furthermore, new principals are likely to assess their own performance in terms of management skills rather than instructional leadership. Baxter (2008) posits this may result from university-based principal preparation programs that apply a business manager metaphor to public school administration rather than one of community leader and public servant. Anagnostopoulus and Rutlege (2007) observed that because urban schools are likely to face state and district sanctions for low performing schools, sanctions rather than best practice have become the focus of urban school administrators. Additional findings suggest that, in such an atmosphere, administrators are more likely to resort to the use of top-down managerial skills rather than collaborative instructional leadership skills. Fewer (from 15% to 5%) principals enter administration directly from the classroom (from 15% to 5%), suggesting another disconnect from the skills of instructional leadership (“The Changing Face of Principals”, 2008). Present circumstances and the convergence of these factors, do little to guarantee quality leadership or stem urban school failure.

In spite overwhelming evidence of the principals’ essential role in creating effective schools, measuring leadership effectiveness has yet to be adequately formalized either by urban school districts or by urban principals.

**Effective Principal Self-Assessment**

Among challenges urban school administrators face, self-assessment might be relegated to the end of the list as less urgent. However, personal introspection is prerequisite to understanding complexities of any leadership position. The interdependent nature of a school community makes it necessary for administrators to reflect, identify and confront their feelings and beliefs about education before they can effectively assess their job-related strengths and
weaknesses (Bennis, 1994). Tredway, Brill, and Hernandez (2007) observed this connection between a principal’s reflection on daily school experiences and resulting leadership actions. Similarly, Krovetz (1999) posited that continual reflection is foundational for effective leadership. Without reflection, urban principals cannot accurately assess their skills in relation to the diversity within their campuses and the standards by which they are held accountable.

In spite of overwhelming evidence that principals have an essential role creating effective schools, measuring their leadership effectiveness has not been adequately formalized either by urban school districts or by urban administrators. The following study attempted to identify the relationship between the leadership skills of urban principals and campus student achievement as measured by current state accountability ratings. Demonstrating the mutuality of specific leadership skills and measurable academic achievement would also provide a basis for reflection and school reform.

Procedure

Every five years in Texas, principals are required to participate in a state-approved professional development performance assessment. Records from one such assessment, Principal Assessment of Student Success (PASS), provided the data for this study (see Appendix A). One component of the PASS assessment requires school administrators to rate themselves on 14 leadership knowledge and skill domains (see Appendix B) identified by Thompson (1993) and adopted by the National Policy Board of Educational Administration (NPBEA). PASS principal self-ratings from 2006 to 2008 determined which NPBEA skills predominated among Texas urban administrators in terms of student achievement as measured by the state of Texas public school accountability ratings Academically Acceptable (AA), Recognized (R) or Exemplary (E) (see Appendix C).
PASS NPBEA skills were divided into four domains and ranked by principals within each domain: functional domain (seven skills), programming domain (six skills), interpersonal domain (four skills), and contextual domain (one skill). The 14 NPBEA skills were not ranked overall (1-14). Data for one skill (*Implementation*) within the functional domain were incomplete due to a malfunction in the database and were omitted. Furthermore, because only one skill was listed in the contextual domain (*Legal and Regulatory Applications*), it could not be ranked and, therefore, was also omitted.

In addition, PASS data provided assessments from teams (two assessors per principal) as to the predominant NPBEA skills exhibited by each urban principal. PASS assessors were recruited among veteran campus and central office administrators, as well as from university educational leadership departments within the state of Texas. Sampled principals provided evidence of their job performance in a variety of ways (campus improvement plan, state accountability data, Adequate Yearly Progress phone interview, teacher performance data, and student performance data). Based on this evidence, assessors cooperatively identified each principal’s NPBEA leadership strengths. The top three skills identified by assessors for all principals sampled were tallied and categorized in terms of student achievement as measured by campus accountability ratings (AA, R, or E).

Finally, to identify the relationship between the leadership skills of urban principals and campus student achievement, NPBEA skills identified by sampled principals were compared to NPBEA skills identified by assessors within student achievement categories as measured by campus accountability ratings (AA, R, or E). Because NPBEA skills *Implementation, and Legal and Regulatory Applications* were omitted from the data set of principal rankings, they could not
be compared to ratings by assessors. It was decided to remove ratings of those three skills from the assessor data set as well.

**Participants**

PASS data accessed from principal evaluations conducted throughout the state of Texas from 2006 through 2008 yielded records of 248 urban school principals, representing 51.6% (128) elementary, 20.2% (50) middle, and 28.2% (70) high school campuses.

Table 1

*Frequency Counts and Percentages of Texas Accountability Ratings by Urban School Type (N=248)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academically Acceptable (AA)</th>
<th>Recognized (R)</th>
<th>Exemplary (E)</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>Table %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Of Total %</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Of Total %</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Elementary Campuses</td>
<td>68 (39.3%)</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>48 (76.2%)</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Middle School Campuses</td>
<td>39 (22.5%)</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>11 (17.5%)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban High School Campuses</td>
<td>66 (38.2%)</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>4 (6.3%)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>173 (100%)</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>63 (100%)</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 248 campuses of sampled principals were identified by Texas state accountability ratings (AA, R, E; see Table 1). Elementary schools received more Academically Acceptable (AA) ratings compared to middle school and high school and campuses with 39.3% (68), 22.5% (39),
and 38.2% (66), respectively. Elementary campuses also lead in Recognized (R) ratings 76.2% (48) compared to middle and high schools 11% (17.5) and 6.3% (4), respectively. In addition, only elementary schools were rated Exemplary (E) as compared to high schools and middle schools by 100% (12), 0%, and 0%, respectively. Unequal representation of schools at each instructional level (elementary, middle and high school) within each state accountability level (AA, R, E) may have affected interpretation of study findings. However, the dispersion of these data reflects the pattern of accountability ratings in Texas. Overall, urban campuses rated Academically Acceptable (AA) were associated with 173(69.8%) of sampled principals, the largest group, while urban campuses rated Recognized (R) and Exemplary (E) were associated with 63(25.4%) and 12(4.8%) sampled principals, respectively.

Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to calculate principal and assessor rankings. Chi-square cross tabulation tables determined dependence/independence by school accountability ratings and principals’ NPBEA skill ranking frequency counts per NPBEA domain. Significant differences and effect sizes were reported.

Results

Principal Self-Rankings of NPBEA Functional Domain Skills

The NPBEA functional domain skills included: Leadership, Information Collection, Problem Analysis, Judgment, Organizational Oversight, Implementation, and Delegation. As noted, the skill of Implementation was omitted due to missing data. Principals ranked themselves on functional domain skills using a seven point scale. Rankings for one of the 248 urban school principals was not complete for the remaining six skills and was omitted; only data from the remaining 247 principal skill rankings were computed. The ranking omitted represented an AA rated campus. Rankings were categorized as skills in which principals were Less Confident
(ranks 5-7), Confident (rank 4), or Most Confident (ranks 1-3). Categorized rankings were then sorted by campus state accountability ratings: Academically Acceptable (AA), Recognized (R), and Exemplary (E) as seen in Table 2.

Table 2

*Frequency Counts and Percentages: Texas Accountability Ratings by Principal Ranked NPBEA Functional Domain Skills (N=248; n=247)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPBEA Functional Domain Skills</th>
<th>Academically Acceptable (AA)</th>
<th>Recognized (R)</th>
<th>Exemplary (E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Confident</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Most Confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>24 (14.0%)</td>
<td>14 (8.1%)</td>
<td>134 (77.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 (7.9%)</td>
<td>5 (7.9%)</td>
<td>53 (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (16.7%)</td>
<td>10 (83.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Collection</td>
<td>68 (39.5%)</td>
<td>28 (16.3%)</td>
<td>76 (44.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 (34.9%)</td>
<td>12 (19.0%)</td>
<td>29 (46.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 (41.7%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td>4 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Analysis</td>
<td>48 (27.4%)</td>
<td>37 (21.5%)</td>
<td>87 (50.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 (14.3%)</td>
<td>14 (22.2%)</td>
<td>40 (63.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td>1 (8.3%)</td>
<td>8 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment</td>
<td>34 (19.8%)</td>
<td>33 (19.25)</td>
<td>105 (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 (31.7%)</td>
<td>15 (23.8%)</td>
<td>28 (44.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (33.3%)</td>
<td>2 (16.7%)</td>
<td>6 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Oversight</td>
<td>103 (59.9%)</td>
<td>21 (12.2%)</td>
<td>48 (27.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43 (68.3%)</td>
<td>4 (68.3%)</td>
<td>16 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 (58.3%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>114 (66.35)</td>
<td>17 (9.9%)</td>
<td>41 (23.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46 (73.0%)</td>
<td>1 (91.6%)</td>
<td>16 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 (50.0%)</td>
<td>4 (33.3%)</td>
<td>2 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count Averages</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. Less Confident = (ranks 5-7), Confident = (rank 4), Most Confident= (ranks 1-3); =divided by.

Skill ranking levels (Less Confident, Confident, Most Confident) across campus accountability ratings manifested similar frequency count patterns per NPBEA skills. With the exception of the *Information Collection* skill, each remaining NPBEA functional domain skill was ranked Most Confident per Texas accountability rating (AA, R, E). *Information Collection* was rated Most Confident at AA (6/44.2%) and R (29/46.0%) rated campuses, while it was rated Less Confident at E rated campuses (5/41.73%). *Organizational Oversight* and *Delegation* skills were ranked Less Confident among all three accountability rating categories: AA = 103/59.9%, R = 43/68.3%, and E = 7/58.3%; AA = 114/66.35%, R = 46/73.0%, and E = 6/55.0%, respectively.

Frequency count averages for skills ranked Less Confident were lower than frequency counts averages for skills ranked Most Confident per campus accountability rating category. This tendency for sampled principals was to assess their skills as Most Confident, rather than Less Confident, regardless of their campus accountability rating. Finally, chi-square comparisons between campus accountability ratings and NPBEA functional domain skill ranking frequency counts proved non-significant.

*Principal Self-Rankings of NPBEA Programming Domain Skills*

The NPBEA programming domain included rankings of six skills: *Instructional Management, Curriculum Design, Student Guidance and Development, Staff Development, Measurement and Evaluation,* and *Resource Allocation*. Principals ranked themselves on the programming domain skills using a six point scale. Principal rankings were categorized as Less Confident (ranks 5 - 6), Confident (ranks 3 - 4), or Most Confident (ranks 1 - 2), across the six domain skills. Rankings for four of the 248 urban school principals were not complete for all six
skills and their rankings were omitted; only data from the remaining 244 principal skill rankings were computed. The four principal rankings omitted all represented AA rated campuses. The remaining principals represented 169/69.3% campuses with AA ratings, the largest group, while sampled principals at R and E rated campuses comprised 63/26.8% and 12/4.9%, respectively (See Table 3).

Table 3

Frequency Counts and Percentages: Texas Accountability Ratings by Principal Ranked NPBEA Programming Domain Skills (N= 248; n= 244)
Total count averages by ranking level per NPBEA skill were not unique and differed slightly within each accountability rating. Chi-square comparisons between campus accountability ratings and NPBEA programming domain skill ranking frequency counts proved non-significant or violated expectancy count assumptions.

Principal Self-Rankings of NPBEA Interpersonal Domain Skills

The NPBEA interpersonal domain included four skills: Sensitivity, Oral and Nonverbal Expression, Written Expression, and Motivation of Others. Principals ranked themselves on interpersonal domain skills using a four point scale. Principal rankings were categorized as Less Confident (ranks 3-4) or Most Confident (ranks 1-2) across the four domain skills. Rankings for four of the 248 urban school principals were not complete for all four skills and their rankings
were omitted; only data from the remaining 244 principal skill rankings were computed. The four principal rankings omitted, all represented AA rated schools. The remaining principals represented 169/69.3% campuses with AA ratings, the largest group, while sampled principals at R and E rated campuses comprised 63/26.8% and 12/4.9%, respectively (See Table 4).

Table 4

*Frequency Counts and Percentages: Texas Accountability Ratings by Principal Ranked NPBEA Interpersonal Domain Skills (N= 248; n= 244)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPBEA Interpersonal Domain Skills</th>
<th>Academically Acceptable (AA)</th>
<th>Recognized (R)</th>
<th>Exemplary (E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Least Confident</td>
<td>Most Confident</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating Others</td>
<td>73 (43.2%)</td>
<td>96 (56.8%)</td>
<td>169 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>57 (33.7%)</td>
<td>112 (45.9%)</td>
<td>169 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral &amp; Nonverbal Expression</td>
<td>91 (53.8%)</td>
<td>78 (46.2%)</td>
<td>169 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Expression</td>
<td>115 (68.0%)</td>
<td>54 (32.0%)</td>
<td>169 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Count Averages              | 84              | 85              | 31.5           | 31.5           | 6              | 6              |

*Note.* Less Confident = (ranks 3-4), Most Confident = (ranks 1-2); /= divided by.

NPBEA interpersonal domain skills differed slightly among principal rankings per accountability level. Principals, regardless of school accountability rating, rated themselves Most Confident in the skills of *Motivating Others* and *Sensitivity*. Furthermore, regardless of school accountability
rating, principals ranked themselves Less Confident in skill *Written Expression*. On the other hand, while *Oral and Nonverbal Expression* was ranked Less Confident by AA (91/53.8%) and R (41/65.1%) campus principals, E rated campus leaders split evenly between Most Confident (6/50.0%) and Less Confident (6/50.0%) rankings.

Total count averages by ranking level per NPBEA interpersonal domain skill did not differ by accountability level. AA, R and E categories manifested the same average count totals per ranking level. Chi-square comparisons between campus accountability ratings and NPBEA interpersonal domain skill frequency counts proved non-significant for all domain skills.

**PASS Assessor Ratings of Principal NPBEA Skills**

Teams of two PASS assessors cooperatively rated the NPBEA skills of each principal based upon data from multiple sources. A total of 707 ratings were produced by 244 assessor teams (three skills per principal). However, because data for four of the 18 NPBEA skills were unavailable for comparison in the principal ranked data (*Implementation* and *Legal and Regulatory Applications*) those skills were removed from the assessor data set as well (35 from 707 ratings), leaving a total of 672 ratings (see Table 5). In addition, the skills of *Motivating Others and Delegation* were not rated by assessors as part of the PASS evaluation.

**TABLE 5**

*Frequency Counts: Texas Accountability Ratings by Assessor Ratings of Principal NPBEA Skills* (N= 244 teams)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPBEA Domains</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Academically Acceptable (AA)</th>
<th>Recognized (R)</th>
<th>Exemplary(E)</th>
<th>TOTAL RATINGS</th>
<th>Total By Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>322/672 (47.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Collection</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership produced the largest frequency count from assessors (117) while the lowest frequency count was found for Resource Allocation (11), a difference of 106 counts (See Table 5). Skills in NPBEA’s functional, programming, and interpersonal domains differed in frequency with 322/47.9%, 197/29.3%, and 153/22.8%, respectively. Functional domain skills netted greater totals than skills in the programming and interpersonal domains by 18.6% and 25.1%, respectively. Overall, within the functional domain, Leadership(117) received the largest count while the highest counts in the programming and interpersonal domain were found for Student Guidance and Development (70) and Sensitivity (97).
The five NPBEA skills with highest frequencies by campus accountability level were: AA = Leadership (86), Sensitivity (67), Information Collection (51), Organizational Oversight (50), and Instructional Management (49); R = Leadership (28), Sensitivity (26), Student Guidance and Development (17), Organizational Oversight (16), and Judgment (14); and E = Sensitivity (7), Student Guidance and Development (7), Oral Communication (4), Information Collection (4), and Leadership (3). Although different in rank, all groups shared the skills of: Leadership, Sensitivity, and Student Guidance and Development. Organizational Oversight was common to the AA and R groups while Information Collection was common to the AA and E groups. Only two skills were unique to one group; Judgment was only noted among principals in the R group and Oral Communication was only noted among principals from E rated campuses (see Table 5 and 6).

Comparison of Principal Self- Rankings and Assessor Ratings of NPBEA Skills by Texas Accountability Ratings

In order to identify the relationship between the leadership skills of urban principals and campus student achievement, NPBEA skills identified by sampled principals were compared to NPBEA skills identified by assessors within student achievement categories as measured by campus accountability ratings (AA, R, or E). Table 6 depicts comparisons of the top NPBEA skills found from principal self-rankings and assessor ratings by campus accountability level.

It should be noted that principals ranked skills within three NPBEA domain groups, whereas assessors rated skills within all 14 skills. This accounts for seeming discrepancies reported in the frequency and percentages of E level principal ratings (see Table 6). Furthermore, as previously mentioned, two NPBEA skills were omitted because data were
missing (*Implementation*) or could not be ranked by principals (*Legal and Regulatory Applications*).

**TABLE 6**

**Most Frequent NPBEA Skills: Principal and Assessors Ratings by Texas Accountability Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academically Acceptable (AA)</th>
<th>Recognized (R)</th>
<th>Exemplary (E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most Confident NPBEA</strong></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SKILLS</strong></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Principal Self-</td>
<td>(77.9%)</td>
<td>(84.0%)</td>
<td>(83.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rankings</strong></td>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>Problem Analysis</td>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(45.9%)</td>
<td>(3.5%)</td>
<td>(75.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgement</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(61%)</td>
<td>(58.7%)</td>
<td>(66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Management</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Student Guidance &amp; Development</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(56.8%)</td>
<td>(49.2%)</td>
<td>Instructional Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Analysis</td>
<td>Information Collection</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Staff Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(50.6%)</td>
<td>(46.0%)</td>
<td>(58.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academically Acceptable (AA)</th>
<th>Recognized (R)</th>
<th>Exemplary (E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most Proficient NPBEA</strong></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SKILLS</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Assessor Ratings</td>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Student Guidance &amp; Development</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Collection</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Student Guidance &amp; Development</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Oral communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Oversight</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Organizational Oversight</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Information Collection</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Guidance &amp; Development</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Judgment</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. # = frequency counts.*

Out of the five highest ranked or rated skills, principals from AA rated campus identified only two NPBEA skills that were also noted by assessors as strength areas: *Leadership* and *Sensitivity*. Three skills identified from principal self-rankings but not noted by assessors as most proficient were *Judgment, Instructional Management, and Problem Analysis*. Instead, assessor ratings identified *Information Collection, Organizational Oversight, and Student Guidance and Development* as AA campus principal strengths.

At campuses with R accountability ratings, assessors and principals also produced similar ratings for two out of five NPBEA skills: *Leadership* and *Student Guidance and Development*. 
However, while principals identified *Problem Analysis, Motivating Others, and Information Collection* as strengths, assessors noted *Sensitivity, Organizational Oversight and Judgment*.

In the category of E rated campuses, assessors named *Leadership* and *Sensitivity* as strengths, in agreement with principal rankings. However, although principals ranked themselves highest on these skills, assessors rated *Leadership* less strongly. For assessors, E campus principals were strongest in *Student Guidance and Development, Oral Communication* and *Information Collection*. Other skills noted by principals, but not by assessors, were *Problem Analysis, Instructional Management, and Staff Development*.

In all campus categories, principal rankings and assessors were consistent in their ratings only 2 out of 5 times. Only four unique skills were noted among these groups: *Motivating Others* and *Judgment*, identified in R campus leaders and *Staff Development* and *Oral Communication* found among E campus principals. This suggests urban school principals from R and E rated schools exhibit different skills than urban principals from AA campuses.

**Conclusions**

Even though effective leadership positively impacts student achievement, it has proved difficult to discern the requisite skills of effective leaders (Leithewood, et al., 2004; Cotton, 1995; Lezotte, 1992; Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Marzano et al., 2006). In this study, the PASS assessment was used to measure leadership skills as defined by the NPBEA. Each NPBEA domain (*Functional, Programming, and Interpersonal*) reflects a particular skill set. Before the findings of this study can be adequately discussed, a deeper understanding of the nature of the NPBEA domain skill sets is necessary.

The functional domain comprises skills needed to manage daily, routine campus business (*Leadership, Information Collection, Problem Analysis, Judgment, Organizational*
Oversight, and Delegation). Thus, the term functional indicates a base level of skills needed to manage a school: an organizational structure exists to provide order (e.g. to run the buses on time, schedule classes, supervise instruction, or maintain order). Evidence of effectiveness is typically measured and quantified (e.g. attendance records, disciplinary referrals, walk-through documentation).

The skill set of the programming domain (Instructional Management, Curriculum Design, Student Guidance and Development, Staff Development, Measurement and Evaluation, and Resource Allocation) provides systemic campus leadership which requires greater perspective than do daily routines. Skills in this domain are more complex and difficult to quantify. Building upon skills in the functional domain, programming skills enable principals to develop frameworks, design anticipated outcomes, implement ongoing supervision, set goals and draw inferences.

Within the interpersonal domain are more subjectively measured skills (Motivating Others, Sensitivity, Oral and Nonverbal Communication, and Written Expression). To effectively employ the skills from both functional and programming domains, these interpersonal skills are subject to individual perception. For example, while principals may perceive themselves to be sensitive, teachers may not feel the same way. Furthermore, these perceptions vary according to time or experiences.

This description of NPBEA domain skill sets provides a context from which to compare the principal self-assessments and the assessor rankings of principal NPBEA skills in relation to campus student achievement as measure by state accountability ratings.

Functional Domain Skill Comparisons
Urban principals, regardless of campus accountability rating, consistently ranked themselves as Most Confident in the NPBEA functional domain skills of *Leadership, Problem Analysis*, and *Judgment*, indicating their perceived ability to manage daily campus tasks requiring direction (*Leadership*), identifying problems and possible solutions (*Problem Analysis*), and drawing logical conclusions and making quality decisions (*Judgment*). However, urban principals ranked themselves differently across accountability levels on *Information Collection* (majority rankings: AA and R, Most Confident; E, Less Confident). Urban principals from lower rated campuses may focus on information collections to monitor pass rates on benchmark testing as noted by the Council of Greater City Schools (2008). Furthermore, information regarding academic performance of sub-populations that include primarily minority and low-income students (Nevarez & Wood, 2007; Talbert-Johnson, 2006; Dittman, 2004; Orfield & Lee, 2004; Porter & Soper, 2003; Lippam, 1996); and greater student diversity (Ryan, 2003) may require greater attention of leaders at lower rated campuses. Notably, E campus principals appear not to focus as intently on *Information Collection* skills, perhaps a result of less pressure to improve academic performance. This may allow E campus leaders time to develop more complex leadership skills.

Regardless of campus accountability rating, urban principals also consistently ranked themselves to be Less Confident in the NPBEA functional domain skills of *Organizational Oversight* and *Delegation*. This may reflect the difficulty urban leaders face in providing leadership and management for large, diverse groups of parents, teachers and students. *Organizational Oversight*, by NPBEA definition, requires principals to facilitate groups (i.e. planning and scheduling own and other’s work, appropriately allocating resources and prioritizing goals to meet deadlines). As noted by Ryan (2003), student diversity issues found on
urban campuses intensifies these duties. Furthermore, because urban schools include large numbers of inexperienced and under-certified teachers (Humphrey, Koppich, & Hough, 2005; Courtney & Coble, 2005; Marine, 2002), Organizational Oversight and Delegation may be exponentially more complex. Faculty instability related to inexperienced, under-certified teachers and attrition may inhibit urban leaders from responsibly delegating duties to meet campus goals and deadlines.

**Programming Domain Skill Comparisons**

As previously noted, NPBEA skills in the programming domain are more difficult to quantify and require use of functional domain skills to facilitate frameworks, design anticipated outcomes, implement ongoing supervision, set goals and draw inferences, and allocate resources to reach predetermined goals. Urban principals, regardless of campus accountability rating, consistently ranked themselves Most Confident in Instructional Management and Student Guidance and Development. Furthermore, urban principals, regardless of campus accountability rating, ranked themselves Confident in the skill of Measurement and Evaluation. Accountability, according to the state of Texas and No Child Left Behind (NCLB), requires principals to insure quality, aligned instruction in every classroom, a time intensive process. Focus on state and national accountability measures requires urban principals to competently provide leadership in Instructional Management, Student Guidance and Development, Measurement and Evaluation. Furthermore, student achievement test scores that are quantified and publicly reported, may inhibit urban leaders from prioritizing other goals.

Again, urban principals, regardless of campus accountability rating, consistently ranked themselves to be Less Confident in the skills of Curriculum Design and Resource Allocation. The complexity of large, diverse student populations, teacher attrition and, inexperienced or
poorly trained teachers provide less continuity in long term curriculum planning. As a result, some curriculum design requires extensive faculty training and preparation time. For this reason, it is not uncommon for urban districts to distribute curriculum documents, scope and sequence timelines, and scripted programs to campuses for expediency, thus, establishing a one-size-fits-all curriculum that lacks authentic instruction for diverse student populations. Additionally, low rankings in Resource Allocation could be attributed partially to limited campus funding. It is clear that as more students leave urban schools to attend charter schools or drop out of school, urban principals find they have even less funding available (May, 2007; Jewell, 2004; Lewis, 2004; Lasley & Binbirdge, 2001). Furthermore, in large urban districts, decisions regarding Resource Allocation of human resources, time, and materials are made at the district office level, with little or no input from the campus principal.

Staff Development was the only skill in the programming domain upon which principals differed. Urban principals at E campuses ranked themselves as Most Confident in the skill of Staff Development while, urban principals on AA and R campuses ranked themselves to be only Confident. As Leithwood, et al. (2004) noted, school leadership is second only to classroom instruction in influencing student achievement and several studies have shown that urban schools employ greater numbers of inexperienced and under-certified teachers (Humphery, et al., 2005; Corntey and Coble, 2005; Marnie, 2002). If E campus principals do provide more effective staff development it would follow that student achievement would be positively affected. This would also imply a systemic approach of collaborative leadership rather than top-down management. Interestingly, E campus principals did not associate skills in Staff Development with greater success in Curriculum Design and Resource Allocation.

Interpersonal Domain Skill Comparisons
NPBEA skills in the interpersonal domain, found urban principals, regardless of campus accountability rating, consistently ranked themselves Most Confident in Motivation of Others and Sensitivity. Complexity at large, urban campuses associated with student diversity (Nevarez & Wood, 2007; Talbert-Johnson, 2006; Dittman, 2004; Orfield & Lee, 2004; Porter & Soper, 2003; Ryan, 2003; Lippam, 1996) and challenges in supervising inexperienced/under-certified teachers (Humphrey, et al., 2005; Cortney & Coble, 2005; Marnie, 2002) require principals to motivate staff through supportive feedback, coaching, and guidance. Sensitivity to individual needs may further enhance the motivation process. Principals in the study appeared to understand the importance of motivation and sensitivity needed within urban settings. Because urban settings have diverse populations, principals, regardless of accountability ratings, appeared to value the ability to motivate, while being sensitive to cultural, religious, and sexual orientation differences.

Whereas principal rankings were Most Confident for Motivation of Others and Sensitivity regardless of accountability rating, urban principals were consistently Less Confident in Written Expression. Large urban districts, regulated by complex bureaucracies, typically require conformity to innumerable legal policies and procedures. Furthermore, district level scrutiny and daunting legal implications afforded written statements may cause principals to perceive their written expression skills less confidently.

Oral and Non-verbal Expression was the only skill in the programming domain upon which principals differed. Urban principals at E campuses ranked themselves as Most Confident in the skill of Oral and Non-verbal Expression, while urban principals on AA and R campuses ranked themselves Less Confident. Oral and Non-verbal Expression assists principals to provide clear direction for staff and students to assure goals will be met. Effective communication has
been identified as a key component for leadership; the glue that bonds leadership responsibilities
together (Scribner, Cockrell, Cockrell, & Valentine, 1999; Elmore, 2000; Fullan, 2001; &
Leithwood & Riehl, 2003). This finding implies that in urban schools, campus student
achievement is connected to the principal’s effectiveness in communicating orally and non-
verbally.

Comparison of Principal Self-rankings and Assessor Ratings

A comparison of urban principal self-rankings and PASS assessor ratings produced the
study’s most important findings: E campus principals possess a different skill set than principals
from AA or R campuses.

Principal Skills at Academically Acceptable Campuses

The top ranked skills identified by AA campus principals from highest to lowest were:
Leadership, Sensitivity, Judgment, Instructional Management, and Problem Analysis. Although
selected skills represented all three domains, three of the five reflected functional domain
attributes. In comparison, the top rated skills identified by assessors from highest to lowest
were: Leadership, Sensitivity, Information Collection, Organizational Oversight, and Student
Guidance and Development. While the majority represented functional domain skills, Student
Guidance and Development reflected the programming domain, and Sensitivity represented the
interpersonal domain.

Overall, assessor ratings of AA campus principals centered on skills related to
management (functional domain) rather than collaborative systemic leadership (programming
domain) focused on broader perspectives that utilize frameworks and processes to reach
anticipated outcomes and goals. These findings support Anagnostopoulus and Rutlege’s (2007)
contention that principals from schools facing state and district sanctions for low student
achievement tend to focus on the sanctions rather than best practice. In addition, when faced with performance pressure, administrators are more likely to resort top-down managerial skills rather than collaborative instructional leadership skills (“The Changing Face Of Principals”, 2008).

Comparison of Principal Skills at Academically Acceptable and Recognized Campuses

Top ranked skills identified by R campus principals from highest to lowest were: Leadership, Problem Analysis, Motivating Others, Student Guidance and Development, and Information Collection. This skill set mirrored AA campus principals’ selection of Leadership and Problem Analysis; however, AA and R campus principals ranked the three remaining skills differently. Three of the five skills selected by R campus were from the functional domain (Leadership, Problem Analysis, and Information Collection); however, while principals from AA campuses selected the programming domain skill of Instructional Management, R campus principals selected Student Guidance and Development. The AA campus principals chose supervision strategies to ensure instructional methods created positive learning experiences (Instructional Management) whereas principals from R campuses enlisted support from groups to promote student achievement. This suggests principals from lower performing campuses focus on management verses collaborative leadership as previously noted (“The Changing Face of Principals”, 2008).

In addition, while AA principals selected Sensitivity from the interpersonal domain, R principals selected Motivating Others, perhaps indicating that AA campus principals responded to individuals (Sensitivity), whereas R campus principals attempted to create conditions promoting goals attainment, by providing staff feedback, guidance, and coaching (Motivating
Others). Once again, this evidence suggests R campus principals provide more collaborative leadership than do AA campus principals.

Top assessor ratings for R campus principals from highest to lowest were: Leadership, Sensitivity, Student Guidance and Development, Organizational Oversight, and Judgment. Assessor rated skills differed from RR campus principal rankings. Although three of the top five assessor rated skills (Leadership, Organization Oversight, and Judgment) were functional domain skills, assessors rated Leadership and Sensitivity as the top two skills for both AA and R principals. Assessors rated Student Guidance and Development third highest for R campus principals, in comparison to Information Collection as third highest for AA campus principals. This implies a shift from decision making based on gathering and classifying information (AA principals), to decision making based on cooperation of diverse groups to address student needs (R principals). Although assessors rated Organizational Oversight fourth highest for both AA and R campus principals, ratings of the fifth skill differed; R campus principals (Judgment), AA campus principals (Student Guidance and Development). Assessors found R campus principals more likely to prioritize significant issues, reach logical conclusions, and make quality decisions (Judgment) than did their AA campus counterparts.

While skill rankings and ratings varied in order for AA and R rated principals, principals and assessors chose only nine of the 14 NPBEA skills within their top five. Of the nine, the following seven skills were identified for both AA and R campus principals:

1. Five functional domain skills Leadership, Information Collections, Problem Analysis, Judgment, Organizational Oversight

2. One programming domain skill: Student Guidance and Development

3. One interpersonal domain skill: Sensitivity
Only two skills were unique to one principal group: *Instructional Management* (AA principals) and *Motivating Others* (R principals), both skills identified through principal rankings. *Instructional Management* indicates the use of supervisor skills to ensure instruction methodology, and *Motivating of Others* indicates collaborative coaching and guidance to promote a desire to achieve campus goals. Finally, although the majority of top skills identified for both AA and R campus principals fell within the functional domain, R campus principals’ skills were slightly more likely to promote collaborative leadership. R campus principals appear to focus leadership in areas that directly impact testing results. *Motivation of Others, Student Guidance and Development, and Information Collection* may be skills valued by R principals seeking to maintain or improve accountability test scores; they may emphasize campus-wide strategies to motivate students to learn and be persistent during benchmark and summative testing, guided by data regarding student test performance. Unfortunately, it is not clear from these findings the degree to which AA and R rated schools may have differed in terms of student diversity. Nevertheless, these findings suggest increased student achievement may occur on campuses where urban campus leaders have developed more expertise in program domain skills.

*Principal Skills at Exemplary Campuses*

Top skills from self-rankings by E campus leaders from highest to lowest were: *Leadership, Sensitivity, Problem Analysis, Instructional Management, and Staff Development*. These skills were identified by principals of AA and R campuses with the exception of *Staff Development*, which was top-ranked exclusively by E campus leaders.

The most frequently noted assessor ratings for E campus principals from highest to lowest were: *Sensitivity, Student Guidance and Development, Oral Communication, Information*
Of these, only one skill was found exclusively among E campus principals: Oral Communication. A comparison of skills identified through principal self-rankings and assessor ratings found six common skills among E campus principals and their AA and R campus counterparts:

1. Three functional domain skills: Leadership, Information Collection, Problem Analysis;

2. Two programming domain skills: Instructional Management, Student Guidance and Development;

3. One interpersonal domain skill: Sensitivity

Most importantly, two skills exclusive to urban principals at E rated campuses were: Staff Development and Oral Communication. As noted previously, if E campus principals do provide more effective staff development than to AA and R campus leaders and if E campus leaders supervise faculty through more effective communication (e.g. providing clear instruction, guidance, training, performance feedback, etc.), it follows that student achievement would improve. Again, this implies that E campus principals demonstrate a more systemic, collaborative leadership approach rather than one focused on top-down management.

Recommendations

Because of the importance of quality school leadership to improved student academic performance (Leithwood et al., 2004), professional development opportunities designed specifically for urban principals are needed. Based on the findings of this study, urban principals with lower campus achievement focus on managerial skills in the functional domain. Conversely, it appears urban principals who demonstrate greater programming domain skills systemically
address campus instructional needs utilizing collaborative leadership. These findings are consistent with recent studies regarding the impact of campus leadership on student achievement (Daresh, 2007; Baxter, 2008; & Rutlege, 2007), establishing the necessity of accurate principal assessment in any school reform plan.

Based on study findings, principal preparation programs might place principals in field learning experiences that emphasize:

Functional domain skills: Leadership, Information Collection, Problem Analysis;

Programming domain skills: Instructional Management, Student Guidance and Development; Staff Development

Interpersonal domain skill: Sensitivity, Oral communication

Principal preparation programs could include more authentic writing experiences for principal candidates to bolster confidence in this form of communication.

Future studies might examine the influence of principal attributes (i.e. gender, pre-administrative educational experience, leadership experience) related to differences in campus student achievement levels. Furthermore, differentiation of principals’ skills by campus level of instruction (i.e. elementary or secondary) might reveal effective leadership skills unique to student instructional level. Finally, the skills of Staff Development and Oral Communication, exclusively found among urban principals at campuses with the highest student achievement should be examined in greater depth to determine the degree to which they account for student achievement and the degree to which they vary among campus leaders.
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Appendix A

Principal Assessment of Student Success (PASS),

Principal Assessment for Student Success (PASS) is a principal assessment that has been approved by the State Board of Educator Certification (SBEC) for principal assessment within the state of Texas. According to Texas Education Code (TEC) 21.054, all principals must complete an assessment in order to maintain certification. The overarching goals of PASS include:

1. To determine the level of knowledge and skills for the principalship that each principal assessed demonstrates.
2. To provide quality assessment activities relevant to the role of the principalship.
3. To provide purposeful and constructive feedback related to each principal’s demonstration of knowledge and skills.
4. To provide opportunities for each principal assessed to be reflective about his/her level of knowledge and skills, as well as to his/her plan for professional growth.

PASS is based on three sets of criteria: skills, standards, and knowledge. The skills included in the assessment comprise 14 of the 21 skills identified for the principalship by the National Board of Policy Educational Administration (see Appendix B). The standards are the seven State Board of Educator Certification (SBEC) Standards which are required by the state to be included in the assessment. The knowledge is a compilation of the Ten Components of Effective Schools, the framework components of Instructional Leadership Development (ILD), and the instructional processes from the Student Success Initiative (SSI).

Each criterion is measured multiple times in PASS through a variety of authentic activities within the assessment. PASS contains a self-assessment process, a campus component,
a teacher component, and a student component. All activities are based on authentic data provided by the principal being assessed and are directly connected to his/her campus.

The assessment process occurs over a 30-day period. All online activities are completed within 16 days and are then submitted for assessor review. The assessors are given 11 days to review the online responses and conduct a phone interview with the principal. Each principal’s data and entry is reviewed by two assessors. One assessor is considered the primary assessor and, in addition to scoring the rubrics for each activity, provides written feedback on each activity. The assessment also includes one, face-to-face feedback day in which principals expand on their previous responses with a state-of-the-campus report and a plan of action for a teacher in need of assistance. Each primary assessor provides up to one hour of verbal feedback to each principal being assessed.
Appendix B

National Policy Board of Educational Administration (NPBEA): Knowledge and Skill Domains

*Functional Domains*

1. Leadership: Providing purpose and direction, formulating goals with staff and setting priorities based on community and district priorities and student and staff needs.

2. Information Collection: Classifying and organization information for use in decision making and mentoring.

3. Problem Analysis: Identifying problems, identifying possible causes, seeking additional needed information, framing possible solutions.

4. Judgment: Giving priority to significant issues then reaching logical conclusions and making quality decisions.

5. Organizational Oversight: Planning and scheduling own and other’s work so that resources are used appropriately and monitoring priorities so that goals and deadlines are met.

6. Implementation: Facilitating the coordination and collaboration of campus activities by establishing checkpoints and providing support.

7. Delegation: Assigning projects, tasks, and responsibilities together with authority to accomplish them.

*Programming Domains*

8. Instructional Management: Ensuring appropriate instructional methods are used to create positive learning experiences.

9. Curriculum Design: With staff, planning and implementing a framework for instruction and aligning curriculum with anticipated outcomes.
10. Student Guidance and Development: Enlisting the support and cooperation of diverse professionals, citizens, community agencies, parents and students to promote the growth and development of all students.

11. Staff Development: Supervising individuals and groups and providing feedback on performance and initiating self-development.

12. Measurement and Evaluation: Examining the extent to which outcomes meet or exceed previously defined goals, or priorities and drawing inferences for program revisions.

13. Resource Allocation: Allocating, monitoring and evaluating fiscal, human, material and time resources to reach campus goals and objectives.

Interpersonal Domains

14. Motivating Others: Creating conditions that promote the staff’s desire to achieve campus goals and providing feedback, coaching and guidance to staff.

15. Sensitivity: Perceiving and responding to the needs and concerns of others.

16. Oral and Nonverbal Expression: Making oral presentations that are clear and easy to understand.

17. Written Expression: Expressing ideas and appropriately in writing for different audiences.

Contextual Domains

18. Legal and Regulatory Applications: Working within local rules, procedures, and directives and recognizing standards of care involving civil and criminal liability for negligence.

(Thomson, 1993).

(Note: only 18 of the original 21 NPBEA knowledge and skill domains are assessed in PASS)
Appendix C

Texas Education Agency: School Accountability Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base indicators</th>
<th>Academically Acceptable</th>
<th>Recognized</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAKS (2006-07)</strong> • All students and each student group meeting minimum size: • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadvantage.</td>
<td>Meets each standard: • Reading/ELA ... 65% • Writing.......... 65% • Social Studies.. 65% • Mathematics .... 45% • Science .......... 40% OR meets Required Improvement</td>
<td>Meets 75% standard for each subject OR meets 70% floor and Required Improvement</td>
<td>Meets 90% standard for each subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SDAA II (2007)</strong> All students (if meets minimum size criteria)</td>
<td>Meets 50% standard <em>(Met ARD Expectations)</em> OR meets Required Improvement</td>
<td>Meets 70% standard <em>(Met ARD Expectations)</em> OR meets 65% floor and Required Improvement</td>
<td>Meets 90% standard <em>(Met ARD Expectations)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completion Rate I (class of 2006)</strong> • All students and each student group meeting minimum size: • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadvantage.</td>
<td>Meets 75.0% standard OR meets Required Improvement</td>
<td>Meets 85.0% standard OR meets 80.0% floor and Required Improvement</td>
<td>Meets 95.0% standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Dropout Rate (2005-06)</strong> • All students and each student group meeting minimum size: • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadv.</td>
<td>Meets 1.0% standard</td>
<td>Meets 0.7% standard</td>
<td>Meets 0.2% standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Provisions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exceptions</strong></td>
<td>Applied if district/campus would be Academically Unacceptable due to not meeting Academically Acceptable criteria.</td>
<td>Exceptions cannot be used to move to a rating of Recognized.</td>
<td>Exceptions cannot be used to move to a rating of Exemplary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Leaver Provision for 2007</strong></td>
<td>A campus or district annual dropout rate, completion rate and/or underreported student measures cannot be the cause of lowered rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>