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Abstract:
Schools nationally have reported concern about shrinking candidate pools for principal candidates. The problem addressed in this study was that the relationship between recruitment and selection strategies used by Montana school superintendents and existing standards for principals was not known. The purpose of this study was to describe and examine the relationship between principal selection strategies utilized by Montana schools in the selection of a new principal and nationally agreed upon ISLLC standards for knowledge, dispositions and performances required of principals. From examination of reported selection strategies used in Montana schools and the recruitment and selection literature, a recruitment and selection model was developed for the hiring of quality principals.

Two parameters guided development of a model and strategies for recruitment and selection of principals. One, effective recruitment strategies identified in the literature and examination of existing recruitment strategies reported by Montana school superintendents. Two, effective selection strategies identified in the literature and examination of existing selection strategies reported by Montana school superintendents. As found in the recruitment and selection literature, there is an emphasis on strategies utilized in the corporate world for CEO recruitment and selection.

Data generated from Montana school superintendents regarding hiring practices for principals revealed that Montana’s administrative shortage parallels national reports; the absence of fully developed recruitment procedures for attracting potential candidates, including minority and female candidates; limited use of succession or internal “grow your own programs;” and, limited training for hiring committees.

Two factor analysis of variance tests on selection data revealed significance in several areas; however, differences should be interpreted with caution due to small case sizes. Factor analysis was used to examine respondent perceptions regarding the use of the ISLLC standards in recruitment and selection and resulted in the identification of two factors accounting for 46.32% of the variance.

This study resulted in the development of a recruitment and selection model that integrates professional development of principals with recruitment and selection practices based on the ISLLC standards. Aligned hired practices contained in the model provide Montana schools with a process that will guide their hiring of quality principals.
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ABSTRACT

Schools nationally have reported concern about shrinking candidate pools for principal candidates. The problem addressed in this study was that the relationship between recruitment and selection strategies used by Montana school superintendents and existing standards for principals was not known. The purpose of this study was to describe and examine the relationship between principal selection strategies utilized by Montana schools in the selection of a new principal and nationally agreed upon ISLLC standards for knowledge, dispositions and performances required of principals. From examination of reported selection strategies used in Montana schools and the recruitment and selection literature, a recruitment and selection model was developed for the hiring of quality principals.

Two parameters guided development of a model and strategies for recruitment and selection of principals. One, effective recruitment strategies identified in the literature and examination of existing recruitment strategies reported by Montana school superintendents. Two, effective selection strategies identified in the literature and examination of existing selection strategies reported by Montana school superintendents. As found in the recruitment and selection literature, there is an emphasis on strategies utilized in the corporate world for CEO recruitment and selection.

Data generated from Montana school superintendents regarding hiring practices for principals revealed that Montana’s administrative shortage parallels national reports; the absence of fully developed recruitment procedures for attracting potential candidates, including minority and female candidates; limited use of succession or internal “grow your own programs;” and, limited training for hiring committees.

Two factor analysis of variance tests on selection data revealed significance in several areas; however, differences should be interpreted with caution due to small cases sizes. Factor analysis was used to examine respondent perceptions regarding the use of the ISLLC standards in recruitment and selection and resulted in the identification of two factors accounting for 46.32% of the variance.

This study resulted in the development of a recruitment and selection model that integrates professional development of principals with recruitment and selection practices based on the ISLLC standards. Aligned hired practices contained in the model provide Montana schools with a process that will guide their hiring of quality principals.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Words like “qualified,” “effective,” and “new breed” have all been used to describe the type of school leadership needed to transform America’s schools into learning centers that will meet the educational needs of students in the 21st century. Central to this transformation to excellence in schools is the principal, which comes at a time when schools nationally have reported a shortage of candidates possessing the knowledge and skills required of today’s principalship (Institute for Educational Leadership [IEL], 2000; National Governors Association [NGA], 2003; Roza, Celio, Harvey, & Wishon, 2003). Anderson (1991) summarizes the leadership shortage issue by stating that, “recruiting and selecting capable candidates for school leadership positions may be the most important task facing superintendents and school boards in the next few years” (p. 29).

In a look at maintaining a competitive and resilient workforce in the world of business, Waterman, Waterman and Collard (2001) state that, “Some management thinkers argue that instead of the traditional focus on employment, the focus should now be on employability [and] having the competitive skills required to find work...” (p. 1). In essence, a new covenant that seeks commitment and productivity from employees must be established, one in which the organization creates an environment that provides opportunities for employees to develop the skills necessary for competitive employability
for self and productivity for the company. Today’s principals require a new set of skills and with the following description, Tirozzi (2001) offers a glimpse at the collective skills required if schools and tomorrow’s educational leaders are to remain competitive for students:

The principal – the instructional “artist in residence” – establishes a climate for excellence, puts forth a vision for continuous improvement in student performance, promotes excellence in teaching, and commits to sustained, comprehensive professional development for all staff members. The principal ensures that curriculum, instructional strategies, and assessments of student progress are coherent components in the teaching and learning process. In short, the principal engages herself or himself as an instructional leader. (p. 435)

Reported leadership shortages at all levels, combined with the many powerful dynamics that will reshape American education in the 21st century, result in needed strategies that support the professional development, identification, recruitment, selection and retention of highly qualified and effective school principals. The number of qualified principals seems to be in short supply with school districts reporting a shrinking pool of viable principal candidates, making recruitment and selection an issue for schools nationally. Efforts to contend with principal shortages have resulted in many state legislatures passing laws that support alternative certification routes to the principalship.

In a position statement responding to increasing shortages and alternative routes to the principal’s office, the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) adopted guiding principles in March of 2001 recognizing the fundamental role of leadership in the teaching-learning process and with gains in student achievement.
Adopted alternatives to working with the shortage must be guided by the following principles:

1. Selection of principals must be based on qualities of instructional leadership rooted in established knowledge and skills that result in dedication to good instructional practice and learning.
2. Quality principal candidates should be identified and “grown” from within the professional teaching ranks within the school district; mentoring and ongoing professional development programs must be established and resources allocated by district, state, and the federal government for this purpose (NASSP, 2001, Guiding principles section, para. 1 & 8).

Based on these alternatives, the training, recruitment and selection of high quality leadership is one of the prerequisite conditions required to effectively raise student achievement. This condition is supported in the 2001 Public Agenda report, funded by the Wallace Foundation, with 99% of superintendents and 97% of principals agreeing that “Behind every great school is a great principal” (p.7). In a new Public Agenda report, Rolling up Their Sleeves (2003) and A Matter of Definition (Roza, Celio, Harvey & Wishon, 2003), the critical role of principal leadership is further affirmed by superintendents as is the need to find and hire for a position that operates under a new set of standards and policy mandates. The effect of school leadership on student achievement is well documented (Larson, 1987; Leithwood, Begley, & Cousins, 1992; Rothman, 2000; Sebring & Bryk, 2000; Rothman, 2000); and Waters, Marzano, and McNulty’s (2003) meta-analysis on school leadership of more than 5000 studies clearly substantiates the effects of “balanced leadership” practices on student achievement. Balanced leadership occurs when leaders identify and focus on the right school improvement effort; understand the implications and order of the change being sought; and engage in leadership practices that support the change being implemented. Balanced
leadership is focused on "concrete responsibilities, practices, knowledge, strategies, tools, and resources that principals and other needs to be effective leaders" in today's schools (Waters et al., 2003, p.2).

Instructional expertise represents just one skill area required of today's principals working in systems that are open, dynamic, and constantly evolving and adapting to both internal and external demands. Historically, schoolhouse doors have served as the gateway for numerous forms of public controversy and dissatisfaction, resulting in calls for educational reform. Reform as defined by Schubert (1993) means "to reshape, to reconfigure, to make different" (p. 80). The 1980's brought forth numerous reports that blamed conditions in public schools for the United States decline in international competition (Mayberry et al., 1995, p. 11-12). Passage of the Obey-Porter list in 1997 focused on school reform and resulted in a roster of 17 model school improvement programs that created controversy among educators (Viadero, 1999). During the past two decades, educational reforms have presented principals at all levels with the challenge of achieving excellence with the current expectation that no child will be left behind.

In a 1999 report on school leadership, the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) asserts that "principals lead change, inspire students and staff, leverage resources to make improvements happen, and bring community members into the process of change" (p. 5). The need for effective school leadership in the principalship is underscored by the realities of the many changes impacting schools. Future trends will impact schools and will place new demands on the principals that lead them. Future trends that will impact schools include changing demographics, funding
available to public schools, transformation of mainstream values, technological advances, societal factors, and the demand for life-long learning (Cetron & Cetron, 2003; Cook, 1990; Levine, 2001). Pressures associated with these future trends further delineate a need for the identification and recruitment of effective school principals who can maintain focus and direction on student learning, and as stated by Leithwood, Begley and Cousins (1992), “expectations have changed at a sufficiently rapid rate to create incompetence among some of those [school leaders] with long tenure in the role” (p. 11). Present and future trends will continue to directly influence the qualities school leaders must possess to contend with complex change events. Thus, a different set of skills and recruitment and selection strategies must be used to identify these qualities in potential principal candidates.

Fullan (1991) further affirms the importance of the aforementioned factors by stating that, “One does not have to be a historian to accept the fact that a number of major external and internal forces over time create pressures for change” in education and within the principalship (p.17). The challenges facing today’s educational leaders result in part from the development of educational policy at all levels of government. The No Child Left Behind Act (Public Law 107-110), signed into law January 8, 2002, is one current example of educational policy that carves out a new direction through specific accountability and assessment provisions for all states as related to the education of our nation’s youth. The Act contains several major implications for educational leaders. One provision within the law seeks “to improve teacher quality and increase the number of highly qualified teachers, principals, and vice principals (Learning First Alliance, 2002, p. 12). Permitted activities in the Act include reforming certification requirements
for teachers and principals and assisting districts with recruitment and retention of quality educators. Accountability and assessment implications in present legislation demand strong leadership and as Webb and Norton (1999) state, "...one of the quickest ways to initiate change and improvement in the services of a school organization" is through the selection of quality school leadership (p. 301). Consequently, recruitment and selection processes play a critical role in school improvement with the identification of principals who can effectively manage schools and provide the necessary leadership to guide and inspire teachers in new directions.

Performance requirements of the principalship have evolved with time, and today's principals cannot rely solely on "basic managerial skills" or "book knowledge" if they are to meet accountability expectations. Furthering existing initiatives surrounding the principalship, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), a program of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), adopted standards in 1996 that redefine the traditional role of the school leader. As noted by Hessel and Holloway (2002), this new "framework for school leaders is organized around the core proposition that the most critical aspect of a school leader's work is the continuous improvement of student learning" and all other performance responsibilities are done in support of student learning (p. 2). The six standards present a common core of knowledge, dispositions and performances designed to "enhance the skills of school leaders to couple leadership with effective educational processes and valued outcomes" (p. iii). Each of the core elements includes indicators that represent the work and practices of effective school leadership. Hessel and Holloway (2002) provide the following definitions for each core element.
The knowledge indicators present the kinds of theories, trends, principles, models, and concepts that serve as a part of the foundation for what the school leader should know and understand. Similarly, the disposition indicators present statements of what the school leader should value and believe in. The performance indicators describe what the school leader actually does (p. 20).

In their entirety, the ISLLC standards contain 43 knowledge elements, 43 dispositions and 97 performance indicators. Murphy (1997) espouses that, “The ISLLC standards marry leadership to learning, management with measurement of academic growth, and stewardship to the development of productive learning communities” (p. 52). Effective leadership for effective schools in view of existing standards for building level leaders adds to the challenge of identification, recruitment, and selection of a new school principal.

Schools require quality leadership in critical areas and the ISLLC standards present a framework for assessing the leadership qualities of principal candidates. In a 1998 exploratory study conducted by the Educational Research Service (ERS) for the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) examining the shortage of qualified principal candidates, approximately 50% of the districts surveyed reported a shortage of qualified principal candidates. The ERS report identified shortages among all types of schools (rural-52%, urban-47%, and suburban-45%) and at all levels (elementary-47%, junior high/middle-55%, and senior high schools-55%). These reported shortages may also be compounded by the lack of aspiring principal programs, with only 27% of all districts in the ERS report indicating the existence of such a program.
Montana's initial principal shortage was first noted in a 1999 study commissioned by the Montana School Board Association (MSBA) in collaboration with the School Administrators of Montana (SAM), the Montana Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Committee, and the Department of Education, Montana State University Bozeman. In this report, the leading problem as reported by Montana superintendents was a small applicant pool. In a follow-up survey conducted in 2002 with the assistance of the State Action for Educational Leadership Project grant from the Wallace-Readers Digest Foundation, Nielson reported a 25% decline in the applicant pool since 1999, from a seemingly large pool of 400 certified, non-practicing administrators to about 300, with 25% of the current pool indicating that they would not pursue administrative positions (p. 1). Compounding this decline in the applicant pool was the reported retirement of existing school leadership at a rate of about "56 retirements each of the five years" (p. 1). Consideration of both reports indicates that Montana will be faced with a serious shortage of school leaders.

Recruitment and selection of a building principal, in view of reported shortages and studies on student achievement, presents consequences for entire learning communities if the end result is a poor hiring decision. Hiring effective principals begins with recruitment and as Barber (1998) states,

Recruitment is an important part of effective human resource management. Recruitment performs the essential function of drawing an important resource—human capital—into the organization. The success of later human resource efforts, such as selection, training, and compensation depends in part on the quality and quantity of new employees identified and attracted through the recruitment process (p. 1).
Wendover (1998) identifies recruitment and the eventual selection of a new employee as an expensive endeavor and states that, "...surveys published on hiring indicate the average professional hire costs approximately $5000" and "averages around $700" for non-professional labor hires (p. 52). Poor recruitment and selection procedures can quickly inflate costs if hiring practices result in high turnover and as reported by Rosse and Levin (1997), "Hiring effectively is not sufficient to bring success, but it is absolutely necessary" (p. xii). With student achievement at stake, well-designed recruitment and selection practices will contribute to a school’s success.

Statement of the Problem

Expectations for what schools must accomplish with respect to student achievement have been made very clear through the No Child Left Behind Act. In meeting current expectations, it is also clear that the leadership capability of principals is critical in determining the success or failure of schools (Jones, 2000; Fullan, 2002), and that there is a positive correlation between leadership and achievement (Waters et al., 2003). One of the primary problems facing schools is the recruitment and selection of quality principal leadership, and according to Rosse and Levin (1997), organizations often engage in "ritual hiring" using practices that are not systematic and not reflective of knowledge, skills, abilities and other characteristics needed to do the job (p. 12).

The shortage of qualified principal applicants presents school trustees and superintendents with a leadership crisis at a time when effective leadership is considered paramount to the formation of high-achieving schools. The practice of using traditional screening methods such as resumés and cover letters may limit school trustees and
superintendents in their recruitment and selection practices by failing to reveal the candidate’s skills, knowledge and dispositions. Consequently, the selection of a school principal is a high-stakes decision and one that demands a new set of strategies for the recruitment and selection of tomorrow’s school leaders.

Using traditional screening practices, school trustees and superintendents run the risk of eliminating viable candidates, both experienced and non-experienced. Recruitment and selection practices result in judgments being made, both from a candidate perspective and employer perspective. The recruitment and selection process should inform candidates, serve as a learning experience for candidates, and for unsuccessful candidates, direct their future professional development so they become viable candidates and remain in the pool of applicants (Leithwood et al., 1992).

Understanding of desired qualities, combined with an examination of existing hiring practices, provides one promising model strategy that may more effectively help school trustees and superintendents recruit, identify, select, develop and retain outstanding principals.

Human relations management for most applicants begins with recruitment and selection procedures. As Schein (1970) reports, “Applicants and employees form an implicit contract with an organization as a result of the way they are evaluated in selection, training and performance appraisal procedures” (as cited in Thorton, 1992, p. 9). Understanding of the recruitment and selection processes used to hire principals in Montana schools is limited. The problem addressed in this study is that the relationship between recruitment and selection strategies used by Montana school superintendents and existing standards for principals is not known.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to describe and examine the relationship between principal selection strategies utilized by Montana schools in the selection of a new principal and nationally agreed upon ISLLC standards for knowledge, dispositions and performances required of school principals. Additionally, from examination of reported recruitment and selection strategies used in Montana schools and the recruitment and selection literature, a model will be developed for the recruitment and selection of principals.

Research questions to be addressed are:

1. What are the recruitment strategies used by Montana schools to secure a candidate pool?
2. What are the selection strategies used by Montana schools to screen or identify potential candidates?
3. Have Montana school superintendents established “grow your own” programs for the development, recruitment and selection of candidates internally?
4. Are there differences in selection strategies used in Montana schools as related to school size, region, experience, and age of practicing superintendents, and gender?
5. What members of the school community typically served on principal selection committees and is training provided to selection committee members?
6. Do principal selection strategies used by Montana schools reflect and evaluate principal candidates using the ISLLC standards?
The development of a recruitment and selection model will also be supported by two parameters that further identify best hiring practice. The following parameters will support development of a model and strategies for the recruitment and selection of school principals:

1. Effective recruitment strategies as identified in the literature.
2. Effective selection strategies as identified in the literature.

Significance of the Study

Development of a recruitment and selection model provides Montana schools with a framework that allows for the effective recruitment and selection of quality principal candidates. This framework and related strategies are based on existing professional development standards for school principals. In Montana, trustees have ultimate authority in hiring the district’s superintendent and share responsibilities regarding the employment or dismissal of a principal (Montana Code Annotated, 20-3-324, 2003). In today’s era of accountability, trustees hold superintendents responsible for district-wide school improvement and for the principals they lead; consequently, superintendents must have the authority to surround themselves with highly capable leaders (Ezarik, 2003; Webb & Norton, 1990).

In response to reported shortages and the quality of applicants applying for job vacancies, a more complete understanding of the human resources management practices utilized for a principal hiring, and the degree to which candidates are assessed with respect to today’s standards for principals provides Montana school superintendents and trustees with a best practice model for the recruitment and selection of principals.
Information obtained through this study informs superintendents, trustees and principal candidates about current recruitment and selection practices; provides information useful in the mentoring of newly hired principals; and provides principals at all stages of their professional careers with information relevant to their ongoing professional development needs. In addition to assisting superintendents and trustees in principal selection, information provided by educational leaders may be useful to potential applicants through an increased understanding of the knowledge, dispositions, and competencies assessed by Montana school leaders during the recruitment and selection process, both for aspiring principals and those already certificated.

Development of model recruitment and selection strategies based on current literature and standards for principals provides Montana superintendents and school trustees with a practical, standards-based model that can be used to develop effective recruitment and selection practices that result in hiring a quality school principal. Reliance on traditional hiring practices will result in candidates being recruited, assessed, and selected using processes that are not aligned with current expectations for principals; and, as Roza et al. (2003) state, “... no statewide or national policy changes can save districts (and local schools) from the consequences of such dysfunctional management” (p. 46). Alignment of recruitment and selection processes with current leadership expectations will allow districts to engage in hiring practices that result in a more comprehensive appraisal of principal candidates focused on organizational needs.

**Definition of Terms**

The following section defines key words and phrases used throughout this study.
District Superintendent, MCA 20-1-101 - (7): A person who holds a valid class 3 Montana teacher certificate with a superintendent’s endorsement that has been issued by the superintendent of public instruction under the provisions of this title (Title 20) and the policies adopted by the board of public education and who has been employed by a district as a district superintendent.

Principal, MCA 20-1-101 – (9): A person who holds a valid class 3 Montana teacher certificate with an applicable principal’s endorsement that has been issued by the superintendent of public instruction under the provisions of this title (Title 20) and the policies adopted by the board of public education and who has been employed by a district as a principal.

Elementary School, MCA 20-6-501 - (1): A school is known as an elementary school when it comprises the work of any combination of kindergarten, other preschool programs, or the first eight grades or their equivalent.

Middle School, MCA 20-6-501- (1): A school comprising the work of grades 4 through 8 or any combination of grades 4 through 8 that has been accredited as a middle school under the provisions of MCA 20-7-102.

Junior High School, MCA 20-6-501 – 2 (a): A junior high school is a school comprising the work of grades 7 through 9 or their equivalents that has been accredited as a junior high school under the provisions of MCA 20-7-102.

High School, MCA 20-6-501 – 2 (c): A four-year high school is a school comprising the work of grades 9 through 12 or their equivalents.

Grow Your Own Program: Initiative at the local school district level designed to recruit and develop potential school leaders from within for future administrative
positions.

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC): “A consortium of thirty-two education agencies and thirteen education administrative associations that have worked cooperatively to establish an education policy for school leadership.”

Interview: “Face to face exchange of job-relevant information between organization representatives and a job applicant with the overall organizational goal of attracting, selecting, and retaining a highly competent workforce” (Eder, Kacmar, & Ferris, 1989, p. 18).

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards: A common core of six standards established from research on educational leadership, productive schools and school improvement.


Selection: Process “aimed at identifying the most qualified from among those individuals” having made formal application for a vacancy in the school district (Barber, 1998, p.3).

Strategies: “The broadly stated means of deploying resources to achieve the organization’s objectives” (Cook, 1990).

Limitations of the Study

Superintendents typically work with selection committees when hiring a new principal, and this study does not include the perceptions of school board members, teachers, and other community members who are often part of the recruitment and
selection process. A number of other recruitment and selection factors that are viewed as being an integral part of the hiring process include the school environment, workings of the organization, individual factors, experience of those working with recruitment and selection processes, and the context of a particular school (Hollenbeck, 1994; Johnson, 2000). This study is further limited as these factors are not considered in this study.

This study may also be limited with respect to the actual awareness that Montana school leaders have regarding the ISLLC standards. Although the standards were adopted in 1996 by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium, their formal adoption on a statewide basis in Montana has not occurred. Perceptions regarding the standards may be limited as a result.

Summary

The complexities associated with educational reform, societal forces, and major policy shifts clearly establish a new era of accountability and assessment for schools and for the principals who will lead them. Quality schools begin in the classroom with well-prepared teachers, and quality schools are the result of effective principal leadership.

The absence of qualified principal candidates adds a significant challenge to the educational issues already facing superintendents and school boards. As noted by Baehr (1992), “To be effective in helping implement organizational objectives, human resources must fulfill at least two needs: (1) accurately forecasting the human resource requirements and (2) providing management with the tools and knowledge for sound personnel decisions” (p. 4). Recruitment and selection of quality leadership can make a difference in the future of schools and learning for students.
The purpose of this study was to describe and examine the relationship between principal selection strategies used in Montana schools and nationally agreed upon ISLLC standards and to develop a recruitment and selection model that can be used during the hiring process. The role of the school principal is far from traditional, and employment practices that fail to subscribe to existing competencies, leadership standards, and expectations will cause schools to fail in their quest for expert leadership.

Superintendents and trustees share a critical role in the hiring and selection of a new principal, and hiring criteria and practices used should result in a good decision and a lasting one. School improvement, student achievement, and organizational effectiveness are first dependent upon the hiring decision made. Development of a recruitment and selection model provides Montana schools with viable strategies that facilitate the recruitment and selection of highly qualified principals for today’s schools. In the absence of any strategy targeting recruitment and selection, “Children [will] suffer from absence of educational leadership...because the focus of the district is not on improving teaching and learning for all children” (Martz, 1992, p. 32). Thus, effective educational leadership, specifically, the selection of a quality principal, is critical to the achievement of excellence in Montana’s schools.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

"Since ancient times, people have searched for ways of identifying leaders who would be strong enough, brave enough, or smart enough to guide them in perilous times. In today's schools, that need is stronger than ever" (Lashway, 1999).

Introduction

Breaking Ranks, a 1996 report of the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the Carnegie Foundation, establishes that for school reform to be successful, "Selection of high school principals will be based on qualities of leadership rooted in established knowledge and skills that result in dedication to good instructional practice and learning" (p. 26). The report identifies principal leadership as the critical element for school renewal and student learning.

As districts nationwide continue to struggle with principal shortages, an understanding of the principalship will add clarity to issues of recruitment and selection. The role of a school leader is exceptionally challenging and understanding the evolution of the principalship and present day complexities of the position will help school districts direct policies and organizational procedures for identifying and hiring the best possible candidate.

The shortage of qualified principal applicants presents Montana school trustees and superintendents with a leadership crisis at a time when effective leadership is
considered to be paramount to the formation of high-achieving schools. Recruitment and selection of a school principal is a high-stakes decision that must be based on present day performance factors and expectations.

The intent of this chapter is to provide a general history of the principalship, a more detailed review of the shortages, presentation of reasons for the scarcity of principal candidates, a review of characteristics and competencies of effective principals, examination of current standards for principals, tools of potential assessment, and a review of recruitment and selection strategies used in personnel selection.

The purpose of this study was to describe and examine the relationship between principal selection strategies utilized by Montana schools in the selection of a new principal and nationally agreed upon ISLLC standards for existing knowledge, dispositions and performances required of school principals. Understanding of current recruitment and selection strategies and an understanding of assessment processes utilized during the selection phase of hiring advances the identification of model recruitment and selection strategies for the employment of quality principals.

History of the Principalship

It is stated in much of the literature for the last decade that the nature of the principalship is increasing in complexity due to a role change, from one with a primacy on managerial expertise to an expanded role that encompasses both managerial and instructional expertise (Marsh, 2000; Portin, Schneider, DeArmond, & Gundlach, 2003; Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). In its 1999 report on the principalship, the National Association of State Boards of Education study group reported that “one of the
underlying challenges in school leadership today is that the principal’s responsibilities are being continually and sometimes monumentally changed by the very reforms they are expected to implement” (p. 5). Ultimately, a first step in the recruitment and selection of an outstanding principal is an understanding of the evolution of the principalship and a construct of the position, its knowledge requirements, dispositions, and competencies as they now exist.

Historically, schooling and school leadership has mirrored our nation’s changing landscapes and as Bolin and Panaritis (1992) point out, “Schools in our society were created in response to changing social conditions and have always been expected to respond” (p. 41). Education’s history is reflected in our rich heritage beginning with the early colonial schools that embodied a Puritan work ethic to present day schools having diverse curricula designed to meet the needs of a diverse society.

Underlying each change in educational landscape is the primary goal of having an educated citizenry, and Ashby (1968) provides the following historical look at early school governance. In 1642, action was taken by the Massachusetts General Court to insure that all students were taught basic skills—reading, writing and arithmetic. Almost 200 years later, the State of Massachusetts passed another law requiring each town to establish an independent committee comprised of citizens or selectmen, the first boards of education, to operate schools. In 1789, Boston became the first city to elect representatives to govern schools. Industrialization served as the catalyst and representatives were selected from business and industry and a classical, scientific management approach to school governance was put in place. With the industrialization and urbanization of America and increases in school complexity came the need for one
person, the superintendent, to direct and manage school on a day-to-day basis. “The first local superintendencies were established in the larger cities” and “Buffalo and Louisville are generally credited with establishing the first ones in 1837” (AASA, 1952, as cited in Konnert & Augenstein, 1990, p. 5). Superintendents initially dealt with day-to-day activities of school and over time, “the role had become more associated with business management [being the expert manager] as well as instruction” (Grogan & Andrews, 2002, p. 234).

Prior to the emergence of the principalship in the 1920’s, a lead teacher on a part-time basis assumed administrative duties at the building level. The principalship of the 1920’s was concerned with pedagogy and during the 1930’s, the role shifted to management of schools and was guided by the principles of scientific management. The 1940’s and early 1950’s were characterized by principals viewed as leaders and promoters of democracy as a result of World War II. Principals of the late 1950’s and 1960’s were focused on academic instruction in the areas of math and science because of schools’ perceived inability to emphasize intellectual growth and rigorous thinking following the launching of Russia’s Sputnik I. The conditions of the 1970’s related to the growth of social problems—racism, drug abuse, and teen pregnancy—resulted in principals focusing less on academics and more on solutions to societal issues (Grogan & Andrews, 2002). The 1980’s headlined with the release of A Nation at Risk, a 1983 report to the American people that, “the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and a people” (p. 5). Dissatisfaction with schools resulted in calls for education reform, placing principals in the role of instructional leader. Principals responded to
public criticisms through implementation of varied school reform efforts in a concerted quest to create the ideal school. The reforms of 1980's lead to increased expectations for principals as instructional leaders during the 1990's. Responsiveness to management tasks became secondary to newly defined roles established around student performance. The challenges of the 21st century delineate roles for principals “who can promote the development of good schools that produce higher levels of learning for all children” (Grogan & Andrews, 2002, p. 241).

The role of today's principal has evolved well beyond that of their 1920's peers, the scientific manager or that of the efficient task manager. This generation of principals must have a capacity for managing information, analyzing and using data, building a community of learners, aligning curriculum, and engaging teachers in constructive conversations about teaching and student learning (Price, 2004, p. 36-37). The essence of today's principalship is one of instructional leadership complete with a new set of competencies and skills that are essential to school improvement efforts that target student learning and achievement. This evolution has resulted in a different view of the position and type of leadership required; consequently, traditional hiring practices will focus on traditional skills—management. Recruitment and selection processes must encompass understanding of the past, but focus on today's competencies and those of the future.

Overview of National Shortage

The question of where we will find capable leaders when many states are reporting a shortage of qualified principal candidates is key to local level recruitment and
selection efforts. As Fenwick and Pierce (2001) state, “Anxiety about finding people who do want the job has led many districts to look for principals anywhere they can find them” (para. 3). Understanding the shortage and associated anxieties provides implications for the preparation, recruitment, selection and retention of school principals.

In seeking an answer to the principal shortage question, the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) secured the services of Educational Research Service (ERS) to examine the problem of principal supply and demand. This 1998 exploratory report “affirms the anecdotal information that there is a shortage of qualified candidates for principal vacancies in the United States” (Table 1) with a projected 10% to 20% increase in job openings to replace retiring administrators. The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) reports that “employment of education administrators is projected to grow about as fast as the average for all occupations through 2010” and in part, this increase results from the large portion of education administrators who are expected to retire in the next ten years (Job Outlook section, para. 1). Adding to this expected shortage is rising school enrollments through 2005 that will create a need for additional education administrators (Educational Research Services, 1998).

Table 1. Availability of Qualified Candidate - Education Research Service (1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School-Grade Level</th>
<th>Surplus</th>
<th>Shortage</th>
<th>Right Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Vacancies</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr/Middle Vacancies</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Vacancies</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In a 1998 study of the elementary and middle school principalship commissioned by the National Association of Elementary School Principals, it “suggests that the principal’s role has become increasingly diverse and complex, and that the 42 percent turnover in the principalship during the last ten years is likely to continue into the next decade” (Doud & Keller, 1998, Implications for the Future section, para. 1). Two of every three principals who participated in K-8 principal’s study expressed a real concern about recruitment and selection of quality principals. In review of the principal shortage, Doud and Keller (1998) presented the following actions “to prevent this situation from becoming a serious problem:”

1. Practicing principals must assume greater responsibility for the identification, encouragement, and mentoring of their replacements.
2. School districts need to establish development systems that facilitate leadership development from the pool of talented teachers.
3. Collaboratively, school districts, state principals’ associations, and universities must work towards development of programs that attract quality candidates and prepare them professionally.
4. State legislators need to actively support principal development programs through actions that will serve to motivate qualified teacher leaders into the school administration programs.
5. School systems need to rethink early “buyout” options and replace them with incentives that keep eligible principals from retiring.

In A Matter of Definition, a 2003 study funded by the Wallace Foundation focusing on an examination of the principal applicant pools concludes by stating, “… that although some districts and regions are experiencing trouble filling vacancies in the principal’s chair; there are far more people certified to be school principals around the nation than jobs for them to fill” (Roza et al., 2003, p. 18). Disparities in the distribution of principal candidates as reported in this study result more from candidate avoidance of districts with challenging work conditions, high poverty and minority rates, and lower
salaries for principals. Distribution of applicant pools is also impacted by a lack of desire to lead at the high school level, resulting in fewer applicants at the high school level. A second finding of this report that adds to the perceived shortage of principal candidates is a lack of congruence in hiring practices where “much of the problem resides within districts where selection criteria conflict with desired attributes” (Rosa, et al., 2003, p. 56). Primary recommendations from this study aimed at addressing the candidate shortage issues faced by some school districts include improved incentives for working in the most challenging schools; re-examination and alignment of hiring processes with leadership attributes; and, to make use of different leadership alternatives and arrangements when no access to a quality principal exists.

In an earlier report examining the role of school leadership by the National Conference of State Legislatures (2002), diversity within schools was viewed as an issue with respect to school leadership. Lack of developed diversity in school leadership also contributes to shortage issues and as reported, “40 percent of public school students are minorities, 50 percent of principals and 95 percent of superintendents are white males” (p. 1). Diversity, the race and gender gap, is somewhat improved according to a 1998 Educational Research Service report. The reported increase for minority principals between 1987-88 and 1993-94 is from 13% to 16%. Using the same reporting periods, the percentage of female principals rose from 24.6% to 34.5%. To further address school leadership in a time of shortage, recruitment and selection practices must recognize and embrace diversity while maintaining a focus on effective leadership and student achievement.
Overview of Regional Shortages

Concerns about principal candidate pools are also found in regional reports and studies. Barker (1997) in reporting on school districts in Washington state reports a shortage of candidates at the secondary levels and an increase in the number of openings for all principals created by school enrollment increases and increases in the number of principals eligible for retirement; resulting in 240 potential openings annually (p. 85-87). Washington’s principal shortage is echoed in a study of Colorado principals conducted by the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL). In a 2002 NCSL news release of the study, 75% of the state’s superintendents indicated trouble filling principal openings and 90% believed the shortage would continue into the future. The NCSL report further estimated that the number of candidates to fill the 740 openings that would occur during the next five years would be insufficient.

Contributing to understanding of regional shortages, a report to the Oregon State Action for Education Leadership Project and the Oregon Department of Education, Young (2002) examined principal and superintendent candidate pools in Oregon. Findings concerning both principal and superintendent candidate pools included: smaller pools with fewer qualified candidates; a lack of diversity with respect to gender, ethnicity, and workforce background—educators versus non-educators; and limited administrative experience (0-3 years) of candidates. The study also identified school funding, job stress, long hours, state mandates, and salary and benefits as reasons limiting the recruitment and retention of highly capable principals and superintendents. With respect to the hiring process, “...training opportunities for individuals leading and
managing principal and superintendent searches in the skills needed to effectively recruit, hire, and retain well-qualified principals and superintendents" was one of the recommendations for the improvement in candidate pools (Young, 2002, p. 15). The challenge for schools is how to recruit, select, hire and retain quality principals from the candidate pools available to them.

Overview of Montana Shortages

National and regional reports indicate that there is a shortage of well qualified candidates prepared to lead as principals even when a pool of certified, non-practicing administrators exists. In a look at trends in Montana, the 2002-2003 vacancy for the Great Falls High principal’s job, a class AA principalship, provides initial insight into Montana’s principal shortage. Johnson (March 31, 2002), a staff writer for the Great Falls Tribune, reported that Great Falls had eight applicants for the high school principalship. This is in stark contrast to “Fifteen or 20 years ago [when] we would have had 30 or 40 applicants for the Great Falls High job,” as stated by School Superintendent Bryan Dunn (as cited in the Great Falls Tribune, 2002, para. 15). In this same article, Loran Frazier, former Executive Director of School Administrators of Montana, exclaimed that the pool was drying up with applicants for secondary principal positions as compared to elementary principalships.

In a second article covering the Great Falls vacancy, Skornogoski (April 9, 2002), also a reporter for the Great Falls Tribune, reported that the trustees “agreed to offer a $7,500 signing bonus” to attract more qualified candidates (para. 3). Great Falls school officials, in an attempt to recruit quality principal candidates, agreed to offer the one time
signing bonus and to begin addressing concerns related to the district’s 42 administrative positions, and the many potential retirements that may open in the future. Specifically, the projected replacement of 17 of 21 administrators in the next three to four years, which includes only the school leadership that accounts for the seven central office administrators, eight high school principals—two lead and six associate principals, and six middle school principals—three lead and three associate principals (B. Dunn, personal communication, December 30, 2003). The Great Falls school system has replaced all 15 elementary principals in the last six years and has formed a community committee to study recruitment and selection issues, including development of an in-house “grow your own” program to address pending leadership issues (B. Dunn, personal communication, December 30, 2003). The Great Falls vacancy and pending leadership shortage provides a first-hand look at the principal shortage problem encountered in one school district and the need to actively address recruitment and selection concerns in Montana schools.

The Great Falls vacancy serves as one indicator of the leadership shortage and recruitment struggles facing Montana schools. The leadership shortage in Montana is documented in two major reports. The first report, *A Study of the Shortage of School Administrators in Montana* (1999), was made possible through the collaborative efforts of the Montana School Boards Association (MTSBA), School Administrators of Montana (SAM), the Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Committee of the State Board of Public Education, and Montana State University-Bozeman. This study examined recruitment and retention issues using input from superintendents, school board chairpersons, principals, and teachers holding administrative certification but who
were not seeking administrative positions. The top three problems encountered when hiring administrators as reported by superintendents and board chairpersons were small applicant pools, a lack of quality applicants, and high salaries sought by applicants. Although a high percentage of districts encouraged qualified individuals to apply for district openings, only 22% reported having a plan for the recruitment of administrators and only 13% had formal mentoring programs for new administrators.

Montana School Leaders: Superintendent and Principals, a 2002 study prepared by Dori Nielson for the Montana State Action for Education Leadership Project (SAELP), supported by a grant from the Wallace Foundation, reports that nearly half (about 280) of current school superintendents and principals will retire within the next five years, seriously depleting school leadership in Montana. The leadership shortage in Montana is exacerbated as “two-thirds of the 298 individuals qualified as administrators intend to become administrators in the future” (Nielson, 2002, p. 9). Perspectives regarding difficulties in hiring school administrators and incentives to recruit and retain administrators differed little from those reported in the 2002 Montana shortage study. A specific recommendation from this study regarding the hiring of school leaders is to provide recruitment and selection training for schools for the purposes of attracting and hiring quality school leaders.

In a 2003 report for the School Administrators of Montana on retirement, “Nearly half of the current superintendents and principals intend to retire within the next five years” and “fifty-five percent of the them are 50 years old or older” (p. 3). Compounding this leadership issue is the exodus of leadership to other states, 44%, and the report that “two-thirds of those considering leaving Montana are younger than 40” (p.
4). These reported findings further affirm two earlier reports (Montana School Boards Association, 1999; and Nielson, 2002) examining Montana school leadership and the lack of qualified candidates.

**Reasons Behind the Shortage**

The National Association Of State Boards of Education (1999) report on the principalship states that “…issues in recruiting and retaining high quality principals are potentially even more insidious than those in the teaching field…” and understanding of reasons are important to development of potential recruitment and selection strategies (p. 6). In the 1998 ERS study of the principalship in conjunction with the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASS), factors discouraging potential applicants were identified. The top three reasons as reported by superintendents contend with:

1. Compensation insufficient compared to job responsibilities. Sixty percent reported compensation as a leading factor.

2. Job too stressful was the second leading factor. Thirty-two percent reported that stress levels inherent with position are not balanced with compensation or expectations.

3. Too much time required to do the job well ranked third with twenty-seven percent of respondents indicating time as a major factor.

These factors are reiterated in the 1999 report of the National Association of State Boards of Education citing that the two primary reasons for the shortage are “that principals are held to unrealistic expectations [escalating responsibilities that fractionalize time] and that there is little reward in the job [inadequate pay for long hours]” (p. 7). In the 2000 report issued by NAESP, NASSP and ERS, titled The Principal, Keystone of a High-
Achieving School: Attracting and Keeping the Leaders We Need, several themes emerged including characterization of the principalship as a position that takes a "superman or superwoman;" fragmentation of time resulting in long hours and stress; diminished opportunities to engage in meaningful professional development; and a lack of appreciation by the public with respect to the job, its complexities and its contributions (pp. 32-34).

Montana's shortage issues with respect to recruitment and the eventual selection of a new principal mirror national findings. In a 1999 study conducted by the Montana School Boards Association, the top six factors most often cited for not applying were: 1) "Salary too low for job responsibilities;" 2) "Other" (factors ranging from a desire to remain in the classroom to politics associated with obtaining a job); 3) "conflicts with desired life style;" 4) "place bound, can't move family;" 5) "longer work hours;" and 6) "job too stressful" (p. 47). Nielson's (2002) report on school leadership affirms that recruitment and retention is linked primarily to higher salaries, better retirement benefits, and more time to do the job. Factors having a moderate rating include expanded professional development opportunities, having a strong administrative network, fewer responsibilities, and an effective mentoring program for new administrators (p. 9).

Insights into the issues causing the reported shortages need to be considered during the recruitment and selection processes. From an organizational perspective, a traditional recruitment process may tend to focus on the needs of the organization and less on the needs of the potential candidate. Schools that consider these factors and those that work to adopt strategies that consider organizational and candidate needs early in the recruitment and selection process may develop stronger relationships with the potential
Principal Leadership and School Effectiveness

Tirozzi (2001), Executive Director of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, states that, “Excellence in school leadership should be recognized as the most important component of school reform” (p. 438). In a 1999 American Association of School Administrators report of recommendations for preparing schools for the 21st century, school leaders are identified as the thoughtful statespersons who “will take the lead in setting vision and in offering direction, guidance, recognition, credit, and support to everyone in the system, including the community” (p. 75). In similar reviews of principal leadership and school effectiveness, a school’s capacity to impact school reform on all levels is tied to quality leadership (Fullan, 1991; Gilman & Lanman-Givens, 2001; Hall & Hord, 1987).

In a study of the school principalship, Portin, Schneider, DeArmond, and Gundlach (2003) state, “The core of the principal’s job is diagnosing his or her particular school’s needs and, given the resources and talents available, deciding how to meet them” (p. 9). Superintendents and school trustees who understand and recognize the characteristics exhibited by effective school principals, position themselves for the recruitment and selection of high-quality candidates who understand what, when, how and why.

The National Association of Elementary School Principals synthesis of the proficiencies for principals include leadership and administrative/management proficiencies that describe skills and behaviors of successful principals. Proficiencies for
1. Leadership Proficiencies: effective principals place teaching and learning as their highest priority while sustaining a quality environment, and by acting morally and ethically. Leadership proficiencies include:
   a. Leadership Behavior: based on values, beliefs, and personal attributes that inspire others to achieve school goals through a shared vision, collaboration, teamwork, innovation, shared decision-making, and a celebration of achievement.
   b. Communication Skills: based on effective strategies that utilize all mediums to project ideas and images, keep the school community informed, and strategies sensitive to the diverse needs of individuals and groups.
   c. Group Processes: encourage collaboration, problem-solving, goal accomplishment, and capitalize upon the talents and expertise of individuals.
   d. Curriculum and Instruction: is aligned with school goals, and that it is specific about knowledge, skills, values, habits, and attitudes that students should develop. Instruction is appropriate and purposeful and capitalizes on staff expertise to ensure and promote learning.
   e. Assessment: ensures that programs and services goals are being met. Evaluation of students, staff and self, reinforces success and allows for remediation of failures.

2. Administrative/Management Proficiencies: include strong organizational skills, ability to manage fiscal resources, and an ability to deal effectively with the political stresses of the principalship.
   a. Organizational Management: encompasses the ability to engage the entire school community in the prioritization and setting of school goals, flexibility in the management of a wide array of daily responsibilities and tasks, and participation in professional development and reflective practices that are open to change.
   b. Fiscal Management: includes the ability to manage resources for school performance and future needs.
   c. Political Management: includes public relations skills that foster support and effectively deal with external pressures, and a working knowledge of local, state, and national political processes.

1. Educational Leadership: includes the capacity to set instructional direction, develop a spirit of teamwork, and demonstrate sensitivity.
   a. Setting Instructional Direction: ability to implement strategies and action plans that improve teaching and learning based on vision, clear goals, direction and commitment.
   b. Teamwork: ability to lead through example while seeking and encouraging team members to strive towards a common goal.
   c. Sensitivity: ability to recognize and react to the needs and concerns of others through what Goleman (1998) identifies as emotional intelligence or “the capacity for recognizing our own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves, and for managing emotions well in ourselves and in our relationships” (p. 317).

2. Resolving Complex Problems: the ability to employ judgment, results orientation and organizational ability to effectively address issues and problems.
   a. Judgment: is the utilization of logic, relevant information, and sound analysis to make high-quality decisions.
   b. Results Orientation: is the ability to take action, make decisions, and assume responsibility for decisions while balancing action with short-term and long-term goals.
   c. Organizational Ability: is the balancing of workload for self and others with respect to resources, and establishing effective schedules and means to monitor projects.

3. Communication: includes effective use of both oral and written communications to deliver understandable ideas for different audiences.

4. Developing Self and Others: ability to help self and others grow professionally.
   a. Development of Others: to lead staff through teaching, coaching, and mentoring with the goal of improving knowledge and skills of staff.
   b. Understanding Own Strengths and Weaknesses: ability to strive through continuous learning developmental activities that build upon personal strengths and weaknesses.

The essence of effective leadership is currently being framed in a meta-analysis conducted by Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL), a nationally recognized, private, non-profit organization that seeks to improve education. This 30-year examination of the research examining the effects of leadership resulted in the identification of “21 leadership responsibilities that are associated with student achievement” and results in a “balanced leadership framework” for effective practice (Waters, et al., 2003, p.2). The 21 responsibilities work in conjunction with the
following knowledge domains: experiential knowledge—knowing why a responsibility is important; declarative knowledge—knowing what to do; procedural knowledge—knowing how to implement and work with each responsibility; and, contextual knowledge—knowing when to do act. Understanding the balanced leadership framework within the context of recruitment and selection will assist superintendents and school trustees in their assessment of principal candidates against those responsibilities that have the greatest impact on student achievement.

The nature of competence is changing in today’s workplaces and as Goleman, (1998) states, “We’re being judged by a new yardstick; not just by how smart we are, or by our training and expertise, but also how well we handle ourselves and each other” (p.3). Adding to the lists of skills and proficiencies, Fullan (2002) identifies five “action-and mind sets” that effective leaders [principals] combine to lead effective organizations: “a strong sense of moral purpose, an emotional intelligence as they build relationships, a commitment to developing and sharing knowledge, and a capacity for coherence making…” (p. 15).

Effective principals are considered critical to current school reform efforts and understanding of the associated knowledge, dispositions, and competencies provides superintendents and school trustees with a real look at principal qualities and characteristics that must be considered during recruitment and selection processes.

**Professional Development Standards for Principals**

In the search for a new school principal, finding a comprehensive set of standards that brings together a complete description of the knowledge requirements, dispositions,
and performances that will guide superintendents and school trustees in the identification of the best candidate is a challenge. In November of 1996, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), a program of the Council of Chief State School Officers, in cooperation with 24 state education agencies and representatives from NAESP, NASSP, and other professional education associations adopted a common set of standards for school leadership that meet this challenge.

Standards adopted by ISLLC (1996) present a common core of knowledge, dispositions and performances that link the principalship to school improvement (Appendix A). Standards were based on effective educational leadership, literature on effective schools, and current trends in society and education (p. 5). In the development of the ISLLC standards for school leaders, seven principles guided the work of the consortium. The seven principles that guided development of the standards are (ISLLC, 1996, p.7):

1. Standards should reflect the centrality of student learning.
2. Standards should acknowledge the changing role of the school leader.
3. Standards should recognize the collaborative nature of school leadership.
4. Standards should be high, upgrading the quality of the profession.
5. Standards should inform performance-base systems of assessment and evaluation for school leaders.
6. Standards should be integrated and coherent.

Principles provided the framework for the development of six standards that blend together the required elements of principal leadership and each standard is accompanied by a description of the knowledge, dispositions, and performances required to meet that standard. The following six standards represent the "heart and soul" of leadership (ISLLC, 1996, pp. 8-21):
Standard I: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

Standard II: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

Standard III: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Standard IV: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

Standard V: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Standard VI: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

The ISLLC standards provide a thoughtful framework that can be used to assess the knowledge, dispositions and performances required of today’s principals. Use of the standards in recruitment and selection processes provides initial information for improving practices designed to seek quality of leadership.

Recruitment and Selection

Hiring processes that fail to consider characteristics of effective leadership or the standards established for principals run the risk of failing to identify the best person for the job. The ISLLC standards provide a complete list of the knowledge, dispositions and performances required of today’s principals and minimally provide schools with a checklist that can be incorporated in recruitment and selection procedures. Hiring an
effective principal in today’s present era of shortages is diminished further if recruitment and selection procedures are not systematic, but left to chance. The underlying principle of any recruitment and selection process is that it results in the effective hiring of an individual who will have a positive impact on the organization (Barber, 1998; Leithwood, Begley, & Cousins, 1992; Rosse & Levin, 1997; Sessa & Taylor, 2000; Webb & Norton, 1999).

Recruitment and selection are not isolated events that take place in a vacuum, but are multi-step processes that result in selection of a school leader (Leithwood, Begley, & Cousins, 1992, p. 222). In distinguishing between recruitment and selection, Barber (1998) describes recruitment as “those practices and activities carried on by the organization with the primary purpose of identifying and attracting potential employees,” and selection as those processes “aimed at identifying the most qualified from among those” individuals who have applied for a job with an organization (pp. 3-5). Webb and Norton (1999) would add that a goal of effective recruitment is “to deter unqualified applicants” (p. 271).

Personnel selection should be the result of an effective hiring system, a recruitment and selection process that allows the organization to measure or distinguish differences among applicants. Rosse and Levin (1997) outline three key principles that are a part of effective hiring systems: 1) a system based on a clear understanding of employee attributes required for success; 2) a system that utilizes a “portfolio” of assessment or screening tools; and 3) screening or assessment tools selected are based on their accuracy, practicality, fairness, and legality (p. 106).
Fernández-Araóz (2001) in a look at the hiring of business executives in the corporate world states that, “between 30% and 50% of executive-level appointments end in firings or resignations” (p. 53). The corporate world’s search for leadership is similar to that of education in the sense that both are subject to “hiring traps” or common mistakes. The following ten deadly traps as presented by Fernández-Araóz (2001), if avoided, may result in a successful hiring and a more systematic process (pp. 58-67).

1. The Reactive Approach: action taken as a result of a job opening, often the result of a firing or resignation. This approach focuses on the familiar and fails to consider job requirements or needs of the organization.

2. Unrealistic Specifications: the list of developed job requirements becomes so extensive, it makes it unrealistic for any candidate to meet performance expectations. This approach fails to focus on critical competencies and can limit the candidate pool through elimination of potential applicants.

3. Evaluating People in Absolute Terms: assessment of candidates during the interview process is tainted as a result of the interviewer’s predetermined answers to questions, regardless of whether questions assess the knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristic critical to the position.

4. Accepting People at Face Value: the belief that answers given during an interview or that information on résumés is accurate. Candidates present their best selves and organization fail to look at what may be the real person.

5. Believing References: candidates typically list people who will hold them in high regard and people who will report the good and not the bad. Additionally, references often withhold information about why an applicant left his or her former job for fear of a potential lawsuit.

6. The “Just Like Me” Bias: refers to the tendency to rate highly those candidates who mirror ourselves, which may eliminate a candidate who can bring a different perspective or set of needed skills to the organization.

7. Delegation Gaffes: include allowing critical steps in recruitment and selection to be conducted by people who are ill prepared due to a lack of knowledge, skill or motivation.

8. Unstructured Interviews: questioning that fails to reveal a candidate’s knowledge, skills, abilities and other characteristics. A more reliable approach is a structured interview that has predetermined set of questions designed to reveal a candidate’s competencies.

9. Ignoring Emotional Intelligence: the tendency to evaluate candidates on the basis of their education, job history and other hard data, while ignoring emotional intelligence which refers to self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills. Goleman’s research (as cited in Fernández-Araóz, 2001, p. 65) identifies emotional intelligence as being twice as important as pure intellect in
the determination of success and performance in a job.

10. Political Pressures: refers to hiring with an agenda with the hope of developing alliances or generating favors to be returned (business, hiring of supporter or friends).

Sessa and Taylor (2000) in their examination of CEO selection identify the following five reasons as causes for poor selection of leaders (pp. 3-6). First, top-level hiring executives often lack the skills to hire effectively. Second, hiring is not something hiring executives feel good about as it is outside their natural roles. Third, the same decision-making processes used to operate and manage the organization are often neglected in hiring, resulting in a poor decision. Fourth, due to downsizing, supply of middle-level managers and other related factors; organizations often overlook the need to develop hiring, promotional, and succession-planning systems. Fifth, and similar to education, leadership demands have changed making selection more complex as practices have not kept pace with these fast changes.

Recruitment

From the literature, Barber (1998) identifies the following five dimensions of recruitment: players, activities, outcomes, context and phases (pp. 7-13). Players are described as the individuals or organizations involved in recruitment, with primary players being the organization and the candidate. Activities refer to all of the specific recruitment tasks, procedures, and actions undertaken by the organization during the hiring process. Outcomes comprise the qualitative and quantitative dimensions and include the actual number of potential candidates, the number of candidates with desired attributes, and post-hire outcomes. Context refers to both internal and external factors
that will influence recruitment efforts (e.g., labor market, salary, employment laws, and culture of the organization). The final dimension of recruitment refers to the phases that result in the generation of a candidate pool, maintenance of candidate status, and job choice or persuading the selectee to accept the job offer.

Recruitment typically begins with the knowledge of an anticipated or known vacancy. Sessa, Kaiser, Taylor, and Campbell (1998), in their study on executive selection, recognize organizational needs assessment as a first step in recruitment. This assessment “is to define and assess the work environment in terms of the characteristics of the organization,” which includes examination of internal and external environmental factors that may influence the process (p. 2). A second step in recruitment is generally the determination of position requirement or job analysis, identification of the knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (KSAOs) required of potential candidates (Schmitt & Chan, 1998; Sessa, Kaiser, Taylor, & Campbell, 1998; Thorton, 1992). The ISLLC standards provide a common core or the KSAOs for job analysis at the organizational level, and as stated by Hessel and Holloway (2002), the standards “define the elements of appropriate practice” for school principals (p. 26). In determination of the KSAOs, the organization can then identify more fully the specific candidate requirements desired for recruitment.

Generation of an applicant pool completes the first stage of the recruitment process. As Barber (1998) notes, “the recruitment process must identify individuals who will meet the organization’s needs” and attract candidates who have an interest in the opportunities afforded by the organization (p. 18). Recruitment issues at this stage also include: deciding whom to target, determination of search boundaries, identification of
recruitment sources and methods, recruitment materials, and applicant issues (pp. 32-39).

Recruitment, according to Barber (1998), “can influence the post-hire attitudes of and behaviors of recruits” and “taken in aggregate, they can have an effect on higher-level organizational outcomes, such as productivity, profitability, or other measures of firm performance” (p. 11). In a time of shortage, greater attention spent on this first stage of recruitment and selection process may result in the generation of a strong candidate pool in a time of pronounced shortages in the principalship:

Selection

According to Lashway (1997), “Selection of a school leader is a high-stakes decision that is often hindered by too many [or too few] applicants and too little information” (p. 2). Selection is a process that typically is characterized by stages and begins with an initial review or screening of each candidate’s cover letter, resume, and credentials to determine if the minimum qualifications have been met (Rosse & Levin, 1997; Webb & Norton, 1999).

Following initial screening and dependent upon candidate numbers, a second, more formalized assessment or screening is conducted to sort candidates into three categories: unqualified, minimally qualified, and desirable (Rosse & Levin, 1997). During this second stage, preliminary interviews, background checks, reference checks, credential checks and formal assessments may be utilized to screen candidates further with the objective of developing a pool of finalists who will be extended the opportunity to participate in a final selection stage (Rosse & Levin, 1997; Webb & Norton, 1999).
In the final stage, finalists typically participate in on-site interviews with a selection committee and if offered a position, may be subject to a criminal background check, final reference checks, medical examinations if relevant to the position and verification of employment eligibility (Rosse & Levin, 1997; Webb & Norton, 1999). Final processes in this last stage of recruitment and selection are selection of a finalist, job offer, acceptance of the job offer, notification of unsuccessful candidates and process evaluation (Webb & Norton, 1999, p. 331).

The Interview

Initial screening of applicants assesses or matches candidates with the job, the organization, and the requirements (Rosse & Levin, 1997; Sessa, Kaiser, Taylor, & Campbell, 1998; Webb & Norton, 1999). Following the initial screening of applicants, the selection process generally moves to the interview process, “the most widely used and most influential tool in hiring decisions” (Hertling, 1999, p. 3). Eder, Kacmar, and Ferris (1989) offer the following definition of the employment interview:

the employment interview is defined as a face-to-face exchange of job relevant information between the organizational representatives and a job applicant with the overall goal of attracting, selecting, and retaining a highly competent workforce. (p. 18)

As Wendover (1998) notes, there are three goals when conducting an interview (p. 122):

1. To develop an accurate picture of the job for which you are hiring and communicate that to each applicant.
2. To collect enough information on the applicant to make an informed decision.
3. To produce a positive and accurate picture of the company—one that will impress applicants and help them decide to work for you.
The interview as a universally accepted practice is not without pitfalls and "one of the ironies in employment practice is the emphasis placed on the relatively unstructured, face-to-face interview to arrive at selection decisions within organizations, despite the interview's questionable validity in predicting job success when compared to other selection techniques" according to Eder, Kacmar, and Ferris (1989).

Two questions need to be asked and answered with respect to this popular selection method. First, "Why are interviews universally used as a selection method?" Second, "What can be done to make interviewing more effective?" Rosse and Levin (1998) provide the following six reasons for using the interview as a hiring tool (pp. 156-163).

1. Interviews provide a personal touch allowing employers and applicants to meet each other prior to establishing a long-term relationship.
2. Interviews allow for the efficient gathering of a variety of information in a short amount of time.
3. Interviews serve as the best way to evaluate certain job qualifications.
4. Interviews provide an opportunity to fill in gaps or confirm other information received from the applicant.
5. Interviews are a good public relations tool and provide an opportunity for the organization to build a positive image with the applicant.
6. Interviews are easy to do.

Rosse and Levin also note in their discussion of the six reasons that our own humanness and biases, the complexity of the interview process, and loss of focus as to the purpose of the interview all serve as pitfalls to reliability, validity and effectiveness of the interview.

What can be done to improve the validity, reliability, and effectiveness of the employment interview? In part, understanding the difference between the traditional, unstructured interview; the systematic or structured interview; and the pattern behavior description interview provides an answer to the question.
Traditional, unstructured interviews can be described as a free-for-all. This type of interview is open-ended and questions asked of the applicant may have little or nothing at all to do with knowledge, dispositions or performances required of the job. Goodale (1989) states that unstructured interviews “produce low reliability and validity” and allow the interviewer to interject their “own biases, stereotypes and first impressions” (p. 310).

Rosse and Levin (1997) identify the systematic or structured interview as being carefully planned with “job-related questions that can be systematically scored so as to reliably identify high-potential job candidates” (p. 156). Barber (1998) affirms the increased validity and reliability of the employment interview when questions are based on a job analysis and presented in an interview structure that poses the same questions to all applicants using a scale that differentiates between good and bad answers to questions (p. 168). Effectiveness of the interview, according to Barber (1998), is also improved through interviewer training specifying how the interview is to be conducted and through the use of multiple independent interviewers (p. 168).

The patterned behavior description interview (PBDI) or descriptive interview is one type of structured interview that “zeros in on what applicants have accomplished (or failed to accomplish), and how they went about doing it, in situations similar to ones they will face on the job” (Janz, 1989, p. 159). The following summary of the PBDI is based on Janz (1989) and Hellervik’s (as cited in Janz, 1989) research using this PBDI approach. The PBDI is based on four key types of interview information:

1. Credentials—objective and verifiable information that can be used to predict performance.
2. Experience Descriptions—the everyday duties, responsibilities or practices of the applicant.
3. Opinions—applicant’s self-perceptions about their own strengths, weaknesses, beliefs, goals, and intentions.
4. Behavior Descriptors—detailed accounts of actual events and choices the applicant has made related to his or her job and life experiences.

Janz (1989) contends “that of the four key types of interview information, only behavior descriptions offer practical, clear data on which to base predictions of future performance” (p. 159). From an interview based on past performance, the interviewer is able to build a picture of the applicant’s past behavior pattern. The interview is not based on situational questions, “What would you do IF...?”; rather, PBDI questions ask, “What did you do WHEN...?” Descriptive questions (WHEN) eliminate the possibility of canned answers to situational questions (IF) during the interview. In contrast, the applicant must contextualize answers based on their job experiences.

In review of the importance placed on interviews and understanding the various types of interviews, the ISLLC standards and the indicators associated with each standard, indicators could be translated into descriptive questions addressing knowledge, dispositions and performances of the applicants. Minimally, the standards appear to be very adaptable to a more systematic and structured interview process and one that is relevant to the role of today’s principals.

Assessment of Potential Leaders

In a review of school leader selection processes, Leithwood, Begley and Cousins (1992) report that the evidence “...paints a bleak picture of such processes” that result from “...the use of inappropriate, ambiguous, and/or invalid criteria, and the collection of
Leadership matters in today’s competitive world, regardless of whether you are a Fortune 500 company or a small rural school. Successful school reform and gains in student achievement can be increased through systematic processes that allow for the identification of effective leadership and the required knowledge, disposition, and performance elements. Recruitment and selection processes should provide for the identification of effective leaders and as stated in a study by the National LEADership Network (1991) on the restructuring of schools, “The challenge is to assess candidates for the principalship for their level of such skills and to develop training experiences to assist them in developing and expanding such skills” (p. 29).

All phases of selection result in the assessment of each potential candidate’s leadership and as Lashway (1999) states, “Leadership appears to be one of those concepts (much like ‘love’ or ‘intelligence’) that plays a vital role in our vocabulary but that stubbornly resists distillation into a pure essence” (p. 7). Assessment of a candidate’s leadership can be achieved using written tests or professional assessment centers, and both methods have advantages and disadvantages.

The Educational Testing Service (ETS) test collection data base currently contains records on over 9,500 tests and research instruments, ranging from assessments of managerial style to instruments that measure shyness (ETS, 2002, para. 1). A readily identifiable disadvantage to formal assessments is the selection of an appropriate test or measure. On the positive side, paper and pencil tests of leadership are generally inexpensive, provide objectivity, systematically explore some measure—leadership—and measure candidates against a larger pool (Lashway, 1997; Rosse & Levin, 1997). Use of
paper and pencil tests in the selection process requires matching the test to the position; determination of the tests’ predictive validity of future performance or leadership; and attention to the interpretations of results (Van Velsor & Leslie as cited in Lashway, 1997). As Lashway states regarding the use of formal tests, “few leadership tests have been specifically designed to select school leaders” and “measures of leadership are designed to provide reliable data, not make decisions” (p. 2). Although it is beyond the scope of this study to recommend a particular test or tests for use in the selection process, carefully selected tests can add useful information to the selection process.

Formal measurement of leadership is possible and can add an objective element to traditional selection processes (Lashway, 1999, 1998; McTague, 2001). Assessment centers typically have well designed selection systems that provide candidates with variety of job-relevant tasks with the goal of assessing performance and leadership qualities using trained assessors (Rosse & Levin, 1997; Webb & Norton, 1999; Wendover, 1998). NASSP and NAESP offer one-day assessment services that can assist with the identification of prospective principals; provide a basis for individual professional development for aspiring, beginning and practicing principals; and provide additional benefits related to mentoring, licensure and assessment of university-based programs. The one barrier to the use of assessment centers is the time and costs associated with assessment. These barriers are also compounded as Montana does not have an established assessment center for school leaders. Formal assessments and assessment center data can contribute to the selection process and as Lashway (1997) points out, measures of leadership “will add depth and richness to the selection process, but will never eliminate the need for careful professional judgment” in the selection of
The role of the principal has changed as well as the demands of the position. Student learning is center stage, as it should be, and in the absence of quality leadership, improvement in teaching and learning will not be realized. Changing the way schools conduct business in a climate of accountability and assessment will be reflected in the recruitment and selection processes utilized to secure quality leadership. Leadership shortages, a lack of qualified and interested candidates, and an increasing number of vacancies are just a few of the factors contributing to the need to better understand current recruitment and selection practices used in Montana’s schools. As stated in the National LEADership Network report (1991), “In many cases, [recruitment and] selection might be a more productive approach to ensuring that leaders of restructuring schools have the required competencies” (p. 55).
School improvement, assessment and accountability, teacher shortages, and the increasing shortage of qualified school principals are just a few of the reported challenges facing school superintendents and trustees. As Drake and Roe (1999) state, “Principals are the focus of enormous expectations… [and] their educational leadership ability is an important key to bringing U.S. schools to a state of excellence” (p. 38). The role of the present day principal is linked to standards that inextricably bind managerial skills and instructional leadership skills together, resulting in new standards for school leadership that provide “the best avenue to allow diverse stakeholders to drive improvement efforts along a variety of fronts—licensure, program approval and candidate assessment” (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996, p. 7).

Schmitt and Chan (1998) in their examination of personnel selection state, “We must learn how organizations work and how decisions are made in organizations so that our interventions can have the intended impacts on the quality of the workforce” (p. 3). Now, with greater emphasis placed on the recruitment and selection of quality leadership, hiring practices and procedures that remain “status quo” will fail in their intended impact; the identification of quality principals capable of orchestrating school improvement efforts aimed at the raising of student achievement for all students (Drake & Roe, 1999).
The problem confronting schools is the absence of quality leadership. The corresponding shortages, at state and national levels, result in the need to examine principal recruitment and selection from many different perspectives and levels. The purpose of this study was to describe and examine the relationship between principal selection strategies utilized by Montana schools in the selection of a new principal and nationally agreed upon ISLLC standards for knowledge, dispositions and performances required of school principals.

Specifically, examination of existing recruitment and selection strategies used by Montana school superintendents in securing quality school leadership provides a holistic look at present day hiring practices. Understanding principal recruitment and selection strategies used in Montana schools was important to the development of a recruitment and selection model and strategies for hiring principals. Model strategies that incorporate the ISLLC standards provide one promising and effective strategy that may help guide and inform trustees and superintendents in the recruitment, identification, selection, development, and retention of outstanding principals.

Data Sources

Key to development of strategies was the participation of practicing Montana superintendents in this study. Identification of practicing Montana superintendents responsible for hiring principals would not have been possible without assistance from the Montana School Boards Association, School Administrators of Montana, and the Montana Office of Public Instruction. Data obtained included the 2002-2003 superintendents’ mailing lists, 2002-2003 school enrollment information, and geographic areas denoting the nine Montana Association of School Superintendent Regions.
Additionally, the many reports and research studies referenced throughout this study and listed in the references cited, provided part of the foundation for the research strategies developed. The ISLLC Standards served as the keystone for the Montana Principal Recruitment and Selection Survey that was developed and disseminated to practicing superintendents. Data obtained from this survey, as discussed in Chapter 5, provided the missing information for the model recruitment and selection strategies developed and recommended for recruitment and selection of school principals.

**Development of Model Recruitment and Selection Strategies**

As reported in the literature, the role of school principals has shifted from basic managerial skills to a revised role that combines both managerial and instructional leadership skills, resulting in established standards for educational leaders tied to specific knowledge requirements, dispositions and performance activities. The development and use of model recruitment and selection strategies provides Montana school superintendents and other school personnel with information that allows for hiring quality leadership.

In consideration of current standards for educational leaders and the reported shortage of principals, the following parameters were used to guide the development of model and strategies for the recruitment and selection of school principals:

1. Effective recruitment strategies as identified in the literature and examination of existing recruitment strategies as reported by Montana school superintendents.

Much of the literature focuses on recruitment strategies utilized in the business world.
2. Effective selection strategies as identified in the literature and examination of existing selection strategies as reported by Montana school superintendents. Selection procedures should be concerned with identification of the most qualified candidate and should include candidate assessment based on existing standards. As found in the recruitment literature, much of the literature focuses on selection strategies utilized in the corporate world and CEO recruitment and selection.

Research questions that further guided the development of model recruitment and selection strategies are as follows:

1. What are the recruitment strategies used by Montana schools to secure a candidate pool?

2. What are the selection strategies used by Montana schools to screen or identify potential candidates?

3. Have Montana school superintendents established “grow your own” programs for the development, recruitment and selection of candidates internally?

4. Are there differences in selection strategies used in Montana schools as related to school size, region, experience and age of practicing superintendents, and gender?

5. What members of the school community typically serve on principal selection committees and is training provided to selection committee members?

6. Do Montana school superintendents perceive district selection strategies of principal candidates as assessing knowledge, dispositions, and performances as defined by ISLLC standards?
Study Population

This study was accomplished with the participation from practicing Montana school superintendents responsible for the selection of school principals in their districts. In the development of a list of potential participants, The Montana School Boards Association (MTSBA) office and the School Administrators of Montana (SAM) office was asked to provide 2002-2003 administrative directory information identifying school superintendents, school principals (elementary, middle, and high school), and other school directories. The directory information received on an Excel-Spreadsheet from the SAM office listed 192 educational leaders. This list was cross-referenced with the published 2002-2003 School Administrators of Montana Directory and the 2002-2003 Directory of Montana Schools (Montana Office of Public Instruction) to identify possible omissions from the spreadsheet and to identify only those individuals serving as a Montana superintendent of schools during the 2002-2003 school year.

From directory information, 189 potential respondents were initially identified for participation in the study. In examination of the 189 school districts employing a school superintendent, 131 districts employed a superintendent and one or more lead principals. Fifty-eight school districts employed only a superintendent, and these districts and superintendents were eliminated from the study. A revised Excel-spreadsheet identifying only those Montana school superintendents serving as the district’s chief executive officer was developed for mailing purposes. This resulted in a final list of 131 school superintendents who were asked to participate in the study. The decision to include the entire population in this study was size of the population because it was not infinitely
large and it was feasible to survey all members of the population. All members of the population studied served as lead administrators in their districts and held responsibilities concerning the present or future hiring of principals. Eight of the 131 superintendents were selected for participation in the pilot study (Appendix C) and 123 superintendents (Appendix D) were selected for participation in the final study.

The eight pilot participants and the 123 participants selected for participation in the final study by distribution in the nine regions that make up the Montana Association of School Superintendents (MASS) are presented in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>North West</th>
<th>North Central</th>
<th>HiLine</th>
<th>North East</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Four Rivers</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>South Central</th>
<th>South East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Study</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Study</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methodology

A descriptive survey approach was used to obtain information concerning recruitment and selection practices utilized in Montana schools to hire principals and to gather information about the respondents. According to Salant and Dillman (1994), “At their very best, surveys can produce close estimates of what people think or do” (p. 13) and as stated by Gay (1996), “surveys can provide necessary and valuable information to both the schools studied and to other agencies and groups (such as boards of public education) whose operations are school related” (p. 252).
Instrumentation

A survey instrument consisting of three sections was constructed to better understand recruitment and selection practices used in Montana schools (Appendix E). Questionnaire design incorporated the processes recommended by Rea and Parker (1997) and Salant and Dillman (1994) concerning respondent burden, questionnaire attractiveness, question development and sequencing of questions, and administration of the final survey.

Part I of the instrument was designed to collect demographic information about the Montana superintendents surveyed. Demographic information collected included: 1) gender, 2) race, 3) age, 4) years in education, 5) years as a school superintendent, 6) years as a superintendent in current district, 7) school classification (size), 8) number of years since last principal hire, and 9) number of years until next principal hiring.

Part II of the survey was designed to gather information about specific recruitment and selection practices and procedures used in the school districts surveyed. Montana school superintendents provided information specific to policies and procedures, recruitment plans (internal and external), recruitment literature, internal "grow your own programs" for in-house leadership identification and development, and recruitment practices designed to reach minority and female candidates.

Part III of the survey instrument was designed to include the six standards and the knowledge, disposition, and performance elements and indicators for public school leaders as identified by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC). In an effort to minimize respondent burden, Part III of survey did not include all 181 ISLLC
indicators; rather, examples of the knowledge, disposition, and performance indicators associated with each standard were provided for respondents. Indicators were selected on the basis of their similarities and differences and for the purpose of providing respondents with a solid overview of each element. Montana school superintendents were then asked to rate how completely their district’s present selection methods assessed potential principal candidates against the six ISSLC standards and the corresponding knowledge, disposition and performance elements of each standard.

**Questionnaire Validation**

As stated by Gay (1996), “Content validity is determined by expert judgment” and “there is no formula by which it can be computed and there is no way to express it quantitatively” (p. 140). Content validity for The Montana Principal Recruitment and Selection Survey was controlled with the field-testing of the questionnaire with eight of the 131 practicing Montana School Superintendents identified for participation in the study. Pilot participants were all experienced superintendents with 21 or more years in public education and six or more years as a superintendent. Four of the participants hold doctoral degrees in education, one participant is in the process of completing a doctoral degree in education, and three of the superintendents hold master’s degrees. In addition to practicing Montana school superintendents, the executive directors of the Montana School Boards Association (MTSBA) office and the School Administrators of Montana (SAM) office were contacted and asked to endorse the study and to provide feedback on the questionnaire design, with both agencies agreeing to endorse this study.
Reliability refers to the dependability or trustworthiness of a measure provided it yields consistent scores across administrations (Gay, 1996). Reliability was not established for the survey either through test-retest or equivalent-forms approaches because of population size. However, factor analysis was used in analysis of Part III of the survey showing that all items can reasonably be seen as measuring leadership which adds to the construct validity of the survey items in Part III.

Superintendents asked to participate in the field test were contacted by telephone prior to mailing the pilot survey and a description of the study was provided. Following telephone contact, all participants were mailed a survey package that included a cover letter (Appendix B), a pilot survey, and a self-addressed, postage paid return envelope. Participants were asked in the cover letter to provide feedback with respect to directions for completion of the survey, recording procedures, and specific items asked in the survey.

Feedback was received from all eight pilot participants, MTSBA and SAM. Completed pilot questionnaires were reviewed and major problems were identified and revised in relation to feedback received from these groups. Specific changes made in the survey included the addition of a third response category (somewhat) for questions 1-6, Part II of the survey; rewording question 7 to include additional directions to identify the primary recruitment method used to attract principal candidates; rewording question 8 in an effort to simplify response to the question; and rewording of the introduction to Part III of the survey. Following revisions, a final cover letter (Appendix C) and survey instrument (Appendix D) were developed for dissemination to participants.
Methodology

As Gay (1996) states, "Descriptive research involves collecting data in order to test hypotheses or to answer questions concerning the current status of the subject of the study" and "...the descriptive method is useful for investigating a variety of educational problems" (p. 249). The basic survey procedures as outlined in Salant and Dillman (1994) were followed with some minor modifications (p. 138).

The revised "Montana Principal Recruitment and Selection" survey, along with a personalized letter, was mailed on April 7, 2003 to those 123 Montana school superintendents who were selected to participate in this study. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was enclosed with the survey to facilitate return. All surveys were coded for ease of determining which participants had responded. On April 21, 2003 participants who had not responded were mailed a postcard encouraging their participation in the study and return of the survey. Participants who had not responded by May 1, 2003 received one final contact by telephone encouraging their return of the survey. In two instances, a new survey package was mailed out to selected participants. Those participants who had not responded by May 30, 2003 were dropped from the study. Of the 123 surveys mailed to selected Montana school superintendents, 100 surveys (81.30%) were returned, and of the 100 returned surveys, 98 (79.67%) of the returned surveys were useable for purposes of this study. Two surveys had incomplete responses and were not considered for further analysis.
Analysis of Data

The demographic variables are found in Part I of the questionnaire included gender, race, age, years of service in public education, years of service as a school superintendent, and years of service in current district. Dependent variables are found in Part II and Part III of the questionnaire. Dependent variables reported recruitment and selection practices and procedures and the perception of school superintendents of the degree to which the ISLLC standards are utilized in the selection and assessment of principal candidates. Differences in the recruitment and selection practices and procedures used in Montana schools were examined and all data analysis was completed using SPSS 11.5.

Analysis of Part I, demographic information, lent itself to basic descriptive statistics, primarily reporting frequencies and percentages as distributed by MASS regions. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze questions 1-10, Part II of the survey. Question 8 of the survey was further analyzed using univariate analysis-of-variance (ANOVA) techniques to determine if significant differences existed among selection methods used in hiring a principal. This procedure assesses the relationship of one or more factors with a dependent variable to determine if differences between groups on some variable are large enough to be considered statistically different and whether those differences represent true differences in population (Green & Salkind, 2003; Sapsford, 1999).

Analysis of Part III, perceptions and use of the ISLLC standards, utilized descriptive statistics to examine the reported perceptions of Montana school
superintendents. Data reported on the standards were also analyzed using factor analysis.

Factor analysis has three major uses according to Sapsford (1999, p. 201):

1. Factor analysis is commonly used as an exploratory tool for simplifying a mass of data and picking out important dimensions for further analysis.
2. Factor analysis is used for demonstrating the unidimensionality of a complex measurement instrument showing that all items can reasonably be seen as measuring the same thing.
3. More rarely, factor analysis is for hypothesis testing when the hypothesis specifies the number of dimensions which are to be found in the data.

Sapsford (1999) presents the following narrative about the results of factor analysis and what happens during the first stage of analysis:

The results of factor analysis are presented as ‘factor loadings’ which are like correlations: the loading of the factor as a whole (squared) is the proportion of overall variance explained, and the loadings of individual items are their contribution to the factor. The significance of contributions to the explanation of variance will be tested, generally by means of the F statistic (variance ratio).

The first stage of factoring a correlation matrix is called principal components analysis. Here the statistical package will construct as many components as there are original variables. The first component, however, will take account of the intercorrelation of variables to select those which together constitute a single component accounting for as much as possible of the variance (somewhat like stepwise multiple regression, where the package picks the variable which makes the single greatest contribution, but in this case the ‘variable’ is a component made of up several variables, weights so that they form, together, as good a single predictor of the different scores as can be formed). Then the second component is constructed to account for as much as possible of what is left over, and the third to account for as much as possible of what is not explained by first two, and so on (p. 201).

The variance accounted for by a factor is called an eigenvalue, and the sum of the eigenvalues in principal component analysis will be equal to the number of variables.

Part III of the questionnaire contains 18 variables, so the sum of the eigenvalues will be 18. In the second stage of analysis, factors are rotated to make them more interpretable.

The meaning of principal components (factors) is constructed through an examination of the variables that make the greatest contribution. In the case of the standards in Part III,
dimensions or constructs should be principal leadership. If leadership is the principal component, inclusion and use of the ISLLC standards in the development of model recruitment and selection strategies are important in the selection of quality leadership.

Summary

A basic premise found throughout the literature is that effective principals are necessary for effective reform in today's schools. It is also stated in the recruitment and selection literature that hiring is a high-stakes decision and one that cannot be left to chance. Through this study of existing Montana recruitment and selection procedures and examination of the literature, model recruitment and selection strategies were developed and founded on standards that clearly define the knowledge requirements, dispositions, and performance requirements for effective leadership. The model strategies developed will assist Montana schools with the recruitment, selection, and hiring of principals based on best practice. Minimally, the strategies improve upon chance.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

The relationship between principal recruitment and selection strategies utilized by Montana school superintendents in the selection of a new principal and the nationally agreed upon ISLLC standards that present a common leadership core of the knowledge, dispositions and performances required of school principals were examined in this study. Understanding the recruitment and selection strategies and their connectedness to the ISLLC standards provided information for development of a recruitment and selection model and strategies for hiring quality principals.

In order to understand current practices used by Montana superintendents, a survey was developed, field-tested for content validity, revised, and disseminated to selected superintendents. The survey consisted of three parts: 1) demographic information was collected in Part I; 2) information about recruitment and selection practices used in hiring was gathered in Part II; and 3) the perceived use of the ISLLC standards in the assessment of principal candidates during the recruitment and selection process was examined in Part III.

Of the 189 superintendents initially identified as potential participants, 58 superintendents were eliminated from the study because they served as the only administrator in their districts and were not responsible for hiring principals. Of the
remaining 131 superintendents, eight superintendents assisted with initial field-testing and validation of the survey instrument. Of the 123 superintendents who received the revised Montana principal recruitment and selection survey, 100 responses were received. The number of valid responses received was 98, resulting in an overall useable return rate of 79.67%.

**District and Respondent Demographics**

Each of the participants was asked to respond to several demographic questions designed to describe characteristics of the school districts and superintendents that lead them. Characteristics included gender, race, age, years in public education, years worked as a superintendent, and years of experience in present district. Two questions gathered information about the number of years since last principal hiring and the number of years until the next anticipated principal hiring. District enrollments (elementary and high school) and Montana Association of School Superintendents (MASS) regions were obtained from Montana Office of Public Instruction and Montana School Boards Association, respectively.

Elementary and high school distribution according to MASS region based on 2002-2003 Montana public school enrollment data size are illustrated in Table 3. Of the 98 school districts participating in the study, district configurations not reported in Table 3 included 83 combined elementary-high school districts, 12 elementary districts, and three high school districts. Elementary (K-8) and high school enrollments were used to determine school size categories and are reported in Table 3. Approximately, 63% of the schools in the study are located in four MASS regions (North, West, Western, 4
Rivers, and North Central) located in the western one-half of Montana, representing the area of greatest population density. The eastern one-half of the state is more sparsely populated and continues to experience loss with 22 of 56 counties having “declining or stagnant populations” (Anez, 2001, para. 7).

Table 3. School District Distribution According to MASS Region and Fall 2002-2003 Enrollments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>North West</th>
<th>North Central</th>
<th>HiLine North</th>
<th>North East</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Four Rivers</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>South Central</th>
<th>South East</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>851+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-850</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151-400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1251+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-1250</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-400</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 or fewer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender, ethnicity and age category of the 98 participants by region are illustrated in Table 4. There were 86 (88%) men and 12 (12%) women, and 96 (98%) of the participants identified themselves as Caucasian, and two (2%) American Indian with no other ethnic groups represented in the group of respondents. The group included no superintendents under 30 years of age, ten (10.2%) between the ages of 30-39, 28 (28.6%) between the ages of 40-49, 47 (48%) between the ages of 50-59, and 13 (13.3%) superintendents 60 years of age or older. Sixty (61%) of the respondents in this study are at or above retirement age, which in Montana is “60 years if the member has five
years of creditable service” or “with 25 years of service a member [of Montana’s Teacher Retirement System] may retire at any age without penalty” (Nielson, 2003, p.7).

Table 4. MASS Regions and Respondent Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>North West</th>
<th>North Central</th>
<th>HiLine</th>
<th>North East</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Four Rivers</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>South Central</th>
<th>South East</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am. Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of years worked in public education and years of experience as a practicing superintendent by region are reported in Table 5. Of the total respondents, 73 (74.49%) have 21 or more years of service in public education, and 34 (34.69%) have 31 or more years of service in public education. In contrast, three (3.06%) respondents had between 0 and 10 years of experience in public education, and the remaining 22 (22.45%) respondents reported 11-20 years of service in public education. Fifty-six respondents
(57.14%) had between 0 and 10 years of experience as a superintendent. Experience as a superintendent within their current district was limited, with 74 (75.51%) respondents indicating 0-5 years of experience in their current district, and six (6.12%) respondents reporting 11 or more years of experience within their current district.

Table 5. MASS Regions and Respondent Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>North West</th>
<th>North Central</th>
<th>HiLine East</th>
<th>North East</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Four Rivers</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>South Central</th>
<th>South East</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Years-Experience in Public Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 Years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 Years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+ Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Years-Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 Years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+ Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Years-as Superintendent in Current District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 Years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+ Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Seventy-three (74.49%) of the respondents have 21 or more years in public education and of these 73, 34 (34.69%) had 31 or more years in public education, indicating that most respondents will soon accumulate or have already accumulated enough years of creditable service (25 years) in Montana’s Teacher Retirement System to retire at any age without penalty as presented in Table 5.

Principal hiring information, years since last hiring and years until next anticipated hiring by region are presented in Table 6. Fifty-seven (58.16%) respondents reported recent hires during the past one to two years. Respondents reporting on future staffing needs indicated that 17 (17.35%) were in the process of hiring a new principal, and 57 (58.16%) respondents indicated no knowledge as to future staffing needs in the principalship.

Table 6. MASS Regions and Principal Hiring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>North West</th>
<th>North Central</th>
<th>HiLine</th>
<th>North East</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Four Rivers</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>South Central</th>
<th>South East</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years-Since Last Principal Hiring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years-Until Next Principal Hiring In Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recruitment and Selection Practices

In Part II of the survey, respondents reported on the recruitment and selection practices and procedures used in their school districts. Recruitment references those processes used to attract a pool of highly qualified candidates for actual or anticipated openings. Selection refers to processes used to identify the most qualified principal candidate from those individuals having applied for a leadership position with the school district.

Responses to survey questions 1-6, Part II, are reported in Table 7, which presents a summary of specific in-district recruitment and practice procedures by region. In examination of developed procedures and practices for the recruitment of principals, only 28 (28.6%) of respondents reported fully developed practices and procedures. Procedures and practices for the out-of-district recruitment of principals were slightly better with 36 (36.7%) respondents indicating the existence of developed practices and procedures. Most respondents reported partially developed recruitment procedures and practices (35.7%) or none at all (35.7%). Twenty-one of the 98 respondents reported having an organized and developed internal “grow your own program” for the recruitment and development of principals, and 49 (50%) respondents reported “no” to having an internal “grow your own program” for aspiring principals. Of the 98 respondents, only 12 (12.2%) reported having a recruitment plan that examined future staffing needs of the district over the next five years, and 66 (67.3%) respondents indicated “no” to having a plan identifying principal staffing needs.
Table 7. MASS Regions and Recruitment Practices and Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>North West</th>
<th>North Central</th>
<th>HiLine North East</th>
<th>North Central</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Four Rivers</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>South Central</th>
<th>South East</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Recruitment Procedures and Practice for Out of District Candidates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed and Organized “Grow Your Own Program”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Recruitment Plan for Future Staffing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Recruitment Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Recruitment Practices for Minority and Female Candidates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Forty-eight of 98 respondents reported having district-developed recruitment literature that accurately represented the district, its mission and vision, work conditions, expectations, and other facts about the school community. Fifty (51%) respondents reported having “somewhat” developed or “no” developed recruitment literature for candidates. The inclusion and existence of recruitment practices and strategies for the recruitment of qualified minority and female candidates was limited with 29 (29.6%) respondents indicating the existence of strategies in this area. Forty-one (41.84%) respondents indicated the absence of recruitment practices for minority and females, and the remaining 28 (28.57%) respondents indicating “somewhat” or partial development of said practices.

In question 7, Part II of the survey, respondents were asked to identify key sources and methods used to secure a principal candidate pool, and to identify the primary method used to attract applicants. MASS regions and sources used to attract principal candidates are presented in Table 8. The four most commonly used sources and methods reported include: district job postings (89.8%); internet-web postings (89.8%); educational institutions—colleges and universities (78.6%); and local newspapers (63.7%). Other moderately used sources include the use of professional organizations (54.9%), peer referrals (52%), state media and newspapers (45.9%), and state employment agencies (40.5%). Use of “grow your own programs” for recruitment was limited with only 30 (30.6%) respondents reporting utilization of this method. Four of 98 respondents reported the use of a professional search firm as a source for the identification of principal candidates and this may be attributable to costs associated with professional search services. In the category for other methods, one respondent indicated
that they use the Montana Office of Public Instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>North West</th>
<th>North Central</th>
<th>HiLine</th>
<th>North East</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Four Rivers</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>South Central</th>
<th>South East</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Job Posting</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Newspaper</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Media &amp; Newspaper</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet -Web Postings</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Employment Agency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grow Your Own Program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Institution</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organization</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Search Firm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Referrals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In examination of the one method that has proven most successful in attracting principal candidates, 60 of the 98 respondents identified a method. Twenty-seven respondents reported use of the internet, 15 respondents identified educational institutions as the primary source, nine respondents indicated "grow your own
programs," and eight respondents identified professional organizations (Montana School Board Association, School Administrators of Montana, and national affiliates) as the primary recruitment source for identification and development of a candidate pool.

The preferred selection methods used in the screening and hiring of potential candidates, question 8, Part II of the survey, are presented in Table 9. Respondents were asked to rank in order of importance only those methods used by their district, with one being most important or the primary screening mechanism, and nine being least important. Ninety-one (92.85%) of the 98 respondents recorded rankings using the scale provided and seven respondents used checks to indicate selection methods used and were not included for this question only. Mean rankings were calculated for each selection method using respondent rankings assigned based on the level of importance and the number of respondents.

In order of preference, the top three selection methods used by respondents in the screening, selection and eventual hiring of a principal are the interview with a mean ranking equal to 1.69, references with a mean ranking equal to 2.58, and resumes with a mean ranking equal to 2.76. Fifty-three (58.2%) of the 91 respondents ranked the interview as being the most important selection method and 21 (23.1%) respondents ranked the interview as the second most important selection method. Transcripts, district applications, and "grow your own programs" had similar mean rankings indicating a similar prioritization with respect to use in the selection process. Use of assessment center results and search firms had low levels of importance relative to selection and this may be attributable to the time elements and costs associated with both methods. The importance of the interview in the selection process is supported by the preference
ranking assigned by superintendents and the reported wide use of the interview by Montana superintendents.

Table 9. Selection Method Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Method</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Fifth</th>
<th>Sixth</th>
<th>Seventh</th>
<th>Eighth</th>
<th>Ninth</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing Resumes n = 91</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Interview n = 88</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Transcript n = 75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Application n = 71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Checks n = 83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisals n = 37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Center Results n = 18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Search Firm n = 18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grow Your Own Program n = 32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two-factor analysis of variance tests were run to determine if significant differences in the selection methods (dependent variables) listed in Table 9 could be attributed to the differences among the independent variables of school size (elementary and high school) region and gender, region and experience as a superintendent, and region and age of practicing superintendents. Tests were run recognizing that strong correlations exist between the independent variables. This was done, however, to provide a description of the use of the dependent variables rather than to generalize about their independent use. Levels of significance were set at .05 (95% confidence interval).

From all tests run, only those interactions that appeared statistically significant are reported in Table 10. Significant differences reported should be interpreted with caution due to unequal group sizes.

Table 10. Analysis of Variance of Selection Methods Used
Factor by Selection Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal</td>
<td>Elementary Size</td>
<td>8.057</td>
<td>2.686</td>
<td>1.076</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal</td>
<td>High School Size</td>
<td>16.661</td>
<td>5.554</td>
<td>2.224</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal</td>
<td>Elementary*High School</td>
<td>14.383</td>
<td>14.383</td>
<td>5.760</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.024*</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Interview</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>15.668</td>
<td>1.959</td>
<td>2.056</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Interview</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>8.905</td>
<td>2.968</td>
<td>3.056</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.035*</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Interview</td>
<td>Region*Age</td>
<td>42.063</td>
<td>2.629</td>
<td>2.706</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.003*</td>
<td>.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcripts</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>13.876</td>
<td>1.734</td>
<td>1.357</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcripts</td>
<td>Years Superintendent</td>
<td>8.432</td>
<td>2.108</td>
<td>1.650</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcripts</td>
<td>Region*Yrs Superintendent</td>
<td>56.670</td>
<td>2.833</td>
<td>2.218</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.015*</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcripts</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>12.641</td>
<td>1.580</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcripts</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>16.685</td>
<td>5.562</td>
<td>3.716</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.018*</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcripts</td>
<td>Region*Age</td>
<td>26.597</td>
<td>1.773</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grow Your Own Program</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>52.774</td>
<td>6.597</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grow Your Own Program</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>39.362</td>
<td>3.9362</td>
<td>5.700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.027*</td>
<td>.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grow Your Own Program</td>
<td>Region*Gender</td>
<td>9.121</td>
<td>4.560</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ANOVA for performance appraisal indicated no significant main effects for elementary size, $F(3, 27) = 1.07, p = .37$, and high school size, $F(3, 27) = 2.22, p = .10$. The interaction between elementary and high school size was significant, $F(1, 27) = 5.76, p = .02$. The interaction found between elementary and high school size has little practical meaning due to radically unequal group sizes in the cells.

The ANOVA for personal interview indicated no significant main effect for region, $F(8, 60) = 2.01, p = .060$, but indicated a significant main effect for age, $F(3, 60) = 3.05, p = .035$. The interaction between region and age was significant, $F(16, 60) = 2.70, p = .003$. Post hoc multiple comparisons tests, Tukey and Tamhane, did not reveal significant differences between personal interview and age. The significant interaction between region and age is due to unequal group sizes, where group cell size was equal to one ($n=1$) in some cases. However, the mean for superintendents 60 years of age or older ($n=11$) was larger than the mean response for superintendents in categories reflecting less than 60 years of age. This indicates a lower preference for use of the interview in the selection of a principal by those superintendents 60 years of age or older.

The ANOVA for transcripts indicated a non-significant main effect for region, $F(8, 48) = 1.05, p = .49$, a significant main effect for age, $F(3, 48) = 3.71, p = .018$, and a non-significant interaction between region and age, $F(15, 48) = 1.18, p = .315$. Tukey and Tamhane post hoc multiple comparisons tests for age, both revealed a significant difference in means. The means for superintendents 30-39 years of age ($n=7$) and superintendents 60 years of age or older ($n=9$) are statistically different from the means for superintendents 40-49 ($N=23$) and 50-59 ($N=36$) years of age. The means for superintendents 30-39 years of age and those 60 years of age or older are larger than the
mean responses for superintendents 40-49 and 50-59 years of age. This indicates a lower preference for use of transcripts in the selection of a principal by superintendents 30-39 years of age and those 60 years of age or older.

The ANOVA comparing the use of transcripts indicated a non-significant main effect for region, $F(8, 42) = 1.35, p = .243$, and years worked as a superintendent, $F(4, 42) = 1.65, p = .180$. The interaction for region and years as a superintendent was significant, $F(20, 42) = 2.218, p = .015$. The significant interaction between region and years as a superintendent is due to radically unequal group sizes in the cells. However, the overall mean for superintendents with 11-15 years of experience ($n=13$) was statistically larger than the mean responses for superintendents in categories reflecting less than 11 years or greater than 15 years of experience. This indicates a lower preference for use of transcripts in the selection of principals by those superintendents with 11-15 years of experience.

The final ANOVA explored use of ‘Grow Your Own Programs’ (GYOP). The ANOVA indicated a non-significant main effect for region, $F(8, 20) = 0.95, p = .496$, a significant main effect for gender, $F(1, 20) = 5.70, p = .027$, and non-significant interaction between region and gender, $F(2, 20) = 0.66, p = .528$. Post hoc tests were not performed for gender because there were only two groups. The significant main effect for gender should be interpreted with caution due to unequal group size, 3 females and 29 males. However, the overall mean for females was 1.0 and 5.03 for males, indicating that the three female superintendents had a stronger preference for the use of GYOPs in the selection of a principal.
Questions 9 and 10, Part II, focus on the selection committee membership and the recruitment and selection training provided to committee members. Committee members used in the recruitment and selection of a new principal and the reported frequency by region (n=98) are identified in Table 11.

Table 11. MASS Regions and Selection Committee Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>North West</th>
<th>North Central</th>
<th>HiLine</th>
<th>North East</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Four Rivers</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>South Central</th>
<th>South East</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Members</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Chairperson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee structure most often include membership comprised of the superintendent (95.9%), board members (85.7%), and teachers (65.3%). Moderate use of parents (39.8%), board chairperson (49.0%), and classified staff (40.8%) were reported. To a lesser extent, committee structure included former principals, personnel directors,
and students. In the response category of other, eight superintendents indicated the use of other principals or administrators in the district. Other one-time responses included the use of community members, central office director and holding a public forum.

In question 10 of the survey, respondents were asked to identify whether or not training was provided to the selection committee members, training that would help members evaluate job applicants. In this study, 72 (73.5%) of the 98 respondents reported that no training was provided, and 26 (26.5%) respondents reported offering training for selection committee members. Twenty-three respondents qualified the type of training offered to selection committees during the hiring process. Training ranges from basic orientations covering policy, procedures and interview processes to workshops conducted by outside agencies (MTSBA). In most cases, superintendents were the facilitators of training provided to members of the hiring committee.

**ISLLC Standards and Selection Assessment**

Part III of this study examined the inclusion of the ISLLC standards in the selection assessment of principal candidates. Superintendents rated how completely their present selection methods assess the knowledge, dispositions, and performance elements for each of the six standards. Selection refers to processes used to identify the most qualified principal candidate from those individuals having applied for a leadership position with the school district. Respondents were provided with a four-point selection assessment scale, a rating of 4 indicates that a candidate is fully assessed in the area denoted in the standard, and a rating of 1 indicated no assessment of the candidate in the area listed.
The mean (n=98) and standard deviation for each ISLLC element are reported in Table 12. The assessment scale for respondent choices was: 4 – fully assess candidate in this area; 3 – somewhat assess candidate in this area; 2 – little assessment of candidate in this area; and 1 – no assessment of candidate is this area. The mean and standard deviation reported across all six standards are homogenous with only slight variations indicating sameness in superintendent perceptions of use of the standards in the assessment of principal candidates using the ISLLC standards.

Table 12. ISLLC Standards and Descriptive Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISLLC Standard</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1-Knowledge</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1-Dispositions</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1-Performance</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2-Knowledge</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2-Dispositions</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2-Performance</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3-Knowledge</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3-Dispositions</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3-Performance</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4-Knowledge</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4-Dispositions</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4-Performance</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5-Knowledge</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5-Dispositions</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5-Performance</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 6-Knowledge</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 6-Dispositions</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 6-Performance</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A descriptive illustration of selection assessment is provided in Table 13. Only two standards, standard IV-knowledge and standard VI-knowledge, had fewer than 70% of respondents indicating that they fully or somewhat assess principals in these areas. Standard IV speaks to the ability of a school administrator to collaborate and communicate with members of the school community in reference to interests, needs, and community resources. Standard VI addresses an administrator’s ability to understand, respond to, and influence the larger political, social, economic, legal and cultural contexts. Standard II was the only standard having greater than 90% of respondents indicate that they fully assess or somewhat assess the candidate with respect to the knowledge, dispositions and performances associated with this standard. Standard II addresses the school administrator’s ability to advocate, nurture, and sustain a school culture and instructional programs conducive to student learning and staff professional development. Perceptions regarding inclusion of the standards in the selection process are fairly consistent across all standards. Superintendents, however, place most of their emphasis on student learning, which may be a response to current accountability and assessment mandates for schools.

Based on the reported data and the homogeneity observed with respondent ratings and perceived use of the ISLLC standards, an overall mean was calculated for each respondent. The overall mean was calculated using each respondent’s rating of each standard and the corresponding ratings for knowledge, dispositions, and performances for each standard. Overall standard means (dependent variable) were used in two-factor analysis of variance tests to determine if significant differences existed in the use of the ISLLC standards and if differences could be attributed to the differences among the
independent variables of school size (elementary and high school), gender and age, gender and region, region and experience as a superintendent, and region and age of practicing superintendents. Levels of significance were set at .05 (95% confidence interval).

Table 13. ISLLC Standards and Selection Assessment Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISLLC Standard</th>
<th>Fully Assess</th>
<th>Somewhat Assess</th>
<th>Little Assessment</th>
<th>No Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1-Knowledge</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1-Dispositions</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1-Performance</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2-Knowledge</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2-Dispositions</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2-Performance</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3-Knowledge</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3-Dispositions</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3-Performance</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4-Knowledge</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4-Dispositions</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4-Performance</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5-Knowledge</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5-Dispositions</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5-Performance</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 6-Knowledge</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 6-Dispositions</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 6-Performance</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ANOVA tests between subject effects indicated no significant interactions between the overall standards means and gender and age, gender and region, region and experience as a superintendent, and region and age of practicing superintendents. For tests using school size, no significant interaction was indicated between overall standard
mean and high school size or the interaction of elementary and high school size. Interaction of overall standard mean and elementary school size was significant, $F(3, 74) = 2.88, p = .04$. Post hoc multiple comparison tests, Tukey’s honesty significant difference test and Scheffe’s test, were used for follow-up analysis to the main effect of elementary school size to determine which means differ. Analysis using both Tukey’s and Scheffe’s tests indicated no significant difference using a .05 level of significance. However, in a comparison of overall means by elementary school size, elementary schools with enrollments between 41-150 students had an overall lower mean (2.88) than elementary school with enrollments greater than 150 students, a mean of 3.20 or higher.

Based on respondent data and the homogeneity in perceptions and a lack of significance with respect to the independent variables tested, factor analysis was utilized as a technique of analysis to “identify factors that statistically explain the variation and covariation among measures” (Green & Salkind, 2003, p. 296). The first stage of factor analysis involves extraction of factors from a correlation matrix. Examination of the correlations matrix revealed significant relationships at the 0.05 and 0.01 levels between all 18 ISLLC variables, the standards and related elements of knowledge, dispositions and performances.

The results of the initial principal component analysis are presented in table 14. Initial factor loadings for each variable on the unrotated component represents the correlation between the ISLLC variable and the component. Data presented under component one (1) would indicate the existence of a common construct, pattern, or unifying dimension, as compared to components two (2) and three (3). Initial principal component analysis allows for initial interpretation and in this case, the initial
interpretation of component one (1) could be labeled principal leadership. Eigenvalues also generated in the initial factor solution indicated the amount of variance of the variables accounted for by a factor and eigenvalues greater than 1 were retained. The eigenvalue associated with the first factor is 7.85 and accounted for 43.61% (7.85/18 x 100) of the total variance. The second eigenvalue (1.50) associated with the second factor accounted for 8.34% of the total variance, and the third eigenvalue (1.17) associated with the third factor accounted for 6.5% of the total variance.

Table 14. Initial Principal Component Analysis-Communalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISLLC Variable</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1-Knowledge</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>-.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1-Dispositions</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>-.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1-Performances</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2-Knowledge</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>-.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2-Dispositions</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2-Performances</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3-Knowledge</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3-Dispositions</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3-Performances</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>-.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4-Knowledge</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>-.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4-Dispositions</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>-.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4-Performances</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5-Knowledge</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>-.322</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5-Dispositions</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>-.415</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5-Performances</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>-.278</td>
<td>.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 6-Knowledge</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>-.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 6-Dispositions</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>-.368</td>
<td>-.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 6-Performances</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>-.244</td>
<td>-.229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A second criterion used to confirm the number of factors to be retained for further analysis is the scree test or plot, Figure 1. Factors on the steepest slope are retained and
components 1 and 2 were retained and components 3 through 18 were eliminated from further analysis as they would contribute little to the final interpretation.

Figure 1. Scree Plot of Eigenvalues

Following the initial principal component analysis, a two-factor, maximum likelihood rotation was conducted using a Varimax rotation resulting in the rotated factor matrix, Table 15. The proportion of variance by each of the rotated factors was 26.87% for the first factor and 19.45% for the second factor. Factors in the rotated matrix were interpreted based on the size of the loadings. Variables associated most with the first factor are: standard 3—the knowledge, dispositions and performances that relate to management of the organization; standard 4—the knowledge and performances that focus on the collaboration with, and responding to members of the school community; standard 5—the knowledge, dispositions and performances that focus on the school
leader’s ability to act with integrity and in an ethical manner; and standard 6—the knowledge, dispositions and performances concerned with the school leader’s ability to work with the political, social, economic, legal and cultural contexts of the school community.

Variables associated most with the second factor are: standard 1—knowledge, dispositions and performances and standard 2—knowledge and performances. Standard 1 focuses on the school leader’s ability to establish a vision, and standard 2 is the promotion of instruction, student learning and professional development of staff.

Table 15. Rotated Factor Matrix(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1-Knowledge</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1-Dispositions</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1-Performance</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2-Knowledge</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2-Dispositions</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2-Performances</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3-Knowledge</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3-Dispositions</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3-Performances</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4-Knowledge</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4-Dispositions</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4-Performances</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5-Knowledge</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5-Dispositions</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5-Performances</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 6-Knowledge</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 6-Dispositions</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 6-Performances</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>.282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


a Rotation converged in 3 iterations.
Discussion of Results

The recruitment and selection strategies utilized by Montana school superintendents and the perceived use of the ISLLC standards in the hiring process were examined in this research study. The method of data collection was through a survey that collected demographic and recruitment and selection information. Data were presented in three areas: 1) demographic information, 2) recruitment and selections practices used in hiring, and 3) use of the ISLLC standards in recruitment and selection processes.

Questions 1-6, Section I of the survey, gathered district and respondent demographics related to gender, ethnicity, age, years worked in public education, years as school superintendent, and years as a superintendent in current district. Aging of those currently working as Montana superintendents serves notice that recruitment strategies are needed as 73 of the 98 of the respondents will soon accumulate or have already accumulated enough years of creditable service (25 years) in Montana’s Teacher Retirement System to retire at any age without penalty. This pending exodus at the school CEO level will lead to openings at the principal level as principals typically seek to move into the superintendency and this movement in leadership supports development of recruitment strategies for principals. Data also presents a low percentage of women (12%) in school leadership positions and minorities (2%). Reported percentages support development of model strategies that support school leadership opportunities for these groups.

Questions 7-8, Section I of the survey, examined the number of years since the last principal hiring and the future staffing needs of districts. Fifty-seven districts (58.16%) reported hiring a principal during the past one to two years. Twenty
respondents anticipated a need to hire a principal during the next four years. Of concern is that a majority of schools (58.16%) had no projections as to when they might need to conduct a principal hiring.

Part I of the survey provided demographic information concerning respondents, and Parts II and III of the survey were designed to provide understanding of recruitment and selection practices used in Montana Schools and to answer the following questions addressed in this study.

Question 1. What are the recruitment strategies used by Montana schools to secure a candidate pool?

Recruitment refers to processes used to attract a pool of highly qualified candidates and Section II of the survey examined recruitment practices utilized by Montana school superintendents. This study identified that 70 (71.43%) respondent schools are not fully prepared with respect to the recruitment of principal candidates as procedures and practices were partially developed or were non-existent. A majority of districts lacked recruitment plans that project changes in principal staffing needs. Additionally, only 12.24% of respondents reported having developed recruitment plans, and 29.6% of respondents indicated that plans were developed for the recruitment of minority and female candidates. A positive note concerning recruitment strategies used in Montana schools surveyed is that 49% of the responding districts had developed recruitment literature for principal candidates; however, 51% of the responding districts were not prepared in this area.

The four most commonly used sources and methods for the recruitment of principal candidates included district job postings (89.8%), internet-web postings
(89.8%), educational institutions—colleges and universities (78.6%), and local newspapers (63.7%). Other recruitment sources used to attract principal candidates include the use of professional organizations (54.9%), peer referrals (52%), state media and newspapers (45.9%), and state employment agencies (40.5%).

Question 2. What are the selection strategies used by Montana schools to screen or identify potential candidates?

In Part II, Question 8 of the survey, respondents were asked to identify screening methods. The three most utilized selection screening methods, in order of preference, used by respondents are interviews, reference checks, and resumes. Fifty-three (58.2%) of the 91 respondents ranked the interview as the most important selection method and 21 (23.1%) respondents ranked the interview as the second most important selection method. Transcripts, district applications, and “grow your own programs” had similar mean rankings indicating a similar prioritization with respect to use in the screening process. The use of assessment center results and search firms had low levels of importance relative to the screening of potential principal candidates and this may be explained by the fact that Montana does not have an assessment center and because only one professional search firm exists for schools in Montana, the Montana School Board Association, which participates primarily in school superintendent searches.

Question 3. Have Montana school superintendents established “grow your own” programs for the development, recruitment and selection of candidates internally?

Part II, Question 3, considering current research about school leadership shortages in the state of Montana, very few respondents (21.42%) indicated having an in-house “grow your own” or succession program for the recruitment of principals from within the
district. In Part II, Question 7, respondents were asked to identify the sources and methods are used to develop a candidate pool. In response, 30 (30.6%) respondents reported utilization of “grow you own programs” as a method for recruitment of principal candidates. In Part II, Question 8, respondents were asked to identify district selection methods used to gather information about principal candidates. Thirty-two respondents indicated utilization of information from internal “grow your own programs” as a method for screening candidates. With respect to processes used to screen candidates, interviews, reference checks and resumes were the preferred screening methods as reported.

Question 4. Are there differences in selection strategies used in Montana schools as related to school size, region, experience, and age of practicing superintendents, and gender?

Two-factor analysis of variance tests were run on Part II, Question 8 of the survey to determine if differences existed in the selection methods used based on school size (elementary and high school), region, gender, experience as a superintendent, and age of practicing superintendents. Significant differences were found as reported in Table 10; however, differences must be interpreted with caution due to the distribution of cases across regions. The mean is affected by extreme scores and with sample size of less than 30 (i.e., number of cases per region), the mean is affected and is less likely to fit within the normal curve of the sample, resulting in p values that were not trustworthy.

Question 5. What members of the school community typically serve on principal selection committees and is training provided to selection committee members?
Part II, Questions 9 and 10 focused on selection committee membership and the recruitment and selection training provided committee members. Selection committees typically include the superintendent, board members, and teachers. Parents, board chairperson, and classified staff were moderately used on selection committees. To a lesser extent, committee structures included former principals, personnel directors, and students. In the response category of other, eight superintendents indicated the use of other principals or administrators in the district. Other one-time responses included the use of community members, central office director and holding a public forum.

In view of present day challenges of leadership and requirements of the principalship, 72 (73.5%) respondents reported that no training was provided to selection committees. Of the 26 respondents reporting the offering of training, 23 qualified the type of training, which ranged from basic orientations covering policy to more formal presentations conducted by outside agencies (MTSBA). In most cases, superintendents facilitated in-house training for selection committee members, training that focused more on procedures versus requirements of present day principals.

Question 6. Do Montana school superintendents perceive district selection strategies of principal candidates as assessing knowledge, dispositions, and performances as defined by ISLLC standards?

Use of the ISLLC standards in recruitment and selection processes were examined in Section III of the survey. Mean rankings ranged from 2.74 to 3.46 with little difference in the standard error of the means. Respondents tended to rate their use of the ISLLC standards as "fully" or "somewhat" assess candidates using the standards. Due to the homogeneity in ratings, a factor analysis was performed to explain the variation and
covariation among measures. Correlations between all six standards and the corresponding elements were significant, revealing a positive relation between items evaluated. Principal component analysis was conducted and revealed three factors accounting for 58.47% of the variance. A second rotation was performed using two factors accounting for 46.32% of the variance. This analysis reveals that the ISLLC standards, developed around instructional leadership and the centrality of student learning, are important not only in the professional development of principals, but also the recruitment and selection of school principals.

Summary

Analysis of the data collected from Montana school superintendents, which examined recruitment and selection practices, resulted in the identification of need, areas that would benefit from a developed recruitment and selection model and from strategies that support the model. Section I of the survey supported present research studies that point to school leadership shortages within the state of Montana. Data presented in Section II reveals a lack of developed recruitment practices and procedures. Data presented in Section III reveals the perceived use of the ISLLC standards in the recruitment and selection of principals. In the absence of developed hiring practices and procedures throughout the state, the model and strategies developed based on the ISLLC standards provide a process for the effective recruitment and selection of quality principals.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

School principals "exert a powerful, if indirect, influence on teaching quality and student learning" as stated in a 2003 National Governors Association (NGA) Center for Best Practices report examining school leadership (p. 1). Galen Jones, the director of the Division of Secondary Education in 1949, stated that, "What is needed in the immediate future is leadership for the cooperative solution of our problems" (p. 37). The quest for leadership is just as true today as it was in 1949 and reflects the continuing challenges associated with leading a school, and the preparation, recruitment and selection of effective school leaders.

Reconfiguring current recruitment and selection practices for principal candidates provides one strategy that will assist Montana school districts with the pronounced shortage of quality candidates. The shortage in most states, Montana included, is not attributable to a lack of certified candidates; rather, the problem is the unequal distribution of candidates based on candidate avoidance of schools with high poverty factors, schools with tougher assignments, community dysfunction, low paying schools, and elementary versus high school principalships; and, based on reports from superintendents stating that they are not finding the desired leadership (Center on Reinventing Public Education, 2003; Roza, Celio, Harvey & Wishon, 2003). The lack of
effective school leadership in American schools results from the retention of a “system of recruitment, preparation, and induction that does not recruit the leaders we need, does not prepare them for their positions, does not reward them on a par with their responsibilities, and locks out candidates with vital knowledge and experience” (Hess, 2003, para. 1).

Today’s sweeping educational reforms require the selection of strong leadership and as stated by Sessa and Taylor (2000) in their examination of organizational recruitment and selection, “The best strategies in the world are useless if you don’t have people who can execute them” (p. 133). Leadership from principals forms the foundation for school improvement and student learning at the building level. Montana’s current administrative needs warrant “training and expertise in hiring procedures and practices” because superintendents and school board members are responsible for hiring the best candidate (Nielson, 2002, p. 19).

Montana school districts are facing an administrative shortage and the problem addressed in this study was that the relationship between recruitment and selection strategies used by Montana school superintendents and the existing standards for principals was not known. The purpose of the study was to describe and examine the relationship between principal selection strategies utilized by Montana schools in the selection of a new principal and the perceived use of the ISLLC standards in recruitment and selection. From this examination of Montana recruitment and selection practices, a model was developed. Through the recruitment and selection model presented, and as stated by Barritt (1986), “…it is hoped [that this] research can lead to better understanding of the way things appear to someone else and through that insight lead to improvements in practice” (as cited in Creswell, 1998, p. 94).
Summary of Findings

The recruitment and selection practices currently used in Montana schools and the perceived use of the ISLLC standards in the assessment of principal candidates were explored in this study. Additional understanding was obtained through a review of the literature specific to the principal shortage, recruitment and selection practices, and the knowledge, dispositions, and performances required of principals.

The demographics reported in Chapter 4 support earlier Montana studies (MTSBA, 1999; Nielson, 2002; and Nielson, 2003) examining the shrinking pool of school leaders, superintendents and principals. Through this study, it was determined that 73 of the 98 respondents will soon accumulate or have already accumulated enough years of creditable service (25 years) in Montana's Teacher Retirement System to retire at any age. The reported experience and age of practicing superintendents indicates future staffing needs for the position of school superintendent, and as superintendents retire from positions of school leadership, vacancies will typically be filled by practicing superintendents moving from one district to another, and by practicing principals seeking to move to the next level of leadership. This void in the principalship is exacerbated as an additional 19 respondents indicated the need to hire a new principal in one to four years. Numbers presented in this study do not reflect retirements or movements of school leadership in the 58 districts deselected from this study or for the eight pilot districts. Additionally, larger districts with multiple principals may have multiple openings; the Great Falls school district provides one example of a district with multiple openings in the next three to four years.
Current recruitment and selection practices in many school districts, as examined in Part II of the survey, appear to be underdeveloped or missing in several areas. Specifically, recruitment practices and procedures were fully developed in only 28 of the 98 districts participating in this study. Reported development of recruitment practices for attracting out-of-district and female and minority candidates was slightly better. This disparity in recruitment practices and procedures indicates that there is a need to review, develop, and align recruitment and practice procedures in most schools with the ISLLC standards. Compounding the absence of recruitment practices and procedures was limited use of internal succession or “grow your own programs” for the development of in-house leadership. Twenty-one districts reported use of developed leadership programs. In view of the projected leadership shortages, nationally, regionally and at the state level, 86 districts reported the existence of partially developed recruitment plans examining future staffing needs in their districts or none at all. The bright spot with respect to recruitment practices and procedures is preparation of recruitment literature. Forty-eight of 98 districts reported that they had developed recruitment literature that accurately represents the district, its mission and vision, work conditions, expectations, and presents other important information about the school community. The absence of recruitment practices and procedures supported the development of a model and recommendations for improving current practices.

Locating and attracting applicants has become increasingly more difficult and employers must be innovative and aggressive in their strategies to reach all sources of potential school leadership. Respondents in this study relied primarily on in-district job postings, Internet web postings, educational institutions, and local newspapers for the
attraction of candidates. Moderately used sources for attracting candidates included state media and newspapers, professional organizations, and peer referrals, followed by the use of "grow your own programs" and professional search firms.

While recruitment results in the development of a candidate pool, selection methods are used to screen, assess and hire principal candidates. In a review of the nine selection methods presented to respondents (Table 9), the top three selection methods used in the hiring process according to respondents, in order of preference, are the interview, personal reference checks, and reviews of candidates' resumes. Equal consideration was afforded the use of district applications, "grow your own programs," or succession programs, reviews of college transcripts and performance appraisals in the assessment of potential candidates. The two methods least used in the selection of principals included assessment center results and use of professional search firms, with 18 of 98 superintendents reporting the use of these methods. As reported by respondents, the interview is the preferred selection method used in the principal hiring process and serves as the fulcrum for hiring decisions.

Getting a number of stakeholders involved in the hiring process, recruitment and selection can contribute to locating the best person for the job. In a look at the composition of selection committees formed by Montana school superintendents, the stakeholders most often included were board members and teachers. Moderately included persons on selection committees were members of the classified staff and parents. Personnel directors and students were minimally used on selection committees. In responding to the category of other in the survey, eight superintendents indicated the use of other principals and administrators on selection committees.
Understanding recruitment and selection processes and practices is the result of training afforded members of hiring committees. Training provides opportunity for committee members to develop an understanding of the qualities and skills desired in a new principal, and to understand specific procedures that will be used during the hiring process. In examination of training afforded selection committees, a majority of superintendents (73.5%) indicated that no training was provided, and while training was provided by some superintendents (26.5%), written comments from respondents concerning training provided did not reflect the complexity of the principalship with respect to the knowledge, disposition, and performances required of today's principals.

Perceptions of respondents concerning the inclusion of the ISLLC standards, the knowledge, dispositions, and performances in the selection process resulted in an overall population mean of 3.15, indicating that most respondents perceived that their selection processes fully or somewhat assessed principal candidates using the ISLLC standards. In examination of respondent responses, no significant differences were observed based on respondents' gender, region, experience or age. Based on homogeneity of responses, a factor analysis of data was done to gain further insight into the homogeneity of responses. Analysis resulted in a correlation matrix (18 x 18) of the 18 knowledge, dispositions, and performances elements that make up the ISLLC Standards. Significant relationships existed between all 18 ISLLC variables. Continued factor analysis resulted in the rotation of two factors that accounted for 46.32% of the total variance. Interpretation and naming of factors is based on the loadings of the 18 variables. Consequently, Standard I (vision of learning) and II (school culture and instructional program) loaded on factor one and this factor could be named appropriately as
instructional leadership. Standard III (management of the organization), Standard IV (community resources), Standard V (ethical leadership), and Standard VI (political, social, economic, legal and cultural leadership) loaded on factor two and could appropriately be named managerial leadership. The standards as a whole reflect a unidimensionality that could be more appropriately named “balanced leadership” (Waters, et al., 2003).

Model and Recommendations

The gauntlet to raise student achievement has been thrown on the desks of principals nationally, resulting in a need to prepare, recruit and select quality principals capable of meeting the mandates of the No Child Left Behind Act. This current mandate coincides with a shortage of quality school principals. Montana’s school leadership shortage is clearly established and through the findings of this study supported the development of a model and recommended strategies for the preparation and professional development, recruitment, and selection of quality principals.

The recruitment and selection model present in Figure 2 is comprised of four integrated elements, the ISLLC standards, preparation and professional development, recruitment practices, and selection practices. The model is based on a review of the literature concerning the history of the principalship, current standards for effective principals, and the recruitment and selection literature. Data concerning Montana’s recruitment and selection practices provides the foundations for recommended strategies that accompany each element in the model as recruitment and selection strategies as reported by Montana school superintendents were missing or partially developed in many
areas of the hiring process. Minimally, these gaps in hiring processes lessen the perceived use of the ISLLC standards in recruitment and selection and support the development of the following model which is based on strengthening the relationship between present hiring practices and the ISLLC standards.

Figure 2. Recruitment and Selection Model

Although this study did not focus specifically on professional development, the evolution of the principalship from a management-based position to a position that hosts
a complex and changing set of skills is accounted for in the literature, a position that encompasses instructional and managerial leadership. The ISLLC standards in conjunction with identified responsibilities that facilitate student achievement establish proficiencies related to the knowledge, dispositions and performances required of quality principals. In the recruitment and selection model presented in Figure 2, the ISLLC standards are central to the preparation and professional development of aspiring and practicing principals, and to actual recruitment and selection practices. Inclusion of the ISLLC standards in recruitment and selection strategies used in Montana schools addresses the problem of this study by establishing hiring processes that are fully aligned with the standards and not based on the perceived use of the standards.

Recruitment and selection of quality principals begins prior to a posted vacancy. Quality recruitment and selection is dependent on the professional development and preparation of aspiring principals and the ongoing professional development for practicing principals. Concern taken regarding the professional development of principals may help with the shrinking pool of quality candidates. Recommendations concerning the professional development are concerned with the professional development of aspiring principals, practicing principals, and the pool of certified, non-practicing principals.

Preparation and the ongoing professional development for aspiring principals, in view of existing shortages, will require greater attention aimed at the establishment of “grow your own programs” or succession programs for the development of future principals from within the district, and need to be linked to the ISLLC standards. District “grow your own programs” can’t function in isolation and must have support from
university systems and national, regional and state professional associations. Preparation and professional development programs must be built upon existing standards, the knowledge, dispositions and performances required of today’s principals.

The ongoing professional development of certificated principals needs to be considered on two levels: 1) professional development for practicing principals, and 2) professional development for certified, non-practicing principals. Recent accountability and assessment requirements have placed new demands on practicing principals and provides one example of where professional organizations can help foster the acquisition of new skills for practicing principals. With respect to certified, non-practicing administrators, training may be dated and professional development programs that serve to upgrade skills and inspire may help recapture members of this group, causing them to rejoin the applicant pool.

Underscoring Montana’s current professional development needs is the Montana State Action for Education Leadership Project which recognizes that one of the most important strategies for the development of quality leadership is preparation and the professional development of tomorrow’s educational leaders (Montana SAELP, 2001, p. 27). This project works with a consortium of key policy leaders to develop comprehensive policies and practices that work in concert to strengthen school leadership in Montana. Specific to the professional development of quality principals is the recognition that preparation and licensure programs must be aligned with standards for today’s principals and the need to engage in ongoing training for all principals irrespective of years of experience.
Recruitment represents the beginning of the hiring process based on anticipated or known vacancies, and typically terminates with the establishment of a viable pool of candidates that will be considered for the principalship. Selection represents that part of the hiring process aimed at identifying the most qualified or the best person for the job. Because recruitment and selection are not isolated events and include phases or stages and multiple steps, effective hiring is the result of systematic processes that are well planned and not left to chance. Five stages, based on a review of the literature in Chapter 2, will be used to present steps within the hiring process and to outline recommendations for Montana schools concerning existing recruitment and selection procedures. Stages I and II correspond to recruitment practices and procedures, and Stages III, IV and V will correspond to selection practices and procedures that would be contained within the model.

Recruitment - Stage I (step and recommendations):

1. Vacancy—known or anticipated. Schools in Montana may be reacting to principal vacancies as few schools reported having recruitment plans that examined potential leadership vacancies due to retirement or other reasons. A specific recommendation is for Montana schools to work cooperatively with their state professional organizations, the Montana School Boards Association (MTSBA) office and the School Administrators of Montana (SAM) office, to develop a method of annually assessing leadership movement within superintendent and principal ranks.

2. Organizational Assessment—"begins with an examination of the internal environment (for instance, strategy, climate, changes, strengths, needs, and short-
and long-term goals) and the external environment (for instance, industry ranking, market, competition, regulatory environment, future trends, and political instabilities)" (Sessa, et al., 1998, p. 2). Although this study did not address organizational assessment, this can be accomplished through school improvement efforts associated with NCLB and Montana Accreditation rule 10.55.601, which ensures continuous education improvement through the development of a five-year education plan. Districts that use their five-year education plans for purposes of organizational assessment and student achievement will better understand the knowledge, dispositions and performances required when hiring a new principal.

3. Position and Candidate Requirements—should address the needs of organizations and the knowledge, dispositions and performances required of the principal to be hired. Position requirements can be derived from examination of the organization assessment. With respect to use of the ISLLC standards during selection, most Montana school superintendents participating in this study reported that candidates were fully or somewhat assessed using the standards. The ISLLC standards provide a creditable beginning point for considering the position and candidate requirements needed to effectively lead a school. From this study, the actual inclusion of the ISLLC standards is not known as related to the different recruitment and selection procedures and practices. In view of this study based on reported perceptions, a recommendation concerning principal candidate requirements is for Montana schools to use the ISLLC standards as the established requirements for Montana school principals and to assess the actual
incorporation of ISLLC standards in district recruitment and selection practices and procedures, which in many areas were not fully developed according to Montana school superintendents.

Recruitment - Stage II (steps and recommendations):

1. Recruitment Elements—refers to those processes that are occurring simultaneously with Stage I of recruitment. Specific elements considered are: decisions regarding who will be involved with the hiring process; what applicant materials are needed and for what purposes; and what recruitment strategies will be used to advertise and attract potential candidates. At this stage, one or more than one person may coordinate the development, sending, and monitoring of applicant material, and be responsible for the marketing and advertising of a principal vacancy. Recruitment of the ideal candidate is dependent upon others clearly understanding the position, and the experience and skills sought by the superintendent. Therefore, a specific recommendation is to review communications ensuring that all members of the recruitment and selection committee have the same information and understanding of hiring processes. Processes that are not aligned may result in a candidate pool that does not match needs of the organization or qualities sought in a new principal. As reported in this study, 72 of the 98 respondents provided no training to those involved with the selection of a new principal. Recruitment materials and advertising may form the first impressions for potential candidates and determine whether or not a potential principal candidate decides to apply. Fifty (51%) respondents in this study indicated having only partially developed or no recruitment materials. A
specific recommendation for Montana schools is to consider the role and importance of effective recruitment materials in attracting candidates and then to develop materials that accurately represent the school district, its mission and vision, work conditions, expectations, and serve to inform potential candidates.

Advertising is the primary method of locating internal and external principal applicants. A recommendation concerning advertising, based on reported shortages of quality leadership, is for schools to broaden their use of recruitment mediums. Respondents in this study primarily used district job postings, Internet postings, and educational institutions as recruitment sources. Expanded advertising with local, state, and regional newspapers, professional organizations, state employment agencies, and development and use of in-house “grow your own programs” results in a more widespread recruitment effort that may attract a greater number of candidates.

Selection - Stage III (steps and recommendations):

1. Initial Screening—is the one task completed at this stage. This stage is characterized by reviews of each applicant’s submitted materials—cover letters, resume, transcripts, district application, credentials, and references. This assessment typically determines if the applicant meets minimum qualifications. In Stage I, position and candidate requirements were developed, and at this stage certain selection methods selected by the district are going to be used to assess candidates. Rosse and Levin (1997) recommend the use of a performance matrix, which is developed around the knowledge, skills, abilities, and other attributes (KSAOs) or as recommended in this study, the knowledge, dispositions and
performances associated with the ISLLC standards. A performance matrix would also include specific tools used during selection for the assessment of candidates. Using the ISLLC standards and based on example selection methods to be used, an example of what a matrix might look like was developed and is presented in Table 16. The boxes in the matrix, if checked (\(\checkmark\)), would indicate which selection methods will be used to assess each of the standards. The X’s in the matrix indicate which selection methods will be used to assess each of the standards. In view of the ISLLC standards and selections methods used by Montana school superintendents, the development and use of a performance matrix is recommended. A performance matrix designed around the standards would ensure that principals are assessed using all six standards. Additionally, it would ensure that selection tools used during the selection process actually are designed with the standards in mind. Development of a performance matrix would require schools to review their preferred selection methods against the ISLLC standards. Based on the review, assessment tools may need to be modified and geared toward the ISLLC standards. For example, an existing district application may seek candidate information that is not useful to the hiring process or the final decision, job offer. In this case, a redesigned district application might contain six questions related to the six standards that ask potential candidates to speak to actual experiences associated with each standard. A second example would be that reference checks can include questions that relate to candidates’ performance with respect to each of the standards. The outcome would be tools that are
aligned with organizational needs and the knowledge, dispositions, and performances sought in a new principal.

Table 16. ISLLC Performance Matrix Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISLLC Standard</th>
<th>District Application</th>
<th>Resume Review</th>
<th>Transcripts</th>
<th>Reference Checks</th>
<th>Assessment Center Results</th>
<th>Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard I - Vision of Learning</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard II - school culture &amp; instructional program</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard III - Management of Organization</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard IV - Community resources</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard V - Ethical leadership</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard VI - Political, social, economic, legal, and cultural leadership</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection - Stage IV (optional):

This stage is optional and would be engaged in situations where a large number of candidates have applied for a vacancy. Following a determination that minimum qualifications were met, preliminary interviews, background checks, reference checks,
and formal assessments may be used to screen down to a smaller pool of semi-finalists. From this pool, finalists would be selected for the final stage of selection.

Selection - Stage V (steps and recommendations): This final stage characterized by on-site interviews, job offer, and termination procedures.

1. Interviews—are the most widely used and influential tool in the hiring process and Montana school superintendents participating in this study identified the interview as the primary method used to select a new principal. The types of interviews were discussed in Chapter II, unstructured or traditional interviews, structured interviews, and the patterned behavior description interview (PBDI) or descriptive interview. Based on the wide and preferred use of the interview by Montana school superintendents, the following recommendation is made concerning the interview process and type of interview used in this final assessment of candidates. Use of the PBDI is recommended as it focuses on what applicants have achieved, how they went about doing it, and in circumstances similar to those they will face on the job (Janz, 1989). Development of PBDI begins with KSAOs, the ISLLC standards, and the development of questions with a rubric for evaluating and rating a candidate’s responses. PBDI questions focus on past performances versus what a person knows. Using ISLLC Standard I, a sample rubric and descriptive questions were developed and are presented in Table 17. In referring back to Stage II, training of selection committee members is strongly recommended as the interview may be the first face-to-face meeting with potential candidates, and selection processes should not alienate candidates or interfere with efforts to obtain accurate information.
Table 17. PBDI Rubric and ISLLC Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISLLC Standard 1 – The school administrator facilitates the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community</th>
<th>Rubric Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question 1**: Give me an example of a time when you had to effectively communicate an idea to parents, students, teachers, or members of the school community. What was the idea? What was the outcome?

4 = candidate has many experiences communicating ideas, provided strong examples, and stated outcomes.

3 = candidate has had experiences communicating ideas, provided examples and stated outcomes.

2 = candidate has little experience communicating ideas and provided examples but could not state any outcomes.

1 = candidate has never had to communicate an idea. Provides examples of what ideas others have presented. Unsure about outcomes.

**Question 2**: Tell me about a time when you had to use assessment data to improve the performance of students. What type of assessment data did you use? What was the student performance problem? What goals did you establish for gains in student achievement?

4 = candidate has many experiences using and interpreting data. Clearly understands assessment and provided specific examples of goals set and outcomes of assessment goals.

3 = candidate has had experiences using data and understands purposes of assessment. Candidate provided examples of when they used data and examples of goals set.

2 = candidate has little experience working with assessment data. Understands purposes of data and provides examples of how to use data. No personal examples of data use or examples of goals.

1 = candidate has not experienced work with assessment data or experience using data to set instructional goals for students.

2. Job Offer—is based on the final selection of one applicant for the principal position based on all information gathered, the offering of a contract, confirmation of contract acceptance by the successful applicant, and final approval by the school board. At this point in the selection process, it is critical
that the contract spells out duties, responsibilities, and other agreed upon
conditions of employment (Webb & Norton, 1999).

3. Termination Procedures—should always include the notification of unsuccessful
candidates and an evaluation of the recruitment and selection process.
Notification allows unsuccessful candidates to begin to pursue other job
opportunities and maintains good public relations with candidates who may seek
employment with the organization in the future (Webb & Norton, 1999).
Evaluation of the hiring process provides opportunity to review and identify any
procedures or practices that did not work well and to make changes. Evaluation
should include input from all committee members and at some point, the new
principal.

Discussion of Broader Implications

The challenges facing schools are enormous and as stated by Goodland (1984),
"...we live in an educational ecosystem whereby numerous institutions and individual
players within a given community are integrally interdependent" (as cited in Jones, 2000,
p. 166). Given this understanding, recruitment and selection processes must focus on
other positions within the school districts. Principals may provide the necessary
instructional leadership for directing school improvement and gains in student
achievement, but their ability to effectively lead schools is dependent on quality teachers,
quality instructional aides, and other resource staff. Recruitment and selection
procedures for all educational staff must be aligned with expected competencies and
organizational needs.
The best recruitment and selection procedures and practices may be meaningless if barriers to the principalship are not addressed. Compensation, stress, and long work hours serve as detractors to the principalship and hiring practices must consider the demands placed on today's principals. Successful recruitment and selection procedures must consider the needs of potential candidates and the needs of the organization. Efforts to acknowledge candidate needs and to work with identified needs may result in stronger working relationships with candidates hired. Ultimately, the success or failure of school may be the result of hiring practices that are not aligned with needs of the district, the current knowledge, disposition, and performances required of principals, or the needs of candidate.

Summary

The problem addressed in this study is that the relationship between recruitment and selection strategies used by Montana school superintendents and the existing standards for principals was not known. The purpose of the study was to describe and examine the relationship between principal recruitment and selection practices and procedures utilized in hiring a new principal and the perceived use of the ISLLC standards in recruitment and selection. From this examination of Montana recruitment and selection practices, a model incorporating the ISLLC standards was developed for the systematic recruitment and selection of school principals. The information obtained from Montana school superintendents participating in this study answered questions about principal recruitment and selection practices in Montana.
This study strengthens current hiring practices by providing an overview of the principalship, a deeper understanding of identified shortages, a review of the characteristics and competencies required of today's principals, and a review of the recruitment and selection literature. The recruitment and selection model and recommendations presented in this study serve as a guide to the development of principal hiring practices that are more fully aligned with organizational needs and the current role of school principals, furthering the recruitment and selection of quality principals.

Implications for Further Research

Contending with Montana’s principal shortage will require ongoing efforts to understand how to attract people into school leadership positions. Based on this study and the model developed, the following recommendations are presented for further research.

This study asked districts to identify the existence of developed recruitment procedures and policies for the recruitment of principals. Of those 28 districts reporting the existence of recruitment procedures and policies, the effectiveness of existing procedures in attracting internal candidates, external candidates, or female and minority candidates is not known and research in this area would add to our understanding of recruitment procedures and policies in Montana.

The reliability of the Montana Principal Recruitment and Selection survey used in this study was not determined, consequently, the dependability of the measure to provide consistent results can not be estimated. Additional research concerning the reliability of the Montana Principal Recruitment and Selection survey would strengthen findings
regarding recruitment and selection practices in Montana and the inclusion of the ISLLC standards in hiring practices.

Twenty-one schools reported the use of in-house “grow your own programs” or succession programs for the development of school leaders. Little is known about the actual structure of these programs and whether or not these programs result in the development of quality principals. Identification criteria, professional development for aspiring leaders, program costs and other factors are not known. Greater understanding of “grow your own programs” used in Montana may provide useful information for schools facing principal shortages.

This study identified the interview as the preferred selection method for obtaining information about principal candidates. The literature review identified two main types of interviews—unstructured and structured. Descriptive interviews or PBDI interviews are one type of structured interview. The recommendation in this study was the development and use of PBDI interviews based on the performances contained in the ISLLC standards. In review of the research concerning unstructured versus highly structured interviews, potential candidates respond less favorably to highly structured interviews and that interviews of this type have implications for applicant attraction (Goodale, 1989). Consequently, additional research concerning the use and impact of PBDI or descriptive interviews in hiring Montana principals is recommended.

This study focused on principal recruitment and selection practices and did not examine the needs of school superintendents or the needs of others involved with the hiring process. Research aimed at understanding the needs of those persons involved in recruitment and selection of a principal or other staff would contribute to our
understanding of the professional development needs of hiring committees and the
development of training experiences for these groups.

Finally, leadership demands have changed making the recruitment and selection
of quality principals more complex. The recruitment and selection model presented
serves as a guide as do the strategies presented. The usefulness of this recruitment and
selection model to Montana school superintendents is not tested and will require
implementation and assessment with Montana school superintendents. Minimally, use of
the ISLLC standards within a more systematic recruitment and selection model provides
Montana school with a process that facilitates the identification of effective principal
leadership.
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APPENDIX A

INTERSTATE SCHOOL LEADERS LICENSURE CONSORTIUM:
STANDARDS FOR SCHOOL LEADERS
Standards I: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community [italics added].

Knowledge—the administrator has knowledge and understanding of:

- learning goals in a pluralistic society
- the principles of developing and implementing strategic plans
- systems theory
- information sources, data collection, and data analysis strategies
- effective communication
- effective consensus-building and negotiation skills

Dispositions—the administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:

- the educability of all
- a school vision of high standards of learning
- continuous school improvement
- the inclusion of all members of the school community
- ensuring that students have the knowledge, skills, and values needed to become successful adults
- a willingness to continuously examine one's own assumptions, beliefs, and practices
- doing the work required for high levels of personal and organizational performance

Performances—the administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:

- the vision and mission of the school are effectively communicated to staff, parents, students and community members
- the vision and mission are communicated through the use of symbols, ceremonies, stories, and similar activities
- the core beliefs of the school vision are modeled for all stakeholders
- the vision is developed with and among stakeholders
- the contributions of school community members to the realization of the vision are recognized and celebrated
- progress toward the vision and mission is communicated to all stakeholders
- the school community is involved in school improvement efforts
- the vision shapes the educational programs, plans, and actions
an implementation plan is developed in which objectives and strategies to achieve the vision and goals are clearly articulated
assessment data related to student learning are used to develop the school vision and goals
relevant demographic data pertaining to students and their families are used in developing the school mission and goals
barriers to achieving the vision are identified, clarified, and addressed
needed resources are sought and obtained to support the implementation of the school mission goals
existing resources are used in support of the school vision and goals
the vision, mission, and implementation plans are regularly monitored, evaluated, and revised

Standard II: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth [italics added].

Knowledge—the administrator has knowledge and understanding of:

- student growth and development
- applied learning theories
- applied motivational theories
- curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and refinement
- principles of effective instruction
- measurement, evaluation, and assessment strategies
- diversity and its meaning for educational programs
- adult learning and professional development models
- the change process for systems, organizations, and individuals
- the role of technology in promoting student learning and professional growth
- school cultures

Dispositions—the administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:

- student learning as the fundamental purpose of schooling
- the proposition that all students can learn
- the variety of ways in which students can learn
- life-long learning for self and others
- professional development as an integral part of school improvement
- the benefits that diversity brings to the school community
- a safe and supportive learning environment
- preparing students to be contributing members of society

Performances—the administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:
all individuals are treated with fairness, dignity, and respect
professional development promotes a focus on student learning consistent with the school vision and goals
students and staff feel valued and important
the responsibilities and contributions of each individual are acknowledged
barriers to student learning are identified, clarified, and addressed
diversity is considered in developing learning experiences
life long learning is encouraged and modeled
there is a culture of high expectations for self, student, and staff performance
technologies are used in teaching and learning
student and staff accomplishments are recognized and celebrated
multiple opportunities to learn are available to all students
the school is organized and aligned for success
curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular programs are designed, implemented, evaluated and refined
curriculum decisions are based on research, expertise of teachers, and the recommendations of learned societies implemented, evaluated and refined
the school culture and climate are assessed on a regular basis
a variety of sources of information is used to make decisions
student learning is assessed using a variety of techniques
multiple sources of information regarding performance are used by staff and students
a variety of supervisory and evaluation models are employed
pupil personnel programs are developed to meet the needs of students and their families

Standard III. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment [italics added].

Knowledge—the administrator has knowledge and understanding of:

- theories and model of organizations and the principles of organizational development
- operational procedures at the school and district level
- principles and issues relating to school safety and security
- human resources management and development
- principles and issues relating to fiscal operation of school management
- principles and issues relating to school facilities and use of space
- legal issues impacting school operations
- current technologies that support management functions
Dispositions—the administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:

- making management decisions to enhance learning and teaching
- taking risks to improve schools
- trusting people and their judgments
- accepting responsibility
- high-quality standards, expectations, and performances
- involving stakeholders in management processes
- a safe environment

Performances—the administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:

- knowledge of learning, teaching, and student development is used to inform management decisions
- operational procedures are designed and managed to maximize opportunities for successful learning
- emerging trends are recognized, studied, and applied as appropriate
- operational plans and procedures to achieve the vision and goals of the school are in place
- collective bargaining and other contractual agreements related to the school are effectively managed
- the school plant, equipment, and support systems operate safely, efficiently, effectively
- time is managed to maximize attainment of organizational goals
- potential problems and opportunities are identified
- problems are confronted and resolved in a timely manner
- financial, human, and material resources are aligned to the goals of schools
- the school acts entrepreneurially to support continuous improvement
- organizational systems are regularly monitored and modified as needed
- stakeholders are involved in decisions affecting schools
- responsibility is shared to maximize ownership and accountability
- effective problem-framing and problem-solving skills are used
- effective conflict resolution skills are used
- effective group-process and consensus-building skills are used
- effective communication skills are used
- there is effective use of technology to manage school operations
- fiscal resources of the school are managed responsibly, efficiently, and effectively
- a safe, clean, and aesthetically pleasing school environment is created and maintained
- human resource functions support the attained of school goals
- confidentiality and privacy of school records are maintained
Standard IV. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources [italics added].

Knowledge—the administrator has knowledge and understanding of:

- emerging issues and trends that potentially impact the school community
- the conditions and dynamics of the diverse school community
- community resources
- community relations and marketing strategies and processes
- successful models of school, family, business, community, government and higher education partnerships

Dispositions—the administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:

- schools operating as an integral part of the larger community
- collaboration and communication with families
- involvement of families and other stakeholders in school decision-making processes
- the proposition that diversity enriches the school
- families as partners in the education of their children
- the proposition that families have the best interests of their children in mind
- resources of the family and community needing to be brought to bear on the education of students
- an informed public

Performances—the administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:

- high visibility, active involvement, and communication with the larger community is a priority
- relationships with community leaders are identified and nurtured
- information about family and community concerns, expectations, and needs is used regularly
- there is outreach to different business, religious, political, and service agencies and organizations
- credence is given to individuals and groups whose values and opinions may conflict
- the school and community serve one another as resources
- available community resources are secured to help the school solve problems and achieve goals
- partnerships are established with area businesses, institutions of higher education, and community groups to strengthen programs and support school goals
community youth family services are integrated with school programs
community stakeholders are treated equitably
diversity is recognized and valued
effective media relations are developed and maintained
a comprehensive program of community relations is established
public resources and funds are used appropriately and wisely
community collaboration is modeled for staff
opportunities for staff to develop collaborative skills are provided

Standard V. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner [italics added].

Knowledge—the administrator has knowledge and understanding of:

- the purpose of education and the role of leadership in modern society
- various ethical frameworks and perspective on ethics
- the values of the diverse school community
- professional codes of ethics
- the philosophy and history of education

Dispositions—the administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:

- the ideal of the common good
- the principles in the Bill of Rights
- the right of every student to a free, quality education
- bringing ethical principles to the decision-making process
- subordinating one’s own interest to the good of the school community
- accepting the consequences for upholding one’s principles and actions
- using the influence of one’s office constructively and productively in the service of all students and their families
- development of a caring school community

Performances—the administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:

- examines personal and professional code of ethics
- demonstrates a personal and professional code of ethics
- demonstrates values, beliefs, and attitudes that inspire others to higher levels of performance
- serves as a role model
- accepts responsibility for school operations
- considers the impact of one’s administrative practices on others
- uses the influence of the office to enhance the educational program rather than for personal gain
- treats people fairly, equitably, and with dignity and respect
Standard VI. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. (italics added).

Knowledge—the administrator has knowledge and understanding of:

- principles of representative governance that undergird the system of American schools
- the role of public education in developing and renewing a democratic society and an economically productive nation
- the law as related to education and schooling
- the political, social, cultural, and economic systems and processes that impact schools
- models and strategies of change and conflict resolution as applied to the larger political, social, cultural, and economic contexts of schooling
- global issues and forces affecting teaching and learning
- the dynamics of policy development and advocacy under our democratic political system
- the importance of diversity and equity in a democratic society

Dispositions—the administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:

- education as a key to opportunity and social mobility
- recognizing a variety of ideas, values, and cultures
- importance of a continuing dialogue with other decision makers affecting education
- actively participating in the political and policy-making context in the service of education
- using legal systems to protect student rights and improve student opportunities
Performances—the administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:

- the environment in which schools operate is influenced on behalf of students and their families
- communication occurs among the school community concerning trends, issues, and potential changes in the environment in which schools operate
- there is ongoing dialogue with representatives of diverse community groups
- the school community works within the framework of policies, laws, and regulations enacted by local, state, and federal authorities
- public policy is shaped to provide quality education for students
- lines of communication are developed with decision makers outside the school community
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MASS REGIONS
Source: Montana Department of Public Health and Human Services (http://virtual.state.mt.us:9999/prev_index.htm)
APPENDIX C

MONTANA SUPERINTENDENT PILOT COVER LETTER
Dear <Name>,

The reported shortage of quality principal candidates at the national and state levels is presenting entire learning communities with a new challenge. In this era of accountability, increasing expectations can be confronted with the recruitment and selection of quality principals at all levels. To help meet this new challenge, I am asking for your participation in a field test of the enclosed Montana Principal Recruitment and Selection Survey that will be mailed to Montana school superintendents in April 2003.

The enclosed survey is designed to assess Montana principal recruitment and selection strategies used by practicing superintendents. Superintendents have a critical role in the hiring of school principals and your responses will provide important information about existing principal recruitment and selection policies and practices. **Completion of the survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes of your time.** In addition to completing the survey, I would ask that you make note of any of the following problems if encountered in completing this pilot survey.

**Problems with respect to the directions for the completion of survey questions.**

**Problems with respect to any of the questions and responses associated with a question.**

**Problems associated with the drafted cover letter that will accompany the final survey.**

Please feel free to make edit notations on the enclosed survey. Your completion of the survey and responses to any problems encountered while completing the survey will be used to construct the final survey to be mailed out to your peers. Additionally, you will be assisting with the identification and development of strategies that impact the recruitment and selection of quality school principals in Montana.

In completion of the survey, please read the instructions carefully, since the format for response differs for each section. The survey number will be used only to exclude your name from follow-up mailings. All responses will remain anonymous. **Please return your completed survey in the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope by March 26, 2003 (or as soon as possible).**

I thank you in advance for your time and cooperation in responding to the recruitment and selection survey and its return.

Sincerely,

Daniel T. Farr
APPENDIX D

MONTANA SUPERINTENDENT PRINCIPAL RECRUITMENT
AND SELECTION SURVEY COVER LETTER
Montana Principal Recruitment and Selection Survey

Dear <<Name>>,

The reported shortage of quality principal candidates at the national and state levels is presenting entire learning communities with a new challenge, the recruitment and selection of quality principals at all levels. To better understand this new challenge, you have been selected to participate in a statewide study of recruitment and selection strategies utilized by Montana school superintendents in the selection of a new school principal. I am conducting this study as part of my Doctoral dissertation in Education Leadership at Montana State University-Bozeman and with the support of the State Action for Education Leadership Project. This survey is endorsed by the Montana School Boards Association (MTSBA) and School Administrators of Montana (SAM), and your participation in this study is encouraged.

The enclosed survey is designed to assess Montana principal recruitment and selection strategies used by practicing superintendents. Superintendents have a critical role in the hiring of school principals and your responses will provide important information about existing principal recruitment and selection policies and practices. Survey results will be used by MTSBA and SAM to improve practices for the recruitment and selection of principals in our state. Completion of the survey will take approximately 15 minutes of your time. Information obtained from this research project will assist with the identification and development of strategies targeting the recruitment and selection of quality school principals in Montana.

In completion of the survey, please read the instructions carefully, since the format for response differs for each section. The survey has an assigned identification number for coding of responses and for mailing purposes. This number will also be used to exclude your name from follow-up mailings. Your responses will remain anonymous and neither you nor your school will be identified in this study. Please return your completed survey in the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope by April 30, 2003 to:

Daniel T. Farr
1012 4th Ave SE
Sidney, Montana 59270

If you would like additional information before completing this survey, please email me at dfarr@sidneyps.com or call me at (406) 433-2330. I will gladly answer any questions that you may have.

A summary of results will be mailed to all participants early this fall. I realize that the survey is coming during a very busy time of year and I thank you in advance for your time and cooperation in responding to the recruitment and selection survey and its return.

Sincerely,

Daniel T. Farr
Principal of Sidney High School
Doctoral Candidate
APPENDIX E

MONTANA PRINCIPAL RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION: A SURVEY OF MONTANA SUPERINTENDENTS
Montana Principal Recruitment and Selection:  
A Survey of Montana Superintendents  
Please complete the following survey and return in the postage paid envelope by April 30, 2003.

The purpose of this study is to learn more about recruitment and selection practices used in Montana schools. Information obtained will be used to develop model strategies for the recruitment and selection of principal candidates.

### Part I: Demographic Information - Please check (√) one item for each of the following questions

1. Gender?  
   - Male  
   - Female  

2. What is your race?  
   - Caucasian  
   - Hispanic  
   - African American  
   - American Indian/Alaska Native  
   - Asian/Pacific-Islander  

3. What is your age?  
   - Under 30  
   - 30-39  
   - 40-49  
   - 50-59  
   - 60+  

4. How many years do you have in public education?  
   - 0-10  
   - 11-20  
   - 21-30  
   - 31+  

5. How many years do you have as a school superintendent?  
   - 0-5  
   - 6-10  
   - 11-15  
   - 16-20  
   - 21+  

6. How many years do you have as superintendent of your current district?  
   - 0-5  
   - 6-10  
   - 11-15  
   - 16+  

7. Years since last principal hiring in the district?  
   - 1-2  
   - 3-4  
   - 5-6  
   - 6+  
   - don’t know

8. Years until your next principal hiring?  
   - In process  
   - 1-2  
   - 3-4  
   - 5-6  
   - 6+  
   - don’t know

### Part II: Recruitment and Selection Questions - the following items pertain to recruitment and selection practices and procedures used in your school district. For each item, please check (√) the practice(s) or procedure(s) that best describes recruitment and selection in the district.

Recruitment refers to processes used to attract a pool of highly qualified candidates for actual or anticipated vacancies. Selection refers to those processes used to identify the most qualified from among those individuals having made application for a vacancy in the school district.

1. Does your district have developed procedures and policies for the recruitment of school principals?  
   - Yes  
   - Somewhat  
   - No

2. Does your district have practices and procedures for recruiting candidates from outside your own district?  
   - Yes  
   - Somewhat  
   - No

3. Has your district organized and implemented an internal, “grow your own” program for school principals?  
   - Yes  
   - Somewhat  
   - No
4. Does your district have a developed recruiting plan that takes into account projected changes in your principal staffing needs and labor pools over the next five years?

☐ Yes  ☐ Somewhat  ☐ No

5. Does your district have recruiting literature that accurately represents the school district, its mission and vision, work conditions, expectations, and other important information about the school community?

☐ Yes  ☐ Somewhat  ☐ No

6. Do existing recruitment practices include strategies that try to reach qualified minority and female candidates for the principalship?

☐ Yes  ☐ Somewhat  ☐ No

Part II: Recruitment and Selection Questions - Continued

7. In seeking to develop a principal candidate pool, what sources/methods does your district use to attract quality candidates? **First, please check (✓) ALL methods that apply. Second, from those methods checked, please underline the ONE method that has proven most successful in attracting candidates.**

☐ In district job postings  ☐ Grow Your Own Programs (Development of Internal Candidate Pool)
☐ Local newspapers  ☐ Educational Institutions (universities, colleges)
☐ State-newspapers/media  ☐ Professional Organizations (MTSBA, SAM, NASSP)
☐ Internet –Web Posting Sites  ☐ Professional Search Firms
☐ State Employment Agencies  ☐ Peer Referrals (word-of-mouth)
☐ Other_________________________________ _________________________________________

8. In the process of screening potential principal candidates, what selection methods does your district use to obtain information? **Please rank only those methods used by your district in order of their importance with 1 being the most important.**

**Selection Method**

☐ Reviewing résumés
☐ Conducting personal interviews
☐ Evaluating college transcripts
☐ Checking district application
☐ Consulting listed references
☐ Examining performance appraisals
☐ Reviewing assessment center results
9. In the selection of a principal candidate, who would be involved in the final selection committee? (Please check all that apply.)

**Selection Committee Members**

- Superintendent □
- Other Board Members □
- Former Principal □
- Parents □
- Other: __________________________________________

**Used (✓)**

- Chairperson of the Board
- Classroom Teacher (s)
- Classified Staff Member (s)
- Students

10. Does the district provide training that will help selection committee members evaluate job applicants?

☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, what type of training is offered? __________________________
Part III: Selection Assessment – The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) has identified six standards for public school leaders ( Principals, Superintendents, and Supervisors). Each of the six standards is presented together with examples of the knowledge, disposition, and performance indicators associated with each standard. Knowledge indicators present the kinds of theories, trends, principles, models, and concepts that serve as part of a foundation for what the school leader should know and understand; Disposition indicators present statements of what the school leader should value or believe in; and, Performance indicators describe what the school leader actually does.

Directions: Using the scale below and based on your perceptions of your district’s selection strategies, please rate how completely your district’s present selection methods assess the knowledge, dispositions and performances, for each potential principal candidate.

**SELECTION ASSESSMENT SCALE**

| Fully assess candidate in this area | 4 |
| Somewhat assess candidate in this area | 3 |
| Little assessment of candidate in this area | 2 |
| No assessment of candidate in this area | 1 |

**Standard I:** The school administrator facilitates the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

**Knowledge Elements - The school administrator has knowledge and understanding of:**
- the principles of developing and implementing a strategic plan or comprehensive school improvement plan including effective consensus-building and negotiation skills; information sources, data collection, and data analysis strategies; and developing learning goals in a pluralistic society

| Selection Assessment Level Circle One |
| Fully | 4 |
| 3 |
| 2 |
| 1 |

**Disposition Elements - The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:**
- the inclusion of all members of the school community; ensuring that students have the knowledge, skills and values needed to become successful adults; doing the work required for high levels of personal and organization performance; continuous school improvement; and a belief that all students can learn

| Selection Assessment Level Circle One |
| Fully | 4 |
| 3 |
| 2 |
| 1 |
Performance Elements - *The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:*  
- The vision and mission of the school are effectively communicated to staff, parents, students, and community members; an implementation plan is developed in which objectives and strategies to achieve the vision and goals are clearly articulated; assessment data related to student learning are used to develop the school vision and goals; the vision, mission, and implementation plans are regularly monitored, evaluated, and revised.

**Directions:** Based on your perceptions of your district’s selection strategies, please rate how completely your district’s present selection methods assess the knowledge, dispositions and performances, for each potential principal candidate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELECTION ASSESSMENT SCALE</th>
<th>Circle One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully assess candidate in this area</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat assess candidate in this area</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little assessment of candidate in this area</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No assessment of candidate in this area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard II: *The school administrator advocates, nurtures, and sustains a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional development.*

Knowledge Elements - *The school administrator has knowledge and understanding of:*  
- Student growth and development and the application of applied learning theories; principles of effective instruction and related measurement, evaluation, and assessment strategies; curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and refinement; adult learning and professional development models; the role of technology in promoting student learning and professional growth; and the importance of a school’s culture.

Disposition Elements - *The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:*  
- Student learning as the fundamental purpose of schooling and the proposition that all students can learn; lifelong learning for self and others; professional development as an integral part of school improvement; a safe and supportive learning environment; the benefits that diversity brings to the school community; and, preparing students to be contributing members of society.
Performance Elements - The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:
- individuals are treated with fairness, dignity and respect; barriers to student learning are identified, clarified, and addressed; curriculum decisions are based on research, expertise of teachers, and the recommendation of learned societies; a variety of supervisory and evaluation models are employed; pupil personnel programs are developed to meet the needs of students and their families; and, the school is organized and aligned for success.

Directions: Based on your perceptions of your district’s selection strategies, please rate how completely your district’s present selection methods assess the knowledge, dispositions and performances, for each potential principal candidate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELECTION ASSESSMENT SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully assess candidate in this area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat assess candidate in this area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little assessment of candidate in this area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No assessment of candidate in this area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard III: The school administrator ensures management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Knowledge Elements - The school administrator has knowledge and understanding of:
- theories and models of organizations and the principles of organizational development; principles and issues relating to school safety and security; human resources management and development; and issues related to financial operations of school management, school facilities and use, and legal matters impacting school operations.

Disposition Elements - The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:
- making management decisions to enhance learning and teaching; taking risks to improve schools through high-quality standards, expectations, and performances; and, involving stakeholders in management processes.
Performance Elements - *The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:*

- Knowledge of learning, teaching, and student development is used to inform management decisions; operational plans and procedures to achieve the vision and goals of the school are in place; effective problem-solving and communication skills are used; fiscal resources of the school are managed responsibly, efficiently, and effectively; and, the school seeks opportunities that support continuous school improvement.

**Directions:** Based on your perceptions of your district’s selection strategies, please rate how completely your district’s present selection methods assess the knowledge, dispositions, and performances, for each potential principal candidate.

**SELECTION ASSESSMENT SCALE**

| Fully assess candidate in this area | 4 |
| Somewhat assess candidate in this area | 3 |
| Little assessment of candidate in this area | 2 |
| No assessment of candidate in this area | 1 |

**Standard IV:** The school administrator collaborates with families and community members, responds to diverse community interests, and needs, and mobilizes community resources.

**Knowledge Elements - The school administrator has knowledge and understanding of:**

- Emerging issues and trends that potentially impact the school community; community relations and marketing strategies and processes; the conditions and dynamics of the diverse school community; and, successful models of school, family, business, community, government, and higher education partnerships.

**Disposition Elements - The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:**

- Schools operating as an integral part of the larger community; collaboration and communication with families; involvement of families and other stakeholders in school decision-making processes; and, resources of the family and community needing to be brought to bear on the education of students.
Performance Elements - *The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:*
- high visibility, active involvement, and communication with the larger community is a priority; information about family and community concerns, expectations, and needs is used regularly; there is outreach to different business, religious, political, and service agencies and organizations; public resources and funds are used appropriately and wisely; and, partnerships are established with area businesses, institutions of higher education, and community groups to strengthen programs and support school goals.

Directions: Based on your perceptions of your district’s selection strategies, please rate how completely your district’s present selection methods assess the knowledge, dispositions and performances, for each potential principal candidate.

**SELECTION ASSESSMENT SCALE**

- Fully assess candidate in this area
- Somewhat assess candidate in this area
- Little assessment of candidate in this area
- No assessment of candidate in this area

---

Standard V: *The school administrator acts with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manner.*

Knowledge Elements - *The school administrator has knowledge and understanding of:*
- the purpose of education and the role of leadership in modern society; various ethical frameworks and perspectives on ethics; the values of the diverse school community; professional code of ethics; and, the philosophy and history of education

Disposition Elements - *The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:*
- the right of every student to a free, quality education; bringing ethical principles to the decision-making process; accepting the consequences for upholding one’s principles and actions; using the influence of one’s office constructively and productively in the service of students and their families; and, development of a caring school community.
Performance Elements - *The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:*

- demonstrates values, beliefs, and attitudes that inspire others to higher levels of performance; treats people fairly, equitably, and with dignity and respect; protects the rights and confidentiality of students and staff; demonstrates appreciation for and sensitivity to the diversity in the school community; and applies laws and procedures fairly, wisely, and considerately

**Directions:** Based on your perceptions of your district's selection strategies, please rate how completely your district's present selection methods assess the knowledge, dispositions and performances, for each potential principal candidate.

**SELECTION ASSESSMENT SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fully assess candidate in this area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Somewhat assess candidate in this area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Little assessment of candidate in this area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No assessment of candidate in this area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Standard VI.* The school administrator understands, responds to, and influences the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

**Knowledge Elements - The school administrator has knowledge and understanding of:**

- the role of public education in developing and maintaining a democratic society and an economically productive nation; the political, social, cultural, and economic systems and processes that impact schools; global issues and forces affecting teaching and learning; the dynamics of policy development and advocacy under our democratic political system; and, the law as related to education and schooling

**Disposition Elements - The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:**

- education as a key to opportunity and social mobility for students; recognizing a variety of ideas, values, and cultures and the importance of communicating with other decision makers affecting education; actively participating in the political and policy-making context in the service of education; and, using legal systems to protect student rights and improve student opportunities
Performance Elements - The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:

- communication occurs among the school community concerning trends, issues, and potential changes in the environment in which schools operate; there is ongoing communication with representatives from various community groups; the school community works within the framework of policies, laws, and regulations enacted by local, state, and federal authorities; public policy is shaped to provide quality education for students; and, lines of communication are developed with decision makers outside the school community.

Thank you for your time and assistance in completing this survey!!

Please return completed survey in the postage paid, self-addressed envelope to:

Daniel T. Farr, 1012 4th Ave SE, Sidney, MT 59270