

The University of Maine

DigitalCommons@UMaine

---

Maine Education Policy Research Institute

Research Centers and Institutes

---

2-1-2017

## Strategies, Supports, and Supervision of Teacher Leaders and Development of Future School Leaders

Ian M. Mette

*Maine Education Policy Research Institute, University of Maine*

Janet C. Fairman

*Maine Education Policy Research Institute, University of Maine*

Seyma Dagistan Terzi

*Maine Education Policy Research Institute, University of Maine*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/mepri>



Part of the [Early Childhood Education Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

---

### Repository Citation

Mette, Ian M.; Fairman, Janet C.; and Dagistan Terzi, Seyma, "Strategies, Supports, and Supervision of Teacher Leaders and Development of Future School Leaders" (2017). *Maine Education Policy Research Institute*. 42.

<https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/mepri/42>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UMaine. It has been accepted for inclusion in Maine Education Policy Research Institute by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UMaine. For more information, please contact [um.library.technical.services@maine.edu](mailto:um.library.technical.services@maine.edu).

# Strategies, Supports, and Supervision of Teacher Leaders and Development of Future School Leaders



Prepared by:

Ian M. Mette, Ph.D.

Janet C. Fairman, Ph.D.

Seyma Dagistan Terzi, M.S.

February 2017

Maine Education Policy Research Institute  
University of Maine  
Orono, Maine





Published by the Maine Education Policy Research Institute in the College of Education and Human Development, University of Maine.

MEPRI was established to conduct nonpartisan studies on Maine education policy and the Maine public education system for the Maine Legislature.

Statements and opinions by the authors do not necessarily reflect a position or policy of the Maine Education Policy Research Institute, nor any of its members, and no official endorsement by them should be inferred.

The University of Maine does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, national origin or citizenship status, age, disability, or veteran's status and shall comply with Section 504, Title IX, and the A.D.A in employment, education, and in all other areas of the University. The University provides reasonable accommodations to qualified individuals with disabilities upon request.

This study was funded by the Maine State Legislature and the University of Maine System

Copyright © 2017

College of Education and Human Development  
University of Maine, 5766 Shibles Hall, Orono, Maine 04469-5766 (207) 581-2475  
*A Member of the University of Maine System*



## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	1
Introduction.....	5
Context.....	5
Impetus for this Report .....	8
Methodology.....	8
Findings: .....	11
Teacher leadership development strategies to reduce administrative workload vary.....	11
Disconnect in understanding support structures needed to develop future school leaders .....	16
Perceptions of mentoring support for school leaders differ.....	21
Conclusions and Implications .....	25
Recommendations.....	29
Bibliography .....	31
Author Information .....	34



## **Executive Summary**

### **Introduction**

Initiated by the Task Force on School Leadership (2016), there has been an on-going interest to study and analyze school leadership development in Maine school districts. As part of this effort to better understand current leadership development strategies, as well as to inform future policy decisions, the Maine Education Policy Research Institute (MEPRI) contracted with the Joint Standing Committee on Education and Cultural Affairs of the Maine State Legislature to conduct a research study of policies and practices supporting the development of school leaders including new principals and teacher leaders in Maine schools. To investigate this topic, the authors conducted a statewide survey of district and school administrative leaders in fall 2016. This report builds on the earlier work of the Task Force on School Leadership, and also offers new insights on the importance of how PK-20 education in Maine might better develop future leaders.

### **Context**

Numerous reports have cited the “pipeline” problem for recruiting and retaining qualified and experienced school principals. Different factors have contributed to this phenomenon in recent years. Changing demographics has resulted in an older workforce generally as well as in education leadership positions. As administrators retire, there are fewer experienced educators to fill these positions. The conditions of PK-12 education have also changed with increasing accountability demands and public scrutiny of school performance. School leadership roles have expanded and the work has become more complex. Engaging teachers in leadership and administrative work within schools is an idea that has traction for managing the work of school improvement. The importance of effective leadership in schools has been correlated with improved teaching practices and student outcomes.

### **Methodology**

In order to understand the various strategies used in Maine schools to develop new school leadership, specifically new principals and teacher leaders, the research team developed four research questions that informed this study:

- What strategies and practices have Maine school districts and schools implemented to encourage increased teacher participation in school leadership?
- What strategies exist for tapping teachers for future administration roles?
- What supports and supervision are used and/or needed to support the development of future school administrators and teacher leaders more broadly?
- What opportunities exist for teacher leadership tasks/roles for educators who choose not to pursue administration?

To answer these questions, an online statewide survey of district administrative leaders and school administrative leaders was conducted in the fall of 2016. The survey was anonymous to ensure confidentiality and the protection of individual identities of participants. To ensure the survey measured important aspects of leadership development based on the feedback of practitioners, the research team worked collaboratively with staff members from both the Maine Principals’ Association as well as the Maine School Management Association in developing the



survey content. The survey questions included 27 Likert-scaled items asking participants to rate their level of agreement with various statements and five open-ended questions that allowed for participants to share their views through more expansive comments.

Working with the Maine School Management Association and the Maine Principals' Association, the survey was disseminated to 178 superintendents and assistant superintendents, as well as 707 principals and assistant principals, using the current email lists maintained by the two professional associations. A total of 69 of the 178 superintendents and assistant superintendents completed the survey for a response rate of 39% for central office administrators. Additionally, 227 of the 707 principals and assistant principals completed the survey for a response rate of 32% for building administrators. The five open-ended response items produced a total of 209 written comments that were analyzed qualitatively. The data were coded using an axial coding process and analyzed into themes and subthemes.

### **Summary of Findings**

As with most survey studies, it is important to note the findings from this report cannot be generalized to the entire population. That said, the responses do provide interesting information regarding leadership development across Maine school districts currently. Highlights of the major survey data findings include:

#### **Teacher Leadership Development Strategies to Reduce Administrative Workload Vary**

- Teachers are typically encouraged to engage in leadership based on principal and superintendent observations during teacher-led collaboration and shared leadership structures. A majority of teacher leaders are used to lead building-level and district-level leadership teams, specifically around issues of curriculum implementation (professional learning community leaders), ongoing professional development and practical implementation (response to intervention, positive behavioral interventions and supports, etc.), and standing committee work. To accomplish these different strategies requires stipends and additional funding.
- However, regarding the use of teacher leaders (professional learning team leaders, department chairs, new teacher mentors) to help reduce the managerial burdens of administrators, there are mixed results, as 51% of superintendents and assistant superintendents and 45% of principals and assistant principals disagree that the current use of teacher leaders reduces managerial burdens of administrators.
- Administrators commented on the lack of ability to use teacher leaders in administrative roles due to constrictions in collective bargaining agreements.

#### **Disconnect in Understanding Support Structures Needed to Develop Future School Leaders**

- Superintendents and principals throughout the State of Maine expressed the need for greater funding and release time to develop teacher leaders and future school administrators. With these supports, current administrators would be able to pay for leadership training, including seminars and university-based training to further develop leaders. Some obstacles may need to be addressed to more actively involve teacher leaders in administrative work. For example, few districts provide teachers the

opportunity to try out administrative work or positions and return to the classroom if administration is not a good fit.

- Additionally, superintendents and assistant superintendents are almost twice as positive about the leadership development their school districts provide as compared to principals and assistant principals.
- Moreover, educational leaders throughout the state feel state policymakers lack an understanding of the importance of supporting school leader development. Almost 4 out of 5 administrators (82% of superintendents and assistant superintendents and 78% of principals and assistant principals) disagree that state policymakers understand the importance of school leader development.

### **Perceptions of Mentoring Support for School Leaders Differ**

- Superintendents and principals throughout Maine understand the importance of mentoring and training opportunities for leadership development of beginning principals, which is accomplished through regular in-district meetings and the Maine Principals' Association (MPA) mentoring workshops.
  - However, principals serving smaller schools (250 or fewer students) were less positive than principals in larger schools about strategies and practices to encourage school leadership, support and supervision needed to develop leadership, and teacher leader opportunities.
  - Additionally, superintendents serving smaller school districts (750 or fewer students) were less positive than superintendents in larger school districts about support and supervision needed to develop leadership and teacher leader opportunities.

### **Conclusions and Implications**

- District and school leaders are using a variety of ways to engage teachers in some aspects of school leadership, but the roles seem fairly focused on providing shared leadership regarding curriculum and instruction, and the survey did not uncover many innovative strategies to engage teachers further in administrative work.
  - Teacher leaders are predominately used to help address issues of curriculum and instruction, and as such could be used to a greater capacity in peer observations to decrease administrative burdens caused by new PE/PG requirements.
- Almost a quarter of all surveyed principals and superintendents commented they currently have no specific strategies to encourage teachers to reduce administrative workload.
  - Teacher leaders could be more engaged in the supervision of their peers for both professional growth and evaluation, which may require some revision of the state or district PE/PG policy, as well as additional training for teachers to standardize the feedback process.
  - There are fiscal constrictions to consider due to collective bargaining agreements on the additional responsibilities that can be assigned to teacher leaders, as well as how teacher leader mentoring programs are supported.
- District leaders and school leaders largely disagreed about the extent to which new leaders are supported, mentored, and trained in their respective districts, with school principals expressing less positive views than superintendents.

- There is a great opportunity for Maine policymakers, practitioners, and researchers to collaborate and influence educational policy development that will provide structures and supports to develop future educational leaders in Maine.
- The development of a ‘no harm clause’ to allow teachers to become an administrator on a probationary level, and to return to the classroom if the professional move was not appropriate, could be a shift in policy that could help encourage leadership development and be studied over time.
- School districts and university-based leadership programs could be incentivized to work more closely to evaluate and develop leadership development efforts in Maine that could contribute to leadership pipeline programs.
- Smaller schools (< 251 students) and school districts (< 751 students) have statistically significant different perceptual needs regarding teacher leader opportunities, suggesting a need to differentiate teacher leadership and beginning administrator support structures compared to larger schools and school districts who benefit from economies of scale.
  - When considering the proposed regionalization and efficiency efforts supported by the Maine Department of Education, metropolitan hubs in Maine (Portland, Augusta, and Bangor) should take into account the creation of online professional network development, as well as addressing issues of rurality that relate to a majority of Maine school districts and school buildings.

## **Recommendations**

- Provide funding for school leadership and development, particularly as it relates to collaborative regional efforts that provide evidence-based training and mentoring aligned with professional standards for new school leaders
- Provide targeted state funding to districts that supports the development of innovative approaches to a) supporting the development of new school leaders or b) encouraging teachers to learn about and gain experience in school administration and leadership
- Increase and improve leadership development opportunities by capitalizing on the expertise of teacher leaders by engaging them more in evaluation of their peers for both feedback for professional growth and evaluation, which may require some revision of the state or district PE/PG policy, as well as additional training for teachers to standardize the feedback process
- Incentivize collaborative efforts between school districts and university-based leadership preparation programs to collaborate more closely in leadership development efforts
- Provide guidance on policy that would allow a ‘no harm clause’ that would contractually allow teachers to develop into future administrators but return to the classroom within one year if the professional move was not appropriate
- Align efforts of policymakers, practitioners, and researchers to develop a strategic educational plan that builds on the Task Force recommendations, as well as this study, to provide synergy to efforts that will increase the ability for Maine to have a strong education system moving into the 21st century
- Conduct studies to a) review national literature on best practices and innovative strategies for supporting leadership development and addressing challenges related to the principal “pipeline”, with a particular focus on effective strategies used in rural states and b) study the disparities in district funding and staffing for school administrative leadership in Maine districts and schools

## **Introduction**

Initiated by the state Task Force on School Leadership (2016), there has been an on-going interest to study and analyze school leadership development in Maine school districts. As part of this effort to better understand current leadership development strategies, as well as to inform future policy decisions, the Maine Education Policy Research Institute (MEPRI) contracted with the Joint Standing Committee on Education and Cultural Affairs of the Maine State Legislature to conduct a research study of policies and practices supporting leadership development in Maine schools. To investigate this topic, the authors conducted a statewide survey of district and school administrative leaders in fall 2016. This report builds on the earlier work of the Task Force on School Leadership, and also offers new insights on the importance of how PK-20 education in Maine might better develop future leaders.

## **Context**

National, state, and research reports have described a “pipeline” problem for recruiting and retaining qualified and experienced school principals (Davis et al, 2005; Institute of Educational Leadership, 2000; Malone & Caddell, 2000; Task Force on School Leadership, 2016). In response to this challenge, the Wallace Foundation launched their “Principal Pipeline Initiative” in 2011 and sponsored work in six large urban districts to implement policies and practices to improve the development of novice principals (Wallace Foundation, 2011). Research and evaluation of the Wallace project and other initiatives have produced some new insights about effective strategies to improve the development of school principals (CCSSO, 2016; Myung et al, 2011; Shelton & Welu, 2014; Turnbull et al, 2016; Wallace Foundation, 2016).

There are many factors that have contributed to the difficulty of attracting and retaining excellent educators to the principalship. One factor that has been cited nationally and in Maine is the demographic trend of an aging population and older workforce which includes teachers and

PK-12 school and district administrators (Colgan, 2006; NAESP, 2008), although national data suggest the average age of public school principals began to decrease by 2007 (Hill et al, 2016). As “baby boomers” age and retire in increasing numbers, higher numbers of job vacancies are created and fewer experienced educators remain to fill the gap. National data confirm a decline in the average number of years of experience for public school principals from 10 years in 1987 to 7.2 years by 2011 (Hill et al, 2016), and high turnover in the principalship for public schools (Goldring & Taie, 2014). A study of Maine principals in 2011 found that about a third of Maine schools have leadership turnover every two years (Donaldson & Marnik, 2012), and data for the 2014-15 school year indicated that a significant portion of Maine school principals (25%-40% depending on grade span) are just in their first or second year in that position (Task Force on School Leadership, 2016). The combination of high turnover and inexperience in school leadership does not bode well for school improvement efforts and instructional leadership needs.

Another challenge for recruitment and retention of principals is the changing nature of school administrative work in recent years which has made this career path less attractive. Several factors have shaped perceptions about administrative roles. For example, increased state and federal accountability and reporting requirements in recent decades have contributed to higher administrative workload for school and district leaders (Malone & Caddell, 2000; NAESP, 2008). At the same time, there has been an expectation for school leaders to shift away from a focus on building and personnel management to more focus on instructional leadership to support schoolwide improvement efforts, teacher supervision and support (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2014; Malone & Caddell, 2000; Mette, Range, Anderson, Hvidston, & Nieuwenhuizen, 2015). While the potential for instructional leadership may make the principalship more attractive, the reality of increased

accountability demands has produced longer work days and increased administrative workload which may deter potential leaders (DiPaola & Tschannan-Moran, 2003; Donaldson & Marnik, 2012; Malone & Caddell, 2000; NAESP, 2008). As the role of school principals has expanded and increased in complexity, support has increased for expanded leadership roles for teachers and distributed leadership structures within schools (Copland, 2003; Dikkers & Kelley, 2016; Tian, Risku, & Collin, 2016). Teacher leaders may be an under-utilized resource in schools for sharing and managing the increased administrative work and other leadership needs in schools, but would need additional training, mentoring and career pathways to move into this sphere of work (Derrington, 2016; Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009; Task Force on School Leadership, 2016). However, there is an inherent disincentive for school and district leaders to groom teachers for administrative roles, as this may remove highly effective teachers from the classroom where they have the most direct impact on student learning and may also encourage teacher leaders to seek administrative jobs in other districts. While larger schools and districts may be able to weather these disruptions, smaller schools and districts may be more negatively impacted by these personnel changes.

Finally, public opinion and reports that critique the status of education are another important factor shaping perceptions about educational leaders and may deter some educators from pursuing leadership roles (Beam, Claxton, & Smith, 2016; Malone & Caddell, 2000). The importance of effective school leadership to guide practice and improvement in schools is often lost in the rhetoric around PK-12 education which more often blames educators and administrators for stagnant student outcomes. Yet, consistently, research studies and national reports have cited empirical evidence linking strong and effective instructional leadership with improved teaching practices and student outcomes (Brian et al, 2013; Leitwood et al, 2004).

## **Impetus for this Report**

The 127<sup>th</sup> Maine State Legislature passed a Resolve (S.P.368 - L.D. 1042) in 2015 to create a Task Force on School Leadership to examine the issues related to developing and supporting effective school leadership in Maine. The 17 member task force included experts on school leadership and professionals in school and district leadership positions. The findings and recommendations focused on several areas including: the preparation of school leaders, induction and mentoring programs, on-going professional development, and retention (Task Force on School Leadership, 2016). Following the work of the Task Force, the Joint Standing Committee on Education and Cultural Affairs of the Maine State Legislature charged MEPRI with the task of studying current district and school policies and practices in Maine to support the development of school leadership—both newly hired principals and teacher leaders. Specifically, MEPRI was asked to identify innovative strategies that encourage teachers to consider school administrative roles and careers. Findings from the survey study conducted by MEPRI are presented in the following section.

## **Methodology**

In order to understand the various strategies used in Maine schools to develop new school leadership, specifically new principals and teacher leaders, the research team developed four research questions that informed this study:

- What strategies and practices have Maine school districts and schools implemented to encourage increased teacher participation in school leadership?
- What strategies exist for tapping teachers for future administration roles?
- What supports and supervision are used and/or needed to support the development of future school administrators and teacher leaders more broadly?

- What opportunities exist for teacher leadership tasks/roles for educators who choose not to pursue administration?

To answer these questions, an online statewide survey of district administrative leaders and school administrative leaders was conducted in the fall of 2016. The survey was anonymous to ensure confidentiality and the protection of individual identities of participants. To ensure the survey measured important aspects of leadership development based on the feedback of practitioners, the research team worked collaboratively with staff members from both the Maine Principals' Association as well as the Maine School Management Association in developing the survey content. Through several rounds of editing, two versions of the survey were created, one which was sent to principals/assistant principals and the other which was sent to superintendents/assistant superintendents.

The survey contained a total of 32 questions that were identical but altered wording to allow for comparison of respective leadership perspectives (e.g. "Aspiring administrators within my building have opportunities..." for principals, and "Aspiring administrators within my district have opportunities..." for superintendents). The format of the survey items allowed for both quantitative and qualitative research methodologies. The survey included 27 Likert-scaled items asking participants to rate their level of agreement with various statements about leadership development, which produced quantitative results. In addition, the survey also included five open-ended questions that allowed for participants to share their views through more expansive comments about current practices and suggestions for increasing support for leadership development in Maine schools.

Working with the Maine School Management Association and the Maine Principals' Association, the survey was disseminated to 178 superintendents and assistant superintendents,



as well as 707 principals and assistant principals, using the current email lists maintained by the two professional associations. A total of 69 of the 178 superintendents and assistant superintendents completed the survey for a response rate of 39% for central office administrators. Additionally, 227 of the 707 principals and assistant principals completed the survey for a response rate of 32% for building administrators.

To establish internal reliability of the survey, a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was calculated on all items and was 0.91. Additionally, Cronbach's Alpha coefficients were calculated on the three subscales which included: strategies and practices to encourage school leadership (0.77); support and supervision needed to develop leadership (0.94); and teacher leader opportunities (0.79). The scaled items were analyzed by comparing the response frequencies of district and school leaders' response, allowing the reader to identify similar and divergent views. Appendix A provides full results for the scaled items for the superintendent survey, and Appendix B provides full results for the scaled items for the principal survey.

For the five open-ended questions, a total of 161 of the 227 (71%) participating principals and assistant principals and 48 of the 69 (70%) participating superintendents and assistant superintendents provided a written response. These five questions produced a total of 209 written comments that were analyzed qualitatively through a process of coding for themes and subthemes.

## Findings

While the broad purpose of this study was to investigate practices for supporting school leadership development generally, an important aspect of this was to learn more about specific strategies that district and school leaders employ to encourage Maine teachers to take on administrative roles or tasks, and to identify particularly innovative practices. Reasons for engaging teachers in administrative work in schools include: 1) expanding the leadership and professional growth opportunities for teachers, 2) developing prospective future school principals and assistant principals, and 3) sharing the administrative workload of principals given the climate of increased accountability demands for schools. To help understand the themes that emerged from the survey results, we first present findings from the scaled items (identified as quantitative findings) and then discuss findings from the comments responding to open-ended items (identified as qualitative findings). Results from the survey are organized into three broad findings.

### **Finding #1: Teacher Leadership Development Strategies to Reduce Administrative Workload Vary**

The survey included questions to understand 1) educational leaders' views about teacher leadership in general, and 2) the current practices and strategies to support teacher leader development. In this section, the quantitative data will be discussed first, which includes attitudinal information about teacher leaders. The qualitative data will be discussed second, which includes descriptions of current practices and strategies being implemented across Maine school districts to develop teacher leaders.

**Quantitative data.** The survey data identified three scaled items which positively reflect the use of teacher leadership in Maine school districts. First, when asked if teacher leaders (henceforth defined as professional learning community leaders, school leadership team

members, department chairs, teacher team leaders, and new teacher mentors, etc.) are an important part of school leadership in school buildings and districts, overwhelmingly principals and superintendents were positive about the role of teacher leaders. For both principals and superintendents, over 95% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Second, when asked if teacher leaders help address the curricular needs of a school building or district, administrators once again noted the importance of teacher leaders as 94% of principals and 96% of superintendents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. Third, when asked if teacher leaders help address the instructional coaching needs of a school building or district, 71% of principals and 78% superintendents agreed or strongly agreed. Table 1, Table 2, and Table 3 present the results of these survey items, respectively, which acknowledges the importance of aspects of teacher leadership, particularly around issues of curriculum and instruction, based on the shared perceptions of principals and superintendents who participated in this survey.

Table 1. Teacher leaders are an important part of school leadership in schools and school districts

	# Agree/ Strongly Agree	Percent
Principals and Assistant Principals (n=229)	217	95%
Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents (n=69)	67	97%

Table 2. Teacher leaders help address curricular needs of schools and school districts

	# Agree/ Strongly Agree	Percent
Principals and Assistant Principals (n=228)	214	94%
Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents (n=69)	66	96%

Table 3. Teacher leaders help address instructional coaching needs of schools and school districts

	# Agree/ Strongly Agree	Percent
Principals and Assistant Principals (n=227)	161	71%
Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents (n=69)	54	78%

However, the survey results also signaled disagreement about the use of teacher leadership, particularly the extent to which teacher leaders can help to reduce the managerial work of administrators. When asked if teacher leaders help address the evaluation needs of school buildings and districts, principals were less positive than superintendents. Just 59% of principals agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, while 76% of superintendents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Table 4 presents the results of this survey item, which might be related to the relative increase in educator evaluation responsibilities for principals in light of new Performance Evaluation and Professional Growth (PE/PG) requirements. In the on-going research MEPRI has conducted to monitor implementation of educator evaluation systems in Maine, researchers have learned that principals have generally shouldered the workload of evaluating teachers (Mette & Fairman, 2016). When asked if overall teacher leaders helped reduce the managerial burdens of administrators, just 55% of principals and 49% of superintendents indicated they agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Table 5 presents the results of this survey item.

Table 4. Teacher leaders help address evaluation needs of schools and school districts

	# Agree/ Strongly Agree	Percent
Principals and Assistant Principals (n=227)	134	59%
Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents (n=69)	53	76%

Table 5. Teacher leaders reduce managerial burdens of administrators

	# Agree/ Strongly Agree	Percent
Principals and Assistant Principals (n=227)	125	55%
Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents (n=69)	34	49%

**Qualitative data.** While the scaled items related to teacher leadership focused more on administrator views of teacher leadership, the open-ended survey items focused more on the practices and strategies used to support teacher leadership and leadership development. The analysis of two open-ended survey questions, *What strategies and practices are you currently implementing in your school building/school district to identify teachers for leadership development?* and, *What strategies and practices are you currently implementing in your school building/school district to encourage teachers to take on school-wide administration responsibilities that might reduce the workload of a principal?* support the individual survey items identified in the section above. With regards to the strategies and practices to encourage teachers to take on school-wide administration responsibilities that might reduce managerial burdens, three main themes emerged from the coding of the open-ended items regarding the practices and strategies listed by educational leaders.

- **Teacher leaders support committee work and legitimize aspects of shared leadership.** First, 16% of principals (26 of 161) and 33% of superintendents (16 of 48) use *teacher leaders to support committee work and legitimize aspects of shared leadership*. These positions typically come with a stipend to support the work, which requires financial support that not all districts are able to provide. Examples of these kinds of committee work typically focus on school-wide or district-wide initiatives and include PE/PG committees, proficiency-based learning (PBL) committees, and positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) committees. As a result, committee work of

this nature allows principals and superintendents to create shared leadership structures that give voice to teachers as school improvement initiatives are introduced and put into practice.

- **Teacher leaders support instructional leadership roles.** Second, 23% of principals (37 of 161) and 23% of superintendents (11 of 48) reported the use of *teacher leaders to support instructional leadership roles*, which are teacher driven but require someone to guide the process. These types of teacher leadership positions include but are not limited to professional learning committees (PLC), response to intervention (RTI) leader, student assistant team (SAT) leader, or grade-level/department head leadership positions. A majority of these leadership positions focus around issues of curriculum and instruction, mostly around teachers helping other teachers improve on their own instruction. Some of these leadership positions target the peer observation component of a PE/PG system, but not the evaluation of other teachers.
- **No specific strategies to encourage teachers to reduce administrative workload.** A remarkably high percent, 22% of principals (35 of 161) and 23% of superintendents (11 of 48) reported that there are *no specific strategies to encourage teachers* to take on school-wide administrative responsibilities. Respondents cited a variety of reasons as to why teachers are not encouraged to take on leadership positions including: restrictions in collective bargaining agreements, lack of financial compensation, and size and composition of smaller school buildings or districts. Additionally, many administrators point to the fact that teachers are already overworked, and that their focus should be on instruction as opposed to “administrivia.” A few respondents indicated that they sometimes informally encourage individual teachers who might be interested in

administrative career paths, by talking with them or suggesting advanced coursework they might pursue.

**Finding #2: Disconnect in Understanding Support Structures Needed to Develop Future School Leaders**

In this section, the quantitative data will be discussed first. These data include attitudinal information about structures needed to develop future Maine leaders. The qualitative data will be discussed second, which includes descriptions of the need for additional resources and restructuring of certain policies to support school leadership development in Maine.

**Quantitative data.** The survey data identified multiple items where the data suggest a disconnect in understanding the support structures that are needed to develop future Maine leaders, specifically in managing the growing workload of school leaders and the mentoring required to support high quality human development. Additionally, school and district leaders perceive a lack of state-level understanding about what supports are needed to develop future school leaders in Maine. When asked if state policymakers understand the importance of supporting leader development, almost 4 out of 5 school leaders (78% of principals and assistant principals and 82% of superintendents and assistant superintendents) *disagree* that state policymakers understand the importance of school leader development. Table 6 presents the results of this survey item. As a result, it appears there may be an opportunity to better connect policy and practice for Maine educational leader development.

Table 6. State policymakers understand the importance of supporting school leader development

	# Disagree/ Strongly Disagree	Percent
Principals and Assistant Principals (n=253)	198	78%
Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents (n=76)	62	82%

In addition, there are large discrepancies between superintendents and principals regarding the perception of support, supervision, and mentoring offered to develop newly hired administrators in Maine schools. These perceptions are important to note, namely when considering the development of teacher leaders who might contemplate moving into an administrative role but perceive a lack of adequate mentoring available for their own principal. When asked if newly hired building principals have adequate mentoring or one-on-one training from another administrator to be successful in the first few years as an administrator, 72% of superintendents agreed or strongly agreed, compared to only 42% of principals. This highlights an important difference in viewpoints, between the practitioners who perceive they are *giving* support and those who perceive they are or are not *receiving* adequate support. Table 7 presents the results of this survey item.

Table 7. Adequate mentoring (one-on-one training) offered to newly hired administrators

	# Agree/ Strongly Agree	Percent
Principals and Assistant Principals (n=232)	97	42%
Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents (n=68)	49	72%

When asked more specific questions about the perception of support, supervision, and mentoring offered to develop newly hired administrators in Maine schools, further discrepancies arise. First, when asked if newly hired building principals are provided adequate mentoring to evaluate teachers, 84% of superintendents agreed or strongly agreed, compared to only 49% of principals. This is another area with an implication for PE/PG implementation, specifically principals feeling a lack of resources and personnel, as well as mentoring and training, to fulfill teacher evaluation requirements. Second, when asked if newly hired building principals are provided adequate mentoring to lead school improvement efforts, 69% of superintendents agreed



or strongly agreed, compared to only 39% of principals. Third, when asked if newly hired building principals are provided adequate mentoring to serve as a curriculum leader, 60% of superintendents agreed or strongly agreed, compared to only 34% of principals. All told, superintendents and assistant superintendents are almost twice as positive about the leadership development their districts provide as compared to the views of principals and assistant principals. Table 8, Table 9, and Table 10 present the results of these survey items, respectively, which suggest a gap in perceptions of principals and superintendents regarding the instructional leadership support offered to new school building administrators. While this will be discussed more in the conclusions section, these findings contrast with how teacher leaders are currently used in schools to support curriculum and instruction, which could suggest teacher leaders are not currently being groomed to move into administration, or they elect not to pursue administration.

Table 8. Adequate mentoring (one-on-one training) to evaluate teachers offered to newly hired administrators

	# Agree/ Strongly Agree	Percent
Principals and Assistant Principals (n=232)	113	49%
Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents (n=67)	56	84%

Table 9. Adequate mentoring (one-on-one training) to lead school improvement efforts offered to newly hired administrators

	# Agree/ Strongly Agree	Percent
Principals and Assistant Principals (n=231)	91	39%
Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents (n=68)	47	69%

Table 10. Adequate mentoring (one-on-one training) to serve as a curriculum leader offered to newly hired administrators

	# Agree/ Strongly Agree	Percent
Principals and Assistant Principals (n=227)	79	34%
Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents (n=68)	41	60%

**Qualitative data.** The analysis of two open-ended survey questions, *What supports would you like to implement in your school building/school district to better support teachers to take on leadership roles and receive formal training?* and, *What opportunities exist for teachers who decide not to pursue administrative careers, or who wish to return to a teaching position after trying administration?* support the individual survey items identified in the section above. With regards to the disconnect in understanding support structures needed to develop future Maine educational leaders, two main themes emerged from the coding of the open-ended items. The analysis of open-ended survey items in this section focused on the need for additional resources and restructured policies to develop teacher leaders in Maine.

- **Need for greater funding and release time to develop teacher leaders and future administrators.** First, 24% of principals (38 of 161) and 29% of superintendents (14 of 48) reported on *the need for greater funding and release time to develop teacher leaders and future administrators*. Principals, specifically, commented on the need for more developed mentoring programs to help teachers learn to take on leadership roles, and with this added mentoring teacher leaders might be more prepared to take on administrative positions. This finding is clearly connected to the quantitative data results regarding the lack of mentoring for school leaders mentioned previously within this section. Examples of these financial supports needed to further develop teacher leaders and future administrators include the ability to pay for leadership training, professional development

seminars, and university-based training. Thus, additional resources, which could be provided by the state, would allow individual school districts to identify the types of support, structures, and supervision that would be best used to develop future leaders within their communities.

- **Lack of ‘no harm clause’ to allow teacher leaders to try administration.** Second, 43% of principals (69 of 161) and 33% (16 of 48) of superintendents commented on the lack of ability to allow teachers who decided not to continue with administration to return to the classroom, highlighting the need to allow a ‘no harm clause’ to allow teachers the opportunity to pursue administrative careers and return to the classroom if it is not the right fit professionally. Thus, the findings indicate that very few districts provide the opportunity to return to the classroom if administration is not a good fit. One district mentioned an innovative strategy negotiating a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the teachers’ association to allow for a teacher to move into an interim administrative position, whereby the teacher tries the administrative position while the district also sees how the teacher does in this position. The teacher is then allowed to return to teaching without loss of pay or step if the move was not conducive to both the district and the teacher. However, a large majority of administrators commented there are no set policies in their own districts and, perhaps more important, there are no safety nets to allow teachers to “try on administration,” likely leading to many teacher leaders deciding not to give up tenure or the prospect that they might be able to return to the classroom should the professional move not be a good fit.

### **Finding #3: Perceptions of Mentoring Support for School Leaders Differ**

In this section, the quantitative data will be discussed first. These data include inferential statistical analyses related to the areas explored by the survey, specifically as this relates to difference in enrollment size of schools and school districts. The qualitative findings will be discussed second, which includes the need to differentiate support for teacher leader development based on proximity to professional development as well as opportunities for in-house mentoring based on the size of the school or school district, as well as general access to a professional network.

**Quantitative data.** The survey data identified two important findings related to perceived supports for school leaders. The first finding relates to discrepancies in views for school leaders of smaller schools (250 or fewer students) compared to leaders of larger schools (251 or more students). Regarding their perceptions of strategies and practices to encourage school leadership, support and supervision needed to develop leadership, and teacher leader opportunities, building administrators serving larger schools with 251 or more students are more positive about practices used for all three areas than building administrators serving smaller schools with 250 or fewer students. An independent *t* test revealed there was a statistically significant difference between principals serving 251 or more students and principals serving 250 or less students in terms of *teacher leader opportunities* ( $p = 0.048$ ). An alpha level of 0.05 was used to determine significance. Table 11 presents the results of this finding.

Table 11. Building administrator perceptions based on school size

	School size (# students)	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Strategies and practices to encourage school leadership	1 to 250	71	2.95	0.352
	251 or more	115	3.01	0.388
Support and supervision to develop leadership	1 to 250	70	2.47	0.529
	251 or more	115	2.49	0.554
Teacher leader opportunities*	1 to 250	70	2.82	0.505
	251 or more	117	2.98	0.474

Note: Scale ranges from 1=*strong disagree* to 4=*strong agree*; \* indicates a significant difference at  $p=0.05$

The second finding relates to discrepancies in views for district leaders of smaller districts (750 or fewer students) compared to larger school districts (751 or more students). Regarding their perceptions of support and supervision needed to develop leadership, and teacher leader opportunities, central office administrators serving larger school districts with 751 or more students are more positive than building administrators serving smaller school districts with 750 or less students on these two subscales. An independent *t* test revealed there was a statistically significant difference between superintendents serving 751 or more students and superintendents serving 750 or less students in terms of *support and supervision to develop leadership* ( $p = 0.05$ ) and *teacher leader opportunities* ( $p = 0.03$ ). An alpha level of 0.05 was used to determine significance. There is no difference regarding perceptions of strategies and practices to encourage school leadership. Table 12 presents the results of these findings.

Table 12. Central office administrator perceptions based on district size

	District size (# students)	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Strategies and practices to encourage school leadership	1 to 750	20	3.04	0.389
	751 or more	32	3.04	0.287
Support and supervision to develop leadership*	1 to 750	19	2.88	0.514
	751 or more	31	3.15	0.440
Teacher leader opportunities*	1 to 750	20	2.78	0.555
	751 or more	33	3.06	0.360

Note: Scale ranges from 1=*strong disagree* to 4=*strong agree*; \* indicates a significant difference at  $p=0.05$

**Qualitative data.** The analysis of the open-ended survey question, *What kind of mentoring and other supports does your school district offer to beginning principals to ensure they are successful in their first few years as an administrator?* adds additional details to the findings identified in the section above. Regarding the kind of mentoring and other supports school districts are able to offer to beginning principals, as well as providing teacher leader opportunities, two themes emerged from the coding of the open-ended items. The analysis of open-ended survey items in this section highlights findings that indicate support for leadership development exists both within and outside of school systems. However, many principals also feel there is a lack of mentoring available to ensure success in the transition to principal.

- Beginning administrator supports exist, but district and building administrators disagree on the adequacy of these supports.** Only 37% of principals (60 of 161) compared to 83% of superintendents (40 of 48) reported that mentoring and training opportunities for the development of beginning principals exist. Much of this work is accomplished through regular in-district meetings where the beginning principal receives direct support and feedback from the superintendent. Additionally, principals and superintendents commented on the use of the Maine Principals' Association (MPA)

training and mentoring workshops, as well as a variety of informal professional development opportunities provided by a mentor administrator in-district.

- **Lack of specific strategy implementation to mentor beginning administrators.**

Second, and somewhat contradictory, 32% of principals (52 of 161) commented there are currently little to no formalized mentoring and support structures offered that help to develop them as leaders. Some principals and superintendents commented on the difficulties of providing support based on the size of their buildings and school districts. Another limiting factor is how isolated many districts are from a regional hub that would be able to provide this professional development and support, as administrators commented on the large amount of time (3-5 hours) it takes to drive to find in-person professional development targeting teacher leaders and beginning principals.

## Conclusions and Implications


Teacher leaders throughout Maine are clearly an important part of school leadership and help provide leadership around issues of curriculum and instruction in schools and districts throughout the state. Additionally, teacher leaders help provide shared leadership and legitimize administrative decisions by providing teacher input on school-wide and district-wide initiatives. That said, one conclusion of the study is there appear to be limitations on how teacher leaders are and can be used to reduce administrative workload. Challenges related to collective bargaining agreements, financial constrictions, and the small size of some school systems all contribute to the limited use of teacher leaders in current practice. Beyond the practice of engaging teachers in curricular and instructional work in schools, as most often reported by school and district leaders in this survey, there is the potential for greatly expanding the role of teacher leaders in sharing the managerial or administrative work of schools. As an example, one area that seems promising is greater use of teacher leaders in supporting PE/PG work through peer evaluation and professional development. Not only would this help alleviate some managerial burden for administrators, but it would also support the goal of teachers leading work to implement best practices to improve instruction. Some obstacles, as mentioned above, would need to be addressed to engage teacher leaders in new hybrid kinds of roles that include managerial or administrative work.

A second conclusion that can be drawn from this study is the relative lack of continuity about how educational policy, practice, and research can work together to help drive school improvement efforts throughout the State of Maine. Not only is there perceptual disagreement about how to best support leadership development in Maine, but there is also disagreement about leadership development, mentoring, and support between district-level administrators and building-level administrators. In a small state like Maine, there is great opportunity for



policymakers, practitioners, and researchers to come together to drive meaningful change (see Figure 1). Based on the findings of this study, there is a need to analyze the financial support offered by the State of Maine to fund and develop teacher leaders and new principals in meaningful ways to help reduce administrative burdens. Additionally, developing a statewide ‘no harm clause’ strategy to contractually allow and incentivize teachers to develop into future administrators, but return to the classroom within one year if the professional move was not appropriate, would increase the opportunity for Maine school districts to identify and develop future leaders within their systems. Further, incentivizing school districts and university-based leadership programs to collaborate more closely, and sponsoring the study and evaluation of leadership development in Maine, would support improved policy and practice to address the school leadership needs for the future of Maine.


*Figure 1: Collaborative Influence of Policy Development*



A third conclusion that can be drawn from this study relates to the perceptual differences of school and district leaders based on school and district size or resources, proximity to

professional development opportunities, and access to a professional network of educational leaders in general. School administrators serving schools with 250 or fewer students have statistically significantly less positive perceptions about *teacher leader opportunities* than larger schools. Additionally, central office administrators serving school districts with 750 or fewer students have statistically significantly less positive perceptions about *teacher leader opportunities* and *support and supervision to develop leadership* than larger school districts. Additionally, while about 1/3 of principals (37%) reported appropriate mentoring and training support both in-district and through statewide efforts such as the MPA's *Great Beginnings* program, an additional 1/3 (32%) of principals in this survey mentioned little or no mentoring supports to help them develop as leaders. Based on the findings of this study, there could be an opportunity to create regional hubs through the regionalization and efficiency efforts recently proposed by the Maine Department of Education, which would be vital to understand what works for leadership development in Maine based on regional and local needs. Establishing regional hubs in metropolitan areas of Maine, such as Portland, Augusta, and Bangor (see Figure 2) could help address regional school improvement efforts and provide targeted professional development. For this to be successful, however, limiting factors that contribute to a lack of leadership mentoring should be taken into account, such as driving time, creation of an online professional network, and addressing issues of rurality as it relates to a majority of Maine school districts and school buildings.

Figure 2: Population Density Areas (US Census, 2013)



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Economics and Statistics Administration U.S. Census Bureau

Source: [http://www2.census.gov/geo/maps/metroarea/stcbsa\\_pg/Feb2013/cbsa2013\\_ME.pdf](http://www2.census.gov/geo/maps/metroarea/stcbsa_pg/Feb2013/cbsa2013_ME.pdf)

## **Recommendations**

The Task Force on School Leadership developed several recommendations in its final report (2016). Broadly, the recommendations proposed: increased funding for school leadership positions and development; improved preparation, induction, and mentoring of new school leaders; improved efforts to market school leadership as a career; reduced obstacles for prospective school leaders; and incentives for regional or collaborative efforts to support the development of new school leaders. Drawing on the recommendations of the Task Force, as well as the findings and conclusions from this study, the following recommendations are offered:

### **Provide Funding for School Leadership and Leadership Development**

- Increase state funding and incentives for statewide, regional or collaborative efforts that provide evidence-based training and mentoring programs and professional networks aligned with professional standards for new school leaders
- Provide targeted state funding to districts that supports the development of innovative approaches to a) supporting the development of new school leaders and/or b) encouraging teachers to learn about and gain experience in school administration and leadership

### **Increase and Improve School Leadership Development Opportunities**

- Capitalize on the expertise of teacher leaders by engaging them more in evaluation of their peers for both feedback for professional growth and evaluation, which may require some revision of the state or district PE/PG policy, as well as additional training for teachers to standardize the feedback process
- Incentivize collaborative efforts between school districts and university-based leadership preparation programs to collaborate more closely in leadership development efforts

- Provide guidance on policy that would allow a ‘no harm clause’ that would contractually allow teachers to develop into future administrators but return to the classroom within one year if the professional move did not work out

### **Align Efforts of Policymakers, Practitioners, and Researchers to Develop Educational Policy on School Leadership**

- Develop a strategic education plan that builds on the Task Force recommendations, as well as this study, to provide synergy to efforts that will increase the ability for Maine to have a strong education system moving into the 21<sup>st</sup> century
- Conduct a study to review national literature on best practices and innovative strategies for supporting leadership development and addressing challenges related to the principal “pipeline” and engaging teachers in school administrative leadership, with a particular focus on effective strategies used in rural states
- Conduct a study of disparities in district funding and staffing for school administrative leadership in Maine districts and schools

## Bibliography

- Beam, A. P, Claxton, R. L., & Smith, S. J. (2016). Challenges for novice school leaders: Facing today's issues in school administration. *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teacher and Program Development*, 27, 145-161.
- Brian, G., Hanushek, E., & Rivkin, S. (2013). School leaders matter: Measuring the impact of effective principals. *Education Next*, 13(1) 62-69.
- CCSSO. (2016). *Building support systems: Partnerships and policy strategies for state education agencies*. Washington, D.C.: author.
- Colgan, C. S. (2006). *Maine's aging economy and the economy of aging*. Prepared for: Blaine House Conference on Aging. Augusta, ME: Muskie School of Public Service and the Maine Department of Health and Human Services.
- Copland, M. (2003). Leadership for inquiry: Building and sustaining capacity for school improvement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25(4) 375-395.
- Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., & Meyerson, D. (2005). *School leadership study: Developing successful principals*. A review of research. Stanford, CA: Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.
- Derrington, M. L. (2016). Implementing teacher evaluation. Lattice of leadership. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 11(2), 181-199.
- Dikkers, S., & Kelley, C. (2016). Framing feedback for school improvement around distributed leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(3), 392-422.
- DiPaola, M. & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The principalship at a crossroads: A study of the conditions and concerns of principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 87(634).
- Donaldson, G. & Marnik, G. (2012). *The Maine principal study: change and stability in school leadership 1997-2011*. Orono, ME: University of Maine.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2014). *SuperVision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (9th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Goldring, R. & Taie, S. (2014). *Principal attrition and mobility: Results from the 2012-13 principal follow-up survey*. Washington, D.C.: NCES, IES, USDOE.
- Hill, J., Ottem, R., & DeRoche, J. (2016). *Trends in public and private school principal demographics and qualifications: 1987-88 to 2011-12*. Washington, D.C.: NCES, IES, USDOE.

- Institute for Educational Leadership. (2000). *Leadership for student learning: Reinventing the principalship. School leadership for the 21<sup>st</sup> century initiative: A report of the task force on the principalship*. Washington, D.C.: USDOE, OERI.
- Katzenmeyer, M. & Moller, G. (2009). *Awakening the sleeping giant*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *Review of Research on How Leadership Influences Student Learning*. Toronto: OISE and Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Maine State Legislature (2015). Chpt. 46, *Resolve to Create the Task Force on School Leadership*. Augusta, ME.
- Malone, B. & Caddell, T. (2000). A crisis in leadership: Where are tomorrow's principals? *The Clearing House*, 73(3) 162-164.
- Mette, I. M., & Fairman, J. (2016). *Piloting PE/PG systems in Maine school districts: Lessons learned*. Augusta, ME: Maine Education Policy Research Institute.
- Mette, I. M., Range, B. G., Anderson, J., Hvidston, D. J., & Nieuwenhuizen, L. (2015). Teachers' perceptions of teacher supervision and evaluation: A reflection of school improvement practices in the age of reform. *Educational Leadership Review*, 16(1), 16-30.
- Myung, J., Loeb, S., & Horng, E. (2011). Tapping the principal pipeline: Identifying talent for future school leadership in the absence of formal succession management programs. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(5) 695-727.
- National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP). (2008). *The K-8 principal in 2008: A ten year study*. Alexandria, VA: NAESP.
- Shelton, S. & Welu, M. (2014). *Building a school principal pipeline: Lessons from the field*. An Education Policy Brief. Denver, CO: National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL).
- Task Force on School Leadership. (Feb. 2016). Report of the Task Force. Augusta, ME: Maine State Legislature.
- Tian, M., Risku, M., & Collin, K. (2016). A meta-analysis of distributed leadership from 2002 to 2013: Theory development, empirical evidence and future research focus. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 44(1), 146-164.
- Turnbull, B., Anderson, L., Riley, D., MacFarlane, J., & Aladjem, D. (2016). *The principal pipeline initiative in action: Building a stronger principalship, Vol. 5*. New York, NY: Policy Studies Associates, Inc. and RAND.

US Census (2013). Maine core based statistical areas (CBSAs) and counties.

[http://www2.census.gov/geo/maps/metroarea/stcbsa\\_pg/Feb2013/cbsa2013\\_ME.pdf](http://www2.census.gov/geo/maps/metroarea/stcbsa_pg/Feb2013/cbsa2013_ME.pdf)

Wallace Foundation. (2011). *The Wallace Foundation launches major “principal pipeline” initiative to help school districts build a corps of effective school principals*. Press release retrieved from:

<http://www.wallacefoundation.org/News-and-Media/press-releases/Pages/The-Wallace-Foundation-Launches-Major-Principal-Pipeline-Initiative-to-Help-School-Districts-Build-Corps.aspx>

Wallace Foundation. (2016). *Building principal pipelines: A job that urban districts can do*. New York, NY.



### **Author Information**

Ian M. Mette is an Assistant Professor in Educational Leadership in the College of Education and Human Development at the University of Maine. His research interests include school reform policy, teacher supervision and evaluation, and bridging the gap between research and practice to inform and support school improvement efforts. Specifically, his work targets how educators, researchers, and policymakers can better inform one other to drive school improvement and reform policy.

Janet C. Fairman is an Associate Research Professor in the College of Education and Human Development, University of Maine, and co-Director of MEPRI. Dr. Fairman holds a doctorate degree in education policy and has expertise in the areas of education policy analysis, program evaluation, and qualitative research methodology. Her research includes a focus on STEM education, innovative and reform practices in education, and teacher leadership.

Seyma Dagistan Terzi is a full-time Ph.D. student in Educational Leadership in the College of Education and Human Development and a graduate assistant at the Office of International Programs at the University of Maine. Mrs. Dagistan Terzi holds a master's degree in psychology and undergraduate degrees in political science, teaching English as a second language, and language, literature, and culture. Her research interests include educational policy and evaluation, educational equity, student-voice, youth-adult collaboration and youth empowerment in education.

## Appendix A Superintendent Survey Results

Question	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total
1. It is important for schools and school districts to develop their own teachers to become future school leaders.	0.00%	0	3.90%	3	46.75%	36	49.35%	38	77
2. It is important for principals to encourage teachers to become school leaders.	0.00%	0	1.30%	1	46.75%	36	51.95%	40	77
3. It is important for superintendents to encourage teachers to become school leaders.	0.00%	0	1.30%	1	55.84%	43	42.86%	33	77
4. State policymakers understand the importance of supporting school leader development.	15.79%	12	65.79%	50	18.42%	14	0.00%	0	76
5. Aspiring administrators within my district have opportunities to engage in practical leadership experiences that focus on leading school improvement efforts.	0.00%	0	9.09%	7	62.34%	48	28.57%	22	77
6. Aspiring administrators within my district have opportunities to engage in practical leadership experiences that focus on curricular decisions.	0.00%	0	3.90%	3	70.13%	54	25.97%	20	77
7. Aspiring administrators within my district have opportunities to engage in practical leadership experiences that focus on teacher evaluation.	0.00%	0	20.78%	16	59.74%	46	19.48%	15	77
8. Aspiring administrators within my district have opportunities to engage in practical leadership experiences that focus on coaching other teachers to improve instructionally.	2.60%	2	15.58%	12	63.64%	49	18.18%	14	77

9. Aspiring administrators within my district have opportunities to engage in practical leadership experiences that focus on school budget decisions.	2.60%	2	48.05%	37	40.26%	31	9.09%	7	77
10. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with adequate support to be successful in the first few years of being a principal.	1.47%	1	5.88%	4	70.59%	48	22.06%	15	68
11. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with professional development opportunities that target leading school improvement efforts.	0.00%	0	8.82%	6	63.24%	43	27.94%	19	68
12. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with professional development opportunities that inform curriculum development and implementation.	0.00%	0	11.76%	8	57.35%	39	30.88%	21	68
13. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with professional development opportunities that target implementing our teacher evaluation system.	0.00%	0	5.88%	4	51.47%	35	42.65%	29	68
14. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with professional development opportunities that target coaching teachers to improve instructionally.	0.00%	0	14.71%	10	55.88%	38	29.41%	20	68
15. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with professional development opportunities that inform budget decisions.	1.47%	1	17.65%	12	66.18%	45	14.71%	10	68
16. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with adequate mentoring (one-on-one training) to be successful in	1.47%	1	26.47%	18	51.47%	35	20.59%	14	68

the first few years of being a principal.									
17. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with adequate mentoring (one-on-one training) to reflect on and improve their ability to lead school improvement efforts.	0.00%	0	30.88%	21	52.94%	36	16.18%	11	68
18. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with adequate mentoring (one-on-one training) to reflect on and improve their ability to be a curriculum leader.	0.00%	0	39.71%	27	45.59%	31	14.71%	10	68
19. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with adequate mentoring (one-on-one training) to reflect on and improve their ability to evaluate teachers.	0.00%	0	16.42%	11	50.75%	34	32.84%	22	67
20. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with adequate mentoring (one-on-one training) to reflect on and improve their ability to coach teachers to improve instructionally.	0.00%	0	31.34%	21	50.75%	34	17.91%	12	67
21. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with adequate mentoring (one-on-one training) to reflect on and improve their ability to make budgetary decisions.	0.00%	0	27.94%	19	57.35%	39	14.71%	10	68
22. Teacher leaders (i.e. PLC team leaders, department chairs, new teacher mentors, etc.) are an important part of school leadership in my school district.	1.45%	1	1.45%	1	47.83%	33	49.28%	34	69
23. Teacher leaders (i.e. PLC team leaders, department chairs, new teacher mentors,	1.45%	1	2.90%	2	57.97%	40	37.68%	26	69

etc.) help address the curricular needs of my school district.									
24. Teacher leaders (i.e. PLC team leaders, department chairs, new teacher mentors, etc.) help address the evaluation needs of my school district.	1.45%	1	21.74%	15	57.97%	40	18.84%	13	69
25. Teacher leaders (i.e. PLC team leaders, department chairs, new teacher mentors, etc.) help address the instructional coaching needs of my school district.	0.00%	0	21.74%	15	60.87%	42	17.39%	12	69
26. Teacher leaders (i.e. PLC team leaders, department chairs, new teacher mentors, etc.) help address the budgetary needs of my school district.	2.90%	2	40.58%	28	50.72%	35	5.80%	4	69
27. Teacher leaders (i.e. PLC team leaders, department chairs, new teacher mentors, etc.) in my school district help reduce the managerial burdens of administrators.	8.70%	6	42.03%	29	43.48%	30	5.80%	4	69

## Appendix B Principal Survey Results

Question	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total
1. It is important for schools and school districts to develop their own teachers to become future school leaders.	0.00%	0	6.27%	16	45.10%	115	48.63%	124	255
2. It is important for principals to encourage teachers to become school leaders.	0.00%	0	2.35%	6	44.31%	113	53.33%	136	255
3. It is important for superintendents to encourage teachers to become school leaders.	0.00%	0	6.27%	16	56.08%	143	37.65%	96	255
4. State policymakers understand the importance of supporting school leader development.	15.02%	38	63.24%	160	18.58%	47	3.16%	8	253
5. Aspiring administrators within my building have opportunities to engage in practical leadership experiences that focus on leading school improvement efforts.	0.78%	2	9.02%	23	63.53%	162	26.67%	68	255
6. Aspiring administrators within my building have opportunities to engage in practical leadership experiences that focus on curricular decisions.	0.40%	1	10.67%	27	62.06%	157	26.88%	68	253
7. Aspiring administrators within my building have opportunities to engage in practical leadership experiences that focus on teacher evaluation.	1.97%	5	37.40%	95	47.24%	120	13.39%	34	254
8. Aspiring administrators within my building have opportunities to engage in practical leadership experiences that focus on	0.40%	1	19.37%	49	63.64%	161	16.60%	42	253

coaching other teachers to improve instructionally.									
9. Aspiring administrators within my building have opportunities to engage in practical leadership experiences that focus on school budget decisions.	6.35%	16	49.21%	124	40.48%	102	3.97%	10	252
10. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with adequate support to be successful in the first few years of being a principal.	8.62%	20	28.45%	66	54.31%	126	8.62%	20	232
11. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with professional development opportunities that target leading school improvement efforts.	4.70%	11	29.91%	70	57.26%	134	8.12%	19	234
12. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with professional development opportunities that inform curriculum development and implementation.	4.29%	10	32.19%	75	56.22%	131	7.30%	17	233
13. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with professional development opportunities that target implementing our teacher evaluation system.	2.15%	5	15.88%	37	62.23%	145	19.74%	46	233
14. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with professional development opportunities that target coaching teachers to improve instructionally.	5.19%	12	31.60%	73	54.55%	126	8.66%	20	231

15. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with professional development opportunities that inform budget decisions.	9.05%	21	47.84%	111	39.66%	92	3.45%	8	232
16. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with adequate mentoring (one-on-one training) to be successful in the first few years of being a principal.	11.64%	27	46.55%	108	34.91%	81	6.90%	16	232
17. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with adequate mentoring (one-on-one training) to reflect on and improve their ability to lead school improvement efforts.	10.82%	25	49.78%	115	32.47%	75	6.93%	16	231
18. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with adequate mentoring (one-on-one training) to reflect on and improve their ability to be a curriculum leader.	12.99%	30	52.81%	122	30.30%	70	3.90%	9	231
19. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with adequate mentoring (one-on-one training) to reflect on and improve their ability to evaluate teachers.	9.05%	21	42.24%	98	39.22%	91	9.48%	22	232
20. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with adequate mentoring (one-on-one training) to reflect on and improve their ability to coach teachers to improve instructionally.	10.78%	25	46.55%	108	37.07%	86	5.60%	13	232



21. Newly hired administrators in my school district are provided with adequate mentoring (one-on-one training) to reflect on and improve their ability to make budgetary decisions.	13.79%	32	51.29%	119	31.03%	72	3.88%	9	232
22. Teacher leaders (i.e. PLC team leaders, department chairs, new teacher mentors, etc.) are an important part of school leadership in my school building.	0.44%	1	4.80%	11	41.05%	94	53.71%	123	229
23. Teacher leaders (i.e. PLC team leaders, department chairs, new teacher mentors, etc.) help address the curricular needs of my school building.	0.88%	2	5.26%	12	50.44%	115	43.42%	99	228
24. Teacher leaders (i.e. PLC team leaders, department chairs, new teacher mentors, etc.) help address the evaluation needs of my school building.	3.96%	9	37.00%	84	43.17%	98	15.86%	36	227
25. Teacher leaders (i.e. PLC team leaders, department chairs, new teacher mentors, etc.) help address the instructional coaching needs of my school building.	0.44%	1	28.63%	65	50.22%	114	20.70%	47	227
26. Teacher leaders (i.e. PLC team leaders, department chairs, new teacher mentors, etc.) help address the budgetary needs of my school building.	5.73%	13	41.41%	94	43.17%	98	9.69%	22	227
27. Teacher leaders (i.e. PLC team leaders, department chairs, new teacher mentors, etc.) in	7.93%	18	37.00%	84	40.53%	92	14.54%	33	227

my school building help reduce the managerial burdens of administrators.									
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--