

# The Condition of School Administration in Arizona: 2005

Arnold Danzig

*Arizona State University Tempe Campus*

Walter Delecki

*Northern Arizona University*

David Quinn

*University of Arizona*

Reviewer: Gary Martin

*Northern Arizona University*

---

## ***Background***

The brief on School Administration in the 2004 *Report* reminded readers that the Latin word for principal means “first teacher.” This definition was used to suggest a new emphasis on the importance of teaching and learning in the field of school administration. In this year’s brief, it is suggested that school administration is also to be understood in terms of leadership. The root word of *leadership* is *leith*, which means “to go forth” or “to cross the threshold.”<sup>1</sup> In 2005, school administrators find themselves between a rock and a hard place. They are held accountable for the collective labeling of their schools and student populations on the one hand, and subject to individual sanctions including loss of job, on the other hand. These new realities imply changes in the role of school administrators and the crossing of a threshold into uncharted territories. At the same time, there is growing recognition that the significance of school administration to student learning is second only to the quality of teaching.<sup>2</sup>

Most indicators suggest that the state of public education in Arizona is dismal. The state has consistently scored below the national average on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) mathematics, reading, science, and writing tests. The

results are even more troubling if student scores are separated by ethnicity. The average scores for Anglo students in Arizona are also consistently lower than the national average for Anglo students on the same tests. Although some states appear to be raising achievement levels overall and reducing the gap between majority and minority students, Arizona suffers the dual problem of overall decrease in achievement and a widening gap between Anglo and African American students.<sup>3</sup> On the state-administered assessment, the Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS), which serves as a high school exit exam for 10<sup>th</sup> grade students starting with the class of 2006, only 36 percent of all students passed the math portion and 59 percent passed the reading portion on their first attempt. The state also has one of the highest dropout rates nationally, with an average high school dropout rate of about 12 percent over the previous five years.<sup>4</sup>

These conditions present daunting challenges for school administrators. In 2001, the National Association of Secondary School Principals predicted that more than 40 percent of public school principals would retire within the next decade.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, increasing job stress, dissatisfaction with school funding, and increased responsibility without adequate incentives have exacerbated an exodus of school administrators from the ranks of an experienced workforce.

This brief begins with consideration of recent policy developments in Arizona, with reference to school administration based on the No Child Left Behind Act and Arizona LEARNS (ARS 15-241). The brief discusses some of the ways these new measures are being implemented and consequences for district and site-based administrators based on Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). There is also a discussion of proposed changes related to administrative certification and of recent policy developments related to proposed legislation on school district unification. The “Findings” section provides data from which to view the condition of school administration in Arizona. This section provides data specific to school administration (employee counts), the number of currently certified individuals at the three different levels of certification (supervisor, principal, and superintendent), data related to ethnicity, and gender, salary data, and administrator testing data. This section is followed by a discussion of the policy implications and recommendations.

## *Recent Policy Developments*

Current policy topics in Arizona school administration encompass licensure and certification, state intervention, school district unification, and opportunities for leadership professional development. Data concerning supply of and demand for school administrators are presented in the “Findings” section, which examines the availability of administrative positions in Arizona.

### **Licensure and Certification**

Since the 2004 Report, there have been no changes in the certification requirements for school administrators. Title VII of the Arizona Administrative Code, Section R7-2-614, lists three different administrative certificates: *supervisor certificate*, *principal certificate*, and *superintendent certificate*. All three certificates require a minimum of three years of teaching experience, a practicum in educational administration at the appropriate level, and a specified number of credit hours or courses related to school administration, which varies by certificate.<sup>6</sup>

At this writing, a sub-committee of the Arizona Board of Education is meeting to examine certification requirements for school administrators in the state. While no new recommendations have been released, there is a discussion at the state level to provide for a waiver of teaching experience for superintendent certification. The rationale is that superintendents of large districts are frequently not the instructional leaders of that district and therefore teaching experience should not be required. The recommendation of the Sub-Committee on Administrative Certification called for the following change. “A process should be developed by which school districts that cannot find a qualified and acceptable certified candidate for superintendent may apply to the Arizona Department of Education for a waiver to allow them to hire a non-certified superintendent, and to have that person continue as long as his or her performance is deemed acceptable to the governing board.”<sup>7</sup>

## State Intervention

The consequences for administrators in underperforming and failing schools include increased scrutiny from the Arizona Department of Education (ADE), public announcements to the community served by the school or district, site visits by a state-sponsored *Solutions Team*, participation in voluntary and mandated professional development activities, and possible replacement. Arizona Revised Statutes (ARS) 15-241 requires that an achievement profile be prepared for every Arizona school and used to classify each school as excelling, highly performing, underperforming, or failing to meet academic standards. At this writing, ADE<sup>8</sup> lists 112 schools as “underperforming” and lists 11 schools as “failing to meet academic standards.” Each of these designations triggers certain events affecting the schools and administrators in those schools.<sup>9</sup>

According to ADE,<sup>10</sup> if a school is designated *Underperforming*, the following shall occur:

- Within 30 days of receiving notice of the designation, the governing board of non-charter schools shall notify each resident in the attendance area of the school's designation. Charter schools shall likewise notify parents of the students attending the school. The notice shall explain the improvement plan process and provide information regarding the public meeting at which the improvement plan will be presented.
- Within 90 days of receiving notice of the designation, the governing board shall develop an Arizona School Improvement Plan (ASIP), submit a copy of it to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and supervise its implementation.
- Schools identified as *Underperforming* in 2003 may wish to update their existing ASIP, but do not submit the revisions to the ADE.
- The governing board of non-charter schools shall hold a public meeting in each school designated *Underperforming* and shall present the respective ASIP that has been developed for each school within 30 days of submitting that plan to the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

- For charter schools, the charter holder shall submit the ASIP to the Superintendent of Public Instruction and present it to the charter sponsor at a public meeting within 90 days of receiving the designation.
- The Superintendent of Public Instruction, based on need, shall assign a Solutions Team to the *Underperforming* school.

The school district is required to submit a detailed school improvement plan, which then must be approved by the state Superintendent of Public Instruction and ADE. A three-day visit by an ADE-trained Solutions Team is part of this process.

ADE's Accountability Division, Intervention Section, has recently announced two opportunities for administrators to work with schools failing to meet the academic standards as outlined in Arizona LEARNS: the *Turnaround Principal* and the *Mentor Principal*. According to the Service Contracts on the ADE<sup>11</sup> website:

A Mentor Principal will be assigned to a School Failing to Meet the Academic Standards. He/she will mentor/supervise the current principal. His mission will be to 1) help the principal gain the knowledge and skills necessary to transform a school from a Failing to Meet Academic Standards school to a Performing school; and to 2) help develop an infrastructure in order to ensure sustainability at a Performing level.

Specifically, the Mentor Principal will be authorized to teach and assist the principal in making decisions regarding operations, budget, personnel, instruction, assessment, and professional development at the assigned school site in accordance with employee contract, governing board policy, state statute, and federal guidelines.

ADE pays \$500 per day for consultation by the Mentor Principal.

A Turnaround Principal will be assigned to a School Failing to Meet the Academic Standards. He/she will replace the current principal and become the educational leader of the school. His mission will be to 1) transform the school from a Failing to Meet Academic Standards school to a Performing school; and to 2) develop an infrastructure in order to ensure sustainability at a Performing level.

Specifically, the Turnaround Principal will be authorized to make decisions regarding operations, budget, personnel, instruction, assessment, and professional development at the assigned school site in accordance with employee contract, governing board policy, state statute, and federal guidelines.

The contract from ADE pays the difference between the school district contract and \$70,000. ADE pays an additional \$20,000 for the first contract year, \$25,000 for the second contract year, and \$30,000 for the third contract year. The types of schools labeled as “failing” and the evidence for these procedures as benefiting children and raising achievement are discussed in the previous section on State Intervention.

## **School District Unification**

A.R.S. 15-458 and 15-459 set out the conditions for elections to approve the unification and consolidation of school districts. Unification refers to a new unified school district formed from common elementary school district or districts, and a high school district. School districts that unify receive an extra 10 percent of their budget the first year, 7 percent the second year, and 4 percent the third year.

Senate Bill 1068 was introduced in the 2005 Legislative session. The bill would create a 13-member school district redistricting commission, with four members appointed by president of the senate, four by the speaker of the house of representatives, and four by the governor with the superintendent of public instruction or designee serving as the 13<sup>th</sup> member. According to SB 1068, the commission “shall review all current common school districts that are not part of a unified school district and consider combining these common school districts into a new unified district or combining common school districts with a union high school district to create unified districts... The commission shall design and submit to the governor on or before December 31, 2006, a proposed school district unification plan.”<sup>12</sup> Voters in all the districts must approve a proposed unification plan. “If any of the affected districts fail to approve the proposed unification plan, the plan is void. The commission may revise the original unification plan and resubmit the plan to the qualified electors of each affect district.”<sup>13</sup>

At this time, however, it is unclear how much local support there is for unification. According to *The Arizona Republic*,<sup>14</sup> there is sentiment that elementary school districts do not come to the bargaining table as equal partners with the high school district involved, which deters support for unification. The history of district consolidation efforts in Arizona suggests that voters have not been inclined to give up local school districts, and for the most part, defeated such efforts, despite the additional revenues that go along with consolidation. Whether there will be a different outcome for unification remains to be decided. *The Arizona Republic* reports that Phoenix Union high school district is holding meetings with 13 feeder elementary districts to discuss unification.<sup>15</sup> Proponents argue that district unification will result in more efficient operations and reduced costs. A recent editorial supports this view with the headline, “Unifying school districts will mean better education for kids.”<sup>16</sup> School district unification is discussed in greater detail in the implications section of this brief.

## **Leadership Development Opportunities**

Noted educational administration scholar Kent Peterson argues that training and professional development serve a critical role during these turbulent times in which school administrators are facing increasing job demands and increased accountability.<sup>17</sup> In response, a number of professional development initiatives for school administrators have emerged in Arizona during the past few years. These enterprises include: 1) AZLEADS<sup>3</sup>: Arizona Leaders in Education for the Advancement and Development of Student and School Success, 2) Arizona State University’s Learner Centered Leadership Program, and 3) The Southern Arizona Educational Leadership Consortium (SAELC).

The AZLEADS<sup>3</sup> project emerged in 2004, after three years of planning by a cadre of organizations and individuals interested in furthering the cause of school leadership in Arizona. ADE assumed leadership of the project and spearheaded a successful grant application from the Wallace Foundation’s State Action for Education Leadership Project (SAELP II). This grant will provide \$3,600,000 over three years to enhance educational leadership in the state. The initial focus of AZLEADS<sup>3</sup> has been to identify a diverse group of seven demonstration school districts to pilot the professional development opportunities.

In October 2002, the Division of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Arizona State University, in collaboration with the Southwest Center for Educational Equity and Language Diversity and four urban school districts (Alhambra, Creighton, Roosevelt, and Phoenix Union), was awarded a \$1.8 million federal grant under the U.S. Department of Education- sponsored School Leadership Grant Program. The School Leadership Grant Program assists high-need local educational agencies in developing, enhancing, or expanding programs to recruit, train, and mentor principals, including assistant principals. Program participants are now in the third year of a three-year training and mentoring program titled, “Learner Centered Leadership for Language and Diverse Schools in High Needs Urban Settings.” The grant draws from both University knowledge and theory and the applied expertise of the four participating school districts by 1) recruiting and training new candidates for school leadership positions, 2) enhancing expertise of beginning principals and assistant principals based on new knowledge and new understandings of the commitments required of educational leaders, and 3) encouraging the retention of expert school principals through participation in mentoring and coaching activities. Approximately 100 aspiring, rising, and experienced school administrators participate in the Learner Centered Leadership program.<sup>18</sup>

The Southern Arizona Educational Leadership Consortium (SAELC) was made possible through a U. S. Department of Education grant. With the support of the Arizona K-12 Center, this grant provides assistance to five southern Arizona school districts to develop and train 45 new and aspiring school administrators to take over leadership positions in their home districts as a large number of practicing administrators retire.

## *Findings*

Recent policy developments suggest new demands are being placed on school administrators with increased pressure for accountability. This section of the brief examines data related to the availability of administrative positions, administrative salaries, and administrative costs.

## Administrative Positions in Arizona

Table 1 reports Full Time Equivalent Employee Count for Arizona school administrators. According to the ADE School District Employee Report (SDER) (Fiscal Year 2003-04),<sup>19</sup> there were 2,987 administrative positions as listed below. This number represents 95 more administrative employees than last year’s SDER statistics, an increase of approximately three percent. Most of the increase comes from additional school principals, where there are 81 more principals this year than last year, the likely result of new schools opening in Arizona.

Table 1: FTE and Employee Count by Main and Second Position

Position Number	Position Name	Position 1 Employees	Position 2 Employees	Total Positions
100	Superintendent	188	2	190
101	Administrative Assistant	18	7	25
102	Assistant Superintendent	116	0	116
103	Principal	1,258	12	1,270
104	Assistant Principal	714	9	723
105	Curriculum Coordinator	89	2	91
106	Personnel Director	21	1	22
107	Supervisor	99	2	101
108	Head Teacher	50	8	58
109	Other	325	18	343
110	Vocational Ed. Admin	28	4	32
111	Business Manager	14	2	16

Source: Arizona Department of Education, *School District Employee Report, 2003-2004* Phoenix, AZ: Author.

The Arizona Department of Education also collects self-report data on ethnicity of the approximately 2,620 individuals holding administrative certificates and currently working in administrative positions. Of this number, 324 are identified as Hispanics, 102 as African American, 2,000 as Anglo, 57 American Indian/Alaska Native, and 12 as Asian/Pacific Islander, 5 listed as Other, and 120 listed as Unknown.

## State Testing of Administrators

Table 2 looks at the results of administrator testing in Arizona, which began in 2000. Since 2000, when the state licensing exam began, 3,603 exams have been administered, resulting in 3,267 passing scores and 336 failures (approximately 10 percent). The failure rate went up in 2002, after the initial phase-in of the exams. No routinely reported information compares in-state and out-of-state applicants, or compares test results for applicants who have gone through approved certification programs with those from applicants who apply directly to the ADE.

Table 2: Administrator Certification Tests Results, 2000 to 2004

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Total
<b>Superintendent Pass</b>	119	115	46	44	108	432
<b>Superintendent Fail</b>	0	3	5	3	3	14
<b>Principal Pass</b>	675	613	347	411	642	2688
<b>Principal Fail</b>	0	12	77	99	105	293
<b>Supervisor Pass</b>	30	33	26	21	37	147
<b>Supervisor Fail</b>	0	1	1	3	4	9

Data are based on tests administered through February 2005.<sup>20</sup>

The increase in the failure rate of principals beginning in 2002 bears closer examination, since it is widely acknowledged that the cut-off scores used to determine Pass/Fail results are subjectively and arbitrarily determined.

## Salary Ranges for School Administrators

Table 3 looks at the salary range of school administrators based on data collected by the Arizona School Boards Association. Table 3 compares the median salaries of superintendent, elementary and secondary assistant principals and principals, separated by district size.

Table 3: Median Salary for School Administrators, 2004–2005

District Size	Superintendent	Elementary Principal	Elementary AP	Middle School Principal	Middle School AP	High School Principal	High School AP
<b>Under 500</b> n=41	65,000	50,078	N/A	55,500	N/A	57,000	34,023
<b>500-5,000</b> n=68	87,562	64,000	56,161	62,448	54,145	67,785	57,814
<b>5,001-10,000</b> n=19	105,082	77,847	58,880	77,375	62,614	79,380	68,093
<b>10,001-20,000</b> n=9	115,000	82,577	68,053	81,749	68,512	88,913	79,410
<b>Above 20,000</b> n=7	149,100	84,217	62,987	83,116	75,233	88,205	77,159

Source: provided by the Arizona School Boards Association, *Salary Survey 2004-2005*.

Note: 'n' means number of districts

Not surprisingly, larger school districts pay higher salaries than smaller districts. Administrator salaries are likely a function of not only district size, but also geographic location and type of district (unified, elementary, or high school district). There is also likely to be some relationship between salary and the experience level of the individual holding the administrative position. The data indicate, however, that in most cases, larger

districts pay school administrators more than smaller districts. Implications for this salary data are explored in the Policy Implications section.

## District Spending on Administration

The final table in this section looks at Arizona school district spending and the percentage of dollars spent on administration and other functional areas. There is a common misconception that administrative costs dominate education spending, and that spending is rising. Table 4 however, challenges these misconceptions.

Table 4: Comparison of Arizona District Spending to National and Peer Group Averages, by Functional Area

Functional Area	U.S. 2001	10-State Peer Group 2001	Arizona 2001	Arizona 2004
<b>Classroom Dollars</b>	61.5%	61.5%	57.5%	58.6%
<b>Plant Operation and Maintenance</b>	9.7%	9.5%	12.5%	11.7%
<b>Administration</b>	10.9%	10.7%	10.5%	9.5%
<b>Student Support Services</b>	5.0%	4.4%	6.4%	7.0%
<b>Instruction Staff Support</b>	4.6%	4.2%	4.2%	4.3%
<b>Food Service</b>	4.0%	5.4%	4.8%	4.7%
<b>Transportation</b>	4.1%	4.1%	3.6%	4.0%
<b>Other Non-Instructional</b>	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%

Source: State of Arizona, Office of the Auditor General. (2005, February). *Dollars Spent in the Classroom*. Phoenix, AZ: Author.<sup>21</sup>

Table 4 indicates that the relative percentage of administrative costs has declined since 2001, from 10.5 percent to 9.5 percent, which is below national and state peer-group averages. School districts spend 58.6 percent of dollars in the classroom, which is the same as reported in Fiscal Year 2003. While the percentage of monies spent on Classroom Dollars is still below the national average, this is largely attributed to higher

costs associated with plant operation (above the national and peer group average) and student support services.

## *Policy Implications*

This section considers issues related to licensure and certification with reference to the underlying issues related to administrator supply and demand. There is also discussion of the implications of the pending legislation for school district unification.

### **Administrator Licensure and Certification**

The data presented in Table 2 show that the passing rate for principals changed significantly in 2002, which suggests that the passing score was changed. With no evidence reported by Arizona Department of Education (ADE) to explain this higher failure rate, and with the low failure rates at the supervisor and superintendent levels (5.76 percent and 3.13 percent respectively), the need for the administrator testing program is questionable. The cost to educators in terms of time and money (\$250-\$300/applicant) is considerable for what seems to be a small and arbitrary outcome.

### **Supply and Demand of School Administrators in Arizona**

According to leading expert Kent Peterson, nationwide, “Over the next five years, districts are expected to replace more than 60 percent of all principals.”<sup>22</sup> According to Peterson, the implication of this turnover is that a new cohort of principals will lead their schools over the next 15 to 20 years. Therefore, he argues, it is crucial to provide high-quality preparation programs for these principals and carefully designed professional development programs throughout the careers of these leaders.<sup>23</sup>

The question of interest to policy makers in Arizona is whether an administrator shortage looms on the horizon. ADE reports that 7,304 valid administrative certificates have been issued at one of three levels (supervisor, principal, and superintendent) in the state. Some individuals hold multiple certificates; others have retired or moved out-of-state. During 2004 and the first two months of 2005, approximately 787 administrator exams were successfully completed, likely resulting in newly certified candidates. As

Table 2 reports, a total of 2,987 administrative positions are currently filled statewide. The number of certified administrators does not indicate an administrator shortage. Some school district administrators, however, report difficulties finding qualified applicants to fill positions. These districts report shallow applicant pools, with a small number of desirable applicants getting multiple offers. Administrator shortages may selectively occur in a few of the rural areas around the state. There may be additional shortages in areas where highly skilled school administrators are needed to serve urban education communities, which serve higher percentages of students and families in poverty, or students and families with limited English proficiency.

One trend, which may be indicative of an administrator shortage, comes from evidence that retired or retiring school administrators are returning to work for 80 to 90 percent of current salaries, as *leased employees*. Leasing retired school administrators is possible because of permissive legislation related to the state Retirement System. Leasing employees at a reduced salary saves school districts' additional costs, because there is no district contribution to health care or retirement benefits.

On one hand, hiring new school administrators is a cause of anxiety, which requires additional effort to socialize new employees; on the other hand, however, new people bring new ideas, new energies, and new capacities for learning into an organization. At the very least, the decision to replace retiring administrators with leased administrators slows the entry of new people into the field. This outcome has implications not only for school districts, but also for the development of administrator training programs in the state. Therefore, while there are understandable financial incentives for school districts to hire leased employees, the cost to districts in loss of new energy, new ideas, and potential for innovation outweighs the benefits.<sup>24</sup>

In addition, leased employees present potential implications for the Arizona State Retirement System. A greater number of people are taking retirement earlier than anticipated, thereby putting additional pressures on the retirement system. For fiscal year 2005, the employee/employer contribution is being raised to between eight percent and 10 percent for the first time. These developments suggest long-term negative

consequences to school districts and to the Arizona State Retirement System, for hiring retiring school administrators back as leased employees

Arizona would appear to benefit from a comprehensive study to identify whether an administrator shortage is looming, where it might be located, and some of the challenges in matching administrators to the urban and rural populations served. An administrator supply-and-demand study could also help ADE estimate and prioritize the professional development needs of new and experienced school administrators, and fund exemplary approaches.

## **District Unification**

District unification has been a consideration at the state level for at least the past 30 years. Conversations about district unification would appear to be less about spending and more about curriculum alignment, communication among various levels of schooling, difficulties for children in various transition points, and the potential impact on student learning. Some neighboring elementary, middle, and high schools are more successful at communicating important information and relevant student experiences than others; district unification does not guarantee that these important conversations will take place. In addition, the history of district consolidation and unification voting in the state does not indicate a great deal of local or community support for these plans.

While some believe that district unification means lower administrative costs and higher quality education, there is little evidence to support these claims. Table 3 indicates that larger districts generally pay administrators more at all levels than do smaller districts. Table 4 indicates that administrative spending in Arizona is below the national average already, and throughout the past three years, has gone down from 10.5 percent to 9.5 percent.

In the case of Phoenix, for example, it may be that 100,000-plus students now served by the 13 elementary school districts that feed into Phoenix Union High School District could be better served by a new configuration. Unification might mean one new school district, multiple school districts with a single high school and multiple feeder elementary and middle schools, or something else entirely. However, the greatest

savings may be found from unifying or consolidating rural districts composed of one school with a small number of students. Yet, cost efficiency is not the sole criterion by which the benefits of district unification, or any other reform, can be measured. Quality educational experiences for children and service to families, schools, and communities offer equally important standards to consider.

## ***Recommendations***

It is recommended that:

1. Absent evidence of its validity, Arizona abolish its administrator-testing program. The question that policy makers face is how to balance the benefits of the administrator-testing program with the costs. This brief argues that the decisions used to set and then raise the passing score of the principal licensure exam are based on subjective criteria and political considerations. The passing rate for the principal exam changed significantly between 2001 and 2002, from 98 percent in 2001, to 76 percent in 2002. No equivalent change is noted for the superintendent pass rate; in 2004-2005, less than 3 percent failed. Considering the time, energy, and costs to individual applicants, the limited impact on the applicant pools, and the arbitrary determination of passing scores, it is argued that the costs of the program outweigh benefits realized.
2. The Arizona Department of Education (ADE) commission a study to provide data to ADE and to administrator training programs in Arizona that can be used to estimate a potential administrator shortage. Up-to-date data and projections concerning supply and demand of school administrators are needed in order to insure that exemplary programs and resources are available to meet the demand for high-quality administrators. Without data, it is likely that entry and exit patterns will result in shortage areas, and the adoption of short-term solutions, which do not serve the long-terms needs of schools and districts.

3. Researchers undertake an inquiry to estimate the effects of leasing retired educators to fill teacher and administrative vacancies beginning with the initial collection of data reporting the number of districts, administrators, and teachers involved, the salary savings to school districts, and the fiscal impact on the Arizona State Retirement System. This trend may be an example of a short-term solution to a supply issue, which may damage schools and districts in the long term.
4. Appropriate entities study the potential impact of district unification on the Phoenix metro area. The study of district unification needs to consider impacts on local communities' commitment to and investment in local schools as well as the curricular and instructional issues that affect children's lives as they transition from one level of the education system to the next.

## Notes and References

- <sup>1</sup>Scharmer, O. (in press). Excerpt from forthcoming book. *Theory U: Leading profound innovation and change by presencing emerging futures*. Retrieved on February 15, 2005, from <http://www.ottoscharmer.com/TheoryU.pdf>
- <sup>2</sup>Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). How leadership influences student learning. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement.
- Hightower, A. (2002). *San Diego's big boom: District bureaucracy supports culture of learning* (R-02-2). Seattle: University of Washington, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy. Retrieved on December 3, 2004, from <http://depts.washington.edu/ctpmail/PDFs/SanDiego-AH-01-2002.pdf>
- Snipes, J., Doolittle, F., & Herlihy, C. (2002, September). *Foundations for success: Case studies of how urban school systems improve student achievement*. Oakland, CA: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation. Available online at: <http://www.mdrc.org/publications/47/full.pdf>
- Spillane, J. & Seashore Louis, K. (2002). School improvement processes and practices: Professional learning for building instructional capacity. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21<sup>st</sup> century* (pp. 83-104). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- <sup>3</sup> Education Trust. (2004, October). *Achievement in America*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved on November 28, 2004, from <http://www2.edtrust.org/NR/rdonlyres/14FB5D33-31EF-4A9C-B55F-33184998BDD8/0/masterach2003.ppt>
- <sup>4</sup> Arizona Department of Education. (2002). *Analysis of the Arizona Measure of Academic Progress, 2000-2001*. Phoenix, AZ: Author. Retrieved June 23, 2003, from <http://www.ade.az.gov/researchpolicy/academicprog/MAPsummarypiece.pdf>
- <sup>5</sup> National Association of Secondary School Principals. (2000). *The principal, keystone of a high achieving school: Attracting and keeping the leaders we need*. Retrieved June 14, 2002, from [www.nassp.org](http://www.nassp.org).
- <sup>6</sup> Arizona Department of Education. (2005). Administrator Certificates. Phoenix, AZ: Author. Retrieved on April 27, 2005, from <http://www.ade.az.gov/certification/requirements/admin/>
- <sup>7</sup> Arizona Department of Education. (2004, April). Memorandum. Final Consolidated Recommendations of the Sub-Committee on Administrative Certification, Revised April 29, 2004.
- <sup>8</sup> Arizona Department of Education. (2005). AZ Learns Achievement Profiles 2003-2004. Phoenix: Author. Retrieved February 18, 2005, from <http://www.ade.az.gov/profile/publicview/AZLEARNSSchoolList.asp?Year=2005>
- <sup>9</sup> Arizona Department of Education. (2003). Consequences for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and Arizona LEARNS. Phoenix: Author. Retrieved February 19, 2005, from <http://www.ade.az.gov/azlearns/PuttingPieces/10ConsequencesAYP.doc>
- <sup>10</sup> Arizona Department of Education. (2004). *Achievement profiles*. Retrieved November 30, 2004, from <http://www.ade.az.gov/profile/publicview/AZLEARNSSchoolList.asp?Year=2005>
- Arizona Department of Education. (2004). *2004-2005 Arizona school improvement plan: Instructional Manual* (p. 2). Retrieved February 25, 2005, from <http://www.ade.az.gov/schooleffectiveness/schoolimprovement/asip/ASIPManual04-05.pdf>
- <sup>11</sup> Arizona Department of Education. (2005). Mentor Principal Contract. Retrieved February 19, 2005, from <http://www.ade.az.gov/intervention/principal.asp>

- Arizona Department of Education. (2005). Turnaround Principal Contract. Retrieved February 19, 2005, from <http://www.ade.az.gov/intervention/principal.asp>
- <sup>12</sup> School District Redistricting, Arizona SB1068, 47<sup>th</sup> Leg. (2005) (Sec. 1. A-F). Retrieved April 20, 2005, from <http://www.azleg.state.az.us/FormatDocument.asp?inDoc=/legtext/47leg/1r/bills/sb1068p%2Ehtm&DocType=B>
- <sup>13</sup> School District Redistricting, Arizona SB1068, 47<sup>th</sup> Leg. (2005) (Sec. 2. D). Retrieved April 20, 2005, from <http://www.azleg.state.az.us/FormatDocument.asp?inDoc=/legtext/47leg/1r/bills/sb1068p%2Ehtm&DocType=B>
- <sup>14</sup> Melendez, M. (2005, February 27). K-12 unification proposed: Phoenix Union set to explore merger, feeder districts feel snubbed. *The Arizona Republic*, pp. B1, B5.
- <sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>16</sup> Viewpoints - Our stand: Unifying school districts will mean better education for kids. (2005, February 27). *The Arizona Republic*, pp. V1, V2.
- <sup>17</sup> Peterson, K. (2002). The professional development of principals: Innovations and opportunities. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 213-232.
- <sup>18</sup> For more information on the methods and outcomes of the Learner Centered Leadership project, see:  
Danzig, A., Kiltz, G., Osanloo, A., Szecsy, E., Wiley, T., Boyle, C., et al. (2004). Creating an environment for learner centered leadership in schools: First-year rationales, experiences, and findings from the Learner Centered Leadership Grant Project. In C. Carr & C. Fulmer (Eds.), *Educational Leadership: Knowing the Way, Going the Way, Showing the Way 2004 NCEA Yearbook* (pp. 318-330). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Education.  
Kiltz, G., Danzig, A., & Szecsy, E. (2004, August). Learner centered leadership: An emerging mentoring model for the professional development of school administrators. *Mentoring & Tutoring* 12(2), 135-153.
- For online summary and resources concerning the Learner Centered Leadership project, visit the LCL website at <http://www.asu.edu/educ/lcl/>
- <sup>19</sup> Arizona Department of Education. (2005). *School District Employee Report, 2003-2004*. Retrieved March 1, 2005, from <http://www.ade.az.gov/sder/publicreports.asp>
- <sup>20</sup> Majerus, R. (Personal communication, March 4, 2005). R. Majerus is staff analyst with the Arizona Department of Education.
- <sup>21</sup> Davenport, D.K. (2005, February). *Arizona's public school districts' dollars spent in the classroom fiscal year 2004*. Phoenix, AZ: State of Arizona, Office of the Auditor General. Available online at [http://www.auditorgen.state.az.us/Reports/School\\_Districts/Statewide/2005\\_February/2005\\_Classroom\\_Dollars\\_Spent\\_in\\_the\\_Classroom\\_Prop301.htm](http://www.auditorgen.state.az.us/Reports/School_Districts/Statewide/2005_February/2005_Classroom_Dollars_Spent_in_the_Classroom_Prop301.htm)
- <sup>22</sup> Peterson, K. (2002). The professional development of principals: Innovations and opportunities. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 213-232.
- <sup>23</sup> Peterson, K. (2002). The professional development of principals: Innovations and opportunities. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 213-232.
- <sup>24</sup> Vickers, G. (1995). *The art of judgment*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.