

# THE ISLLC STANDARDS’ “FOOTPRINTS” AND PRINCIPAL EVALUATION: A NATIONAL STUDY OF SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS\*

Gerard Babo

This work is produced by The Connexions Project and licensed under the  
Creative Commons Attribution License †



NOTE: This manuscript has been peer-reviewed, accepted, and endorsed by the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) as a significant contribution to the scholarship and practice of education administration. In addition to publication in the Connexions Content Commons, this module is published in the *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, <sup>1</sup> Volume 5, Number 1 (January – March 2010). Formatted and edited in Connexions by Theodore Creighton, Virginia Tech.

## 1 Introduction

As one of the primary elements of the licensing process for public school administrators, specifically the principalship, The ISLLC Standards (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996) are referenced by approximately 43 states (Derrington & Sharrat, 2008). Additionally, 16 states use the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA), which is based on the ISLLC Standards, as the chief test for granting principal certification (ETS.org, 2009). Since 1996 the ISLLC Standards have influenced both individual state certification requirements and university principal preparation and licensing programs across the nation (Davis & Hensley, 2000; Waters & Kingston, 2005; Crow, 2006). The ISLLC Standards have come to be accepted by the fields of public school administration and administrator preparation as the gold standard for the training and licensing of public school building principals (Murphy & Shipman, 1999).

Although some have argued that there is a lack of experiential evidence to support these nationally accepted standards (English, 2005; English, 2006; Lindle, Stalion & Young, 2004), principal preparation

---

\*Version 1.1: Dec 24, 2009 7:29 am US/Central

†<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>

<sup>1</sup><http://ijelp.expressacademic.org>

programs and state licensure agencies continue to provide a level of credibility through a *de facto* level of acceptance of the ISLLC Standards. However, little has been done to distinguish and identify if a preferred hierarchy exists on the application of these standards at an operational level (Lindle, Stalion & Young, 2004), which would impact perceived competency, as documented with regard to the summative evaluation process, for building principals currently working in the field.

This research was inspired by a similar yet smaller study on the possible application of the ISLLC Standards' "elements" by suburban New Jersey (NJ) school superintendents on principal evaluation (Babo, 2009). Partial results from that study found that a hierarchy of importance does exist for the ISLLC 2008 Standards' "footprints" as they are applied to the process of principal evaluation by suburban NJ school superintendents. Those findings suggested that NJ school superintendent's might rank order the ISLLC 2008 Standards' "footprints" in the following manner: 1) Standard II – Instruction and Student Achievement; 2) Standard V – Acting in an Ethical Manner; 3) Standard I – Vision; 4) Standard III – Managing the Organization; 5) Standard IV – Collaborating with Community; 6) Standard VI – Understanding the Larger Context (Babo, In Press). Since these results seem to contradict some of the discussion in the field about what a principal's primary concerns should be, further exploration at a national level in this area seemed a reasonable query.

Additionally, very little empirical research addresses the school superintendent's role and responsibilities as the primary agent who is assigned the task of principal evaluation (Derrington & Sharrat, 2008). Moreover, the literature base discussing a reliable system of principal evaluation is at best scant (Rosenberg, 2001; Catano & Stronge, 2006). Consequently, studies examining the evaluation process of building principals and what influences these evaluations need to be considered as an essential area for exploration in the field of public school leadership. Clearly, the field of public school administration, specifically programs in administrator preparation, needs to better understand how chief school administrators apply the ISLLC standards to the summative evaluation process for principals currently working in the field if they want to ensure that their graduates will be successful in the future (Barnet, 2004).

The purpose of this research project then was to determine the hierarchy of importance for the basic leadership functions and responsibilities associated with the job of a building principal, as defined by the ISLLC 2008 Standards' "footprints," through the context of the summative evaluation process for building principals as it is carried out by the nation's superintendents. The primary research question addressed in this paper is: To what extent does a hierarchy of importance exist when a national sample of school superintendents applies the ISLLC 2008 Standards' "footprints" to the summative evaluation process of building principals?

## 2 Methodology

### 2.1 The Survey and Data Collection

This study can be characterized as a descriptive research design, which used an on-line survey data collection tool accessed through Qualtrics Inc. (<https://www.qualtrics.com/>). The construct model for the survey was based on The Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008 (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2007). The ISLLC 2008 Standards provide a generally accepted operational model for what public school principals need to be able to do in their role as building leaders as has been suggested and proposed by the authors and developers of the ISLLC standards (Latham & Pearlman, 1999). Construct validity for the 66 item "forced response" multiple selection survey was acquired through expert review. A reliability alpha of .95 was obtained using the Cronbach's Alpha function in SPSS.

The primary focus of this paper is based on the results of a single multiple response matrix question that appeared at the beginning of the 66 item survey. This matrix response question required respondents, presumably superintendents or the district's chief school administrator, to determine a hierarchy of importance or rating for each of the ISLLC 2008 Standards' six "footprints" in the context of their application to the summative evaluation process for their school district's building principals.

The sample selection was acquired by randomly selecting potential participants' school district's e-mail

addresses from each of the 50 states' Department of Education's Internet website. Forty addresses were randomly selected from each States' website for a total sample of 2,000. These 2,000 e-mail addresses were then forwarded a correspondence explaining the nature of the research and instructions for participation. Of the 2,000 addresses e-mailed, 257 failed to be delivered. Of the 1,743 that were potentially delivered, 363 individuals decided to participate in the study for a return rate of 21%. Unfortunately, of those 363 that did participate, a range of only 240 – 252 responded to the matrix question while still replying to the additional 66 survey questions. This would account for a return rate of between 14% - 15% for the data reported in this study. A reason for this differential of approximately 120 responses will be briefly addressed in the next section.

The second section of the survey attempted to collect demographic data on each of the participants and as such, information provided by the respondents was voluntary. This data was collected to better describe the participating sample of superintendents and for future exploration of differences in responses to the 66 items and the discovery of possible relationships between item responses and identifying characteristics (e.g., gender, administrative experience, geographic location, etc.), which will be explored in a future paper.

### 3 Results and Discussion

#### 3.1 Demographic Results

The national sample of school superintendents participating in this study represented an equitable cross section of America. Of the respondents that participated in this study 70% were male and 30% were female. Additionally, 22% were from the Northeast, 25% the Southeast, 24% the Midwest, 24% the West and only 5% from the Southwest. The small percentage of representation from the Southwest could be attributable to the fact that the Southwest is comprised of only four states, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico and Arizona. Each of the other regions is comprised of between 11 and 12 states each, accounting for a potentially larger sample.

Ninety-five percent of the participants were current school superintendents or chief school administrators with 3% identifying themselves as assistant superintendents and 2% as "other." Sixty-eight percent of this population sample work in rural school districts, 21% in suburban, 8% in urban and 3% in urban-inner city. These results could be questionable since a definition for what constitutes district typology was not included on the survey. One could assume that many participants who reported "rural" were actually in suburban or suburban-like districts. The same assumption could be made for suburban and urban. This constitutes a limitation for making possible inferences as they are related to a particular district's demography.

Eighty percent of the participants oversee K – 12 school districts and approximately 79% said they have 11 or more years of administrative experience. Forty-six percent claimed to have an earned doctorate (Ed.D/Ph.D) and 79% have 6 or more years teaching experience. With the exception of the large percentage of participants claiming they work in rural school districts the sample of participants represents a diverse population of experienced public school administrators.

#### 3.2 Survey Findings

Since this is a descriptive study, Table 1 represents the participants' prioritized rankings in order of importance, or suggested hierarchy, of the ISLLC 2008 Standards' "footprints." The table displays the actual raw count and the percentages of responses for each "footprint's" hierarchical ranking. The bold numbers in the parentheses represent the national sample of superintendents' hierarchical ranking for each of the ISLLC 2008 Standards' "footprints."

The participants were posed with the following question: *The six (6) principles listed below are considered to be the essential characteristics a principal must possess and/or develop to be a successful building leader. Please rate these six (6) principles in order of importance as they relate to your evaluation criteria when you evaluate the principals in your school district.* This question was followed by a randomly ordered list of the ISSLC 2008 Standards' "footprints."

Further instruction requested that the participants rank each of the standards' "footprints" from most important (1) to least important (6). The on-line survey was constructed so that respondents could not use the numbers 1 through 6 more than once in the ranking of each of the six "footprints." If a participant ranked Standard 1 as a "2" then the number "2" could not be used on any of the other remaining standards. If that occurred, the on-line survey would default and the "2" would be removed from the previous ranked standard and switched to the current standard. This was implemented to ensure that all of the six standards could only be ranked once in order from 1 through 6. Unfortunately, some participants did not fully understand the instructions and it could be assumed became frustrated with the matrix question and failed to answer it while proceeding on to the 66 item section.

#### 4

*1 – Most Important to 6 - Least Important*

#### **Frequency Responses and Percentages for a National Sample of School Superintendents'**

**Hierarchical Ranking of the ISLLC 2008 Standards' "footprints."**

	ISLLC 2008 Standard*	1	2	3	4	5	6	Mode	SD
I(2) (n = 242)	<i>A principal* should promote the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.</i>	(61) 25%	<b>(77)</b> 32%	(33) 14%	(28) 12%	(23) 9%	(20) 8%	2.00	1.58
II (1) (n = 241)	<i>A principal should promote the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining</i>	<b>(72)</b> 30%	(60) 25%	(54) 22%	(25) 10%	(19) 8%	(11) 5%	1.00	1.44

III (4) (n = 242)	A principal should promote the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.	(25) 10%	(39) 16%	(52) 22%	(61) 25%	(50) 21%	(15) 6%	4.00	1.41
<i>continued on next page</i>									

IV(5) (n = 240)	A principal should promote the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.	(12) 5%	(22) 9%	(45) 19%	(60) 25%	<b>88</b> 37%	(13) 5%	5.00	1.26
<i>continued on next page</i>									

V(1-4) (n = 245)	A principal should promote the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.	60 24%	(29) 12%	(44) 18%	(59) 24%	(39) 16%	(14) 6%	1.00	1.58
VI(6) (n = 252)	A principal should promote the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.	(20) 8%	(20) 8%	(13) 5%	(8) 3%	(23) 9%	(168) 67%	6.00	1.70

Table 1



(\* = the term “principal” is substituted for the term “educational leader” on the survey)

Upon reviewing the data in Table 1, according to the participants, the most important ISLLC 2008 Standards’ “footprint” is Standard II; which suggests that the primary responsibility of a building principal in the United States is to sustain and nurture instruction, student learning and professional development. This finding agrees with current literature on the topic where the principal is the primary instructional leader in a school building (Quinn, 2002).

Curiously, ISLLC 2008 Standard V also obtained a hierarchical ranking of 1 by 24% of the respondents, suggesting that *acting with integrity and ethically* is a very important part of the principal’s daily actions. However, this standard also obtained the same percentage of respondents ranking it 4<sup>th</sup> in order of importance. The nation’s superintendents seem to be split as to where Standard V seems to rank in the hierarchy of importance in relation to the summative evaluation process.

The remaining rank order for each of the ISLLC Standards’ “footprints” by the nation’s superintendents is clearly delineated, as suggested by the results reported in Table 1. Those hierarchical rankings are Standard I – Vision, 2<sup>nd</sup>; Standard III – Managing the Organization, 4<sup>th</sup>; Standard IV – Collaborating with Community, 5<sup>th</sup>; and Standard VI – Understanding the Larger Context, 6<sup>th</sup>. Absent from this list is Standard V – Acting in an Ethical Manner, which was previously discussed. Since the observed ranking of the four standards previously listed is clearly delineated, a hierarchical ranking of third is a logical conclusion for ISLLC 2008 Standard V.

To determine if the observed hierarchical rankings by the respondents can be considered significant, a series of chi-square tests on each of the standards observed rankings was executed. Chi-square analyses statistically tests quantitative, categorical data and qualitative, nominal data to determine if the observed frequency of responses is significantly different that the expected frequency of responses (Witte & Witte, 2007).

In reference to this study, it would be hypothesized that an equal number of respondents would select each ranking for each “footprint” proportionally. For example, in the case of Standard I (n = 242), approximately 40.3 of the respondents would have rated it 1, 40.3 would rank it 2, 40.3 would rank it 3, etcetera. Some fluctuation is allowed in a chi-square analyses, however, if the observed rankings differ greatly from the above outlined hypothesized rankings then it can be concluded that something statistically significant is occurring in the population.

A chi-square analysis of the rank ordering by the nation’s superintendents for ISLLC 2008 Standard I, “*An educational leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders*” (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2007) is displayed in Table 2. The results indicate a statistically significant difference in the population,  $\chi^2 (5, N = 242) = 66.727, p < .0001$ , which suggests a hierarchical ranking of second (2<sup>nd</sup>) in order of importance by the nation’s superintendents when applying this standard to the process of principal evaluation.

### Chi-Square analyses for hierarchical ranking of ISLLC Standard I

Ranking	Observed N	Expected N	Residual	Standardized Residual
1	61	40.3	20.7	3.26*
2 *	77	40.3	36.7	5.78*
3	33	40.3	-7.3	-1.15
4	28	40.3	-12.3	-1.94
5	23	40.3	-17.3	-2.72*
6	20	40.3	-20.3	-3.19*
Total	242			
Chi-Square	66.727			
df	5			
Asymp. Sig	.0001			

**Table 2**

(\* = Major contributor to statistical significance)

Even though Table 2 displays a significant finding, in general, chi-square analyses does not specify a particular category that is the primary contributor to the statistical significance. It is merely determining that the observed frequencies are not the result of chance or error. This is a weakness associated with chi-square analyses overall. Witte and Witte (2007) state that with chi-square analyses, “there are no statistical grounds for identifying the largest discrepancy as the discrepancy” (p. 421) for contributing the most to a statistically significant chi-square. As a result, the researcher has to use additional data and data analyses to assume basic conclusions about the chi-square findings. Consequently, in order to determine what categories might be the major contributors overall to the statistical significance, the “standardized residual” needs to be calculated for each category. This is done by subtracting the expected frequency from the observed frequency and dividing it by the square root of the expected frequency. When it is discovered that a standardized residual for a particular category is greater than an absolute value of 2.00, the researcher can conclude that it is a major contributor to the significant chi-square value (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs 1998).

For the results reported in Table 2, all of the categories considered to be major contributors are marked with an asterisk (\*). Consequently, it can be suggested that ranking 2 is determined to be a major contributor to the significance with a calculated standardized residual of 5.78, the largest of standardized residuals’ absolute values.

A chi-square analysis of the rank ordering by the nation’s superintendents for ISLLC 2008 Standard II, “*An educational leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth*” (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2007) is displayed in Table 3. The results indicate a statistically significant difference in the population,  $\chi^2(5, N = 241) = 77.846, p < .0001$ , which suggests a hierarchical ranking of first (1<sup>st</sup>) in order of importance by the nation’s superintendents when applying this standard to the process of principal evaluation.

**Chi-Square analyses for hierarchical ranking of ISLLC Standard II**

Ranking	Observed N	Expected N	Residual	Standardized Residual
1 *	72	40.2	31.8	5.01*
2	60	40.2	19.8	3.12*
3	54	40.2	13.8	2.18*
4	25	40.2	-15.2	-2.39*
5	19	40.2	-21.2	3.34*
6	11	40.2	-29.2	-4.6*
Total	241			
Chi-Square	77.846			
df	5			
Asymp. Sig	.0001			

**Table 3**

(\* = Major contributor to statistical significance)

In the case of Standard II, all categories are major contributors to the statistically significant chi-square value. However, the overall value of the observed frequency for ranking 1 and the large value of the standardized residual could suggest that this ranking category is the preferred hierarchical ranking by the respondents.

A chi-square analysis of the rank ordering by the nation’s superintendents for ISLLC 2008 Standard III, “An educational leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment” (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2007) is displayed in Table 4. The results indicate a statistically significant difference in the population,  $\chi^2 (5, N = 242) = 38.066, p < .0001$ , which suggests a hierarchical ranking of fourth (4<sup>th</sup>) in order of importance by the nation’s superintendents when applying this standard to the process of principal evaluation.

**Chi-Square analyses for hierarchical ranking of ISLLC Standard III**

Ranking	Observed N	Expected N	Residual	Standardized Residual
1	25	40.3	-15.3	-2.41*
2	39	40.3	-1.3	-2.0*
3	52	40.3	11.7	1.84
4 *	61	40.3	20.7	3.25*
5	50	40.3	9.7	1.52
6	15	40.3	-25.3	-3.98*
Total	242			
Chi-Square	38.066			
df	5			
Asymp. Sig	.0001			

**Table 4**

(\* = Major contributor to statistical significance)

In the case of Standard III, ranking categories 1, 2, 4, and 6 are major contributors to the statistically significant chi-square value. However, the overall value of the observed frequency for ranking 4 and the large value of the standardized residual could suggest that this ranking category is the preferred hierarchical ranking by the respondents.

A chi-square analysis of the rank ordering by the nation’s superintendents for ISLLC 2008 Standard IV, “An educational leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources”(Council of Chief State School Officers, 2007) is displayed in Table 5. The results indicate a statistically significant difference in the population,  $\chi^2 (5, N = 240) = 114.150$ ,  $p < .0001$ , which suggests a hierarchical ranking of fifth (5<sup>th</sup>) in order of importance by the nation’s superintendents when applying this standard to the process of principal evaluation.

**Chi-Square analyses for hierarchical ranking of ISLLC Standard IV**

Ranking	Observed N	Expected N	Residual	Standardized Residual
1	12	40.0	-28.0	-4.43*
2	22	40.0	-18.0	-2.83*
3	45	40.0	5.0	.79
4	60	40.0	20.0	3.16*
5 *	88	40.0	48.0	7.56*
6	13	40.0	-27.0	-4.27*
Total	240			
Chi-Square	114.150			
df	5			
Asymp. Sig	.0001			

**Table 5**

(\* = Major contributor to statistical significance)

In the case of Standard IV, ranking categories 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 are major contributors to the statistically significant chi-square value. However, the overall value of the observed frequency for ranking 5 and the large value of the standardized residual could suggest that this ranking category is the preferred hierarchical ranking by the respondents.

A chi-square analysis of the rank ordering by the nation’s superintendents for ISLLC 2008 Standard V, “An educational leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner” (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2007) is displayed in Table 6. The results indicate a statistically significant difference in the population,  $\chi^2 (5, N = 245) = 38.469$ ,  $p < .0001$ , which suggests a hierarchical ranking of first or fourth (1<sup>st</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup>) in order of importance by the nation’s superintendents when applying this standard to the process of principal evaluation.

### Chi-Square analyses for hierarchical ranking of ISLLC Standard V

Ranking	Observed N	Expected N	Residual	Standardized Residual
1 *	60	40.8	19.2	3.00*
2	29	40.8	-11.8	-1.85
3	44	40.8	3.2	.5
4 *	59	40.8	18.2	2.84*
5	39	40.8	-1.8	-.28
6	-4.19	40.8	-26.8	-4.19*
Total	245			
Chi-Square	38.469			
df	5			
Asymp. Sig	.0001			

**Table 6**

(\* = Major contributor to statistical significance)

In the case of Standard V, ranking categories 1, 4, and 6 are major contributors to the statistically significant chi-square value. However, the overall value of the observed frequencies for rankings 1 and 4 in addition to the large values of the standardized residuals suggests a confounding dichotomous result concerning the preferred hierarchical ranking for this standard by the respondents. Based on the separate standardized residuals a ranking of first for this standard could be suggested.

Then again, when you take into consideration that 30% of the population ranked Standard II first in the preferred hierarchical ranking and 25% ranked Standard III fourth, Standard V poses a problem as to where it falls in the hierarchy since only 24% of the population ranked it first and fourth respectively. Additionally, 32% of the population ranked Standard I second in order of importance, so a logical conclusion to rank Standard V second in order of importance by default cannot be made. Since the hierarchical rankings of the remaining Standards appears to be clearly delineated by the respondents, and since the ranking of Standard V by the participants displayed such variance, first and fourth respectively, a conclusion to rank Standard V third (3<sup>rd</sup>) in order of importance is offered (refer to the Friedman test at the conclusion of this section).

A chi-square analysis of the rank ordering by the nation's superintendents for ISLLC 2008 Standard VI, "*An educational leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context*" (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2007) is displayed in Table 7. The results indicate a statistically significant difference in the population,  $\chi^2(5, N = 252) = 457.190, p < .0001$ , which suggests a hierarchical ranking of sixth (6<sup>th</sup>) in order of importance by the nation's superintendents when applying this standard to the process of principal evaluation.

**Chi-Square analyses for hierarchical ranking of ISLLC Standard VI**

Ranking	Observed N	Expected N	Residual	Standardized Residual
1	20	42.0	-22	-3.39*
2	20	42.0	-22.0	-3.39*
3	13	42.0	-29.0	-4.48*
4	8	42.0	-34	-5.25*
5	23	42.0	-19.0	-2.93*
6 *	168	42.0	126.0	19.4*
Total	252			
Chi-Square	457.190			
df	5			
Asymp. Sig	.0001			

**Table 7**

(\* = Major contributor to statistical significance)

In the case of Standard VI, all ranking categories are major contributors to the statistically significant chi-square value. However, the overall value of the observed frequency for ranking 6 and the large, positive value of the standardized residual could suggest that this ranking category is the preferred hierarchical ranking by the respondents.

Although the chi-square analyses reveals a preferred hierarchical ranking of the ISLLC Standards’ “footprints,” the analyses looked at each standard separately and not in relation to each other. Since each superintendent was ranking each standard in comparison to each of the other standards, it became evident that a Friedman Test for related samples needed to be executed. The Friedman Test was used to evaluate the differences in medians among all six of the ISLLC Standards’ “footprints” (Huizingh, 2007). The test was found to be significant  $\chi^2 (5, N = 240) = 303.924, p < .0001$  with a Kendall’s coefficient of concordance of .25, indicating a reasonably solid difference among the six standards (see Table 8).

**Friedman Test for related samples on the ISLLC Standards “Footprints” preferred rank order**

	Median	Mean Rank
ISLLC Standard I	2.00	2.73
ISLLC Standard II	2.00	2.56
ISLLC Standard III	4.00	3.50
ISLLC Standard IV	4.00	3.95
ISLLC Standard V	3.00	3.14
ISLLC Standard VI	6.00	5.12
N	240	
Kendall’s W	.253	
Chi-Square	303.924	
df	5	
Asymp. Sig	.000	

**Table 8**

The results of the Friedman Test in Table 8 clearly delineate the ISLLC Standards' "footprints" rank order of importance. The mean rankings indicate that Standard II was ranked first (2.56), Standard I was ranked second (2.73), Standard V was ranked third (3.14), Standard III was ranked fourth (3.50), Standard IV was ranked fifth (3.95) and Standard VI was ranked sixth (5.12). This ranking replicates the results of the chi-square analyses and as such, validates this preferred rank ordering of the standards when superintendents reference them to evaluate their school district's building principals. Additionally, whereas the chi-square analyses did not clearly demarcate the rank order preference between Standard I and Standard V, the Friedman Test clearly supports the previously suggested rank order of Standard I second and Standard V third.

## 5 Conclusions and Discussion

The descriptive data reported in Table 1, the chi-square analyses reported in Tables 2 through 7 and the Friedman Test displayed in Table 8, all suggest a preferred hierarchical ranking of what is important when it comes to evaluating America's public school building principals by the nation's superintendents. Consequently, the nation's principals are evaluated, in order of importance, based on their expertise and efforts placed on instruction and learning (Standard II), developing and implementing a vision (Standard I), acting in an ethical manner (Standard V), managing the organization (Standard III), collaborating with the local community (Standard IV), and understanding the larger global context (Standard VI).

The results reported here suggest the following perceived prioritized listing of the ISLLC 2008 Standards' "footprints" as they are operationalized by America's public school superintendents and chief school administrators when they compile a summative evaluation for their school district's building principals:

1. An educational leader should promote the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth (Standard II).
2. An educational leader should promote the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders (Standard I).
3. An educational leader should promote the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner (Standard V).
4. An educational leader should promote the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment (Standard III).
5. An educational leader should promote the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources (Standard IV).
6. An educational leader should promote the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context (Standard VI).

Research reported earlier, based on a similar study with New Jersey Superintendents serving as the survey sample (Babo, In Press; Babo, 2009), and the results detailed in this study, indicates that ISLLC Standards I, II, and V head the list of performance criteria for building principals when evaluated by their respective school superintendents. The reader can come to his/her own conclusions as to what this means with regards to principal preparation and evaluation but there is no denying that the ability for current principals and principals in training to develop and build on their ability to adequately address classroom instruction, school vision, and ethical conduct is paramount.

Since the ISLLC standards continue to influence the field of public school building level administration, the more data and information that can be generated as to the practical application of these standards in the field will help to inform those who are in the business of school leadership and school leadership preparation.

A better understanding of how these standards influence not only the evaluation of building principals across the nation but also how they might influence principal selection and professional development is paramount for all those involved in principal preparation, licensing, recruiting, and development. A clearer picture on how to best measure and evaluate the actual operationalization of these standards needs to be the focus of discussion by all those with a vested interest in developing and producing quality principals. The success of the nation's public school students is contingent upon this discussion.

## 6 References

Babo, G. (In Press). Principal evaluation and the ISLLC 2008 Standards: A proposed hierarchy of application by suburban New Jersey chief school administrators on the summative evaluation of building principals. *Journal for the New Jersey Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development*, January 2010 (Winter Issue).

Babo, G. (2009). Principal evaluation and leadership standards: Using the ISLLC 2008 "functions" as a perspective into the evaluation of building principals by New Jersey Chief School Administrators in suburban school districts. *Education Leadership Review*, 10 (1), pgs. 1–12.

Barnet, D. (2004). School leadership preparation programs: Are they preparing tomorrow's leaders. *Education*, 125 (1), Fall 2004.

Catano, N., & Stronge, J.H. (2006). What are principals expected to do? Congruence between principal evaluation and performance standards. *National Association of Secondary School Principals; NASSP Bulletin*, 90 (3), 221 – 228.

Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). (1996). *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standard for School Leaders. 5-21*. Washington, DC: Author.

Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). (2007). *Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008*. Adopted by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) on December 12, 2007. Washington, DC: Author.

Crow, G.M. (2006). Complexity and beginning principal in the United States: Perspectives on socialization. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44 (4), 310 – 315.

Davis, S.H. & Hensley, P.A. (2000). The politics of principal evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 13 (4), 383 – 403.

Derrington, M.L. & Sharratt, G. (2008). Evaluation of principals using Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards. *Journal of Scholarship & Practice*, 5 (3), 20 – 29.

English, F. (2005). *Educational leadership for sale: Social justice, the ISLLC Standards, and the corporate assault on public schools*. Retrieved on April 9, 2009 from <http://cnx.org/content/m12868/1.3/8englishsmall.pdf>

English, F. (2006). The unintended consequences of a standardized knowledge base in advancing educational leadership preparation. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42 (3), 461 – 472.

ETS.org. (2009). *Frequently asked questions about the School Leadership Series (SLS)*. Retrieved March 11, 2009 from <http://www.ets.org/portal/site/ets/menuitem.1488512ecfd5b8849a77b13bc3921509/?vgnnextoid=ff8cc1b161055010VgnVCM10000022f95190RC>

Hinkle, D.E., Wiersma, W. & Jurs, S.G. (1998). *Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company

Huizingh, E. (2007). *Applied statistics with SPSS*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.

Latham, A.S. & Pearlman, M.A. (1999). From standards to licensure: Developing an authentic assessment for school principals. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 13 (3), 245 – 262.

Lindle, J.C., Stalion, N. & Young, L. (2004). *Content validity of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium's (ISLLC) Standards for school leaders: To what extent do ISLLC skill indicators describe school leaders' instructional leadership work?* A paper presented at the annual convention of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), Kansas City, MO.

Murphy, J. & Shipman, N. (1999). The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: A standards based approach to strengthening educational leadership. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 13 (3), 205 – 224.

<sup>2</sup><http://www.ets.org/portal/site/ets/menuitem.1488512ecfd5b8849a77b13bc3921509/?vgnnextoid=ff8cc1b161055010VgnVCM10000022f95190RC>



- Quinn, T. (2002). Redefining leadership in the standards era. *Principal*, 82 (1), September/October 2002, 16 – 20.
- Rosenberg, M. (2001). The values of school principal evaluation. *Education*. 212 – 214.
- Waters, T. & Kingston, S. (2005). The standards we need. *Leadership*, 35 (1), 14 – 16, 36 – 39.
- Witte, R.S. & Witte, J.S. (2007). *Statistics* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace & Company.