

**SCHOOL DISTRICT-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS:
GRADUATE STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF
THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF
A REFORMED LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

Introduction

Almost two decades have passed since the onset of major criticisms of educational leadership programs across the United States. Various organizations such as the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (1989), the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987), and other public school administrator organizations called for a revamping of educational administration programs. More recently, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortia (1996) have advocated changes in administrator preparation programs. These organizations called for a redefinition of educational leadership, improved field experiences, greater relevance to K–12 education, and a redesign of curricula to reflect modern content, to name a few of their proposals (McCarthy, 1999). Some would argue, however, that these recommendations for reform have led to few changes in leadership preparation programs, which have not had a strong tradition of program self-evaluation (Glasman, Cibulka, & Ashby, 2002).

This article presents a summary of data collected over four years from three different leadership development cohorts in a revised program delivered in partnership with school districts. Faculty members collecting these data believe strongly in program self-evaluation for improvement. An instrument comprised of open-ended questions was designed to understand the perceptions of cohort members about their experiences in the partnership program. Approximately 90 graduate students from the three programs provided written feedback at the end of their two-year programs. Cohort members were asked about curriculum content, quality of instruction, advantages and disadvantages of the partnership arrangement, program delivery, value of cohort learning, internship component, and quality of advising.

Contextual Background

Criticisms of typical educational leadership programs during the past few years have been many. These have included: (a) limited recruitment to identify leadership potential; (b) few significant selection criteria for entry into programs; (c) ineffective pedagogical techniques; (d) low performance expectations; (d) lack of meaningful experiential opportunities; and (e) few programmatic linkages with local school districts (Grosso, 1993; Kelley & Peterson, 2000).

Research conducted by McCarthy (1999) indicated that the basic structures of leadership preparation programs had altered little over time. Many of the course offerings attempted to prepare school leaders to be proficient in such management areas as budgeting, law, organization, and administration but lacked a focus on curriculum and instructional leadership (Glasman & Glasman, 1997). Similarly, Murphy and Forsyth (1999) point-

ed out that in the early 1990s educational administration programs focused on the study of management with little attention to teaching and learning, values and ethics, and student outcomes. They also noted a problem with weak scholarship and instructional methods that relied heavily on lecture and textbook assignments. The Danforth Foundation also recommended an audit of the curricula in leadership preparation programs to assure relevance and the need for varied pedagogy to relate to adult learning styles (Gresso, 1993).

Many of the reports criticizing preparation programs pointed to the paucity of connection between theories studied in coursework with practice in the field (Leithwood, Jantzi, Coffin, & Wilson, 1996). Gallagher and Kimball (2000) compared the realities of the principalship with the realities of principal preparation programs as summarized in the literature. They noted gaps in the areas of instructional leadership, facilitating the change process, and collaborative leadership for preparation programs, to name a few. Most recently, Murphy (2002) stated that the “development of better, or more refined, or more elegant theories in and of itself will have almost no impact on the practice of school administration” (p. 181). Thus, he calls for a reculturing of the profession of educational leadership. Such a reculturing would require a direct connection between theories presented in educational leadership preparation programs and the application of those theories to the challenges encountered by principals. Moreover, reculturing requires a focus on the central roles of leaders: moral steward, educator, and community builder.

Other groups have specifically criticized the internship component of preparation programs (Milstein & Krueger, 1997). The failure of some internship programs may be associated with traditional approaches, an inability to define the process clearly, and a failure to incorporate best practices into the experience (Calabrese & Straut, 1999). Calabrese and Straut (1999) noted that many principals who supervise interns have not formalized a set of experiences to improve the intern’s decision-making abilities; moreover, most site principals lack training in coaching and feedback and oftentimes interns become passive recipients of traditional, normative practices.

Following these criticisms and recommendations from a variety of groups, leadership preparation programs began a flurry of reforms during the 1990s (Hart & Pounder, 1999). These reforms included changes in program content to reflect ethics, social justice, instructional leadership, and developing democratic communities (Murphy, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1994; Pounder, Reitzug, & Young, 2002), and changes in pedagogy to incorporate techniques such as problem-based learning (Hallinger & Bridges, 1996). Other reforms in some preparation programs included an expanded and rigorous internship (Calabrese & Straut, 1999) and the initiation of cohorts for enhanced learning (Basom, Yerkes, Norris, & Barnett, 1996). During the past decade funding by the Danforth Foundation was particularly helpful to several universities around the country in reexamining their leadership preparation programs in response to criticisms. The main intentions of the Danforth Foundation were for preparation programs to (a) redesign curriculum to include skills and knowledge required in the actual role of principal,

(b) design more authentic and rigorous assessment procedures, (c) strengthen the internship component, and (d) offer programs in a cohort format (Grosso, 1993).

More recently, to respond to the perceived lack of connection between university programs and school districts, some universities have initiated partnerships with school districts to strengthen programs and provide greater relevance to the work in schools (Glasman et al., 2002; Whitaker & Barnett, 1999). In part, these partnerships have been formed to respond to the growing problem of a shortage of candidates for the principalship (Whitaker, 2003). Several features of partnership or “grow your own” programs include use of cohort learning, district input on curriculum and instruction, on-site delivery of courses, formal mentoring, joint selection of participants, and the use of practitioners from participating districts as instructors (Whitaker & Barnett, 1999).

Background of Partnership Program

In 1998 discussions began between a district level administrator and the Division Director overseeing our program regarding a possible partnership between the school district and our leadership development program. The major reason behind the idea rested with a shortage of qualified candidates for principalships in this school district. After several meetings, the goals of the partnership were developed and the features of the partnership delineated. These features included: joint planning between the university and school district, formation of a steering committee and site coordinator, joint selection of participants in the program, on-site delivery of the program, use of cohort learning, district input on curriculum and instruction, and mentoring of program participants through the internship component. After a year of success with the first or Northern I partnership, the model was expanded the next year to include an urban/suburban partnership with four districts in a large metropolitan area, referred to as the Metro I partnership. These urban/suburban districts were also experiencing a shortage of qualified applicants for principalships. Subsequent partnerships were established during the next four years involving eight school districts, one with four districts in proximity to the university referred to as the Northern II partnership and a continuation of the urban/suburban partnership, referred to as the Metro II partnership.

Results

The following sections describe the program evaluation data received from cohort members from the Northern II, Metro I, and Metro II partnerships. These data are organized according to curriculum content; quality of instruction; value of cohort learning; delivery site and scheduling; advantages/disadvantages of the partnership arrangement; internship component; and quality of advising and assistance during the program. The article then concludes with recommendations for improving the total program.

Whitaker
King
Vogel

Curriculum Content

The curriculum content for this leadership development program included the following courses: Leadership Development Through Inquiry, External Environments: Social, Political, and Economic Influences in Educational Leadership, Shaping Organizations: Leadership and Management in Education, Understanding People: Human Resources and Professional Development, Supervision of Curricular and Instructional Programs, Law and the Administrator, The Principalship, and Internship.

Cohort members' responses about the curriculum content of the program were positive overall. One student responded:

The courses offered during the program were very beneficial. The content of each course was stimulating and thought-provoking. In each course, I took ideas and/or activities that I would implement in my classroom or "administrative career." In addition, the courses frequently referred to previous coursework and activities. The instructors/professors spent a great deal of time making certain the activities and learning were relevant and practical.

Another student expressed a positive comment about the content of the program by stating, "The curriculum was top notch. I feel I could walk into an administrative job tomorrow and have the skills and knowledge to do the job. In the end, that is the real test." One cohort member commented that the curriculum was presented with flow so that individuals could build on prior knowledge.

A student from a different cohort was less enthusiastic about the content, stating, "Overall the content was adequate. There were times I questioned the type of information passed on—too theoretical, ideal, and not enough real world stuff." Similarly, a few mentioned that there was overlap among the courses. Others expressed slight concern over missing topics or insufficient depth. In one cohort, in particular, the need for more skill development in budgeting was mentioned. A cohort member stated that "the primary focus in the program was on people and interpersonal skills. We need more concrete details on how to do the job—budget, staffing, master schedule. Law should have been over a longer period of time."

The courses that were most frequently mentioned as relevant and interesting to students were Law and the Administrator, and Supervision of Curricular and Instructional Programs. One student remarked, "the law class was tough, but helpful as we examined current issues and understood the legal implications we may face as principals." Another cohort member said about the supervision course, "I really enjoyed learning about cognitive coaching and strategies for evaluating teaching. Learning about instructional leadership was also valuable."

Quality of Instruction

The instructional model used in these partnership programs included an instructor from each participating school district for some courses or as team teachers, balanced with full time professors in the Division. Students in the cohorts seemed to appreciate the balance of instructors between

full time professors and practitioners from the participating school districts. Typically the practitioners were superintendents, assistant superintendents, and/or principals. One cohort member expressed, "One of the biggest selling points to this program is that some of the instructors are practitioners. Their willingness to share their expertise, experience and time with cohort members was unsurpassed by any academic experiences I have had in the past. The instructors were highly qualified, excellent pedagogues, and very interested in assisting the students in clearly understanding the administrator's role." In contrast, one student stated that the adjunct instructors were not "teachers" and conducted direct instruction classes that did not serve cohort members who worked all day before attending class.

Most of the responses about the quality of instruction were positive. Many cohort members expressed feelings about particular instructors and their instructional techniques. One student commented, "I applaud the university for its fine instructors especially in light of the personnel issues experienced by the department. The combination of professors and administrators made for a strong mix of theory and practice."

Several students commented on the array of instructional techniques used and the variety that existed among the different professors. The strategies that were viewed most positively included simulations, role playing, and panel discussions with current administrators. One cohort member offered, "Those instructional strategies that were practical and hands on worked best, including the shadow a principal project and the field practice observing and conferencing with teachers." A student from a different cohort expressed, "The reflective questioning and writing were helpful techniques in helping me define who I am as a person and as a leader. The ethics interviews in the Principalship class were also helpful in defining values. I would suggest using more shadowing of principals at other levels."

Value of Cohort Learning

It is not surprising that all students in the three cohorts valued cohort learning to a great extent. Similarly, the research on the use of cohort learning has pointed to many positive effects (Basom et al., 1996; Norris, Barnett, Basom, Yerkes, 2002). These positive effects include a contribution to academic rigor, development of community, and fostering team building (Murphy, 1993; Basom et al., 1996). The long term association with the same individuals fosters strong interpersonal relationships, creates caring learning climates, and supports students' sense of competence and well being (Crow & Glascock, 1995; Norris & Barnett, 1994). Students in the three cohorts described here found many benefits including bonding, support for each other professionally and personally, increased academic learning, and positive networking between districts. Below are several direct quotes from students in the three cohorts about the value of cohort learning:

The advantage of establishing relationships and trust goes well beyond the cohort time period. As time goes on, a support group evolves and a unique bond develops among people. The cohort extends beyond "class time" and on many occasions people in the cohort become advisors and providers of information.

*Whitaker
King
Vogel*

The cohort has become an invaluable resource for my career goals. It is nice to have a group of people who understand what it is like to be a “baby” administrator. These are people with whom you share your educational philosophy as well as your mistakes.

The value of the cohort for me was the learning environment that evolved. I think I gained a deeper, more meaningful involvement with the material as a result.

Immeasurable! Each semester we were together brought the value to a higher level. I cannot imagine doing this program in any other way. It would not have been nearly as valuable!

I would not have completed this program had it not been for this supportive group of people. It was helpful to study and learn with them, given their varied experiences. I feel more confident applying for jobs outside my own district because of them.

Clearly, the cohort model of learning was the most positive aspect of the program overall. Not one student from the three cohorts expressed a negative statement about cohort learning. From the students’ comments, each group grew personally and professionally the longer it stayed together. The trust and bonding that occurred among group members over the two-year programs seemed to enhance their professional learning individually and collectively.

Delivery Site and Scheduling

In the Metro I program, the Steering Committee made the decision to rotate delivery sites among the four districts involved. Thus, each semester the site for the course offered was different. Each district provided a site at no cost to the university since this was a partnership arrangement. In most cases, the site was a room at the district administration office and in one case the site was a middle school classroom. Most students in this group viewed the site change each semester as positive. One cohort member stated, “I loved the rotation among districts; Wednesday nights were great and consistency was good.” Another student remarked, “Excellent—everyone was close to the site at some point. I really preferred having classes during the week rather than on weekends.” A few other students in the Metro I cohort stated a preference for a consistent site that was centrally located. One individual expressed, “A central location would have been nice; it would seem better to have one consistent site for all classes.”

In the Metro II program, the district level administrators decided to have the entire program at a centrally located site in one of the participating school districts. Part of the reason for this change was that a new professional development center had opened in the school district and the facility was more conducive to adult learning than, and technologically superior to, the sites other districts could offer. Additionally, having to find a site each semester was somewhat time consuming for the district administrators and the university coordinator. Since the program was in partnership with school districts, there was no charge to the university for using the facility.

The Metro II cohort members reported a great deal of satisfaction with the site of program delivery at the new professional development cen-

ter. All of the comments were highly positive. One student remarked, "The site was convenient and dependable. I found it easy to get to and it was such a professional environment." Another student stated, "The site and timing was excellent. It couldn't be improved in my opinion. I was delighted to be participating in a program in a building within my own district. The facility was comfortable and accessible." Similarly, the Northern II cohort responded positively to locating the entire program at a new centrally located high school media center.

All classes were held on the same weekday evening during the academic year. Rather than alter the day of the week each semester, the decision was made to have consistency in scheduling so that students could plan in advance. All program participants provided positive remarks about the once-per-week evening schedule. A few students commented on the more compressed summer schedule, when two courses were offered back to back, especially during one of the cohorts when the law course was offered during a short summer session. The program participants felt that there was so much information to acquire from the law course that a short summer session was not enough time to grasp the content. Thus, in future cohorts the decision was made not to offer the law course during the shortened summer session.

Advantages/Disadvantages of the Partnership Arrangement

All cohort members from these three partnerships expressed highly positive feelings about the collaborative arrangement among the school districts and the university educational leadership program. Within each partnership, a district level administrator from each participating district served on a Steering Committee with the university coordinator. Districts provided cohort members with two days of release time per year to attend conferences, complete fieldwork, and participate in other professional growth activities. According to cohort perceptions, the positive aspects of the partnership and the inclusion of four school districts included networking among districts, learning about policies and practices in other districts, and hearing diverse views from different district administrators. An individual Metro II cohort stated:

The partnership is another remarkable and unique feature to the program. It was exciting to work with other professionals from other districts. The insight gained by viewing the world from another perspective is incredible. Additionally, using administrators from the different districts enabled me to learn more in-depth information about the administrators and their responsibilities in each district.

Another student remarked:

I enjoyed listening to how other districts do their thing. Sometimes it is easy to get tunnel vision when it comes to problems in your own district. It was also nice to make some connections with other districts. When I think of becoming a principal at a school and how lonely it is, I like the thought of having colleagues in other districts that I can go to for advice.

Attitudes about district level support to cohort members during the program were mixed. In both of the Metro cohorts, program participants received two days of release time per year as a way to demonstrate district support and this release time was viewed positively. A few students commented about the lack of district involvement after the cohort was started. One student remarked, "I felt the district leadership really dropped the ball. After being accepted into the program, there was little encouragement or recognition from my own district." Another cohort member stated, "Initially the districts seemed supportive. I didn't feel any recognition or support from my district in the second year." Some felt the districts should provide more financial support. A student from Metro I cohort offered, "If these districts are serious about growing their own and supporting us, why not support us financially? For a whole district the cost of 25% of the tuition would not be a burden. At a minimum, the internship should be a paid stipend to cover the tuition for the internship course."

In the Northern II partnership with districts closer to the university campus, district level support differed somewhat among the four participating districts. One district, for example, provided their program participants with more release days than other participating districts. Moreover, one district provided participants with tuition funds obtained from a grant by a local foundation and a second district provided tuition assistance as well. A student from a district that provided financial assistance commented, "I didn't feel much district support other than the financial contributions." However, in the smaller district involved, no financial assistance was provided and comments among these students were less positive as one student remarked, "I wish my district would have provided more or at least equivalent support as the other districts did."

Some cohort members obviously perceived they had more district support than others, either financial or in other ways. A few individuals felt their district administrators knew them and this would translate into better job possibilities after completing the program. Several program participants appreciated the financial support, but they desired more contact with district administrators during the program. All program participants in all the cohorts valued the participation of district administrators in the instructional component.

Internship Component

In all partnership programs, students were assigned a formal mentor, usually their principal, to guide them in the internship component. Each mentor received a \$500 stipend for their guidance over the duration of the program. The internship component was extended over the two-year length of the program so that students could have more time to complete internship hours. Students seemed to like the internship over the duration of the program as is illustrated by a student who expressed:

This component is another big seller for this program. In most programs, the internship is completed in a single semester. The opportunity to work with the building principal to develop a meaningful internship over two academic years enhances the successful cohort

experience. I was able to fine tune my internship, focus on areas of need and develop my skills. When completed appropriately and honestly, the internship can offer the student a lifetime of learning.

Generally, cohort member responses were mixed about the quality of the internship experience. As is usually the case, the quality of the internship depends on the level of commitment and guidance provided by the mentor. In the two Metro cohorts, the same university faculty member coordinated the internships and made site visits to school sites to discuss the internship and mentor roles and responsibilities. Although the internship was spread over two years, several students expressed the need to have more release time to complete internship requirements. One program participant stated, "It was very hard to find time, in a full teaching schedule with all the other responsibilities, to feel like one had a comprehensive program."

In the Northern II partnership, the internships were supervised by district level administrators rather than a university faculty member. We found that the internship ran more smoothly if coordinated by a university faculty member rather than four different district administrators who were overwhelmed by their own job responsibilities. A program participant commented, "My internship was probably the weakest part of the overall program. I felt it lacked support and direction." Another student in this cohort who did not have a quality internship expressed, "I had to scramble for every moment, continually remind my mentor that I wanted hours, had to create work and hours on my own, beg for meeting time and usually didn't get it. I am not sure my mentor earned the money." Conversely, another program participant in this cohort stated, "My internship experience was truly a quality one. I was able to be a part of the leadership team in our building and take a major role in several large projects."

Quality of Advising and Assistance Received During the Program

Most of the attitudes concerning advising given during the program were positive. Although each program participant was assigned a faculty member as advisor, advising was usually done in a group setting at the beginning of and during the cohort experience. Since the sequence of courses was already established at the beginning of the program, students knew from one semester to the next what course they would need the following semester. However, about half the students chose to enroll in additional courses to earn graduate degrees such as the Master of Arts or Education Specialist degrees beyond the principal licensure program. For these students, advising required more frequent contact to discuss transfer hours, optional offerings, and comprehensive exams. Since these cohorts were off-campus, individual advising was also done via email. As one cohort member expressed, "The ability to connect with my advisor via email helps address concerns in a timely manner. I was thrilled with the academic advising. My advisor was instrumental in fostering the desire to learn. The time I waited for a response from my advisor was more reasonable than what most students in public high schools wait for time with their counselors. The advising is great!"

*Whitaker
King
Vogel*

In the Northern II partnership, the advisor originally assigned to the cohort left the university half way through the program. While the program assigned a new advisor to this group, some cohort members felt the transition was confusing. As one student stated, “The advising element wasn’t as strong as we had to change advisors midstream. I was always playing catch-up.” A different view was expressed by another participant from this cohort, “I felt the quality of advising and assistance from the professors was very good. I found them highly available and helpful.”

Recommendations and Summary

The experiences of these partnerships between the university and select school districts support the findings of other studies pertaining to best practices in leadership preparation. These best practices include quality curriculum and instruction, cohort learning, the integral involvement of school districts, an excellent internship with committed mentors, and commitment to the program participants through advising and other forms of assistance.

While most of the program participants viewed the curriculum content as highly relevant and satisfactory, a few individuals offered suggestions for improvement, particularly in managerial aspects related to school leadership. While only one of the ISLLC standards address managerial functions (ISLLC, 1996), principals must deal with issues of safety, construction, scheduling, and budgeting on a regular basis. Such topics are often viewed as mundane and easy to learn “on the job,” but they should also be included in the curriculum as vehicles of school improvement. These managerial functions are also identified by female and minority administrators as areas in which they receive the most scrutiny and feel the least prepared (Gardiner, Enomoto, & Grogan, 2000). Although the internship component of the program includes managerial functions, we recommend inclusion of these issues throughout the curriculum in addition to a focus on instructional leadership, social justice, and ethics. For example, managerial functions such as budgeting and finance can be included in the External Environments class, personnel functions can be more fully addressed in the Understanding People class, and other management functions can be incorporated in The Principalship class.

Closely related to the curriculum content is the instructional component of the program. Similarly, the feedback from program participants about the overall quality of instruction in the programs was positive. Cohort members reported that the most useful instructional techniques included role playing, simulations, assignments directly connected to the field, and guest speakers in roles as administrators. In particular, program participants expressed a high degree of satisfaction in the balance of district level administrators and university professors for instruction. While this model appears to be a positive component of the program, it is important for the coordinator of the programs to communicate well with practicing administrators about the overall program content and expectations for delivering the curriculum. This communication should include sharing course syllabi, lesson plans, and other curricular materials to assist the practicing administrators. Given the overwhelming job responsibilities of these administrators, it is

easy to resort to “stories of administrative life” while omitting some of the intended content of the preparation program.

The use of cohort learning is another esteemed element of the program. Although effective use of cohorts in higher education requires considerable collaboration and additional work for faculty (Muth & Barnett, 2001), the cohort model builds relationships among program participants, as well as among practicing administrators who can serve as mentors, and networks of professional support that promote both entry into administration and the retention of school leaders. In addition, this model permits a sequential set of learning experiences and greater connection between theory and internship activities. As Jackson and Kelley (2002) observed, virtually all exemplary leadership preparation programs are cohort based.

The partnership model is becoming more and more prevalent in the evolution of leadership preparation programs. No longer can preparation programs design and deliver learning experiences without the integral involvement of the school districts they serve. Given the shortage of principal candidates faced by most school districts across the country, more district level leaders are clamoring for “grow your own” programs (Whitaker, 2003). Based on previously cited literature and the feedback from the program participants described in this paper, the partnership model is a highly valued component of our preparation program and should be continued. However, this model should not be the only approach to leadership preparation. It is not possible for limited numbers of universities to partner with all districts in a large metropolitan area, or within all rural areas in the state. Within partnership programs, there also must be better assurance that districts use more uniformity in offering release time or financial assistance to cohort members.

The on-site delivery of instruction and the use of local school district administrators, as well as university faculty, encourage the integration of knowledge and skills acquired through coursework because of an enhanced mutual awareness of opportunities for application between students and instructors. Clearly, the program participants found value in district administrators being included in the instruction and delivery of courses. The on-site delivery model increases the access of administrators to teach in the program since these individuals lead busy professional lives and need close proximity to the classes. Additionally, cohort members have busy professional and personal lives as well, and need easy and convenient access to programs. Based on the feedback from the cohort members in these programs, a central and consistent site for coursework delivery in a highly professional and well-equipped setting is preferred.

The literature suggests that the internship is perhaps the most important component of preparation for effective school leadership (Geismar, Morris, & Lieberman, 2000; Valentine, 2001). The model described in this article supplies the practical application of educational leadership theories to real school leadership challenges. The two-year length of the internship in this cohort model exemplifies the benefits of long term involvement in one or more school settings (Bottoms, 2002; Grogan & Andrews, 2002). Interns are able to observe the implementation of policies and the application of leadership practices in their entirety rather than the traditional snap-

shot exposure at the conclusion of the preparation program. Valentine (2001) found that students who were involved in a long-term internship that was integrated with coursework as part of a cohort model scored high on the ISLLC assessments and employer evaluations. A sustained involvement in a school setting also allows the development of reflective practices through group discussions and class activities, as well as for the natural development of mentoring relationships (Bottoms, 2002). The perceived lack of involvement of some mentors and lack of district support for some cohort members suggest that more formal and explicit agreements between participating districts and the university and/or planned mentorship training at the beginning of the program might enhance the mentoring component of the internship.

Finally, the commitment to program participants is of vital importance to a partnership arrangement that works. If program participants perceive that either the university or the districts involved have little commitment to them, they will not leave the program with a positive view. We recommend a program coordinator who works closely with participating school districts. This coordination involves organizing regular meetings with school district representatives, developing schedules and site selection for the program, supervising the internship component including working with mentors, communicating with and providing materials to practicing administrators who teach in the program, and providing quality advising and regular communication with individuals in the program.

As the nation faces a shortage of highly qualified school leaders who are willing to fill vacancies left by massive waves of retiring administrators, the preparation of these future leaders is perhaps more important than at any time in the history of U.S. public education (Educational Research Service, 1998). The challenges of educational leadership will never diminish, and it is the responsibility of preparatory institutions to design and redesign with school districts effective partnership programs to prepare individuals to rise to the challenge and effectively lead schools in the twenty-first century.

References

- Basom, M., Yerkes, D., Norris, C., & Barnett, B. (1996). Using cohorts as a means for developing transformational leaders. *Journal of School Leadership, 6*(1), 99–112.
- Bottoms, G. (2002). *Leading school improvement: What successful school leaders need to know and be able to do*. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Calabrese, R. L., & Straut, D. (1999). Reconstructing the internship. *Journal of School Leadership, 9*, 400–421.
- Crow, G. M., & Glascock, C. (1995). Socialization to a new conception of the principalship. *Journal of Educational Administration, 33*(1), 22–43.
- Educational Research Service. (1998). *Is there a shortage of qualified candidates for the principalship? An exploratory study*. Reston, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

- Gallagher, H. A., & Kimball, S. M. (2000, November). *Lessons in principal training and support: Case studies of principal assistance under comprehensive school reform designs*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Albuquerque, NM.
- Gardiner, M. E., Enomoto, E., & Grogan, M. (2000). *Coloring outside the lines: Mentoring women into school leadership*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Geismar, T., Morris, J., & Lieberman, M. (2000). Selecting mentors for principalship interns. *Journal of School Leadership, 10*, 233–247.
- Glasman, N. S., Cibulka, J., & Ashby, D. (2002). Program self-evaluation for continuous improvement. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*, 257–288.
- Glasman, N. S., & Glasman, L. D. (1997). Connecting the preparation of school leaders to the practice of school leadership. *Peabody Journal of Education, 72*(2), 3–20.
- Grosso, D. W. (1993). Genesis of the Danforth preparation program for school principals. In M. M. Milstein & Associates (Eds.), *Changing the way we prepare educational leaders* (pp. 1–16). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.
- Grogan, M., & Andrews, R. (2002). Defining preparation and professional development for the future. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(2), 233–256.
- Hallinger, P., & Bridges, E. (1996). Developing school leaders who are learning through problem-based learning leadership development. *Teaching in Educational Administration, 3*(2), 1–4.
- Hart, A. W., & Pounder, D. G. (1999). Reinventing preparation programs: A decade of activity. In J. Murphy & P. B. Forsyth (Eds.), *Educational administration: A decade of reform*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC). (1996). *Standards for school leaders*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Jackson, B. L., & Kelley, C. (2002). Exceptional and innovative programs in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(2), 192–212.
- Kelley, C., & Peterson, K. (2000). *The work of principals and their preparation: Addressing critical needs for the 21st century*. Madison, WI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., Coffin, G., & Wilson, P. (1996). Preparing school leaders: What works? *Journal of School Leadership, 6*(1), 316–342.
- McCarthy, M. M. (1999). The evolution of educational leadership preparation programs. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research in educational administration* (pp. 119–139). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Milstein, M. M., & Kruger, J. A. (1997). Improving educational administration preparation programs: What we have learned over the past decade. *Peabody Journal of Education, 72*(2), 100–116.
- Murphy, J. (1992). *The landscape of leadership preparation: Reframing the education of school administrators*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Whitaker
King
Vogel

- Murphy, J. (Ed.). (1993). *Preparing tomorrow's school leaders: Alternative designs*. University Park, PA: University Council for Educational Administration.
- Murphy, J. (2002). Reculturing the profession of educational leadership: New blueprints. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38, 176–191.
- Murphy, J., & Forsyth, P. B. (Eds.). (1999). *Educational administration: A decade of reform*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Muth, R., & Barnett, B. G. (2001). Making the case for professional preparation: Using research for program improvement and political support. *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program Development*, 13, 109–120.
- National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. (1987). *Leaders for America's schools*. Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (1989). *Improving the preparation of school administrators: An agenda for reform*. Charlottesville, VA: Author, University of Virginia. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 310493)
- Norris, C. J., & Barnett, B. G. (1994, October). *Cultivating a new leadership paradigm: From cohorts to communities*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Philadelphia, PA.
- Norris, C. J., Barnett, B. G., Basom, M. R., & Yerkes, D. M. (2002). *Developing educational leaders: A working model, the learning community in action*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Pounder, D., Reitzug, U., & Young, M. (2002). Preparing school leaders for school improvement, social justice, and community. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century* (pp. 261–288). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1994). Organizations or communities: Changing the metaphor changes the theory. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30, 214–226.
- Valentine, J. (2001). *Goals 2000 principal leadership development project: Final report*. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.
- Whitaker, K. S. (2003). Superintendent perceptions of the quantity and quality of principal candidates. *Journal of School Leadership*, 13, 159–180.
- Whitaker, K. S., & Barnett, B. G. (1999). A partnership model linking K-12 school districts and leadership preparation programs. *Planning and Changing*, 30(3/4), 126–143.

Kathryn S. Whitaker is a Professor in Educational Leadership and Policy at the University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colorado.

Richard King is a Professor in Educational Leadership and Policy at the University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colorado.

Linda R. Vogel is an Assistant Professor in Educational Leadership and Policy at the University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colorado.