Georgia State University
ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

Educational Policy Studies Dissertations | Department of Educational Policy Studies

5-5-2008

Leadership Preparation through the Internship at Four Universities in the State of Georgia

Jami Royal Berry

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/eps_diss

Recommended Citation
Berry, Jami Royal, "Leadership Preparation through the Internship at Four Universities in the State of Georgia" (2008). *Educational Policy Studies Dissertations*. Paper 17.

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Educational Policy Studies at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Educational Policy Studies Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

ACCEPTANCE

This dissertation, LEADERSHIP PREPARATION THROUGH THE INTERNSHIP AT FOUR UNIVERSITIES IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA, by JAMI ROYAL BERRY, was prepared under the direction of the candidate's Dissertation Advisory Committee. It is accepted by the committee members in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy in the College of Education, Georgia State University.

The Dissertation Advisory Committee and the student's Department Chair, as representatives of the faculty, certify that this dissertation has met all standards of excellence and scholarship as determined by the faculty. The Dean of the College of Education concurs.

_____
Donna A. Breault, Ph.D.
Committee Chair

_____
Randall F. Dobbs, Ed.D.
Committee Member

_____
Sheryl A. Gowen, Ph.D.
Committee Member

_____
Laura McNeal, Ph.D.
Committee Member

_____
Hayward Richardson, Ed.D.
Committee Member

_____
Date

_____
Sheryl A. Gowen, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Educational Policy Studies

_____
Ronald P. Colarusso, Ed.D.
Dean, College of Education

AUTHOR'S STATEMENT

By presenting this dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the advanced degree from Georgia State University, I agree that the library of Georgia State University shall make it available for inspection and circulation in accordance with its regulations governing materials of this type. I agree that permission to quote, to copy from, or to publish this dissertation may be granted by the professor under whose direction it was written, by the College of Education's director of graduate studies and research, or by me. Such quoting, copying or publishing must be solely for scholarly purposes and will not involve potential financial gain. It is understood that any copying from or publication of this dissertation which involves potential financial gain will not be allowed without my written permission.

_____

Jami Royal Berry

NOTICE TO BORROWERS

All dissertations deposited in the Georgia State University library must be in accordance with the stipulations prescribed by the author in the preceding statement. The author of this dissertation is:

Jami Royal Berry
8281 Wood Street
Covington, Georgia 30014

The director of this dissertation is:

Dr. Donna A. Breault
Department of Educational Policy Studies
College of Education
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia 30303-3083

VITA

Jami R. Berry

ADDRESS: 8281 Wood Street
Covington, Georgia 30014

EDUCATION:

Ph.D.	2007	Georgia State University Educational Policy Studies
Ed.S.	2001	Georgia State University Educational Leadership
M.Ed.	1998	Georgia State University Educational Leadership
B.Ed.	1992	Morehead State University Music Education

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

1999 – Present	Instructor Georgia State University
1995 - 2000	Teacher/Administrator Henry County Board of Education
1994 – 1995	Teacher Clayton County Board of Education

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES AND ORGANIZATIONS:

2007 - Present	National Association for Developmental Education
2006 – Present	University Council for Educational Administration

PRESENTATIONS AND PUBLICATIONS:

Royal Berry, J. (2007, November). *A study of leadership preparation through the internship.* Paper presented at the meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Washington, D.C.

LEADERSHIP PREPARATION THROUGH THE INTERNSHIP
AT FOUR UNIVERSITIES IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA
by
Jami Royal Berry

This study examines educational leadership internship experiences at four public University System of Georgia universities. It is a qualitative multiple case study. The research presented contributes to the literature by providing information about leadership training through internship programs that was collected via interviews with program faculty and documentary analysis. Presentation of the data in this manner offers a comprehensive description of internship experiences at four universities within the state of Georgia. This description helps explain the linkages between classroom knowledge and its application as it relates to the internship experience.

This study also utilizes cross-case analysis. Following the comprehensive presentation of each individual case, the four cases are considered together, and analyzed for similarities and differences. The purpose for analyzing the data in this manner is to provide both an in-depth analysis of each program and an understanding of the similarities and differences in internship experiences throughout the state of Georgia.

The research presented in this inquiry contributes to the literature by providing information about internship programs through interviews with program faculty and data collected from the programs. The findings of this study could be of interest to university personnel as they examine and modify their criteria for designing internship experiences. Additionally, this investigation contributes to the literature by providing a comprehensive

description of internship experiences at four universities. Through this study, the voices of the university personnel and information from the data collected provide insight into the overall experience of the educational leadership internship. Finally, this study provides insight into the correlation between classroom knowledge and the application of this knowledge within the field through internships.

LEADERSHIP PREPARATION THROUGH THE INTERNSHIP AT FOUR UNIVERSITIES IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA

by
Jami Royal Berry

A Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the
Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in
Educational Policy Studies
in
the Department of Educational Policy Studies
in
the College of Education
Georgia State University

Atlanta, Georgia
2007

Copyright by
Jami Royal Berry
2007

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

An old African proverb begins, “It takes a village…” This rings true when highlighting the power of community to impact the lives of young people and when considering the myriad of people it takes for a student to successfully complete a doctoral program. This dissertation never could have been completed without the help of my very own village – the people who held my hand, patted my back, and when necessary, kicked my tail – to help me finish this work and obtain my degree. To each of you I say thank you for being a part of my village and for helping to shape my life….

Dr. V. Darleen Opfer who originally encouraged me to pursue this degree; Dr. Douglas Davis who served as my initial advisor and helped with the framing of this study; Dr. Donna Breault who gave freely of her time and talent in serving as my dissertation chair. Dr. Randall Dobbs who afforded me a gift which all educators should be given – the opportunity to work and learn at the side of a master teacher; Dr. Ronda Tighe, Dr. Sheryl Gowen and Mary Anne Gaunt who offered support and words of encouragement when they were most needed; Dr. Laura McNeal and Dr. Hayward Richardson who provided instrumental input; Sherry Kirby, Jeff Stockwell and Tenia Wright who know everything there is to know about how to get things done in the Department of Educational Policy Studies and who were always willing to help when asked; Dr. Joe and Eugenia Murphy who gave so freely of their talents so that my editing load would be lighter; Dr. E. Paul “Beep” Bicknell III, who served as the peer de-briefer for this study; the faculty at my four research sites for giving of their time and expertise; and finally the students in the Educational Leadership Program at Georgia State University who have allowed me to work with them throughout their internship processes and who, in turn, will impact the villages of many children for many years to come.

This dissertation is lovingly dedicated in memory of Dad, William Royal, and in honor of Mom, JoAnne Royal, who long ago shared their belief that I might be “college material” and for whom college was a mighty dream. To my daughters, Dory Ruth and Mia Anne, my reasons for wanting to leave the world in general and the field of education in particular, a better place for all children; and most of all to my husband, Frank, “who walks with me always” to whom this accomplishment belongs as much as it does to me. Without you, I could have never completed this degree. Thank you so very much for being by my side, every step of the way.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

List of Tables v

Chapter

1 A STUDY OF LEADERSHIP PREPARATION 1
Introduction.....1
The Problem.....2
Purpose of the Study 6
Research Design.....9
Limitations and Delimitations.....11
Summary 12

2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 14
Introduction.....14
The History of Educational Leadership 14
Leadership Preparation 17
The Internship 20
Criticisms of Leadership Preparation Programs and Calls for Reform 23
Standards Guiding Leadership Preparation 26
Summary 28

3 RESEARCH DESIGN 29
Introduction.....29
Research Questions.....30
Method 30
Participants.....33
Data Collection 38
Interview Guides.....38
Data Analysis 39
Document Analysis.....40
Limitations 42
Researcher Bias.....42
Summary 43

4 THE RESULTS- ALPHA UNIVERSITY.....45
Introduction.....45
Alpha University.....46

Alpha University Interview Information 47
Alpha University Document Analysis 52

5 THE RESULTS – BETA UNIVERSITY 56
Beta University 56
Beta University Interview Information 57
Beta University Document Analysis 62

6 THE RESULTS – GAMMA UNIVERSITY 70
Gamma University 70
Gamma University Interview Information 70
Gamma University Document Analysis 75

7 THE RESULTS – DELTA UNIVERSITY 82
Delta University 82
Delta University Interview Information 82
Delta University Document Analysis 86

8 SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES OF THE PROGRAMS STUDIED 95
Introduction 95
Standards and Program Design 97
Classroom Knowledge and Field Application 98
On-the Job Training 100
Performance Data Collected on Students 102
Differences of the Programs Studied 103
Alpha University Lessons Learned 105
Beta University Lessons Learned 108
Gamma University Lessons Learned 111
Delta University Lessons Learned 114
Summary 116

9 DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 118
Review of the Findings 118
Connection to the Literature 119
Recommendations 123
Conclusion 124

References 128

Appendixes 137

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1 Archival Document Information – Alpha University 51

2 Archival Document Information – Beta University.....62

3 Archival Document Information – Gamma University 75

4 Archival Document Information – Delta University 86

5 Table of Institutions and Evidence of Performance.....96

CHAPTER 1

LEADERSHIP PREPARATION THROUGH THE INTERNSHIP

Introduction

This study examines educational leadership internship experiences at four University System of Georgia universities. The study is a qualitative multiple case study, and the research presented contributes to the literature by building on current knowledge of leadership preparation through the internship. Information analyzed for the study was collected via interviews with program faculty and document analysis. Data analyzed for the study offers a comprehensive description of internship experiences at four universities within the state of Georgia. This description lends understanding to the linkages between classroom knowledge and opportunities to practice and apply this knowledge in internship experiences.

Educators are expected to be knowledgeable of their profession, maintain high academic standards, teach all types of learners using a variety of strategies, and ensure each student achieves academic progress. School leaders are also expected to demonstrate these qualities while serving as role models for students, staffs, parents, and community members. Public schools are entrusted by society with the challenge to educate all children. It is the teacher's obligation to properly educate students, and the leader's charge to see that this obligation is fulfilled.

Today, a school's success, and similarly the success of its teachers and leaders, is often judged by student performance on mandated standardized tests. Thus, educators feel a heavy burden of trying to meet the individual needs of students by providing effective teaching and learning processes and maintaining a safe and orderly learning environment.

In response to this need, colleges and universities are under pressure to prepare increased numbers of knowledgeable candidates to become school leaders. It has been reported that vacancies in leadership positions will continue to rise (Bowles, 1990; Hess, 1998; National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1998; Tingley, 1996). This increase is a result of retirement, high turnover, a shrinking applicant pool, and a predicted increase of 10 to 20 percent in the number of new positions over the next decade (Newton, 2001). New standards and accreditation processes in higher education, similar to increasing standards in K-12, have brought added challenges to the university programs that prepare educational leaders. Many programs are struggling to meet the more stringent guidelines. Programs are under increased pressure to prepare school administrators with the knowledge, skills, and disposition to lead schools to improved student achievement.

The Problem

Over the last several years, mounting national attention has focused on educational leadership including mandates by the U.S. Department of Education, and studies funded by the Annenberg Foundation, the Broad Foundation, the Fordham Foundation, and the Wallace Foundation (Young, Petersen & Short, 2002). Most of these studies have outlined shortcomings of programs that prepare educational leaders, and

while criticism of these programs is not new, it has become increasingly negative (Young, 2001).

Recently, it has become increasingly difficult to fill school leadership vacancies because the pool of qualified candidates is growing smaller while the number of positions is increasing (McAdams, 1998; Newton, 2001; Young, Petersen, & Short, 2002). Trends show that over the course of the next decade, more than one-third of those currently serving as principals will reach retirement age (Doud & Keller, 1998). Adding to the shortage is the fact that classroom teachers are increasingly disinclined to pursue leadership positions due in part to the narrowed gap between teacher and administrator salaries and the increased complexity of school leadership positions (Bredeson, 1998; McCarthy, 2002). Colleges and universities are under considerable scrutiny to ensure that they are attracting the best possible students and that those they enlist go into the field of educational leadership with outstanding preparation.

Since 1980, the federal government has sought to mandate positive change in the realm of education through programs associated with the “new accountability” movement, and as a part of this movement, the role of school leaders has been under increased scrutiny. Beginning as a response to A Nation at Risk (1983), and continuing through America 2000 (1991), Goals 2000 (1994), and the current accountability program, No Child Left Behind (2002), the accountability movement’s hallmark is an element that “rewards the nation’s most effective schools and generates increased scrutiny of the least effective ones” (Ladd, 1996). Most of the resulting bureaucratic demands on school leaders have taken the familiar form of procedures and regulations, but they have also involved setting outcome triggers which permit principals to be

removed or where schools or districts are taken over by the state (Doyle, Cooper, & Trachtman, 1991).

In addition to the federal government's attempts to strengthen education through the accountability movement, universities have also been under increased pressure due to criticisms involving leadership preparation. These criticisms include reports from the Anneberg Institute, the Fordham Institute, the Broad Foundation, and the Wallace Foundation. Each of these reports is summarized below in order to provide a clearer understanding of the key criticisms of current preparation practices.

The Anneberg Institute for School Reform was funded by a $50 million grant in 1994 through the Annenberg Challenge. The Institute is currently focusing on four key program areas including, educational leadership. According to the Institute's website, "some school leaders are born, but most grow into the role, given the combination of responsibility, trust, training, experience and support required by these difficult jobs" (Annenberg Institute for School Reform, 1994). One of the stated goals of the Challenge is to broaden and deepen leadership inside schools, among both principals and teachers. It also seeks to broaden the pipeline of those moving into leadership ranks via alternative programs for leadership training.

In Better Leaders for America's Schools: A Manifesto (2003), the issue of leaders and potential leaders for America's schools is outlined. The report, published jointly by the Fordham Institute and The Broad Foundation, contends that American public education faces a "crisis in leadership" that cannot be alleviated from traditional sources of school principals and superintendents. Its signers do not believe this crisis can be fixed by conventional strategies for preparing, certifying and employing education leaders.

Instead, they urge that first-rate leaders be sought outside the education field, earn salaries on par with their peers in other professions, and gain new authority over school staffing, operations and budgets.

The Wallace Foundation created a series of six reports developed at the Center on Reinventing Public Education (2003). The reports, funded under a grant from the foundation's school leadership initiative, looked at elements ranging from the principal shortage to standards governing preparation to changing the pipeline that supplies schools with leaders. According to the foundation's work, the processes and standards by which many principal preparation programs traditionally screen, select, and graduate candidates are often ill defined, irregularly applied, and lacking in rigor. As a result, many aspiring administrators are too easily admitted into and passed through the system on the basis of their performance on academic coursework rather than on an assessment of their acquisition of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to successfully lead schools (National Policy Board for Educational Administration [NPBEA], 2001). The findings of the foundation assert that even though aspiring administrators are certified, they may not be equipped for the shifting role of the principal from manager to effective instructional leader.

While the methods and motives of critics are questioned, there is agreement from scholars in the field of educational leadership that positive change must occur. However, according to those scholars, several elements needed to support change are missing. First, little has been written with regard to complex analyses of program strategies (Young, 2001). Secondly, there has been no systemic examination of the impact of national standards on preparation programs (Murphy & Forsyth, 1999). Finally, according to

Young (2001), little systemic analysis of how effective university preparation programs are in preparing school leaders has been offered.

This study contributes to the available literature by providing insight into processes used in university programs that prepare school leaders. Specifically, school-based internship experiences at four programs are evaluated. Internships are the focus of this study for two reasons. First, much of the criticism surrounding leadership preparation centers upon the linkages between classroom knowledge and real-world application. School-based internships are typically the courses in which this linkage is most prevalent. Secondly, while authors such as Hess and Kelly (2005) have sought to present a comprehensive analysis of leadership preparation programs, previous analysis lacks an examination of internship or practicum courses, despite the fact that these courses exist almost universally as a part of preparation programs. Therefore, this study includes both interviews with program faculty and an examination of archival materials directly associated with the internship process in order to provide a comprehensive illustration of the overall internship experience.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to contribute to an area of limited scrutiny in existing research about leadership preparation programs. Forty years ago, the call began for research on school leadership: “It would appear that research on the school administrator represents an immature field” (Erickson, 1967, p. 430). Since that time, numerous scholars have called attention to the shortage of work within the field (Immegart, 1990; Ogawa, Goldring, & Conley, 2000; Pounder, 2000).

In 2004, a comprehensive presentation of the existing literature on administrative preparation was published (Murphy & Vriesenga, 2004). The findings of this study established, among other things, that "there is not an overabundance of scholarship in the area of administrator preparation" (p. 28). Murphy asserted, "at least when we focus on the leading journals in school leadership, it is clear that descriptions and analyses of preparation programs do not occupy much space in these outlets" (p. 28). In summarizing the writings from scholarly journals from 1975 to 2000, his analysis showed only eight percent of the work centered upon leadership preparation.

Other scholars in the field have echoed the finding that there is a lack of scholarly literature surrounding leadership preparation. As quoted in Lashway (2003) in reference to the research on leadership preparation programs, Wildman (2001) asserted, "the inescapable conclusion is…that there isn't much research." His findings outlined a few studies evaluating different dimensions of leadership programs, but include nothing that would permit any conclusions about their overall effectiveness. Leaders of major educational leadership organizations including UCEA (University Council for Educational Administration), NCPEA (National Council of Professors of Educational Administration), and NPBEA have all asserted that not only is the scholarly literature on leadership preparation lacking, but funding for research endeavors in this area has grown more barren over the last ten years (Murphy, 2004).

According to Michelle Young, UCEA's Executive Director, there is an urgent need to develop a base of knowledge around the preparation of school and school system leaders (2001). UCEA is a consortium of research/doctoral granting institutions committed to advancing the preparation of educational leaders for the benefit of schools

and children. Among other activities, UCEA promotes and sponsors research on the essential issues of schools and leadership practice; impacts the areas of leadership preparation and professional development; and positively influences educational policy (UCEA, 2002).

Within the scope of what has been written about leadership programs, much work has centered upon what is lacking in these programs, despite the fact that very little has actually been written about them (The Broad Foundation, 2003; Hess, 2003; Kottkamp, 2002; Levine, 2005). In particular, little has been offered in the way of stakeholders' perceptions of program content as it relates to practice. In Murphy's analysis of literature in the field of leadership preparation from 1975-2002, he found that only seven articles, or 5.2 percent of all scholarly writings, centered upon clinical experiences in leadership training (2004). Of these articles, most provided one-time cross-sectional snapshots into internship content. Only two studies provided a longitudinal analysis of internship program content from multiple viewpoints (Bratlein, 1993; Corderio & Sloan, 1996).

An additional area of criticism of preparation programs is the gap between classroom knowledge and the application of this knowledge within the field (Cambron-McCabe, 1999). One way universities seek to address this gap is to provide internship experiences that give students relevant opportunities to apply knowledge (Creighton, 2001; Fusarelli & Smith, 1999; Tucker & Grogan, 2001; Williamson & Hudson, 2001; Wilmore 2002). This study provides insight into how the connections between program knowledge and practice are developed through the internship experience while adding to the scholarly literature on the linkages between classroom knowledge and professional application. Through this study, the following research questions are answered:

1. To what degree do adopted standards impact the design of internship processes within programs?
2. How do the programs seek to provide linkages between classroom knowledge and the application of this knowledge within the field through internships?
3. How do internship experiences provide preparation for the on-the-job needs of future school leaders?
4. How do programs provide evidence of students' ability to perform through data collection on internship experiences?

Research Design

Four institutions within the state of Georgia were selected for this study on educational leadership preparation through the internship experience. The study is a qualitative multiple case study. A case study is an exhaustive examination of a single setting, subject, or event (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). A case is a program, event, activity, or individuals, and a case study is an exploration of a "bounded system" or a case over time through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information rich in context (Creswell, 1998). Case study is an appropriate methodology for this inquiry because in-depth investigation is necessary to understand the underpinnings of the internship experiences (Feagin, Orum, & Sjoberg, 1991).

Purposeful sampling was used in selecting the four institutions to enable the researcher to illustrate internship experiences at varied programs throughout the state. In purposeful sampling, the researcher selects research subjects from a population according to preset criteria (Hydi Educational New Media Centre, 2006). In this study, the criteria for selection included that the programs offered leadership training at the L-5 level and

that the programs were offered at Board of Regents institutions within the state of Georgia. L-5 certification programs service two groups of students – those who are completing master's degrees in educational leadership and those holding master's degrees in other fields. Completion of the master's degree entitles graduates to the Georgia Certificate (L-5) in Leadership. Individuals holding master's degrees in other fields may complete as nondegree students all requirements for the Fifth-Year Leadership (L-5) Certificate.

Purposeful sampling is appropriate for this study because the researcher desired to outline similarities and differences across types of organizations (Creswell, 1998). The goal of purposeful sampling is to attain a sample for qualitative inquiry from which the researcher can "learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research" (Patton, 1990). Four programs were selected because the researcher desired to provide a small enough sample to allow for a detailed analysis of each internship program, while providing enough data for comparison and analysis.

Data for this study was collected in three ways. First, in-depth, on-site interviews with faculty in the educational leadership program at each site were conducted. These interviews were designed to be semi-structured and open-ended (Johnson &Christensen, 2004; Maxwell, 1996), and were based upon the interview guide (Appendix A). Typically, interviews begun with the respondent being asked to describe and discuss standards under which the overall preparation program operated. The next area of focus was a detailed description of the internship experience. Capstone questions of each interview addressed how overlying standards were integrated into the practicum experience.

Data was then collected via examination of the practicum syllabi, and finally, other archival sources including: advising guides, descriptions of project and portfolio requirements, data collected for NCATE and Board of Regents reports, and sample projects and portfolios. The structure for analysis of these documents followed the methods used by Hess and Kelly (2005). While their study had some shortcomings with reference to data triangulation, their guiding questions were solidly based upon the theoretical underpinnings of leadership preparation. As this is the case, and in that their work is considered to be one of the most comprehensive analyses of course content currently available, this study utilized their guiding questions in analyzing both the course syllabi and other documents associated with the internship experience (Appendix B).

In approaching the study in the manner discussed above, answers to each of the four research questions are provided. Modeling the document analysis on Hess and Kelly's framework, together with information collected from the interviews lends clarity to the issue of how standards impact internships. Information collected from the interviews, sample projects, and portfolios offers ample data to show how programs provide linkages between classroom knowledge and application, and how internships provide preparation for the on-the-job needs of future school leaders. Finally, the information collected illustrates how programs provide evidence of students' ability to perform through the data collected on internship experiences.

Limitations and Delimitations

This research study is limited to the educational leadership internship experience at four universities within the state of Georgia and is based on data collected from those

programs. The programs studied are all at University System of Georgia institutions, and none is in an urban area. Moreover, only selected sources of data - including syllabi, advising guides, descriptions of project and portfolio requirements, data collected for NCATE, Board of Regents reports, sample projects and portfolios - were examined.

The delimitations of the study are tied to the outcomes. While the study does provide insight into internship programs at four universities, it does not provide data regarding student perceptions and experiences. Additionally, the success of students once they complete the programs was not studied. Interviewing current students, graduates holding leadership positions, and graduates who do not aspire to leadership roles on their perceptions of the internship programs would provide additional research opportunities. While information contained in this study was collected in order to provide insight into the internship experiences at four universities, it is not generalizable to all educational leadership programs.

Summary

A description of the problem studied was presented in this chapter. The research presented in this inquiry contributes to the literature by providing information about internship programs through interviews with program faculty and data collected from the programs. The findings of this study could be of interest to university personnel as they examine and modify their criteria for designing internship experiences. Additionally, this investigation contributes to the literature by providing a comprehensive description of internship experiences at four universities. Through this study, the voices of the university personnel and information from the data collected provide insight into the overall experience of the educational leadership internship. Finally, this study provides

insight into the correlation between classroom knowledge and the application of this knowledge within the field through internships.

Chapter 2 contains a review of the literature relevant to leadership programs. This review includes a brief history of educational leadership; literature on leadership preparation in general; the internship experience as it relates to the overall preparation of leaders; criticisms of preparation programs and calls for reform in leadership preparation; and an overview of the standards guiding leadership programs in the state of Georgia. Chapter 3 illustrates the methodology used for the study and provides a description of the study design and procedure. Chapters 4 through 7 present the findings of the study related to each individual case. Chapter 8 includes a discussion of the similarities and differences of the four programs studied as they relate to the questions guiding this inquiry. Chapter 9 presents the conclusions and recommendations of the researcher with regard to what is working and not working within the internship programs studied.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter contains a review of the literature relevant to the field of educational leadership and to leadership preparation programs. The purpose of the review is to provide a framework for this study on educational leadership internship experiences at four universities in the state of Georgia. It includes a brief history of educational leadership; an overview of leadership preparation in general; a discussion of the internship experience as it relates to the overall preparation of leaders; a presentation of the criticisms of preparation programs including calls for reform in leadership preparation, and an overview of the standards guiding leadership programs in the state of Georgia.

The History of Educational Leadership

The first college level courses of educational administration were taught beginning around 1880 (Cooper & Boyd, 1987). Between 1890 and 1910, they evolved from individual offerings to full-blown leadership programs in response to the expansion of public schools in America (Powell, 1976). In 1900, no university in the country offered a degree in educational leadership. By the end of World War II, 125 colleges and universities offered these programs (Murphy, 1998).

Leadership programs brought far more prestige to schools of education than teacher training programs. Rather than just preparing low status, primarily female teachers, they were now educating principals and superintendents, who coincidentally were males, in their colleges of education (Levine, 2005).

The superintendency, dating from the mid-1800s was established approximately thirty years prior to the principalship (Carter & Cunningham, 1997). By 1890, superintendents were found in all large cities, but it was not until the 1920s that the principalship became commonplace in schools throughout the nation. In the 1920s, the principalship was characterized by a values-based concern with pedagogy (Grogan & Andrews, 2002). In the 1930s, the role shifted from facilitating connections between schools and families toward the ideals of scientific management (Beck & Murphy, 1993). In the 1940s and 1950s, in reaction to the political climate created by World War II, the focus of leadership in schools again shifted, this time toward the importance of education in a democratic and strong society (Lucas, 2001). In response to the Soviet Union's launch of Sputnik in the late 1950s, schools of the late 1950s and early 1960s focused primarily upon math and science. As a result of this shift in focus, school principals drew on empirically developed strategies for management and instruction (Grogan & Andrews, 2002).

The growth of social problems as well as the civil rights movement caused principals and superintendents to shift their attention away from academic leadership and toward avoiding political controversy in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Likewise, the make-up of college classrooms for students of educational leadership changed dramatically. Under pressure from activists, professors and school administrators began

opening their doors to women and people of color. In contrast to earlier days when professors of education could simply send their latest protégés, usually white males, into school systems for high level positions, jobs had to be announced and advertised. Searches had to be open, and affirmative action was expected to guide hiring (Levine, 2005).

With the publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983, the era of educational reform began. The spotlight was cast on school leadership when the overwhelming sentiment was that the nation's schools, and likewise America's school leaders, were failing. This document called for districts and schools to refocus on academic achievement and the preparation of students for the workplace. Alternative educational administration programs were created, and those seeking leadership positions had options outside the nation's colleges and universities for leadership preparation.

In 1987, the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration issued *Leaders for America's Schools*. Among other findings, it asserted that fewer than half of the nation's graduate programs in educational administration were capable of meeting their standards of excellence.

The late 1980s and 1990s marked a dramatic change in conceptualization of the work of school principals (Grogan & Andrews, 2002). The principal was seen as both building manager and instructional leader of the school. Additionally, the focus of school systems in general became more site-based, away from district offices. Principals were expected to be agents of shared, collaborative forms of leadership rather than merely hierarchical building managers (Brunner, 2001).

Changes in the nature of principal preparation programs have been slow to follow change in the conceptual role of the principal (Grogan & Andrews, 2002). Despite the prominent changes in the ideologies guiding school leaders, leadership preparation programs have not changed dramatically over the last half-century. Typically, administrative preparation programs are similar in philosophy and content including courses such as *Introduction to Leadership, School Law, Personnel*, and the *Internship* (Tillman, 2001).

Leadership Preparation

Murphy (2002) asserts that there are four basic premises used in the conceptual design of educational leadership programs and that one or more of these four premises serve as the basic foundation for leadership preparation programs throughout the United States. The premises are processes; roles, functions, and tasks; knowledge, and methods.

In the process premise, the underlying ideal is that content is less important than development of metacognitive skills. According to Murphy, ideas such as administrative problem solving, decision making, and thinking or reflecting fall under this category. One example of how this strand is highlighted in preparation programs is the cohort system of delivery. Cohorts are used in structuring a large number of the nation's leadership preparation programs. As quoted by Jackson and Kelley (2002), according to a 1995 study by the Center for the Study of Preparation Programs, "half of the UCEA units used cohorts at the master's level and 80% used them at the doctoral level" (McCarthy, 1999, p. 128).

The use of cohorts has been credited with developing stronger social and interpersonal relationships, greater cohesiveness among students and faculty, and

stronger professional relationships (Jackson & Kelley, 2002). This is, in part, because the cohort model of instruction provides students with ample opportunities to network with colleagues as they work through course content together, allowing students to learn both from faculty members and fellow graduate students, who work through processes at the same time. This cohesive relationship in turn provides opportunities for in-depth problem solving and reflection that are not as apparent in other delivery models.

Other examples of this strand can be found in the work of authors such as Griffiths (1988) and Osterman and Kottkamp (1993). Griffiths has written extensively on issues including problem-based instruction. This method of delivery is increasingly seen as a vehicle with potential to bridge the gap between what typically goes on in classrooms the skills needed for successfully practicing school administrators. Osterman and Kottkamp (1993) have offered insight into how the process of reflection can inform practice. They have described reflection "as a means by which practitioners develop a greater level of self-awareness about the nature and impact of their performance" (p. 19). In addition to the work of these and other scholars, Murphy refers to the work of the assessment centers of both the NASSP and the NAESP as other examples of the process strand in action (2002).

Regarding Murphy's (2002) second premise, the idea of roles, functions, and tasks are considered (p. 67). He asserts that this conceptual premise is prevalent in the writings of authors including Cuban (1976), Deal and Peterson (1990), and Sergiovanni (1991), all of whom are considered to be influential in the realm of educational leadership theory and whose work is frequently assigned to graduate students in educational leadership programs. Cuban's (1976) writing, for example, has examined the roles of

women versus men throughout the history of education. Deal and Peterson (1990) have studied school culture and how it shapes the functionality of the school's environment, and Sergiovanni (1991) presents the phases of leadership and how each individual stage can impact a school's stakeholders. According to Murphy, the body of literature that centers upon specific jobs such as the principalship or the superintendency as well as the tasks associated with these jobs such as supervising employees and other personnel matters also fall under this strand.

The content or knowledge premise is the area in which the ideals of technical knowledge and practice-based knowledge come into play (Murphy, 2002). Murphy asserts that work in this area can be broken down into three areas – struggles over the viability of knowledge-based foundations, attempts to widen the traditional knowledge domains that define preparation programs, and analysis and initiatives aimed at improving preparation programs (p. 68). In designing leadership preparation programs, one area in which this strand comes into play is through the inclusion of field experiences or internships. Researchers looking at the knowledge premise suggest that field experiences provide core-learning experiences in programs that allow students to observe, participate in, and analyze problems (Jackson & Kelley, 2002). The majority of preparation programs currently utilize field experiences to apply what is learned in the classroom (Hallinger, Leithwood, & Murphy, 1993).

Murphy's final conceptual premise covers the area of methods and includes work in the areas of research strategies and designs, problem-based learning (PBL), and a renewed emphasis on case studies. PBL centers the learning experience on professional issues in a manner that allows them to bring a variety of resources including research,

data, and prior experiences to the clarification of the problem (Jackson & Kelley, 2002). Those who are advocates for this conceptual premise assert, “students learn teamwork, administrative and project development skills, and problem solving” (Hart and Pounder, 1999). In addition to those cited above, Murphy offers work in the area of qualitative methodology of scholars such as Lincoln and Guba (1985) as a noteworthy example of this strand.

The Internship

One challenge faced by any leadership preparation program is how to develop effective entry-level school administrators (Edmonson, 2002). The role of field-based experiences as an integral component of principal preparation programs has long been advocated within the educational administration profession (Hackman, Russell & Elliott, 1999). While a well-designed preparation program including a comprehensive curriculum is essential to this process, it is the internship that provides a wealth of opportunities to apply knowledge in a setting beyond the traditional classroom (Capasso & Daresh, 2001). An internship is not a typical content course, but rather a course in which content learned in other courses is applied. In most programs, the internship is the culminating experience in the certification program. Interns are able to apply their knowledge in practice, demonstrate their knowledge through action, and improve upon leadership competencies (Wylie & Michael, 1991). Through the internship, students have the opportunity to fuse classroom theory and practical application. When thoughtfully planned and conducted in stimulating settings, internships can link intellectual competence with outstanding performance (Milstein, Bobroff, & Restine, 1991). Because internship experiences are almost exclusively field-based, they can be extremely effective in providing students with

opportunities to fuse knowledge and application (Bass, 1990). In designing effective internships, a number of areas including the role of the internship in the overall preparation program, internship design, site placement, and activity selection must be considered in order to ensure the best possible experience.

Internships must be an integral component of leadership preparation programs (Hackman, Russell & Elliott, 1999). As such, they must be designed in a way that allows interns to see how site administrators manage and lead (Milstein et al., 1991). As the need for quality school administrators reaches critical levels (Jording, 2001), quality internships provide the much-needed skills to develop effective administrators. Unlike student teachers, who are typically able to be full practitioners in a classroom of students during their internship (Edmonson, 2002), administrative interns are typically full-time employees of the school in which they are completing their internship. In light of the nationwide shortage of certified individuals willing to assume principalships (Barker, 1997), it has been suggested that providing release time for teachers to complete internship activities or establishing paid internships may help alleviate the shortage.

In looking at the design of the internship experience, NPBEA recommends that it should last a minimum of one year in order to allow the intern to experience activities at all stages of the academic year (1989). While Gresso (1993) recommends one-semester placements, both sources agree that the most important component of the design is to ensure that the intern has the opportunity to develop comprehensive understanding of routines and daily tasks. Additionally, Senge (1990) states, “we learn best from experience but we never directly experience the consequences of many of our most

important decisions" (p.23). Extended internship experiences enable students to visit and revisit issues as they resurface throughout a period of time.

Field site selection in the area of leadership preparation has been discussed by a number of scholars, with many agreeing that the current model of placing students in their home schools is less-than-adequate (Cordeiro & Sloan, 1996; Daresh & Playko, 1992; Gresso, 1993; Milstein, 1993; NPBEA, 1989). Typically, students in leadership preparation programs are part-time students who are employed as full-time teachers. As a result of this situation, internship experiences are often designed around work schedules. Some difficulties associated with this model include that the quality, continuity, and flow of the internship experiences suffer. As a result of these difficulties, interns often struggle to gain a comprehensive understanding of the role of the principal.

In contrast to the current system, Cordeiro and Sloan (1996) suggest that the intern should be matched with a compatible mentor and placed in a school that provides appropriate growth-evoking activities. As opposed to placing interns in the most convenient placement, students should be allowed to observe administrators in an assortment of settings using a variety of skills (Milstein, 1993). Placement options should include various demographic and socio-economic settings as well as encompass all grade levels. Rather than simply relying on the intern's existing knowledge base, the placements should seek to strengthen the scope of experiences.

The final area of concern in designing internships centers upon the intern's activities. In order to maximize effectiveness, the activities should be authentic administrative experiences, offer a variety of opportunities to exercise skills, and increase in complexity as the internship progresses (Hackman, Russell & Elliott, 1999). Cordeiro

and Sloan (1996) suggest that mentors scaffold opportunities for interns so that the experiences increase in complexity as the intern gains skills. Shadowing mentors, together with observing meetings, and performing duties all provide valuable opportunities for growth. However, as the internship progresses, the time spent on active experiences should far outweigh that spent on passive observations (Milstein, 1990).

Criticisms of Leadership Preparation Programs and Calls for Reform

In looking at the scholarly literature regarding leadership preparation, it is evident that a great deal of attention has been paid to what is lacking in preparation programs. The release of Leaders for America's Schools by the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (UCEA, 1987) began what Jacobson (1990) refers to as the third wave of education reform: reforming administrator preparation programs (Fusarelli, 2001). As a part of this reform movement, the dissatisfaction with preparation programs has encompassed everything from the role and function of programs (Haller, Brent & McNamara, 1997; Levine, 2005); to the effectiveness of programs (Kempner, 1991; Wallace Foundation, 2003); to the skills being taught to aspiring leaders (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996; Daresh, 2002); to the appropriateness of universities in delivering instruction to aspiring leaders (Haller, Brent & McNamara, 1997; Broad Foundation, 2003).

Since the beginning of the reform movement, mandates by the U.S. Department of Education, studies funded by the Annenberg Foundation, the Broad Foundation, the Fordham Foundation, the Wallace Foundation, and reports by scholars such as Murphy (2002) and Levine (2005), have all been highly critical of the content and delivery models of leadership preparation programs (Young, Petersen & Short, 2002). While

criticism of preparation programs is not new, it has become increasingly negative (Young, 2001). Even principals across the nation have weighed in and agreed that leadership preparation programs are out of touch with what it takes to run today's schools (Farkas 2001).

Since 1980, the federal government has sought to mandate positive change in the realm of education through programs associated with the "new accountability" movement, and as a part of this movement, the role of school leaders has been under increased scrutiny. Beginning as a response to A Nation at Risk (1983), and continuing through America 2000 (1991), Goals 2000 (1994), and the current accountability program, No Child Left Behind (2002), the accountability movement's hallmark is an element that "rewards the nation's most effective schools and generates increased scrutiny of the least effective ones" (Ladd, 1996). Most of the resulting bureaucratic demands on school leaders have taken the familiar form of procedures and regulations, but they have also involved setting outcome triggers at which principals can be removed or where schools or districts are taken over by the state (Doyle, Cooper, & Trachtman, 1991).

In addition to the federal government's attempts to strengthen education through the accountability movement, school leaders have also been under increased examination due to criticisms involving leadership preparation. These criticisms include reports from the Anneberg Institute, the Fordham Institute, the Broad Foundation, and the Wallace Foundation. The Anneberg Institute for School Reform's focus centers upon four key program areas including educational leadership. One of the stated goals of the Institute is to broaden and deepen leadership inside schools, among both principals and teachers. It

also seeks to broaden the pipeline of those moving into leadership ranks via alternative programs for leadership training (1994).

In the joint report issued by the Fordham Institute and Broad Foundation, Better Leaders for America's Schools: A Manifesto (2003), the issue of leaders and potential leaders for America's schools is outlined. The report contends that American public education faces a "crisis in leadership" that cannot be alleviated from traditional sources of school principals and superintendents. Its signers urge that first-rate leaders be sought outside the education field, earn salaries on par with their peers in other professions, and gain new authority over school staffing, operations and budgets.

The Wallace Foundation's reports (2003) assert that the processes and standards by which many principal preparation programs traditionally screen, select, and graduate candidates are often ill defined, irregularly applied, and lacking in rigor. As a result, many aspiring administrators are too easily admitted into and passed through the system on the basis of their performance on academic coursework rather than on a comprehensive assessment of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to successfully lead schools (NPBEA, 2001). The findings of the foundation assert that even though aspiring administrators are certified, they may not be equipped for the shifting role of the principal from manager to effective instructional leader.

Murphy (2002) has characterized the current state of leadership preparation as "bankrupt" and argues that putting academic knowledge at the center of programs is self-defeating. Murphy contends that the current model of attempting to fuse knowledge with practice often builds a bridge to nowhere (2002). Daresh (2002) echoes Murphy's sentiments in saying that both practical experience and academic knowledge have

limitations and benefits. He argues that rather than attempting to fuse knowledge and practice, programs should help students develop the tools to integrate personal and profession knowledge in order to become more purposeful leaders.

In March 2005, a report to the Education Project by Arthur Levine was published in which several criticisms were leveled at university-based educational leadership programs. Among the criticisms, Levine asserted that the admission standards for school leaders are among the lowest in American graduate schools, and that programs pay insufficient attention to clinical education and mentorship by successful practitioners (p. 23). According to Levine, the findings of his report were very disappointing, and he called educational administration programs "the weakest of all the programs at the nation's education schools" (p. 12). Among his recommendations was that the current grab bag of course offerings give way to a more relevant and challenging curriculum designed to better prepare leaders (pp. 66). Levine asserts that preparation programs must equip graduates with the skills necessary to lead today's schools, and in order to do so, leadership programs must be redesigned.

Standards Guiding Leadership Preparation

As a partial answer to these criticisms, programs throughout the nation including those in the state of Georgia, have examined how they educate school leaders. Since the mid-1980s a number efforts aimed at defining the knowledge base and the standards under which leadership preparation programs operate have been undertaken (Jackson & Kelley, 2002). These include endeavors by the NPBEA, the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) (Donmoyer et al., 1995). In the mid-1990s, the UCEA

appointed scholars from throughout the country to define the knowledge base in educational administration (Jackson & Kelley, 2001). Soon after this project, the Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) was established resulting in the development of the ISLLC standards for the professional practice of school leaders. The purpose of the standards was to provide a clear and organized set of standards that could be used as the basis for the preparation, professional development, and licensure of both aspiring and existing leaders (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996). The ISLLC standards were crafted to shape the knowledge, performances and skills of prospective leaders in preparation programs and to influence the leadership skills of existing school leaders (Murphy, 2005).

While the goal of the developers was to provide a basis for the educational leadership profession through the ISLLC standards, in order to have an impact on preparation, the standards needed to be linked to the accreditation process. The Educational Leadership Constituency Council (ELCC) developed guidelines for accreditation that were scaffolded directly on the ISLLC standards. In fact, the ELCC guidelines are basically a paraphrase of the six ISLLC standards with a supplemental guideline addressing the internship piece of preparation programs (Murphy, 2005).

A caution that has been noted regarding standards-based redesign is that courses and content must be coupled with both high standards and a collaborative approach between all stakeholders (Norton, 2002). While standards alone are not a means for reshaping leadership preparation programs, standards that lead to a rethinking of content, delivery, and assessment are undoubtedly a step in the right direction (Lashway, 2003).

The ISLLC standards strive to address all three areas and provide benchmarks to measure how well this task is accomplished.

Summary

This chapter outlined the literature relevant to the field of educational leadership and to leadership preparation programs. The review included a discussion of the history of educational leadership; an overview of leadership preparation in general; a discussion of the internship experience as it relates to the overall preparation of leaders; a presentation of the criticisms of preparation programs including calls for reform in leadership preparation; and an overview of the standards guiding leadership programs in the state of Georgia. The purpose of the review was to provide a framework for this study on educational leadership internship experiences in the state of Georgia.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN

Introduction

This study examines educational leadership internship experiences at four public University System of Georgia universities. It is a qualitative multiple case study. The research presented contributes to the literature by providing information about leadership training through internship programs that was collected via interviews with program faculty and documentary analysis. Presentation of the data in this manner offers a comprehensive description of internship experiences at four universities within the state of Georgia. This description helps explain the linkages between classroom knowledge and its application as it relates to the internship experience.

This chapter describes the methods used in this study. As a qualitative multiple case study, the work highlights individual cases as well as provides a cross-case analysis. The chapter begins with a restatement of the research questions, followed by an overview of qualitative research, a discussion of case study, and the rationale for using both in designing the study. Next, the methods used in the study are explained, including participant selection, data collection, and analysis. Finally, acknowledgements of limitations and researcher bias are presented.

Research Questions

Over the last several years, mounting national attention has been focused on educational leadership in general and in particular on what is lacking in leadership preparation programs. Many of these studies have outlined shortcomings of programs that prepare educational leaders, and while criticism of these programs is not new, it has become increasingly negative (Young, 2001). One area of coverage lacking in the literature concerns what is being taught in preparation programs linking classroom knowledge and practical application (Murphy & Vriesenga, 2004). This study addresses this shortcoming by providing insight into how the connections between knowledge and practice are developed through the internship experience at four University System of Georgia universities. Through this study, the following research questions are raised and answered:

1. How do the programs seek to provide linkages between classroom knowledge and the application of this knowledge within the field through internships?
2. To what degree do adopted standards impact the design of internship processes within the programs?
3. How do internship experiences provide preparation for the on-the-job needs of future school leaders?
4. How do programs provide evidence of students' ability to perform through data collection on internship experiences?

Method

Qualitative research has been defined as a process of understanding based on distinct methodological traditions of inquiry that explore a social or human problem

(Creswell, 1998). Qualitative research is highly descriptive in ways that quantitative strategies cannot capture. Rather than using numbers to substantiate a hypothesis, data are collected with words and pictures, and presented in the context of the setting. The researcher includes interviews, transcripts, field notes, photographs, audio recordings, and other means to illustrate accurately the data collected in original form (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Slavin, 1992). In compiling the data in this manner, the researcher builds a complex, holistic picture, analyzes words, reports detailed views of informants, and conducts the study in a natural setting.

A qualitative study relies on meticulous descriptions of events or subjects (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Johnson & Christensen, 2000). The researcher spends a great deal of time in the environment where the data are collected and as a result, the interview process yields a thick description of the phenomena being studied (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1993). According to Denzin (1989), a thick description provides the context of an act, clarifies the intentions and meanings that organize the action, and presents the action as a text that can then be interpreted. In contrast, a thin description simply reports facts, independent of intentions or the circumstances that surround an action. As a result of utilizing thick description, the research is described so that the reader has the sense of actually being present during the fieldwork (Stake, 1995).

This study of educational leadership internship experiences at four universities in Georgia is a case study. (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998) describe a case study as an exhaustive examination of a single setting, subject, or event. Researchers utilizing case study methodology must establish criteria or standards necessary for a group to be included in the investigation (Merriam, 1988). Merriam (1988) states, “A case study approach is

often the best methodology for addressing problems in which understanding is sought in order to improve practice" (p. 13). As one of the fundamental goals of this study is to provide insight into the connections between knowledge and practice through the internship experience, case study is an appropriate method for reaching this goal.

Case studies are particularistic in that they are an examination of a specific phenomenon such as a program, event, a person, a process, an institution, or a social group (Merriam, 1988). A case is a program, event, activity, or group of individuals, and a case study is an exploration of a "bounded system" or a case over time through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information rich in context (Creswell, 1998). Case study is an appropriate method for this study because in-depth investigation is necessary to understand the underpinnings of the internship experiences (Feagin, Orum, & Sjoberg, 1991).

A qualitative case study is descriptive in nature, emphasizing description and interpretation within a bounded context (Merriam, 1988). Qualitative case studies rely heavily upon qualitative data obtained from interviews, observations, documents, and artifacts (Merriam, 1988). This study provides an in-depth account of each of the four programs studied through direct quotes from people about their experiences, attitudes, beliefs, and thoughts. Data in the form of interviews and documents were collected and assessed at each site.

This study also utilizes cross-case analysis. Following the comprehensive presentation of each individual case, the four cases are considered together, and analyzed for similarities and differences. The purpose for analyzing the data in this manner is to

provide both an in-depth analysis of each program and an understanding of the similarities and differences in internship experiences throughout the state of Georgia.

Participants

Participants for this study were selected through three purposeful sampling techniques - typical case, criterion, and chain (Patton, 1990). Purposeful sampling was utilized as it allows the researcher to outline similarities and differences across organizations (Creswell, 1998). For this inquiry, the researcher desired to outline similarities and differences across internship programs at Board of Regents universities in the state of Georgia. Purposeful sampling enabled the researcher to select cases for this qualitative inquiry in order to learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research (Patton, 1990).

According to Patton (1990) key informants or knowledgeable participants can identify what is typical. Typical sampling cases represent "average" examples. For this study, the researcher's aim was to identify educational leadership programs at Board of Regents universities within the state of Georgia. After identifying eleven such programs, the study was narrowed through the use of criterion sampling.

Criterion sampling involves selecting predetermined criteria that are of importance to the study. The criteria used in selecting programs for this study included which institutions had leadership programs that had been in existence for five or more years and which institutions had programs that were accredited by NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education). NCATE is "the profession's mechanism to help establish high quality teacher preparation" (http://www.ncate.org).

NCATE accredits schools, colleges, and departments of education. NCATE's website states

> Our performance-based system of accreditation fosters competent classroom teachers and other educators who work to improve the education of all P-12 students. NCATE believes every student deserves a caring, competent, and highly qualified teacher. NCATE was founded in 1954. Five groups were instrumental in the creation of NCATE: the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC), the National Education Association (NEA), the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), and the National School Boards Association (NSBA). NCATE is the teaching profession's mechanism to help to establish high quality teacher, specialist, and administrator preparation. Through the process of professional accreditation of schools, colleges and departments of education, NCATE works to make a difference in the quality of teaching, teachers, school specialists and administrators. NCATE believes every student deserves a caring, competent and highly qualified teacher. NCATE currently accredits 632 colleges of education with nearly 100 more seeking NCATE accreditation (http://www.ncate.org).

Within the context of the University System's mission and vision, the four first tier institutions share core characteristics as research universities including a commitment to excellence and responsiveness in academic achievements that impart national or international status; a commitment to a teaching/learning environment, both inside and outside the classroom, that sustains instructional excellence, serves a diverse and well-prepared student body, provides academic assistance, and promotes high levels of student achievement; a commitment to wide-ranging research, scholarship, and creative endeavors that are consistent with the highest standards of academic excellence; a commitment to public service, economic development and technical assistance activities designed to address the strategic needs of the State of Georgia along with a comprehensive offering of continuing education programs, including continuing professional education to meet the needs of Georgia's citizens for life-long learning, and a

range of disciplinary and interdisciplinary academic programming at the baccalaureate, masters and doctoral levels, as well as a range of professional programs at the baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate level, including the doctoral level (http://www.usg.edu/inst/mission/research.phtml).

Two institutions share core characteristics as second tier or regional universities within the context of the University System's mission and vision. These characteristics include a commitment to excellence and responsiveness within a scope of influence defined by the needs of a specific region of the state, and by particularly outstanding programs or distinctive characteristics that have a magnet effect even beyond the region; a commitment to a teaching/learning environment, both inside and outside the classroom, that sustains instructional excellence, serves a diverse and well-prepared student body, promotes high levels of student achievement, offers academic assistance, and provides developmental studies programs for a limited student cohort; a range of disciplinary and interdisciplinary academic programming at the baccalaureate and masters levels, as well as a range of professional programs at the baccalaureate and post baccalaureate levels, including a limited number of professionally-oriented doctoral level programs; commitment to public service, continuing education, technical assistance, and economic development activities that address the needs, improve the quality of life, and raise the educational level within the university's scope of influence, and a commitment to scholarly and creative work to enhance instructional effectiveness and to encourage faculty scholarly pursuits, and a commitment to research in selected areas of institutional strength and focused on regional need (http://www.usg.edu/inst/mission/regional.phtml).

In looking at the context of the University System's mission and vision, thirteen institutions share core characteristics as state universities. The core characteristics include a commitment to excellence and responsiveness within a scope of influence defined by the needs of an area of the state, and by particularly outstanding programs or distinctive characteristics that have a magnet effect throughout the region or state; a commitment to a teaching/learning environment, both inside and outside the classroom, that sustains instructional excellence, serves a diverse and college-prepared student body, promotes high levels of student achievement, offers academic assistance, and provides developmental studies programs for a limited student cohort; a high quality general education program supporting a variety of disciplinary, interdisciplinary, and professional academic programming at the baccalaureate level, with selected master's and educational specialist degrees, and selected associate degree programs based on area need and/or interinstitutional collaborations; commitment to public service, continuing education, technical assistance, and economic development activities that address the needs, improve the quality of life, and raise the educational level within the university's scope of influence, and a commitment to scholarly and creative work to enhance instructional effectiveness and to encourage faculty scholarly pursuits, and a commitment to applied research in selected areas of institutional strength and area need (http://www.usg.edu/inst/mission/stateuniv.phtml).

After taking into account which universities had programs that were both NCATE accredited and had been in existence for more than five years, the researcher determined that there were no first tier institutions within the state, other than the researcher’s home institution, with leadership programs accredited by NCATE. As a result, invitations to

participate in the study were extended to the remaining programs, all of which were in place at second and third tier institutions. One institution from the second tier and three from the third tier were included in the final study.

In making initial contact with the leadership programs, the researcher emailed or telephoned each university's leadership department in order to determine who would be appropriate to approach regarding the internship program. Potential participants were then contacted via electronic mail and/or telephone for further discussion of the research topic, questions, methods, and procedures. In identifying participants in this manner, the researcher used chain sampling to narrow the search for the best person to talk with about the internship. The chain sampling approach allows one to identify "cases of interest from people who know people who know people, who know people who know what cases are information-rich, that is, good examples for study, good interview subjects" (Patton, 1990, p. 72).

A common element across almost all leadership programs nationwide is the inclusion of an internship (Hackman, Russell & Elliott, 1999). While there were many ways the study could have been narrowed, the researcher decided to concentrate on programs within the state of Georgia due to feasibility issues including time and other resources. Once the study had been narrowed, the researcher determined that four programs would allow for a comprehensive description of each while permitting comparisons across programs.

Participants were given the option to remain anonymous. As a result of their decision to do so, names, place names, and other potential identifying factors were changed or broadened to respect the participants' wishes.

Data Collection

The primary data sources in this case study analysis of internship programs throughout the state of Georgia were in-depth, on-site interviews with personnel in the educational leadership department at each institution. An interview is an instrument with a set of specific questions used by the researcher to obtain information from participants (Creswell, 1992). The purpose of interviewing participants is to find out what is on their minds, what they think, or how they feel about something (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1993). Interviewing is one of the most important data collection techniques a qualitative researcher possesses (Fetterman, 1998). Interviewing participants gives the researcher the opportunity to discover information that cannot be observed (Seidman, 1989).

The interviews for this study were designed to be semi-structured and open-ended. In semi-structured interviews the questions are a mix of structured predetermined questions that are flexibly worded. This format allows new ideas about a topic to emerge (Merriam, 1988). The interviews were forty-five to ninety minutes in length and were taped in order to ensure that information was accurately recorded.

Interview Guides

The initial round of interviews for this study utilized open-ended questions allowing for individual variations. These initial interviews were structured on the topics outlined in the interview guide (Appendix A). An interview guide is a list of general topics or questions that the researcher wishes to explore during the interview. Interview guides ensure that basically the same information is discussed with each participant (Hoepfl, 1997). This guide effected good use of limited interview time while also providing more comprehensive coverage of topics with each participant. In keeping with

the flexible nature of qualitative research, the interview guide was modified to focus attention on areas of particular importance or to exclude questions that were found to be unproductive to the goals of the research (Lofland & Lofland, 1984).

Seidman (1989) encourages tape recording interviews, as doing so allows the researcher continued access to the original data. Note taking allows the researcher to highlight elements for further questioning. Both forms of data collection were used in this study.

Secondary data sources include practicum syllabi and other archival data, such as advising guides, descriptions of project and portfolio requirements, data collected for NCATE, Board of Regents reports, sample projects and portfolios. These secondary data sources provided triangulation, which "involves confirming or crosschecking the accuracy of data obtained from one source with data collected from other, different sources" (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999, p.131).

Data Analysis

Data analysis is the process of systematically searching and arranging interview transcripts and other materials to increase one's own understanding of them and to enable the researcher to present what has been discovered to others (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998). The researcher is required to interpret and make sense out of the collected materials (Schatzman & Strauss, 1973; Spradley, 1980). For this study, data analysis was conducted by generating categories, searching for alternative linkages and relationships, and writing the narrative report (Marshall & Rossman, 1995).

Original categories were developed by reading through each transcript and breaking down each piece into sections that emphasized their own meaning (Strauss &

Corbin, 1990). The researcher by becoming familiar with the data identified categories by themes or patterns that emerged. Progressive data analysis was conducted during data collection to determine the need for further probes.

Once the data were transcribed, the researcher listened to the recordings while reading the transcripts in order to ensure accuracy of the data. Following this check for accuracy, the transcriptions were given to the interviewees for review. After both the researcher and the participants determined that the transcriptions were accurate, they were coded.

In order to ensure credibility of the data, peer debriefing was utilized (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Peer debriefing is "a process of exposing oneself to a disinterested peer in a manner paralleling an analytic session and for the purpose of exploring aspects of the inquiry that might otherwise remain only implicit within the inquirer's mind" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 308). The peer debriefer for this study was Dr. E. Paul Bicknell III. Dr. Bicknell is a doctor of psychology in a private practice that uses clinical analysis on a daily basis, thereby merging theory and application. He graciously agreed to lend his expertise to discussing the methods, data, and framing of this study.

Document Analysis

In the scholarly literature relevant to leadership preparation, it has been stated numerous times that there exists no systemic analysis of the content taught in preparation programs (Grogan & Andrews, 2002; Hess & Kelly, 2005; Levine, 2005; Portin et al 2003; Young, 2001). Furthermore, the literature that does address the topic of leadership preparation often asserts that typical course content is largely disconnected from

professional practice (Farkas et al, 2003; Lashway 2003; Levine, 2005; Murphy & Vriesenga, 2004).

In an attempt to address this gap in the literature and to provide an analysis of what is taught in preparation programs, Hess and Kelly (2005) conducted a study on core course syllabi in a stratified sample of the nation's preparation programs. According to the authors, "this study presumes that university syllabi generally reflect the content and perspective of the courses being taught" (p. 6). Absent from their analysis, however, were three key elements. First, they did not examine syllabi from internship or practicum courses despite the fact that these courses exist almost universally as a part of preparation programs, and arguably, these courses provide the much-needed link between course content and practical application. Secondly, they did not follow up with course instructors to ensure that the coding of the course syllabi reflected content of the classroom experiences. Finally, they looked only at syllabi and not at other archival data including advising guides, descriptions of project and portfolio requirements, data collected for NCATE, Board of Regents reports, and sample projects and portfolios. Each of these sources would have lended greater clarity to the focus of their study.

While the above stated issues with the Hess and Kelly report render it an incomplete analysis, their guiding questions were solidly based upon the theoretical underpinnings of leadership preparation. As this is the case, and as their work is considered to be one of the most comprehensive analyses of course content currently available, this study utilized their guiding questions as an a priori framework for analyzing both the course syllabi and the other documents associated with the internship

experience. A copy of the guiding questions for document analysis, based upon the model of Hess and Kelly, can be found in Appendix B.

Limitations

This research study was limited to the educational leadership internship experience at four University System of Georgia universities and was based on data collected from four programs. The programs studied are all second- or third-tier institutions, and none is in an urban area. Moreover, only selected sources of data, including syllabi, advising guides, descriptions of project and portfolio requirements, data collected for NCATE, Board of Regents reports, sample projects and portfolios were examined.

The delimitations of the study are tied to the outcomes. While the study does provide insight into internship programs at four universities, it does not provide data regarding student perceptions and experiences. Additionally, the success of students once they complete the programs was not studied. Interviewing current students, graduates holding leadership positions, and graduates who do not aspire to leadership roles on their perceptions of the internship programs would provide additional research opportunities. While information gained from this study was collected in order to provide insight into the internship experiences at four universities, it is not generally relevant to all educational leadership programs.

Researcher Bias

One concern related to using qualitative methods in conducting a research study is researcher bias. As this is a qualitative study, the researcher is the research instrument, and thus, brings bias to the study. Brody (1992) states, “Qualitative inquiry cannot avoid

observer bias by using the instrument to insulate the experiment from the preconceptions of the investigator. Open disclosure of preconceptions and assumptions that may have influenced data gathering and processing becomes an inherent part of the conduct of the inquiry" (p.179).

The preconceptions brought into this study center upon the linkage of classroom knowledge and professional practice through the internship. The researcher has worked with students in the internship program at Georgia State University for over five years and holds strong beliefs that internship experiences, when properly designed, provide students with opportunities to link knowledge and practice. In stating this bias, it is the researcher's hope that the reader has a clearer understanding of the personal beliefs guiding this inquiry.

Summary

This research study provides an insight into educational leadership internship experiences at four universities in the state of Georgia. The study is a qualitative multiple case study that utilizes generated categories, linkages and an a priori framework for data analysis. The method used in this study was typical case sampling. This study used both within- and cross-case analysis of the internship programs at the four universities. The cases are presented individually in order to provide thick description of each case (Stake, 1995), after which the four cases are considered together and analyzed for similarities and differences. The purpose for analyzing the data in this manner is to provide both an in-depth analysis of each program and an understanding of the similarities and differences in internship experiences throughout the state of Georgia.

Chapters 4,5,6 and 7 provide a description of each case study generated by the research design and methodology. Chapter 8 contains a discussion of the similarities and differences in the cases studied through consideration of the four questions guiding this inquiry.

CHAPTER 4

THE RESULTS – ALPHA UNIVERSITY

Introduction

The purpose of the next four chapters is to present the findings of the study through a discussion of the characteristics of the programs studied. Each chapter is divided into three sections. First, an individual overview of each interview site is presented in order to provide a framework for the discussion of the school's internship experience. The overviews give the reader contextual insight into each program and set the stage for the analysis of the data.

Next, interview information for each site is offered. A faculty member in educational leadership at each institution was interviewed using the interview guide (Appendix A). The interviews were designed to be semi-structured and open-ended (Johnson &Christensen, 2004; Maxwell, 1996). The interviews were forty-five to sixty minutes in length and were taped in order to ensure that information was accurately recorded. Seidman (1989) encourages tape recording interviews, as doing so allows the researcher continued access to the original data. Note taking allows the researcher to highlight elements for further questioning. Both forms of data collection were used in conducting the interviews. The interviews were then transcribed, and the analysis of those interviews provides the context for the interview information section.

Finally, the document analysis section discusses the syllabus and other archival documents from each site.

Information in this section is framed through the document analysis guide (Appendix B), based on the work of Hess and Kelly (2005). While Hess and Kelly did not examine syllabi from internship or practicum courses, their work is considered to be a comprehensive analysis of course content because the guiding questions are solidly based upon the theoretical underpinnings of leadership preparation. The categories for analysis, based on the work of Hess and Kelly, are data analysis; personnel management; technical knowledge; community interactions; norms and values; instructional leadership, and school culture. This study uses these categories as an a priori framework for conveying the content of the course syllabi and the other documents associated with the internship experience at each of the four sites.

Alpha University

Alpha University is a regional institution including eight colleges. Within the College of Education is housed the Department of Leadership. This department offers advanced study opportunities to persons pursuing careers in educational administration including certification at the L-5, L-6, and L-7 levels. Completion of the master's degree entitles graduates to the Georgia Certificate (L-5) in Leadership. Completion of the specialist's degree produces eligibility for the renewable Six-Year (L-6) Leadership Certificate. Individuals holding master's and specialist's degrees in other fields may complete as nondegree students all requirements for the Fifth- and Sixth-Year Leadership Certificates. Completion of the L-7, doctoral, program in Educational Administration satisfies state requirements for the Seventh-Year Certificate.

Alpha University Interview Information

Prior to coming to Alpha University, the leadership faculty member interviewed for this study had been a public school educator and administrator in the area for thirty-one years. At the time of his interview, he had been at Alpha University for four years. The interview took place in the instructor's office, a small, tidy space in the new College of Education building. The instructor seemed eager to talk about the educational leadership program, and offered his personal cell phone number for follow-up questions. Throughout the course of the interview, it was obvious that he felt strongly about the quality of the program at Alpha and that he was vested in providing the students with a sound mentor during their time of study.

The L-5, masters level, and L-6, specialist level, certification programs at Alpha University have been in place since the late 1970s, and the L-7, doctoral level, program was put in place in 1993. Traditionally, Alpha University has been considered an institution centered upon teacher education. The instructors within the Department of Leadership have worked to structure their certification programs to aid teaching and learning. Students within the L-5 and L-6 programs are able to proceed through the programs at their own pace, and the L-7 program is offered as a sequential, closed cohort.

While students are able to proceed through the L-5 certification program at their own rate, there is a structural element to how the courses are offered. In their first semester of study, they are required to take a general school administration course and the first section of the internship. Following their first semester, they must take four content courses – school law, school business administration, supervision, and an elective from a set list – but can do so in any sequence. The terminal courses for the L-5

certification are the principalship course and the second phase of the internship. The leadership faculty for the Department of Leadership is comprised of eight full-time instructors, six of whom hold assistant professor status and one each who hold associate and full professor status.

The L-5 internship is designed to be taken over the course of two semesters, and the same instructor supervises both sections of it. Each of the two semesters of the internship provides the student with three course hours of college credit toward the L-5 certificate. Students enrolled in the L-5 certification program take the internship courses in their first and last semesters of the program, and there are typically between thirty and forty students in each phase of the internship.

During each phase of the internship, students have specific requirements that they are expected to fulfill. In the first phase of the internship, students must select a mentor, develop a plan, keep a log of their activities, and become familiar with the ELCC standards. In the second phase, they continue to keep a log of their activities and are evaluated by their mentors. Each semester requires the students to log at least 100 hours of site-based service for a total of 200 hours for the entire program.

Each section of the internship meets as a formal group three times throughout the course of each semester. On the first night of the first phase, the internship's sister class, general administration, allots an hour to focus upon the internship. During this time, questions are addressed including those focusing upon how to structure the process, what can count as activities, and other general issues. Halfway through the semester, there is a second group meeting to answer questions and field problems. At the end of the semester before the first check of the portfolio, the students meet as a group to discuss relevant

issues. The second phase is structured in a similar manner, with the first meeting coinciding with the first night of the principalship course. A subsequent meeting is held halfway through the semester, and the final meeting takes place before the last portfolio check. The meetings for the second phase of the internship are typically shorter than those for the first phase because there are fewer problems and issues due to students having a clearer understanding of the process by the final semester.

In phase one of the internship, the student selects a mentor. This person is typically an administrator in the student's school. During this phase, the university faculty member designated to work with the internship visits the student's school site and meets with both the student and the student's mentor. As a part of this visit, the mentor is given a copy of the course syllabus and takes part in a discussion about relevant activities for the internship process. The interviewee highlighted that this person is typically a university faculty member who has previously served as a public school administrator in the area and that this knowledge of the inner-workings of area schools aided the initial meeting tremendously. Because the university mentor typically knows many of the practicing administrators who mentor Alpha's students, the relationship between the three is a collaborative effort aimed at designing appropriate site-based activities.

Once a mentor has been selected and the initial meeting takes place, the student works with that person to develop a contract containing activities to fulfill the 100 hours of service. These activities must fit into one of twelve categories as outlined in the course syllabus. The interviewed faculty member and a former instructor at Alpha University developed content areas for the course syllabus based upon activities a practicing administrator would undertake on a regular basis. The content areas are

leadership/management theories, public relations, finance, legal issues, safe schools, planning, opening/closing school, personnel, student services, auxiliary services, activities outside the selected site, and participant's option. According to faculty member, these content areas were selected in order to include all of the areas one might encounter as a public school administrator. Additionally, the content areas are cross-walked on the ELCC standards in order to ensure that students are fulfilling both the requirements set forth by Alpha University and those set forth by the Professional Standards Commission. The syllabus gives the students guidance on how many hours should be spent in each area, and the instructor provides ideas with regard to activities and where certain activities might fit into the requirements.

Once the contract has been developed, the student keeps a log of the activities, including what was done, the amount of time spent on the activity, where the activity fits into the content areas, and his/her thoughts on the activity. As documentation of the activity log, the student develops a portfolio including artifacts from each activity. According to the interviewee, the purpose of this activity is to help the educators make the shift from thinking and acting like a teacher to thinking and acting like an administrator.

In addition to the activities discussed above, students are required to create a report discussing how their school site addresses the ELCC standards. This gives the students an opportunity to become familiar with the standards guiding leadership preparation in the state while providing an opportunity to use the language of school administration in discussing the practices within a school setting.

The evaluation of both sections of the internship is based upon successful completion of the portfolio and a confidential evaluation completed by the student's mentor. The evaluation includes questions based on each of the ELCC standards, and is weighed more heavily in the second phase of the internship than the first.

Alpha University Document Analysis

Table 1
Archival Document Information – Alpha University

Hess and Kelly's (2005) Category	Number of Elements	Element(s) Providing Evidence
Data Analysis	3	Field experience integrating knowledge and practice Contract of assigned activities Coding requirements
Personnel Management	1	Hourly requirement in internship
Technical Knowledge	2	Instruction on how internship should be conducted Hourly requirement in each area - finance, legal issues, and management
Community Interactions	1	Hourly requirement that time should be devoted to activities outside of the school site
Norms and Values	3	Student attention to detail Student responsibility Accreditation report
Instructional Leadership	1	Hourly requirement for site-based activities
School Culture	2	Statement of how cultural norms should be addressed Statement of how formal protocols should be adhered to
Other	2	ELCC standards Student evaluation

In discussing the archival data associated with the internship program at Alpha University, information contained in the course syllabus and the College of Education's

accreditation report is highlighted. The document analysis for Alpha University's internship program provided evidence in the area of data analysis. The opening statement in the course syllabus for the internship states that almost all certification programs in educational administration, including the one at Alpha University, require "a field experience to integrate research-based knowledge with the problems of daily practice" (p. 3). This stated emphasis on data analysis was further highlighted in the outline for the contract of assigned activities. Students in the program are expected to spend at least five of their 200 hours on the area of leadership management theory. Additionally, as a part of their internship experience, they are to take part in planning based upon data indicators such as school improvement, strategic planning, and curriculum instruction for a minimum of thirty hours. Over seventeen percent of the students' 200 hours are spent in data-driven, site-based activities as a result of these two requirements. A final element indicating the data analysis category is the requirement that students code each leadership activity with one of the twelve leadership dimensions as outlined in the syllabus.

Hess and Kelly's second dimension, personnel management, was also evidenced in the course syllabus, but to a lesser degree than many of the other categories. According to the contract outline, students are required to engage in activities involving personnel for a minimum of ten of the 200 hours. While the internship devotes a significantly lower number of hours to this dimension, the required general administration, supervision, and principalship courses cover a good deal of the content related to this area.

The third category relates to the area of technical knowledge and includes the subtopics of school law, school finance, and facilities management. As was the case in the dimension of personnel, these categories are addressed in required courses beyond the

internship. However, the internship also addresses them in a number of ways. First, the syllabus outlines the expectation that the student "carrying out one's obligations promptly and consistently with existing school/district regulation and policies" (p. 5). This is evidence of technical knowledge in that it requires students to become familiar with the policies under which they will operate and then integrate that understanding into the carrying out of activities. Further, the outline for the contract of assigned activities requires that students devote fifteen hours to each area – finance, legal issues, and management. Over twenty percent of the student's required internship activities are centered upon the area of technical knowledge.

The next area outlined by Hess and Kelly is that of community interactions and includes elements relative to school leadership beyond the school setting. Again, Alpha University's internship syllabus evidenced this area by requiring students to devote at least fifteen of their 200 hours to activities beyond the school site. These hours could be fulfilled through attendance at school board meetings or through participation in a variety of other educational forums.

The dimension of norms and values was evidenced in both the course syllabus and the accreditation report. The syllabus states that students should complete all assignments with the utmost degree of thoroughness, regardless of how trivial the task. It also devotes an entire section to the discussion of student responsibility and encourages students to exhibit ethics and a commitment to professional excellence in all activities. The accreditation report touts the graduates of Alpha University's program as ranked number one in the state for meeting the needs of schools in the area.

A commitment to the area of instructional leadership, Hess and Kelly's next dimension, is supported through a required fifty hours of site-based service devoted to student services and planning. Fully twenty-five percent of all activities undertaken at a student's school are to center upon instructional leadership. This emphasizes Alpha University's commitment to training instructional leaders with knowledge of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of their fields as mentioned in the accreditation report.

Hess and Kelly's final dimension, school culture, is also evidenced in Alpha University's internship course syllabus. It states that a student "should behave within the cultural norms of the faculty and staff in his or her workplace" (p. 5). It also encourages students to exhibit a total acceptance of the formal protocols dictated by the local situation, and it goes on to mention areas such as punctuality, proper language, and dress as examples of this requirement in practice.

Beyond Hess and Kelly's framework, the document analysis guide for this study added a final dimension entitled "Other" (Appendix B, Item 8) to enable the researcher to mention other areas included in the documents that are worthy of note. In the case of Alpha University, the dimension of standards is such an area. The ELCC standards are the current norms under which educational leadership programs in the state of Georgia operate. As such, program linkage to the ELCC standards is of utmost importance for certification and accreditation purposes. Alpha University has linked its leadership program in general and the internship specifically to the ELCC standards in numerous ways. First, the syllabus states that it is the goal of Alpha University to make the practicum a more relevant experience than what is offered at many universities. The long-

range plan of (the university's leadership department) is to link the ELCC standards to the practicum process as much as possible (p. 3). In order to accomplish this, the student is required to perform hands-on administrative tasks and then "reflect on how the ELCC standards are being or could be integrated into his/her educational setting" (p. 3). The syllabus goes on to discuss how the student should accomplish this task. "Each enrollee will be required to submit a written report on how the ELCC standards are being addressed in his/her educational setting. The enrollee should examine how the school leader is facilitating, processing, and engaging in activities that ensure the standards are being addressed." (p.7). Further, the first appendix to the internship syllabus is a copy of the ELCC standards. Finally, both the formative evaluation, which takes place at the end of the first internship, and the summative evaluation, which occurs at the end of the second internship, is cross-walked on the ELCC standards.

CHAPTER 5

THE RESULTS – BETA UNIVERSITY

Beta University

Within the context of the Georgia State University System there are thirteen institutions considered to be state institutions because they all embody common characteristics. Beta University is one such institution because it adheres to the core characteristics of state institutions including:

A commitment to excellence and responsiveness within a scope of influence defined by the needs of an area of the state; a commitment to a teaching/learning environment that provides developmental studies programs for a limited student cohort; a high quality general education program supporting a selected group of master's and educational specialist degrees; a commitment to public service, continuing education, technical assistance, and economic development activities that raise the educational level within the university's scope of influence; a commitment to scholarly and creative work, and a commitment to applied research in selected areas of institutional strength and area need.

Beta University's degree programs are offered through five colleges, with the Educational Leadership Program being offered through the College of Education. The program has experienced tremendous growth during the past five years, and currently offers certification at the L-5 and L-6 levels. Additionally, Beta University partners with one of Georgia's regional universities to offer an Ed. D. L-7 degree. The offerings for the

L-7 are based at the regional university rather than at Beta University. Because of undesirable economic conditions, resources to adequately facilitate the growing leadership program have been insufficient. In an effort to assure quality control and best serve students, the College of Education has developed a cohort structure to deliver the Educational Leadership degrees and programs.

The stated objectives of the Educational Leadership program are to enhance faculty/student ratio; to assure admission of highly qualified leadership candidates; to improve collaborative activities within the community of practice; to enhance mentorship and faculty-student time; to enhance cohort cohesiveness and reciprocal learning among groups of students; to enable faculty to continue mentorship relationships after graduation; to enhance the potential success of graduates; to increase research and scholarly activities; to assure students the opportunity to complete required the courses in a 15 month time frame, and to produce leaders who improve student achievement and impact the school improvement process. In working to attain these stated goals, the faculty of the Educational Leadership Program has aligned every course offering within the curriculum of the L-5 and L-6 degrees with the ELCC/ISLLC standards. Additionally, each course features technology integration and multi-cultural elements and is based upon transformational leadership theory concepts. The L-5 program makes use of a twelve-month problem-based field experience in which students can carry out activities in partner schools and/or distinguished regional business settings.

Beta University Interview Information

The faculty member interviewed at Beta University had been a member of the department for eight years at the time of our interview. She earned her Ed. D. in

Educational Administration from a university in a neighboring state, and had served as an intermediate school principal, assistant superintendent for curriculum, chair for the school of education, team leader for a department of education and an interim superintendent prior to coming to Beta University. At the time of our interview she was finalizing a training manual for teachers on best practices in education.

The interview took place in her office within the College of Education. The room had a homey quality, with a sofa and other comfortable furniture serving as seating. Pictures of her friends and family members were placed throughout the setting. Additionally, the room was filled with books, portfolios, and other educational materials in various degrees of order. From the unique mixture of personal and professional materials that were in place throughout the office, it was evident that a great deal of time was spent within it.

One entire wall of the room was dedicated to a mural-sized rubric of the course offerings within the Educational Leadership Department. The rubric was covered with sticky-notes identifying content areas and strands for the ELCC/ISLLC standards. Each course within the L-5 and L-6 program was represented, and the standard or standards that were addressed as a part of that course were included. When questioned about this rubric, the instructor stated that it had taken members of the leadership department team over one year to develop it. She further stated that in designing their course curriculum, they used to rely on slides to remember what content was being covered in each course. As the program grew, it became increasingly difficult to keep track of content in this manner. As a result, they decided to put together a visual aid that could be modified as needed. The leadership staff or leadership team as she referred to them was made up of

four full-time faculty members and met on a weekly basis to discuss items including course content.

At the time of our interview, every course offering within the Educational Leadership Department had a departmental syllabus, including links to the ELCC/ISLLC standards, which had been developed by the leadership team. The instructor emphasized that individual instructors could modify instructional delivery as desired, but that the standards addressed by the course were to remain consistent throughout the department. Further, she stressed that structuring the courses in this manner was of considerable benefit to adjunct instructors within the department as it allowed them to have a concrete understanding of what was expected with regard to course content.

The L-5 program at Beta University is structured to take students three semesters to complete and is offered as a closed cohort model. Selection for the program is based upon the traditional college application as well as a detailed interview process in which students are required to articulate their reasons for wanting to become school leaders.

In the first semester of study, students are required to take a technology course in addition to two other courses. The technology course serves as a foundational element for the remainder of their coursework. The remaining three semesters are structured to include two traditional, on-campus leadership courses and the internship. Throughout the course of the three-semester internship, students utilize information gained from the technology course in structuring their online leadership portfolio (e portfolio). The credit requirement for L-5 certification from Beta University is 36 hours of coursework.

The original L-5 internship at Beta University was developed around the standards that were guiding leadership preparation in the year 2000. At that time, those

standards were the BOR (Board of Regents) standards, and there were eight that guided the internship. Students were asked to go out into the schools and structure their internships around those standards. They were required to spend 150 hours total in a school or central office setting looking at how aspects of the daily operations could be described through the lens of the standards. One half of the 150 hours was to be made up of shadowing an administrator or writing up research that would be of assistance at a school site. Students were expected to log their hours, summarize their findings in the language of the standards, and turn in a portfolio including their log and findings for evaluation of their overall internship experience.

Beginning in 2002, the internship was modified and became an embedded part of the L-5 coursework rather than an individual offering. Students were asked to make observations of school settings and relate those observations back to their courses rather than relating them to the standards guiding leadership preparation. As opposed to a summative evaluation of the internship, work in the field was counted toward a percentage of the overall grade for each course. The L-5 internship at Beta University operated in this manner until 2005.

In 2005, the L-5 internship at Beta University was again restructured. At the time, standards guiding leadership preparation in the state of Georgia were the ELCC/ISLLC standards. The instructors within the leadership program together with the Department Chairperson modified the internship and linked it to the ELCC/ISLLC standards. The internship became a three-part course in which students were expected to shadow an administrator for no less than 30 hours per semester. This shadowing experience had to take place outside the student’s school system. Rather than submitting a hard copy

portfolio for summative evaluation, the students were required to create an e portfolio linking their experiences to both the course content and the ELCC/ISLLC standards. At the time of our interview, the internship at Beta University was still operating in this manner. However, the interviewee foreshadowed that another modification was in the works as the overall structure of leadership preparation in the state was about to undergo a significant change.

The internship at Beta University required students to meet with the university instructor or mentor at least two times during each of the three semesters for a total of six one-on-one meetings. Throughout the course of these meetings, students were required to discuss growth in knowledge, skills, and dispositions, and relate this growth back to the ELCC/ISLLC standards. Additionally, a unique requirement of the internship at Beta University was the condition that internship experiences be conducted outside the student's school and system. Despite the fact that the literature strongly recommends this model (Cordeiro & Sloan, 1996; Daresh & Playko, 1992; Gresso, 1993; Milstein, 1993; NPBEA, 1989), Beta was the only institution interviewed that utilized it. When asked how the time constraints associated with release time for the internship were handled, the instructor stated that students had to work out release time on an individual basis. She stated that many interns logged their hours in evening schools, and that some specifically selected field sites with opposite holiday schedules in order to facilitate observation opportunities.

In addition to the e portfolio, students completing their L-5 certification were also required to take an exit exam that had been developed by the Educational Leadership Department. The written component of the exam was linked to the ELCC/ISLLC

standards and the test also included an oral interview component. Students were required to show artifacts from their internship activities at their exit conference. Evaluation of the overall exit exam was based upon the ELCC/ISLLC standards. Beta University's L-5 graduates boasted a ninety percent plus pass rate on Praxis II Examination for leadership certification in the state of Georgia.

Beta University Document Analysis

Table 2
Archival Document Information – Beta University

Hess and Kelly's (2005) Category	Number of Elements	Element(s) Providing Evidence
Data Analysis	4	Linking activities to standards Portfolio development Assessment of student work Work in partner schools for internship
Personnel Management	3	Scheduling and staff development Decision making Building support for school's agenda
Technical Knowledge	2	Real-world application of knowledge at partner schools Documentation through e portfolio
Community Interactions	2	Internship plan School/community partnerships
Norms and Values	3	Working within the school environment Working through the decision-making processes, Comprehension of the overall internship process
Instructional Leadership	3	Implementation of curriculum Curriculum analysis Attendance at meetings
School Culture	2	Familiarizing self with mission/vision statement Adherence to dress and other protocols
Other	2	Partner Schools Network Standards

This review of the archival data associated with the internship program at Beta University considers information contained in the course syllabus, the educational leadership internship manual and the curriculum alignment matrix in discussing the categories set forth by Hess and Kelly (2005). The categories for discussion are data analysis; personnel management; technical knowledge; community interactions; norms

and values; instructional leadership, and school culture. Additionally, the category "other" is included in order to highlight the placement of interns within the Partner Schools Network and standards, as neither of these aspects is addressed directly in the first seven categories.

In considering the topic of data analysis, Beta University's archival documentation addressed this area in several ways including linking activities to standards; having students work through portfolio development; requiring that students conduct assessments of student work; and having students work in partner schools to conduct their internship experiences. The internship at Beta University requires that students develop an e-portfolio spanning the three semesters of their time in the program. This portfolio includes artifacts demonstrating candidate expertise developed during coursework. Each of the student's activities is to be posted under the appropriate ELCC/ISLLC standard on the e-portfolio system. Further, the stated goal of the portfolio is for students to look at their development both personally and professionally and reflect upon their growth in both areas as it relates to the ELCC/ISLLC standards (p. 5). This requirement indicates that students participate in experiences and then analyze how they link back to the standards guiding leadership preparation as well as how those experiences help them to grow as leaders.

A second example of the data analysis requirement in Beta University's internship is evidenced in the activities students are asked to complete as a part of their site-based hours. The syllabus states that interns are to take part in authentic assessments of student work through the evaluation of rubrics, end-of-course tests, and projects (p. 11), and further, that they are to analyze data in order to refine instruction (p. 12). Both of these

requirements indicate that beyond simply working to improve the current status of instruction, students are to examine curricular shortcomings for root causes and then work to improve conditions based upon the results of that examination.

A final example of the data analysis strand in Beta University's internship program is that the internship activities are conducted entirely in schools that are a part of the Beta University Partner School Network. According to the internship guide, the program is set up in this way in order to "increase the amount of school-based research to inform the continuous improvement of schools and educator preparation and development programs" (p. 23). All site-based activities at Beta, from teacher preparation experiences to L-6 internships, are conducted at one of seventeen partner schools. One advantage to conducting experiences in these settings is that the mentors have been trained extensively and are committed to working with interns under the auspices set forth by Beta University. Further, these mentors work in collaboration with the university supervisors and student interns to continuously analyze data generated by internship experiences. This ongoing analysis leads both to higher levels of student achievement and a better understanding of the causes driving phenomenon within the school settings.

Hess and Kelly's (2005) second category, personnel management, is also evidenced in Beta University's archival documents, although to a lesser degree than the category of data analysis. Interns are expected to participate in scheduling and conducting staff development opportunities for the teachers at their internship sites (p.12). Further, interns are asked to work with faculty and staff to include all stakeholders in decision-making processes in order to facilitate a more inclusive educational environment for the parents, students, and community members. Finally, interns are encouraged to work with

faculty to build support for the school's agenda (p. 13). Each of these aspects of the internship is aimed to give students the opportunity to work in the area of personnel management.

Hess and Kelly's (2005) category, technical knowledge, refers to fundamental elements a leader must grasp in order to successfully guide a school. While this is a rather broad category, it is evidenced in Beta University's archival documents in a very direct way. The opening sentence of the internship manual states the purpose of the internship is to provide an opportunity for the "real-world application of knowledge, skills and dispositions through the engagement of the candidate in leadership work at partner schools" (p. 3). In order to document their work in the schools, students are required to develop an e-portfolio including all of their site-based experiences and linking them back to the ELCC/ISLLC standards. While the overall purpose of the internship is to provide candidates with real-life leadership experiences in a school setting, the e-portfolio element provides a vehicle for systemic goal setting pertaining to those experiences. The accomplishment of goals is documented through a reflective essays link on e-portfolio, and students participate in an ongoing self-evaluation of the overall internship experience.

Community interactions are addressed at Beta University in several ways including the overall development of the internship plan and school/community partnerships as a part of the internship requirements. In developing the internship plan, students meet with both their university and partner school mentors. During the initial meeting, the student and the mentors develop a plan that will be implemented over the three-semester timeframe. The plan must comprise a minimum of thirty clock hours per

semester, address each of the ELCC/ISLLC standards, and demonstrate a link between each planned activity and the guiding standards. Planning the internship in this manner assures the student of a collaborative experience that meets the requirements of the Beta University program. Other ways that community interactions are evidenced in the Beta University internship include student involvement in task forces (p. 11), collaborating with adults from within the school and community (p. 11), and writing grants (p. 12). Beyond these activities, students are encouraged to develop methods of outreach aimed at business, religious, political and service organizations. As stated earlier, the internship at Beta University is a community-based experience due to the requirement that students fulfill their site-based hours at one of the Partner School Network sites.

The category of norms and values is evidenced in the internship in several ways including how students are expected to approach working within the school environment; how students work through the decision-making processes, and how students comprehend the overall internship process. With reference to working within the school environment, interns are directed to work with the staff of their partner schools to identify the needs of all students (p. 11). In other words, rather than just implementing curricular elements that already exist, interns are to examine what is already in place and work to improve upon current practice in order to aid student learning. Additionally, the idea of building a more collaborative learning community is touched upon by the requirement that interns engage parents in decision making processes and that they work to build a learning community that involves all stakeholders (p. 12). Interns are also encouraged to capitalize on the diversity of the school community in order to improve the school community and meet diverse needs.

With reference to making decisions, interns are directed to make and explain decisions based upon ethical and legal principles (p. 13). As a result, the interns begin to link the decisions they make back to the knowledge content they have built from their courses as well as to the ELCC/ISLLC standards. Working through the decision-making process in this manner helps the interns to become more reflective and as a result, more insightful about why they do what they do.

A final example of norms and values in the Beta University archival documents comes from the internship manual's statement that students should become familiar with the expectations outlined in the internship manual and other documents (p. 22). In other words, students in the internship are expected to take the time to understand what they are asked to do and carry out those expectations in a manner that is acceptable to their university and school mentors.

Internship students are asked to carry out experiences under the category of instructional leadership in several ways. First, while working at their internship sites, students are told to work with teachers to implement a curriculum that produces gains in student achievement (p. 11). Additionally, interns are asked to develop a variety of strategies aimed at analyzing the quality of current instructional practices in order to improve upon them. Once again, rather than just working through the curriculum as it currently exists, the students are to become familiar with current practice, analyze what is happening with regard to student understanding and achievement and make modifications based upon the analysis. Finally, interns are required to attend professional and community meetings that support the school in order to improve upon instruction and as a result, advance student achievement.

Because internships at Beta University are conducted in a school other than the intern's home school, an understanding of school culture is a crucial element to the success of the internship experience. As this is the case, students are required to work with all stakeholders to first, understand the vision and mission of the school, and then adapt the vision or mission as necessary (p.11). In other words, internship students need to become familiar with the culture of the school prior to working to change anything within the school environment. Finally, because the students are serving as both interns and representatives of Beta University, and because they are aspiring to leadership positions, they are encouraged, in bold type, to dress professionally for all on-site internship activities (p. 20).

There are two other noteworthy elements of the internship at Beta University that were highlighted through review of the archival documents – Beta University's Partner School Network and the linking of content to the ELCC/ISLLC standards. While both of these elements have been mentioned in passing, they are such strong aspects of the overall experience that they need to be reiterated.

First, as was stated earlier, rather than doing internships in their home schools, interns at Beta University conduct their site-based activities at one of seventeen partner schools. While the partnership was originally established to assist student achievement and offer improved educational opportunities for leader candidates, it also serves to help streamline the internship experience. Mentors at the partner schools have a clear understanding of what is expected of the students and what types of experiences students are required to carryout in order to fulfill the Beta expectations. Further, because the site-based mentors work so closely with the university mentors, it is rare for issues with

interns to linger unaddressed. Because of the close working relationship the unique setting at Beta provides, students are virtually assured of rich, authentic internship experiences.

Finally, Beta University's commitment to standards integration in the internship experience specifically and the leadership experience generally, cannot be overstated. In every element of the program - from the planning of courses, to the articulation of student goals, to the planning of internship experiences, to the reflection of what has been accomplished – standards are the fundamental building block. The first thing a person notices when arriving in the leadership department is the curriculum alignment matrix, and in every other interaction regarding the internship – from the interview, to the archival documents - standards play a major role. Beyond the standards integration in their regular coursework, students must complete at least one activity per ELCC/ISLLC standard at the partner school under the joint supervision of the university and school mentor. Further, these experiences must be linked to the standards-based coursework and documented in the portfolio to evidence both the standard itself and a reflection of how student growth has taken place relative to it.

CHAPTER 6

THE RESULTS – GAMMA UNIVERSITY

Gamma University

Gamma University is one of thirteen state universities within the University System of Georgia. More than 100 programs are offered at the university through three colleges—the Arts and Sciences, the College of Business and the College of Education. The Master of Education Degree with a major in Educational Leadership consists of 36 semester hours of approved course work in research, professional studies, and content specialization. Educators who presently hold a masters degree in either teaching or a school service field may complete the Leadership Certificate Program (L-5) in 21 semester hours. The program is for professional educators who intend to pursue careers in educational administration and/or supervision.

Gamma University Interview Information

The interview took place in the instructor's office located in the annex to the education building. The room was small and tidy with room for a desk and a chair on either side of it. The instructor sat across his desk from the interviewer, and was pleased to provide information about the overall certification program and the L-5 internship specifically. At the time of our interview, the instructor had been a faculty member at Gamma University for three years. Prior to coming to the university, he had been an educator in several southern and northeastern states. He had served as an elementary

school teacher, a principal, and a central office administrator, and he was a public school superintendent for 22 years.

Students in the L-5 program at Gamma University pursue their certification in one of two ways. At the time of the interview, Gamma was conducting two L-5 cohort programs in conjunction with school systems in the area. The students in both of those programs were selected by their systems to participate, and were pursuing their certification in a prescribed sequence. With regard to the students who were not in a system-based cohort, they applied to the College of Education and once they were accepted, pursued courses at their own rate. The instructor estimated that at the time of the interview, there were approximately 200 students enrolled in the L-5 program at Gamma University and that any given time, seventy-five students were taking the internship course.

During his three-year tenure at Gamma University, the L-5 internship had undergone significant changes. Prior to his arrival, the internship consisted of a one semester, one-credit-hour introductory course that was offered during the first semester of study. The culminating course for the internship was a two-credit-hour offering that took place during the last semester of study. In the interim, students were to touch bases with their instructors and follow through with certain elements including a research project.

According to the instructor, the process did not work as planned, and a number of students left the course requirements until the last possible minute, negatively influencing the quality of the internship. Additionally, because of how the internship was structured, instructors taught the introductory course and then were to supervise students throughout

the rest of their time in the program despite the fact that they did not see the students for any of the core courses.

The result of the failed original structure was a complete restructuring of the L-5 internship program at Gamma University. Beginning in 2004, the internship became a program-long event coupled with five core courses in the L-5 program. Students are required to perform twenty hours of administrative field experience for each of the core courses, for a total of 100 hours. The instructors of each core course are responsible for supervising and signing off on the field experiences. Additionally, the field mentor, the school system administrator with whom the student is working, signs off on the experiences. Because of this restructuring, the students get varied perspectives on the internship experience, and the instructors within the Educational Leadership Department are able to make sure that field experiences, course content, and the ISLLC standards are linked with one another. During the last semester in the program students take a culminating three-credit-hour internship course in which they are required to log fifty hours of field experience.

The advantage to the original structure was that once students completed their first semester, they had one specific instructor with whom to touch bases for the remainder of their time in the program. In order to supplement this element being eliminated from the program, the leadership faculty meets periodically to discuss how the internship is approached in each of the core courses. Additionally, the student planning forms help ensure that every standard is identified and addressed in the course of the internship.

The students within the program are allowed a good deal of leeway in selecting the activities they will participate in as a part of the internship. They are required to work with their field mentor to design experiences, and each experience must be linked back to one of the ISLLC standards. The core content instructors monitor each student's log of internship activities and work with the student to assure each standard is addressed at some point in the internship.

Within each of the five core courses, approximately two hours of group class time is devoted to a discussion of the internship and internship activities. At the beginning of each core course, students are required to submit a plan that is approved by their field mentors and college instructors. The plan includes each experience and the standard to which it is linked. Students who select activities that are not appropriate or are not linked to the standards are contacted via phone or email at the beginning of the semester, and when necessary, the core course instructor meets with the field mentor and the student to aid the process of activity selection. At the end of the semester, the students return the original, approved form along with write-ups of the activities. The field mentors also sign these write-ups as affirmation that the stated duties were carried out by the students.

The five core courses at Gamma University are Principles of Leadership, School Business, School Law, Supervision, and Human Resources. According to the instructor, students sometimes run into problem conducting activities related to school law and human resources because of policies governing confidentiality within school systems. When this difficulty occurs, the core course instructors help the students come up with alternative activities to fulfill the hours, such as reviewing policies and programs as opposed to taking part in site-based experiences.

In addition to their plan, students are required to develop a school improvement project as a part of their 150-hour field experience. As was the case with the plan, students have latitude in creating and carrying out this project as long as it is tied to the ISLLC standards and approved by the field mentor and core course instructor. As a culmination to the final internship course, students present their improvement project to their classmates and conduct a question and answer session. Additionally, they submit a written version of the project together with any artifacts they have developed as a part of it.

In addition to their internship hours and improvement project, students keep a portfolio of their experiences in the internship. At the time of the interview, Gamma's portfolio system was under modification. It had originally been structured as a traditional, paper portfolio. In the years preceding the interview, students had turned in portfolios in CD format. At the time of the interview, Gamma University was piloting an online portfolio system. The reservation with this system was the cost to students beyond tuition and other materials.

Students in the L-5 program typically carry out their internship experiences in the school where they work. The only exception to this noted by the instructor was if a student had come into the L-5 program under one administrator and a change had taken place, either with the student changing schools or with a shift in administrators. He stated that in those instances students sometimes carried out their leadership activities in a school setting outside their own.

Gamma University Document Analysis

Table 3
Archival Document Information – Gamma University

Hess and Kelly's (2005) Category	Number of Elements	Element(s) Providing Evidence
Data Analysis	3	Situational analysis Relating theory to practice Process evaluation
Personnel Management	2	Management for efficiency Use of technology
Technical Knowledge	3	Blending classroom knowledge and real-world application Operational aspects of principalship Standards integration
Community Interactions	2	Board meetings Shared decision making
Norms and Values	2	Leadership portfolio Narrative report
Instructional Leadership	2	Staff development plan Program evaluation
School Culture	2	Building on effective communication practices Working to understand the structure of the learning environment
Other	1	Standards

This review of the archival data associated with the internship program at Gamma University considers information contained in the course syllabus, the unit assessment conceptual framework for the College of Education and the rejoinder for the Professional Standards Commission Board of Examiner's Report in discussing the categories set forth by Hess and Kelly (2005). As state earlier, after considering the overall effectiveness and repeated negative comments made by students relative to the internship at Gamma University, the internship program was revamped in 2004. As it is currently structured, students are given options for creating a series of field experiences to be undertaken and compiled in an electronic portfolio. The experiences are linked to the ISLCC standards, and each of the standards must be addressed at some point in the internship process. The categories for document analysis are data analysis; personnel management; technical

knowledge; community interactions; norms and values; instructional leadership, and school culture. Additionally, the category “other” is included in order to highlight the inclusion of standards in discussing the overall structure of the internship.

Data analysis is addressed in the requirements for students in several ways including that students are expected to take part in situational analysis; students are to relate theory and practice; students are to take part in school improvement processes, and students are to compare and contrast leadership styles. Relative to situational analysis, the syllabus states that students will have a firm grasp on situational analysis within the context of their internship experiences. The underlying concept behind this requirement is that schools and the shareholders involved with them exist within a situation that is often complex and changing. Understanding the situation is the first step in designing the educational response and as such, care should be given to understanding both what is going on in the school and why the phenomena is taking place. Gamma University subscribes to the view that the more students know about the underlying causes of a situation, the more solid their foundational understanding of how to design programmatic responses will be.

A second element evidencing the area of data analysis in the requirements of students is the statement in the syllabus that students will understand the importance of relating theory to practice through direct observation and contact with field problems and experiences. In other words, students are expected to develop and build on both the theoretical and practical knowledge gained throughout their coursework. In working to bridge academic knowledge and practical experience, the internship at Gamma is structured to be coupled with five core courses, and in each coupling the internship

experiences are designed to fit with the content of the courses as well as with the ISLLC standards. In the culminating internship, students are to create a school improvement project that builds upon the content gained from previous coursework and addresses identified needs in their school sites.

Finally, students are expected to demonstrate knowledge of data analysis through activities that give them the opportunity to evaluate processes within schools – both those where they are carrying out their internship activities and others that are in some way different from their internship sites. In addition to creating and implementing a school improvement project as a part of the internship, students are also asked to look at and evaluate a school improvement project that is already underway at their internship site. This requirement helps students to better understand how processes are structured and how those structures impact the success of programs. Similarly, students are required to compare and contrast the experiences of two leaders as a part of their internship. This activity is designed so that students can look at various leaders in diverse settings and compare how leadership differs from site to site and person to person. While one of the leaders used for comparison can be someone with whom the intern is conducting his/her other activities, the second person must be from a dissimilar setting.

The category of personnel management is addressed in the documents associated with the internship at Gamma University, although to a lesser extent than the previous category. The syllabus states that students are expected to use management techniques to maximize efficiency in their school sites. To this end, they are encouraged to become familiar with how their schools are organized and how those structures ensure a safe, efficient and effective learning environment. Additionally, students are to take part in

experiences involving issues such a staffing and mock observations when possible. Finally, students are encouraged to use technology and other sources to deliver instruction to teachers in their buildings. Some examples of experiences in this category include communicating electronically to the staff on relevant issues and taking part in the delivery of staff development activities through the use of technology.

Regarding the category of technical knowledge, both the syllabus and the other archival documents make several references to the idea of blending classroom knowledge and real-world application through the internship experience. For instance, one of the stated objectives of the internship is for students to gain perspective on varied aspects of leadership. Included in this are elements such as working to have a better understanding of the varied duties of school leaders through shadowing and taking part in hands-on activities. Additionally, students are required to become familiar with the operational aspects of the principalship as they relate to the larger context of the school and community. This means that students are to shadow administrators, take part in leadership experiences, and work with their mentors to understand how the activities they participate in impact the overall school environment. Finally, when designing leadership experiences, students are expected to work with the school mentor to design authentic internship experiences that pertain to the ISLLC standards.

Students in the internship at Gamma are required to show evidence of community interactions through a variety of activities. First, they are asked to attend at least two board meetings or school board planning sessions for their school systems and write-up what they observe at those meetings in order to show an understanding of the politics involved in running a school system. Additionally, they are to write-up their experiences

from the perspective of a board member in order to demonstrate an understanding of how local control shapes school system decision-making. Conducting the write-up in this manner gives the students an opportunity to examine the topic of control from several perspectives and aids them in having a clearer understanding of the process from all angles.

Beyond the school board experiences, students are also expected to gain an understanding of how to involve stakeholders in leadership decisions. This includes facilitating a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community and collaborating with families and community members on decisions that impact the overall school environment. Finally, students are asked to interact with community leaders for the betterment of school and system by joining and becoming active in a secular community-based group.

Internship students are asked to show evidence of promoting a culture of norms and values through the culminating leadership portfolio and narrative report. The portfolio is to include, among other things, a belief statement explaining their viewpoints about the educational process. This report is to cite examples of how the viewpoint has been impacted by coursework and the site-based experiences in an effort to help students have a stronger understanding of their leadership style and how it has been developed. The narrative report is to explain their progress throughout the internship experience. This progress is to be described through a discussion of how they have promoted the success of all students, facilitated a vision of learning, mobilized community resources, and acted with integrity.

The area of instructional leadership is addressed in the internship in two ways. First, students are asked to work in the area of instruction through developing a plan to sustain a program conducive to staff professional growth. In other words, they are to work with staff members to better implement a program that is currently working successfully at their school site. A second way that the criteria can be met is for the student to work with staff members to implement a new program aimed at positively impacting student achievement. Finally, students are asked to evaluate an existing school improvement project at their internship site. Once again, this evaluation is designed to give students a clearer insight into the programs that are already in place and how those programs impact the overall instructional focus of the school.

In considering the category of school culture, the internship experience at Gamma requires several activities of the students enrolled. First, students are expected to gain a greater understanding of how to effectively communicate with external and internal groups. To this end, students are asked to engage in activities that promote the advocating, nurturing and sustaining of the school's culture. In other words, students are to become familiar with what is already in place at the school, determine what is conducive to student learning, and respond to the community's interests and needs based upon this assessment. Additionally, as previously mentioned under the category of norms and values, students are to gain a clearer perception of the structure of the overall learning environment by attending and writing up school board meetings from multiple perspectives. Fulfilling this requirement gives students a glimpse into the culture of the school environment and the larger context under which it operates.

Finally, the Gamma University document analysis provides strong evidence of the linkage between the content of the internship and the ISLLC standards. First, the syllabus states that students will demonstrate progress in the achievement of the six areas addressed by the ISLLC standards. Additionally, students are required to address each standard in designing their internship experiences with their site-based mentors. Their experiences are to be documented in a log and each is to be categorized by the ISLLC standard it addresses. Finally, once the internship is completed, students are asked to complete a narrative in order to demonstrate an understanding of how the internship experiences are linked to the ISLLC standards.

CHAPTER 7

THE RESULTS – DELTA UNIVERSITY

Delta University

Delta University was founded in the late 1800s, and it is located in the center of Delta, Georgia. The institution offers students 58 undergraduate degree programs and 32 graduate-level programs in its three colleges. At the heart of the university's core curriculum are required interdisciplinary studies courses integrating aspects of the liberal arts core into the study of an array of topics and problems too broad to be fully addressed in any one discipline. The university currently serves approximately 5,500 students, has 700 faculty and staff members, and a budget of $60 million. The graduate program numbers more than 1,050 students.

Delta University Interview Information

The instructor who was interviewed about the L-5 internship at Delta University had been public school teacher and building level principal and held an Ed. D. in educational leadership from an institution in a neighboring state. In addition to her public school experiences, she had also worked extensively on reform efforts aimed at securing services for children and adults with disabilities. Her work experiences ranged from school-level to state level reform efforts. At the time of our interview, she had been at the university for seventeen years.

The Department of Educational Leadership at Delta University had undergone significant staff changes in recent years, including a shift from a program delivery by

many adjunct instructors and only one full-time faculty member to the current setting which included five full-time faculty members and one adjunct instructor. According to the interviewee, most of the faculty members were former practitioners. In addition to the core teaching staff, Delta had a number of doctoral-level practicing administrators serving as field mentors to the students in the internship. These doctoral-level practitioners were also considered to be adjunct instructors but did not teach traditional courses.

The L-5 internship at Delta University is set up in a cohort model. Each internship group has approximately twenty students per one instructor. At the time of our interview, there were five cohorts operating at the L-5 certification level with approximately ninety-five students total.

The core courses are offered in a closed lock-stepped system. If a student gets out of sequence or has to leave the program for a period of time, the only option is to come back into the program a year later. Students are only able to begin the L-5 program in the fall semester and complete the program in the summer term. As a result of this structure in both the L-5 and L-6 programs, a student desiring initial leadership certification could complete the requirements for both the L-5 and L-6 in six semesters.

The internship element of the L-5 spans the student's entire time in the program. Students are required to sign up for two classes each semester in addition to the internship, and several of the core courses are offered on Saturdays with a heavy online component. For courses offered in this manner, students meet on campus an average of six times a semester with the remaining coursework being completed in non-traditional

ways. The interviewee emphasized that this delivery model was extremely beneficial to the students because it was less invasive than traditional evening classes.

The minimum requirement for internship hours is 240 for both the L-5 and the L-6 internship. There are five core courses and a capstone course in the L-5 certification program at Delta University in addition to the three-semester internship. While the internship is taken at the same time as the core courses, it is not embedded into them. Both the core courses and the internship are linked to the ELCC standards.

Each of the core courses has a departmental syllabus that instructors are encouraged to use. These syllabi are linked to the ELCC standards, and while there is room for academic freedom regarding instructional delivery, the instructors are expected to cover the main objectives and standards as they are set forth by the syllabi. To this end, the faculty of the Leadership Department meets monthly to ensure that the course offerings are aligned with the standards. Also, the Leadership Department has Leadership Advisory Council that reviews the program regularly to make sure the standards are being met. One result of these meetings was the elimination of the School Law course. Rather than offering it as a stand-alone course, the content of it was embedded into other courses, resulting in the addition of the capstone course to the program.

The cohort groupings for the internship are determined geographically so the internship instructor can conduct site visits at the intern's school setting. Every intern is visited at least twice throughout the course of the three semesters, with those needing more intensive work being visited more often.

The internship at Delta University is typically a site-based experience that takes place at the intern's own school. The interviewee estimated that 90% of the school-based

mentors had gone through either the L-5 or L-6 program at Delta University, and as a result, what was expected of the intern with regard to types of activities was rarely an issue. Additionally, the internship instructor met with the site-based mentor during the initial visit to the school setting, and Delta University had developed an on-line handbook outlining the expectations of the internship.

At the beginning of the internship, students were instructed to discuss and develop a vision statement with their site-based mentor. Additionally, the mentor and the student met about the expectations in the Mentorship Handbook and worked to develop a plan of activities that are linked to the ELCC standards. Following the initial mentor/student meeting, the internship supervisor met with the mentor and the student and monitored the activities through the internship log. Finally, the interviewee monitored each student log from the university. The culmination of the L-5 program was a course in which students were required to pull together all of the artifacts from their internship experience and present them to their peers. Students were expected to keep a spreadsheet log of their activities and link them back to the ELCC standards. At the time of the interview, Delta was modifying the log so as to make it an online element of the program.

On top of the experiences at the intern's school setting, the internship at Delta University required community involvement and joining a professional group. The interviewee offered membership in the Chamber of Commerce or the Education Committee as examples of this requirement. Finally, all interns are expected to have experiences that span the elementary, middle, and high school levels as a part of their 240 hours.

Delta University Document Analysis

Table 4
Archival Document Information – Delta University

Hess and Kelly's (2005) Category	Number of Elements	Element(s) Providing Evidence
Data Analysis	2	School improvement project Use of technology
Personnel Management	3	Familiarizing self with forms Chairing instructional meetings Co-observing teacher
Technical Knowledge	4	Participation in interviews Shadowing administrators Participating in professional development Acquiring technology skills
Community Interactions	3	Board meetings Innovative programs Secular group membership
Norms and Values	3	Action plan Personal educational leadership philosophy Reflection
Instructional Leadership	3	IEP meetings Interviews of those responsible for scheduling classes Behavior management program
School Culture	1	Architect of change
Other	2	Standards Internship evaluation

The documents reviewed for analysis at Delta University were the internship syllabus and the Professional Standards Commission Report. The categories for discussion of these documents, based on the work of Hess and Kelly, are data analysis; personnel management; technical knowledge; community interactions; norms and values; instructional leadership, and school culture. The category "other" is included to highlight the integration of standards into the internship experience, and to underscore how the elements of the internship are assessed. The internship syllabus for Delta University states, "Graduate education at Delta incorporates the view of education as an on-going effort that is never completed. Practitioners who are committed to growing and

developing professionally must invest energy in staying informed and increasing their skills," (p. 4). In order to address this belief, the internship at Delta has been structured to include elements of professional growth, both through site-based experiences and through continuing scholarly inquiry.

In considering the first category, data analysis, the internship calls for achievement in this area through the requirement that students complete a school improvement project. Students work with their site-based mentor to determine an area of need within the school setting. Then, they are asked to work in collaboration with their mentor to research the issue and determine root causes. Once they have considered the data collected, they are to conduct research and write a paper outlining how the need could best be addressed based upon the data collected and programs studied in similar settings. This project allows students to look at what is going on within their school settings and determine how best to improve upon the current situation through research and data collection.

A second way that data analysis is utilized within the internship is the requirement that students use computers in specific ways. First, students are to demonstrate a working knowledge of how to use computers for data collection for their school improvement projects. Secondly, they are to use them to manage information through the e portfolio system. Finally, they are to use computers and technology as problem-solving vehicles when determining the course of action their school improvement projects should take.

In considering Hess and Kelly's second category, personnel management, the internship at Delta requires students to develop several competencies in this area. First, they are expected to collect and work to understand forms utilized by school

administrators. This requirement gives internship students the opportunity to look at what is required of leaders with reference to paperwork and how those expectations impact the ability to work with staff members. Additionally, the requirement helps students gain insight into the managerial aspects of a leader's work.

Secondly, interns at Delta are required to chair instructional meetings at their school sites. This expectation gives the interns an opportunity to work with staff members in developing and implementing instructional strategies. It also affords the interns the opportunity to serve as teacher-leaders to the staff members at their school sites.

Finally, Delta's internship has a requirement in the area of personnel management that is unique when looking at the four programs participating in this study on the internship. Students at Delta are required to co-observe a teacher at their internship site together with their mentor. This expectation is to be documented through the observation instrument as well as through a comprehensive entry in the intern's journal. While interns are often asked to observe a teacher, the requirement that the students at Delta do so alongside their mentors provides two added benefits to students. First, they are able to compare and contrast their observations to those of their leader and make inferences on the differences in their leadership styles. Secondly, they are given the opportunity to work beside their site's educational leader to view how the curriculum is presented in the school setting. Doing so allows the students to begin to have a clearer understanding of the role of an instructional leader.

The third category, technical knowledge, is also highlighted in the internship at Delta University in a variety of ways including requirements that students participate in interviews, shadowing opportunities, ongoing professional development, and technology

acquisition. First, students are asked to interview central office finance officers to gain a clearer understanding of how budgets for their school systems are determined. After the interviews, they are to write up what they learned and use their reflective journals to link their perceptions to the ELCC standards.

A second, unique requirement to the internship at Delta asks students to read and write a critical review of at least one book on the principalship. This requirement demonstrates the linkage at Delta between theory and practice because students are expected to do this while they are conducting their internship activities and relate what they have read to what they are experiencing. Additionally, this requirement provides evidence of Delta's stated philosophy of education as an on-going learning process for leaders. Requiring students to continue to read and reflect upon writings pertinent to the field sets the stage for producing leaders who see the value in continuing to learn throughout their educational careers.

Interns at Delta are also expected to shadow assistant principals and principals in a variety of school settings. This expectation is in place so that students can begin to become familiar with varied leadership styles and how those styles impact learning environments. Beyond shadowing administrators, interns are also asked to interview them and reflect on their experiences in their journals. Doing so allows the interns to gain a better understanding of why leaders make decisions and what their perceptions are on how those decisions impact students. Finally, working with current leaders as well as shadowing and interviewing them gives interns a window into the world of schools from the leader's perspective and helps them to continue to develop their own leadership styles.

A final way the category of technical knowledge is addressed in the internship at Delta University is through the expectation that students demonstrate skill in the use of computers. While this requirement may seem minor, computers have drastically changed the way school leaders do everything from observing teachers to conducting interviews to submitting required paperwork. As this is the case, Delta's interns are required to submit their work electronically and present their school improvement projects through a PowerPoint presentation. Doing so gives interns opportunities to demonstrate skills in using technology including word processing, database, and spreadsheet utilities.

In considering the category of community interactions, students at Delta are to take part in several activities. Interns are asked to interact with community leaders for the betterment of the school system by attending school board meetings and other community forums. First, interns are to demonstrate a comprehension of the concept of local control of public education from the perspective of the school board. In order to do this, they attend work and public sessions of various school systems' board meetings and write reflections on these meetings from both their perspective and the perspective of the school board members. Secondly, they are to visit innovative programs at various schools and record reflections in their journals on what makes the programs successful and on how the lessons learned will inform their future practice. Finally students are required to become active members of a secular community service group in order to demonstrate a commitment to the idea that schools exist as a part of the larger community in which they operate.

In looking at the category of norms and values, students in the internship at Delta are to complete several activities aimed at helping them to better understand and develop

their own leadership styles and beliefs. First, they are asked to develop a professional action plan. In this plan, they are to set professional goals for themselves and then outline how they will reach those goals. This activity gives the students a forum to consider and articulate where they want their professional paths to lead and how they plan to reach their objectives. Students are also asked to develop a personal educational leadership philosophy. This activity gives students a chance to reflect upon what they have learned through practice and coursework and then integrate that knowledge into a unique statement about their values and beliefs. Finally, students in the internship at Delta are to take part in continuous reflection. Doing so gives them a forum to analyze the activities in which they have participated and then record their perceptions in order to gain a clearer understanding of their professional experiences.

The category of instructional leadership is addressed by the internship at Delta both through the expectations placed upon students and the requirements of the individuals mentoring those students. First students who are enrolled in the internship are required to attend Individualized Education Plan (IEP) meetings and write reflections on those meetings. This requirement gives interns the opportunity to participate in setting instructional strategies for students while working as a part of a larger team of individuals. In addition to this requirement, students are asked to interview the persons responsible for scheduling classes, both at their sites and at other, dissimilar sites. This gives interns the chance to see how the instructional day is structured in a variety of settings and what drives those decisions. Finally, students are asked to help plan a behavior management program for a student at their internship site. After working with the school staff to put together the plan, the intern is expected to conduct a conference

with student's parents and reflect upon the overall process. Again, working with students, staff, and parents in this manner gives the interns an opportunity to play a part in the design process while gaining a clearer understanding of how the overall instructional team operates.

A final way that the internship at Delta addresses instructional leadership is through the instruction the department provides to those individuals mentoring the interns. Rather than just relying upon meetings to provide information about what is expected of the internship process, Delta's leadership department developed an on-line training manual for site-based mentors. This document serves several purposes. First, it clearly articulates what is expected of the mentors so they know what to count on with regard to how the internship should be structured and what their responsibilities include. Second, it gives concrete examples of what the students are expected to do with regard to each ELCC standard. Finally, because the manual is on-line, it assures every mentor and every student equal access to the information required to successfully complete the internship. While the university still conducts both on-campus and school-site meetings throughout the internship process, the on-line manual gives everyone involved – the professors, the site-based mentors, and the interns – continual access to the information they need to better understand the internship process.

Hess and Kelly's (2005) final category, school culture, is also evidenced in the documents associated with the internship at Delta University. The internship syllabus states, "As an architect of change, the practitioner will have the skill to cultivate partnerships within the schools and community while collaborating with the larger professional community to solve problems while making decisions about the current

educational climate and future trends in education," (p. 3). In other words, students in the internship are to work throughout the process to understand how to collaborate with stakeholders in both the school and the community as a whole. This collaborative process should take into account both the current educational climate and also consider what is on the horizon with regard to changes.

The final category for document analysis for this study is "other" and is included to allow for a discussion of any areas evidenced that are not fully highlighted by Hess and Kelly's categories. Two elements of the internship at Delta University, standards and student assessment, fit into this final category. First, with regard to standards, every program participating in this study integrated standards into the internship on some level. Delta is no exception, but the integration of standards is taken to a higher level because of the way the program is structured. Every course activity for the internship is linked to both the ELCC and BOR standards. Further, rather than just stating this linkage, the syllabus provides a table that includes the expected course outcomes linked to the appropriate standard and related again to the specific activity the student is to complete. Structuring the course expectations in this manner gives the students a clear understanding of both what they are supposed to do and of how that activity fits into the overall structure of standards guiding the program.

With regard to student assessment, the linkage is carried a step further. The syllabus clearly states the outcome assessments for every required activity, and links the assessment back to the ELCC and BOR standards. The internship activities for the most part are assessed by rubric, and grades are determined by level of competency for each activity. Structuring both the activities and the assessment of those activities in this

manner allows the students to expand their functional understanding of the standards guiding leadership preparation in the state of Georgia.

CHAPTER 8

SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES OF THE PROGRAMS STUDIED

Introduction

This chapter discusses the similarities of the four programs included in this study of the L-5 internship in the state of Georgia. Highlighted in this chapter are how standards impact the design of the leadership preparation program generally and the internship specifically; how each site links classroom knowledge and internship experiences within the field; how the internship prepares students to become school leaders, and how programs collect data on internship experiences in order to demonstrate the ability of students to perform.

Following the discussion of similarities of the four programs, the differences are presented. These differences center upon how the internship is structured as an embedded portion of the overall L-5 program at one institution and how another institution requires its interns to carry out their site-based experiences at a setting other than their home school. Presenting the data with reference to the similarities and differences of the programs studied lends greater clarity to the internship structure at programs throughout the state of Georgia and sets the stage for the final chapter's discussion and recommendations.

Table 5
Table of Institutions and Evidence of Performance

Institution	Standards and Program Design	Classroom Knowledge and Field Application	On-the Job Training	Performance Data Collected on Students
Alpha University	Content areas are cross-walked on the ELCC standards Syllabus gives the students guidance on how many hours should be spent in each area Instructor provides ideas with regard to activities. Students create a report discussing how their school site addresses the ELCC standards	The internship's sister class, general administration, allots an hour to focus upon the internship. There is a second group meeting to answer questions and field problems	Internship activities must fit into one of twelve categories as outlined in the course syllabus	Activity log Portfolio Confidential evaluation
Beta University	Courses have a departmental syllabus, including links to the ELLC/ISLLC standards Original L-5 internship was developed around the BOR (Board of Regents) standards	Mural-sized rubric of the course offerings identified content areas and strands for the ELCC/ISLLC standards Each course within the L-5 and L-6 program addressed specific standards	The internship is a three-part course in which students shadow an administrator for no less than 30 hours per semester Shadowing must take place outside the student's school system	E portfolio Exit exam Artifacts from internship activities
Gamma University	Field experiences, course content, and the ISLLC standards are linked with one another Culminating internship must have each experience linked to one of the ISLLC standards. The core content instructors assure each standard is addressed at some point in the internship	Internship is a program-long event coupled with five core courses in the L-5 program Students perform twenty hours of administrative field experience for each of the core courses	Students submit a plan that is approved by their field mentors and college instructors	Internship plan and write-up School improvement project Portfolio
Delta University	Core courses have a departmental syllabus Syllabi are linked to the ELCC standards Leadership Advisory Council reviews program to ensure standards are met	Internship is not embedded into core courses Core courses and the internship are linked to the ELCC standards	Community involvement is required All internship experiences must span the elementary, middle, and high school levels	Presentation of artifacts of internship experience Spreadsheet log activities linked to ELCC standards

Standards and Program Design

Each of the four programs studied utilized the ELCC/ISLLC standards as one of the building blocks for course content within the L-5 preparation program. While the standards were integrated into the overall program design in different ways, each program provided two or more ways that standards were a part of program design.

Alpha University's program took the ELCC standards and cross-walked the overall course content to those standards ensuring that each standard was addressed as a part of every core course. With reference to the internship, the internship syllabus gives students guidance on how many hours should be spent on activities centered on each area of the ELCC standards. Finally, as a part of the culminating internship activity, students are required to create a report discussing how their school site addresses the ELCC standards in order to demonstrate an understanding of how the standards link to practice.

At Beta University, every course with the L-5 program has a departmental syllabus, and it is linked to the ELCC/ISLLC standards. The leadership team developed the course syllabi, and while individual instructors can modify instructional delivery as desired, the standards included in the course content are to remain consistent throughout the department. Further, standards integration has been a part of the program design at Beta for a number of years. The original L-5 internship at Beta University was developed around the standards that were guiding leadership preparation in the year 2000. At that time, those standards were the BOR (Board of Regents) standards, and subsequently, when the standards guiding leadership preparation in the state of Georgia were changed, Beta's program design continued the commitment to standards integration.

As was the case with the aforementioned programs, Gamma University links field experiences, course content, and the ELCC/ISLLC standards are linked with one another. During the last semester in the program students take a culminating three-credit-hour internship course in which they are required to log fifty hours of field experience. Each activity documented for the field experience must be linked back to one of the ISLLC standards. As the internship at Gamma is supervised by the core content instructors, those people monitor each student's log of internship activities and work with the student to assure each ELCC standard is addressed at some point in the internship.

At Delta University, like Beta University, each of the core courses has a departmental syllabus that instructors are encouraged to use. These syllabi are linked to the ELCC standards, and while there is room for academic freedom regarding instructional delivery, the instructors are expected to cover the main objectives and standards as they are set forth by the syllabi. To this end, the faculty of the Leadership Department meets monthly to ensure that the course offerings are aligned with the standards. Also, a Leadership Advisory Council guides the Leadership Department at Delta. This group reviews the L-5 program regularly in order to make sure the standards are being adequately integrated throughout the courses.

Classroom Knowledge and Field Application

Each of the four programs studied links classroom knowledge to field application in more than one way. At Alpha University, the internship begins during the first semester of study. On the first night of the first semester, the internship's sister class, general administration, allots an hour to focus upon the internship. During this time, questions are addressed including those focusing upon how to structure the process, what

can count as activities, and other general issues. Halfway through the semester, once students have had a chance to structure their internships and gain clarity on the design of the internship, there is a second group meeting to address questions and field problems. This same process is repeated during the second semester of the internship and allows students guidance with reference to how to integrate classroom knowledge with field experience.

Beta University's program relies heavily on standards integration, and as a result, field experiences are impacted by this design. For instance, the leadership department has developed a rubric of all the courses and the content strands of the ELCC/ISLLC standards addressed within that course. Similarly, those content strands are linked to internship experiences resulting in a strong alliance between what occurs in the classroom and what activities are conducted in the field that were addressed as a part of that course.

The design of Gamma University's internship provides what is arguably the strongest link of any of the four programs with regard to classroom knowledge and field application. Beginning in 2004, the internship became a program-long event embedded into five core courses in the L-5 program. Students are required to perform twenty hours of administrative field experience for each of the core courses, for a total of 100 hours of field experience related to each specific course. In other words, for each of the five core courses, students at Gamma take part in internship activities that are related to the content of the course as well as the ELCC standards. Additionally, the Gamma internship contains 50 hours of required activity that do not have to be linked to a specific course but must still address the ELCC standards.

Finally, with regard to classroom knowledge and field application, Delta University also provides a link between the two. The internship is taken at the same time as the core courses although it is not embedded into them. However, both the core courses and the internship are linked to the ELCC standards, and the instructors within the program work to help students design activities within the field that address standards and thus, course content. Additionally, in order to help students better design appropriate experiences, Delta has put a Mentorship Handbook on the web so that those administrators supervising interns in the field have a clear understanding of what is expected with regard to activities and application of course content.

On-the-Job Training

In considering the topic of on-the-job training, Alpha University has addressed this in a unique way. In addition to being linked to course content and the ELCC standards, internship activities must fit into one of twelve categories as outlined in the course syllabus. The interviewee and a former instructor at the university developed content areas for the course syllabus in order to cover all of the areas one might encounter as a public school administrator. The content areas are leadership/management theories, public relations, finance, legal issues, safe schools, planning, opening/closing school, personnel, student services, auxiliary services, activities outside the selected site, and participant's option. According to the interviewee, these content areas were selected specifically because both he and the other instructor felt that they would give students a broad view of the activities required of a practicing administrator.

At Beta University students take part in the internship throughout their three semesters in the L-5 program. During this time, they are expected to shadow an

administrator for no less than 30 hours per semester. This shadowing experience must take place outside the student's school system in order to provide exposure to different settings and different leadership styles. The rationale behind structuring the internship in this manner is that it affords students the opportunity to observe educational environments that are differing from their own.

Students at Gamma University work with their field mentors and their college instructors to design internship experiences. The collaborative plans they develop include experiences that provide on-the-job training and link those activities to the appropriate ELCC standard. As a result of this structure, students are able to design experiences using both knowledge gained from their courses and the expertise of the practitioners under whom they are carrying out their internship activities.

At Delta University the internship provides on-the-job training that reaches beyond the school setting. In addition to the experiences at the intern's school, the internship at Delta University requires community involvement by way of joining a professional group. The interviewee offered membership in the Chamber of Commerce or the Education Committee as examples of this requirement and felt strongly that this prerequisite better prepares interns for their positions as school and community leaders. Additionally, all interns at Delta are expected to structure their internships in order to have experiences that span the elementary, middle, and high school levels. This structure, again, provides students with the opportunity to have a better understanding of what is required of leaders in varied settings.

Performance Data Collected on Students

Regarding data that is collected on students enrolled in the L-5 internship, all four of the programs in this study require students to assemble some type of a portfolio for evaluation purposes. While the format of the portfolios varies from site to site, all four universities call for students to include artifacts from their internship experiences in the documents.

According to the faculty member interviewed at Alpha, these portfolios help the interns make the shift from thinking and acting like a teacher to thinking and acting like an administrator because they must frame their activities around the ELCC standards. Additionally, at Alpha, students' site-based mentors use a confidential evaluation that is linked to the ELCC standards to evaluate their progress and activities.

At Beta in addition to the portfolio component, students are also required to take an exit exam that was developed by the Educational Leadership Department. The written component of the exam is linked to the ELCC/ISLLC standards and the test also includes an oral interview component. Students are required to show artifacts from their internship activities at this exit conference, and evaluation of the overall exit exam is based upon the ELCC/ISLLC standards.

In addition to the portfolio requirement, Gamma University has students develop a school improvement plan as a part of their 150-hour internship. This project is developed using data collected from the school site and in cooperation with the intern's site-based mentor. The improvement project is designed to address a need within the school and usually has a curricular component. The students' final evaluation is based on the successful completion of this project as well as the portfolio.

At Delta University the culmination of the L-5 program is a course in which students are required to pull together all of the artifacts from their internship experience and present them to their peers. This presentation, together with the spreadsheet log of the students' activities throughout the internship serves as the final evaluation of the L-5 program.

Differences of the Programs Studied

Overall, the four programs in this study of the L-5 internship in the state of Georgia have many similarities. All four of the programs provide evidence of standards with regard to the design of both the leadership program generally and the internship specifically. Additionally, each program links classroom knowledge and internship experiences within the field in several ways. Alpha, Beta, Gamma, and Delta Universities all provide evidence of ways that the internship prepares students to become school leaders. Finally, each program collects data on internship experiences in order to demonstrate the ability of students to perform through the use of portfolios and other means. While the programs are all similar with regard to the aforementioned criteria, there are two distinct ways in which the internships at Beta and Gamma University differ from the other institutions studied.

Beta University, unlike the other institutions in this study, requires that students conduct their internships in a setting outside their home school. Despite the fact that the literature overwhelmingly encourages this model (Cordeiro & Sloan, 1996; Daresh & Playko, 1992; Gresso, 1993; Milstein, 1993; NPBEA, 1989), Beta was the only institution interviewed that utilized it. While a common assumption is that it is more difficult to conduct activities outside one's own school setting, the interviewee at Beta

stated that students are able to work out release time on an individual basis. She added that many interns logged their hours in evening schools, and that some specifically selected field sites with opposite holiday schedules in order to facilitate observation opportunities. This literature-based model of structuring the internship is the first of two major differences noted among the programs studied.

The second major difference was noted with reference to the internship at Gamma University. While each of the other three programs offers the internship as a stand-alone course, at Gamma the bulk of the internship is embedded into five core courses within the L-5 program. The interviewee at Gamma offered that this model was more effective than the pure stand-alone model because the later process did not work as planned at Gamma. In years prior, when the internship was not embedded into the core courses, students were required to carryout their activities without as much guidance from university personnel. As a result, students often left the course requirements until the last possible minute, negatively influencing the quality of the internship.

Beginning in 2004, the internship became a program-long event coupled with five core courses in the L-5 program. Students are required to perform twenty hours of administrative field experience for each of the core courses, for a total of 100 hours. Because of this restructuring, the students get varied perspectives on the internship experience, and the instructors within the Educational Leadership Department are able to make sure that field experiences, course content, and the ISLLC standards are linked with one another. The culmination of the internship at Gamma University is a stand-alone course in which students are required to log an additional 50 hours of site-based activities and present their school improvement projects and portfolio artifacts to an audience of

their peers. The combination of embedding the internship into the five core courses and completing it as a stand-alone course offers students the opportunity to closely link their experiences to both course content and the ELCC/ISLLC standards under which the overall leadership program operates.

In closing, the internships at the four universities in this study share many more similarities than differences. When considering the questions guiding this study, Alpha, Beta, Gamma, and Delta all provide evidence of standards; offer links between classroom knowledge and internship experiences in the field; provide on-the-job training, and collect several sources of data with reference to student performance. While this is the case, Beta and Gamma Universities provide examples of two notable differences in program design. At Beta, students are required to conduct their site-based activities at an institution outside their own school. At Gamma, the internship is structured as an embedded element of the five core L-5 classes. Both of these variances give the students within the programs a wider perspective than students at the other institutions receive. In participating in the internship at another school site, students at Beta have the opportunity to become familiar with varied leadership styles and different school cultures. By embedding the internship into the core courses, the instructors at Gamma have provided students with an experience that more closely links classroom knowledge and field experience. Both of these variations are an example of how a difference in program design can afford students a stronger overall experience.

Alpha University Lessons Learned

Based upon the data collected from Alpha University, the certification program in general and the internship specifically can best be characterized as a practice-based

model. Evidence of this was provided via information on how the internship is formulated, what elements are fundamental to program design, and how students are assessed. This practice-based model has strong attributes including that students have a stronger working knowledge of how to apply program content to practice and that positive professional relationships typically result from the pairing of mentors and students. However, there are also potential shortcomings with this model including issues associated with negative student/mentor relationships and issues of evaluation bias.

The literature states that because of the field-based nature of internships, they can be extremely effective in providing students with opportunities to fuse knowledge and application (Bass, 1990). At Alpha University, this concept is carried into practice with the integration of a list of twelve competencies that students must master in order to successfully complete the internship process. The list was developed by two former school administrators, and it gives Alpha's students a directed list of items they are to master as a part of their site-based work. This list covers the content areas of leadership/management theories, public relations, finance, legal issues, safe schools, planning, opening/closing school, personnel, student services, auxiliary services, activities outside the selected site, and participant's option. This is relevant because not only is the internship provided as a means by which students can learn about how schools are run, but the list of competencies give the students a concrete direction in which to focus their activities. Further, the students are required to undertake activities from each of the twelve areas. This helps assure that the internship process will be well-rounded and will include activities the interviewee highlighted as "...everything we dealt with on a

day-to-day basis as school principals ourselves" (Personal Communication, August, 2006).

A second advantage of the practice-based model is that students have the opportunity to develop strong professional relationships with both the university supervisor and the site-based mentor. Further, because the overall program at Alpha is offered as a closed-cohort model, strong professional relationships also develop between the students in the program. The literature frequently touts the benefits of this professional bonding. In particular the cohort model of delivery has been credited with developing stronger social and interpersonal relationships, greater cohesiveness among students and faculty, and stronger professional relationships (Jackson & Kelley, 2002). At Alpha University, the university mentor also visits the internship site and works closely with the student and the site-based mentor in selecting activities that fit into the twelve competencies. This networking also provides the students at Alpha with additional opportunities for building professional relationships.

While the practice-based model provides the aforementioned benefits, there are also several potential pitfalls associated with it. One such issue occurs when a student is partnered with a less-than-adequate mentor. The interviewee stressed this potential problem when he stated, "Face it, the quality of the internship depends on what their mentor lets them do, and we find so much variability there" (Alpha Interviewee, Personal Communication, August, 2006). While the vast majority of internships in this practice-based model are positive, when the pairing is problematic, the student can suffer immensely. This can perpetuate itself in the way of interns receiving little or no direction; interns being asked to do one activity, such as bus duty, in order to fulfill their

entire internship requirement, and in the worst cases, interns not having the opportunity to carry out their activities at all. Unfortunately, when these situations occur, the university has little recourse except to help the student find another placement, and often, this can mean the student must delay completion of the program.

A final potential issue with regard to the practice-based program at Alpha University is the site-based mentor's input into the student evaluation process. While this is usually a helpful tool for student growth, in instances where the student and the mentor have professional issues, it can be problematic. The interviewee highlighted this potential issue stating, "On occasion we will have them bring a student into the office and ask if they are sure that administration is where they want to be" (Alpha Interviewee, Personal Communication, August, 2006). Because at Alpha the student's internship is graded based on the portfolio and the two-part mentor evaluation, the mentor's input is weighted heavily. When the relationship between the mentor and the student is positive, this can be a valuable tool. However, in instances where the student and the mentor have professional issues, this can be devastating to the student's progress through the program.

Beta University Lessons Learned

In considering the data collected from Beta University, leadership preparation at that institution can best be characterized as a standards-based delivery model with an emphasis on best practice in internship design. This was evident from answers given throughout the interview, from the standards-aligned course rubric in the interviewee's office, and from the model used for student placement. As was the case with the practice-based delivery model, the standards-based model offers positive and negative components to students. The positives associated with the model include that students

have a clear understanding of what is expected of them with regard to state standards and certification and that programmatically there is consistency across the courses. The negatives associated with this model include that there is less room for leeway in the courses and internship activities can be too prescribed.

The literature suggests that the current model of leadership preparation is outdated and less than adequate. Levine (2005) argues that the current grab bag of course offerings must give way to a more relevant and challenging curriculum if the goal of better preparing leaders is to be attained. Despite prominent changes in the ideologies guiding school leaders over the last century, leadership preparation programs have not changed dramatically from their inception into graduate schools eighty-plus years ago (Tillman, 2001). In order to address how best to approach program design, a standards-based model has been utilized at Beta University. The result of the design at Beta is a program that is continuously updated using the most current standards in leadership training as the building blocks for course content and internship activities. According to the interviewee, the internship at Beta had been redesigned three times in eight years with each change stemming from a shift in statewide standards (Personal Communication, September 2006).

The positives resulting from this standards-based delivery model are two-fold. First, the content aspiring leaders are expected to master for statewide certification tests is updated and taught systematically throughout the program. Secondly, by assigning explicit standards-based content to specific courses, students are assured of being exposed to elements considered by the state to be crucial to the leadership knowledge base regardless of who is teaching the course. Further, Beta has universal syllabi for all

courses. The interviewee stated, “The faculty team works together to review and modify the syllabus, and everyone who teaches a course uses the same one” (Personal Communication, September 2006).

The literature touts this standards-based design as sound when it leads program designers in a direction of rethinking content, delivery, and assessment (Lashway, 2003). At Beta, standards-based design guides the rethinking process through periodic meetings of the leadership faculty in which content placement and order is revisited and refined.

A caution that has been noted regarding standards-based design is that courses and content must be coupled with both high standards and a collaborative approach between all stakeholders (Norton, 2002). This is in part because failure to consider elements beyond the standards can lead to a prescribed delivery model that lacks any room for broadening within the individual courses. This can be especially true when universal syllabi are utilized because there is less room for individual instructor modifications throughout the semester. Beta University addresses this potential issue through regular team meetings involving both the full-time leadership faculty and the leadership counsel, a group comprised of adjunct instructors utilized in the program as well as administrators at Beta’s partner schools.

Field site selection in the area of leadership preparation has been discussed by a number of scholars, with many agreeing that the current model of placing students in their home schools is less-than-adequate (Cordeiro & Sloan, 1996; Daresh & Playko, 1992; Gresso, 1993; Milstein, 1993; NPBEA, 1989). Beta University was unique to this study because it was the only program that supported current scholarship and put students in internships outside of their home schools. Rather than allowing students to perform

their internship activities in their home schools, students at Beta are required to complete their activities in one of Beta's partner schools. While institutions that do not use this model assert that it is too difficult for students to log their hours, the interviewee at Beta had a different perspective stating "Many of our students log their hours in evening academies or they purposely select schools outside their own systems so they have alternating vacation schedules" (Personal Communication, September 2006). This model of placing interns at Beta not only provides them with a strong standards-based curriculum, but it also offers them a unique opportunity to view the field of leadership beyond their own school setting.

Gamma University Lessons Learned

The format of the internship at Gamma University is best described as structural in nature with a strong linkage between the internship and the core courses offered for certification. The internship at Gamma was the only example in the study of an experience that was embedded into the core course offerings as opposed to being offered as an individual class. As was the case with Alpha and Beta's structuring, the model used at Gamma provides both pros and cons to students. One effective point of this delivery model is that the internship is closely linked to the courses resulting in a strong theory to practice link. However, a substantial shortcoming associated with structuring an internship in this way is in the area of university supervision. Additionally, the actual linkage between the content of the courses and the site-based element can be problematic if the courses are not designed using the most current models.

According to Bass (1990) internship experiences are almost exclusively field-based and as such can be extremely effective in providing students with opportunities to

fuse knowledge and application. The internship at Gamma is designed to maximize this effectiveness through linking the internship to the five core courses required for certification. The internship at Gamma was restructured from a stand-alone delivery model to an embedded part of the core courses in 2003. The interviewee highlighted the reasons behind this structural shift in stating, “The restructuring was done to make sure the field experiences related to course work” (Personal Communication, September 2006). The interviewee emphasized that prior to the shift the internship was often an after-thought for students rather than an authentic experience stating, “A lot of students would leave everything until the very end” (Personal Communication, September 2006). Since the internship has been restructured, the students are able to complete a portion of their site-based requirements as a part of each class, and those activities are directly linked to the course topics. This change ensures that they work on their site-based requirement throughout the program. Further, it virtually guarantees that the student’s activities will have a good deal of variation.

While the embedded structure at Gamma does provide a stronger link to the coursework, it also presents a potential pitfall related to supervision and program consistency. Interestingly, this very issue is one reason the internship was originally restructured. Before the restructuring, the required 150 hours were supervised by the introductory course instructor. After the first semester, the students would not have that instructor again for a traditional course, yet he/she was still supervising the internship. In an effort to address this disconnect, Gamma restructured the supervision model so that each core course instructor oversees the portion of the internship related to his/her class. The interviewee highlighted the concerns with the restructured model in saying, “There is

not a single advisor for field experience. Now they go to their core course professor and obviously several professors teach the same core courses, and they each do it a little differently" (Personal Communication, September 2006). As a result of this variation, students from semester to semester may not be required to do the same types of activities for the internship portion of their core courses. Additionally, some instructors emphasize the importance of the internship more than others. Therefore, while there is greater consistency with regard to what is expected of students within an individual course, there is actually less consistency program-wide because so many people are supervising isolated pieces of the internship.

A second area of concern with the structural format of Gamma's internship is related to the actual content of the courses and how that content impacts the internship. The literature suggests that internship activities should include authentic administrative experiences and increase in complexity as the internship progresses (Hackman, Russell & Elliott, 1999; Cordeiro and Sloan, 1996). While none of the programs in this study emphasized the idea of the internship activities increasing in complexity as the students progressed, the embedded model provides the least effective structure for this to occur. Because the internship is pieced together as a part of five distinct classes, the activities are compartmentalized to address the more narrow focus of each course. When one course is complete, the intern moves on to a new university supervisor, a new course, and a new narrow activity set related to the new course. This virtually guarantees that the intern's activities will provide glimpses into leadership activities rather than the opportunity to develop a more comprehensive understanding of routines and daily tasks as encouraged in the literature (Gresso, 1993; NPBEA 1989; Senge, 1990).

Delta University Lessons Learned

The internship model at Delta University can best be characterized as practice-based coupled with clear expectations that are articulated to all stakeholders. While this model is extremely effective with regard to content delivery, there is also a major shortcoming with overall program structure.

The internship at Delta University is a practice-based model that differs from the model at Alpha University with regard to how stakeholders are included in the overall process. The literature emphasizes that principals are expected to be agents of shared, collaborative forms of leadership rather than merely hierarchical building managers (Brunner, 2001). At Delta, this collaborative focus is integrated into the structure of the internship in several ways. First, the majority of the site-based mentors are graduates of the Delta program. The interviewee highlighted this in stating, "It is ironic, but at least 90% of our host mentors are previous students so we already know them" (Personal Communication, September 2006). Because of this prior relationship, the site-based mentors are more familiar with what is expected of the Delta interns and of how to help focus their internship experiences. Additionally, those mentors help guide the internship process from both a former student standpoint and from a current leader stance. Further, Delta publishes an online mentorship manual so both mentors and students have continuous access to what is expected of them throughout the progression.

While this prior relationship and online manual both help clarify the process, the internship at Delta is further structured to ensure all stakeholders are involved. The literature has been very critical of leadership preparation programs and the lack of connection between what students need to know and what is taught. This sentiment has

been echoed by principals across the nation. Many have weighed in and agreed that leadership preparation programs are out of touch with what it takes to run today's schools (Farkas 2001). To address this criticism, Delta's Leadership Advisory Council, comprised of current and former educational leaders, reviews the content of all courses and makes suggestions for improvement based on practice.

Finally, Delta's internship is unique in that part of the required student activities center upon joining organizations beyond the actual school. The interviewee offered, "I like for my students to join the Chamber of Commerce and get on the Education Committee. That way, they become actively involved in the community" (Personal Communication, September 2006). Through each of these requirements, the students at Delta are provided with an internship that centers on the collaborative process that is so often lacking in leadership preparation programs.

While the aforementioned structural elements render the Delta internship extremely effective, there is one component of the program that is problematic for students. The course offerings are only offered during one semester each year. The interviewee highlighted this in stating, "Everything is lock stepped. You cannot enter except in the fall, and you are finished by the end of the summer" (Personal Communication, September 2006). While this structure does provide a concise model for those desiring certification completion in three semesters, it does not allow students who may need to postpone courses for one or more semesters any options except to come back a year later. The interviewee elaborated, "You can't just skip over a semester. I'm not saying that that's a good thing, I'm just saying that right now that's what we offer and it seems to work" (Personal Communication, September 2006). Therefore, students finding

themselves in need of skipping a semester must either delay certification for an entire year or complete their certification requirements at another institution.

Summary

In closing, each programmatic structure outlined above offers positive elements that are worthy of reflection when considering how best to structure an internship. First, a strong internship is one that provides solid linkages between program content and application. The programs that best addressed this linkage used a combination of theory-based and practice-based competencies to guide student experiences. The attributes of this model include that students have the opportunity to learn the latest theories and exercise them in practice and that strong professional ties often result from the site-based relationships. While programs must be mindful of the potential issues associated with these relationships, the vast majority of them are positive and are invaluable to students.

While fusing knowledge and application is important, it is equally necessary to base programmatic content on the standards guiding leadership preparation. Further, programs must continuously review content and update course offerings as the guiding standards are modified. The standards-based program in this study relied upon both the standards themselves and a leadership counsel comprised of current and former educational leaders to review and revise course content. This two-tiered approach to program design serves students in providing up-to-date content that is examined through a practice-based lens.

Finally, the importance of site selection in internship experiences has been stated frequently in the literature and disregarded habitually by programs. While it may be undue to expect all internship experiences to take place outside the student's home

school, programs could certainly benefit from Beta University's model. Soliciting partner schools and building relationships between universities and the leaders of those schools serves students by providing opportunities to carry out site-based activities in settings dissimilar to those in which they work. Emulating this concept for even a portion of the internship would undoubtedly prove beneficial to students as their base of understanding would be expanded.

CHAPTER 9

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study examines educational leadership internship experiences at four University System of Georgia universities. The study is a qualitative multiple case study, and the research presented contributes to the literature by building on current knowledge of leadership preparation through the internship. The research questions explored in this study were

1. To what degree do adopted standards impact the design of internship processes within programs?
2. How do the programs seek to provide linkages between classroom knowledge and the application of this knowledge within the field through internships?
3. How do internship experiences provide preparation for the on-the-job needs of future school leaders?
4. How do programs provide evidence of students' ability to perform through data collection on internship experiences?

This chapter provides a review of the findings of the study, suggests links between the study and the literature presented in Chapter 2, and provides recommendations for further research.

Review of the Findings

This section provides a review of the findings of this study. These findings provide the foundation for the next section in which the findings are linked to the

literature presented in Chapter 2. The interviews of faculty members in the L-5 certification program at all four sites offered verification of the four categories outlined by the questions guiding this study. Those categories are standards and program design; classroom knowledge and field application; on-the-job training, and performance data collected on students.

Additionally, all four programs provided evidence of the categories for document analysis. These categories were based on the work of Hess and Kelly (2005) in which they conducted a study on core course syllabi in a stratified sample of the nation's preparation programs. Those categories were data analysis; personnel management; technical knowledge; community interactions; norms and values; instructional leadership, and school culture.

The findings of this study, while beneficial, are limited. The study was conducted in the state of Georgia, at four University System of Georgia institutions. None of the universities in the study was in an urban area. Further, all of the universities participating in the study were second or third-tier institutions. Therefore, it is important to note that programs at first-tier institutions within the state of Georgia and institutions in other states may produce different results than those in this study.

Connection to the Literature

One challenge faced by any leadership preparation program is how to develop effective entry-level school administrators (Edmonson, 2002). The role of field-based experiences as an integral component of principal preparation programs has long been advocated within the educational administration profession (Hackman, Russell & Elliott, 1999). An internship is not a typical content course, but rather a course in which content

learned in other courses is applied. This study examined the L-5 internship at four University System of Georgia institutions and sought to discern how the internship provided connections between course content, the application of this content within the field, and standards governing preparation programs in the state of Georgia.

In the four programs studied, ample evidence of how content that is learned in other courses is applied through the internship was available. At Alpha University, time from the core courses is devoted to helping students better understand how they should structure their internships. At Beta and Delta Universities, the core course content as well as the content of the internship is linked to the ISLLC/ELCC standards and as a result, to one another. Gamma University structures its internship as an embedded element of the five core courses and requires internship activities that mirror the content of the courses.

Field site selection in the area of leadership preparation has been discussed by a number of scholars, with many agreeing that the current model of placing students in their home schools is less-than-adequate (Cordeiro & Sloan, 1996; Daresh & Playko, 1992; Gresso, 1993; Milstein, 1993; NPBEA, 1989). Typically, students in leadership preparation programs are part-time students who are employed as full-time teachers. As a result of this situation, internship experiences are often designed around work schedules.

In contrast to the system mentioned above which is utilized by Alpha, Gamma, and Delta Universities, Cordeiro and Sloan (1996) suggest that the intern should be matched with a compatible mentor and placed in a school that provides appropriate growth-evoking activities. As opposed to placing interns in the most convenient placement, students should be allowed to observe administrators in an assortment of settings using a variety of skills (Milstein, 1993). Placement options should include

various demographic and socio-economic settings as well as encompass all grade levels. Rather than simply relying on the intern's existing knowledge base, the placements should seek to strengthen the scope of experiences.

Beta University utilizes the model encouraged by Cordeiro and Sloan (1996) and Milstein (1993). The interviewee at Beta University offered that working out the placements was not as difficult as it might seem. Students work out their schedules on an individual basis and many take part in evening school activities or work to find placements that have differing vacation schedules than their home schools. Structuring the internship in this manner gives the students at Beta University a broader range of experiences with regard to becoming familiar with varying school cultures and leadership styles.

In considering internship activities, the literature offers that they should provide authentic administrative experiences, provide a variety of opportunities to exercise skills, and increase in complexity as the internship progresses (Hackman, Russell & Elliott, 1999). While there was not support in any of the four programs studied that the internships were designed to increasing in complexity as time progressed, there was evidence that all four programs worked to provide authentic experiences and build upon necessary skills. As an example, all four of the programs in this study structure their internship activities around the ISLLC/ELCC standards. Structuring the programs in this way means that students take part in activities that cover a large scope of content relevant to the needs of practicing administrators. In addition to this model, Alpha University also utilizes an activity content guide. The content areas covered in the guide were selected in order to include all of the areas one might encounter as a public school administrator and

were developed by two former school administrators. The content included in the guide gives students ample opportunities to hone skills related to practice.

The standards guiding leadership preparation are another area that has received a good deal of attention in the literature. In the mid-1990s, the UCEA appointed scholars from throughout the country to define the knowledge base in educational administration and soon after came the development of the ISLLC standards for the professional practice of school leaders. While the goal of the developers was to provide a basis for the educational leadership profession through the ISLLC standards, in order to have an impact on preparation, the standards needed to be linked to the accreditation process. The ELCC developed guidelines for accreditation that were scaffolded directly on the ISLLC standards. In fact, the ELCC guidelines are basically a paraphrase of the six ISLLC standards with a supplemental guideline addressing the internship piece of preparation programs (Murphy, 2005). Each of the four programs in this study provide numerous examples of how the internship specifically and the preparation program overall are linked to the ELCC/ISLLC standards.

Each of the four programs studied utilized the ELCC/ISLLC standards as one of the building blocks for course content within the L-5 preparation program. While the standards were integrated into the overall program design in different ways, each program provided two or more ways that standards were a part of program design. Alpha University's program took the ELCC standards and cross-walked the overall course content to those standards ensuring that each standard was addressed as a part of every core course. The Alpha internship syllabus gives students guidance on how many hours should be spent on activities centered on each area of the ELCC standards.

At Beta University, every course with the L-5 program has a departmental syllabus, and it is linked to the ELCC/ISLLC standards. Gamma University links field experiences, course content, and the ELCC/ISLLC standards with one another. Like Beta University, each of the core courses at Delta University has a departmental syllabus that instructors are encouraged to use. These syllabi are linked to the ELCC standards. Finally, a Leadership Advisory Council guides the Leadership Department at Delta. This group reviews the L-5 program regularly in order to make sure the ELCC/ISLLC standards are being adequately integrated throughout the courses.

In summary, each of the four programs provided ample links to the suggestions in the literature with regard to content from courses being applied in practice. Additionally, Beta University has created an internship model that is in keeping with the proposal that internship activities be completed outside a student's own school site. All four programs have designed their internships in order to give students prospects for authentic experiences and ample opportunities to hone the skills required of practicing administrators. Finally, all four of the programs have addressed standards both in the design of their internships and with regard to what they require from their students.

Recommendations

This section focuses on recommendations for further study. This study provides information about the L-5 internship at four universities in the state of Georgia through the voices of faculty members within the L-5 program and through documentary analysis. The information provided about each program is unique because it is specific to the perspectives of the people interviewed and the documents analyzed.

Further study is recommended via several avenues. First, it would provide further insight into the programs studied to interview current students in the L-5 programs at Alpha, Beta, Gamma, and Delta Universities. The student perspective would lend greater clarity to the overall internship experience and provide additional data for consideration. Second, interviewing former students who currently hold leadership positions as well as former students who do not hold leadership positions would add another layer of insight into the overall process. Individuals in those settings could provide a field-based assessment of the effectiveness of the L-5 internship experience. Finally, replicating this study at universities offering the L-5 leadership certification outside of the state of Georgia would provide a broader perspective on the internship at a national level. Doing so would add to the literature on leadership preparation and provide data that could be more generalizable to programs throughout the country.

Conclusion

This study examined educational leadership internship experiences at four public University System of Georgia universities. It is a qualitative multiple case study. The research presented contributes to the literature by providing information about leadership training through internship programs that was collected via interviews with program faculty and documentary analysis. Presentation of the data in this manner offers a comprehensive description of internship experiences at four universities within the state of Georgia. This description helps explain the linkages between classroom knowledge and its application as it relates to the internship experience as well as providing answers to the study's guiding questions.

The literature reviewed for this study included a brief history of educational leadership; literature on leadership preparation in general; the internship experience as it relates to the overall preparation of leaders; criticisms of preparation programs and calls for reform in leadership preparation; and an overview of the standards guiding leadership programs in the state of Georgia. The literature reviewed provides a context for the current state of leadership preparation nationally and sets the stage for the methods and analysis.

As a qualitative multiple case study, the work highlights individual cases as well as provides a cross-case analysis. A qualitative case study is descriptive in nature, emphasizing description and interpretation within a bounded context (Merriam, 1988). Qualitative case studies rely heavily upon qualitative data obtained from interviews, observations, documents, and artifacts (Merriam, 1988, p. 68). This study provides an in-depth account of each of the four programs studied through direct quotes from people about their experiences, attitudes, beliefs, and thoughts. Data in the form of interviews and documents were collected and assessed at each site. Four sites were selected in order to allow for a comprehensive analysis of the data. The cases are presented individually in order to provide thick or detailed, in-depth descriptions of each case (Stake, 1995).

This study also utilizes cross-case analysis. Following the comprehensive presentation of each individual case, the four cases are considered together, and analyzed for similarities and differences. The purpose for analyzing the data in this manner is to provide both an in-depth analysis of each program and an understanding of the similarities and differences in internship experiences throughout the state of Georgia.

The similarities section of the study centers upon how standards impact the design of the leadership preparation program generally and the internship specifically; how each site links classroom knowledge and internship experiences within the field; how the internship prepares students to become school leaders, and how programs collect data on internship experiences in order to demonstrate the ability of students to perform.

In the section addressing differences, two noteworthy examples are discussed. This section speaks to how the internship is structured as an embedded portion of the overall L-5 program at one institution and how another institution requires its interns to carry out their site-based experiences at a setting other than their home school. The information in these two sections lends greater clarity to the internship structure at programs throughout the state of Georgia

Finally, the study offers conclusions and recommendations for further study. These include interviewing current students in the L-5 programs at Alpha, Beta, Gamma, and Delta Universities. The student perspective would lend greater clarity to the overall internship experience and provide additional data for consideration. Additionally, interviewing former students from each of the four sites would add another layer of insight into the overall process. Finally, replicating this study at universities offering the L-5 leadership certification outside of the state of Georgia would provide a broader perspective on the internship at a national level.

The work included in this study provides a window into the L-5 internship at four University System of Georgia institutions. It shows that each of the programs provide evidence in the areas of standards; linkage of classroom knowledge and field application; school leadership preparation, and student performance data. While literature criticizing

preparation programs has been abundant, especially with regard to linking classroom knowledge and field application, this study offers that at four institutions in the state of Georgia, internship program design is driven in part by a desire to provide students with ample opportunities to link course content and site-based activities. Perhaps this study will encourage others to look at internship experiences and analyze how those activities address the needs of the future leaders of America's schools.

References

Annenberg Institute for School Reform (1994). Strategy for a challenge to the nation for the reform of america's public schools. Providence, RI: Annenberg Institute for School Reform.

Barker, S. (1997). Is your successor in your schoolhouse? Finding principal candidates. *NASSP Bulletin*, 81, 592 85-91.

Bass, G. (1990). The practitioner's role in preparing successful school administrators. *NASSP Bulletin*, 74 (529), 27 – 30.

Beck, L. & Murphy, J. (1993). *Understanding the principalship: Metaphorical themes 1920s-1990s.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Board of regents university system of geogia. (n.d.). Retrieved February 24, 2007 from http://www.usg.edu/

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods, 3ed.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bowles, B. D. (1990). The silent crisis in educational leadership. *The Education Digest 55*, 12-14.

Bratlein (1993). Competencies and aspirations: Determining internship needs – an eight-year study. *Journal of School Leadership*, 3(5), 498-509.

Bredeson, P. V. (1998). *Superintendents as instructional leaders: Examining the rhetoric and realities.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Diego, CA.

The Broad Foundations & Thomas B. Fordham Institute. (2003). Better leaders for America's schools: A manifesto. Los Angeles, CA: The Broad Foundation.

Brody, H., (1992). Philosophic approaches. In B. Crabtree & W. Miller, (Eds.), *Doing qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Brunner, C. C. (2001) New faculty member examines power and female school superintendents. *The Link on the Web.* Retrieved February 15, 2006 from http://education.umn.edu/alum/link/2001fall/female.html.

Cambron-McCabe, N. H. (1999). *Confronting fundamental transformation of leadership preparation.* In J. Murphy, & P.B. Forsyth (Eds.), Educational administration: A decade of reform (pp.217-227). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press Inc.

Capasso, R. & Daresh, J. (2001). *The school administrator internship handbook.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Carter, G. & Cunningham, W. (1997). The American school superintendent: Leading in an age of pressure. *Journal of Educational Policy, 4*(1), 49-64.

Creighton, T. (2001, November). *Towards a leadership practice field: An antidote to an ailing internship experience.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Cincinnati, OH.

Creswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cooper, B. S., & Boyd, W. L.(1987). The evolution of training for school administration. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), *Approaches to administrative training* (pp.3-27). Albany: SUNY.

Corderio & Sloan (1996). Administrative interns a legitimate participants in the community of practice. *Journal of School Leadership* 6(1), p. 4-29.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards for School Leaders. Washington, DC: Author. Available: http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/isllcstd.pdf.

Cuban, L. (1976). *Urban school chiefs under fire*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Daresh, J.C. (2002). *Leaders helping leaders: A practical guide to administrative mentoring* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Daresh, J. C., & Playko, M. A. (1992). *The professional development of school administrators: Preservice, induction and in-service application*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Baco.

Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (1990). *The principal's role in shaping school culture.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Denzin, N. K. (1989). *Interpretive interactionism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Donmoyer, R., Imber, J., & Scheurich, J. J. (Eds.). (1995). *The knowledge base in educational administration: Multiple perspectives.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Doud, J. L., & Keller, E. (1998). *The K-8 principal in 1998: A 10-year study of the national association of elementary school principals.* Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

Doyle, D. P., Cooper, B. S., & Trachtman, R. (1991). *Taking charge: State action on school reform in the 1990s.* Indianapolis: Hudson Institute.

Edmonson, S. (2002, August). *Effective internships for effective new administrators.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. Burlington, VT.

Erickson, D. A. (1967). The school administrator. *Review of Educational Research, 37*(4), 417-432.

Farkas, S.(2001, November). Trying to stay ahead of the game: Superintendents and principals talk about school leadership. *Public Agenda*: New York.

Farkas, S., Johnson, J., & Duffett, A. (2003). *Rolling up their sleeves: Superintendents and principals talk about what's needed to fix public schools*. New York: Public Agenda.

Feagin, J., Orum, A., & Sjoberg, G. (Eds.). (1991). *A case for case study*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Fetterman, D.M. (1998). *Ethnography: Step by step*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fraenkel, J.R. & Wallen, N.E. (1993). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

Fussarelli, L.D. (2001, Winter). Administrator preparation programs: Reforming again, again, and again. *UCEA Review*, 12-15.

Fussarelli, L.D. & Smith, L. (1999). Improving urban schools VIA leadership: Preparing administrators for the new millennium. *Journal of School Leadership, 9,* 534-551.

Gresso, D. W. (1993). *Genesis of the Danforth preparation program for school principals*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.

Griffiths, D. E. (1988). *Educational administration: Reform PDQ or RIP* (Occasional paper, no. 8312). Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.

Grogan, M., & Andrews, R. (2002). Defining preparation and professional development for the future. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(2) 233-256.

Hackman,D., Russell, F.S., & Elliott, R.J. (1999). Making administrative internships meaningful. *Planning and Changing*, 30 (1), 2–14.

Hallinger, P., Leithwood, K., & Murphy, J. (Eds.). (1993). *Cognitive perspectives on educational leadership.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Haller, E., Brent, B., & McNamara, J. (1997). Does graduate training in educational administration improve America's schools? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 79(3), 222-227.

Hart, A. W. & Pounder, D. G. (1999). Reinventing preparation programs: A decade of activity. In J. Murphy @P.B. Fowyth (eds.), *Educational administration: A decade of reform.* Thosand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hess, F. M. (1998). When our veteran superintendents retire who'll step into their shoes? *The American School Board Journal*, p. 39.

Hess, F. M. (2003). *A license to lead? A new leadership agenda for America's schools.* Los Angeles, CA; Progressive Policy Institute, 21st Century Schools Project.

Hess, F. M. & Kelly, A. P. (2005). Learning to lead: What gets taught in principal preparation programs. Washington, DC: The American Enterprise Institute.

Hoepfl, M. (1997). Choosing qualitative research: A primer for technology education researchers. *Journal of Technology Education, 9*(1), Retrieved April 2, 2006 at http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/JTE/v9n1/hoepfl.html

Hydi Educational New Media Centre. (2006). Massey University. Retrieved April 1, 2006 at http://education.massey.ac.nz/wellington_online/bedu6205/course/205dictqual.htm

Immegart, G. L. (1990). What is truly missing in advanced preparation in educational administration? *Journal of Educational Administration, 28*(3), 5-13.

Jackson, B. L. & Kelley, C. (2002, April). Exceptional and innovative programs in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly 38*(2) 192-212.

Jacobson, S. L. (1990). Reflections on the third wave of reform: Rethinking administrator preparation. In S.L. Jacobson & J.A. Conway (Eds.), *Educational leadership in an age of reform* (pp.30-44). New York: Longman.

Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2000). *Educational Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2004). *Educational research: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. (2nd ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

Jording, C. (2001). A model for field-based superintendent preparation programs. *Catalyst for change*, 16,(1), 16-19.

Kempner, K. (1991). Getting into the castle of educational administration. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 66(3), 104-123.

Kottkamp, R. (2002). What makes a difference in developing effective school leaders? A challenge to the field. *Teaching in Educational Administration 9*(2) 1.

Ladd, H. F. (Ed.). (1996). *Holding schools accountable*. Washington, D.C. The Brookings Institution.

Lashway, L. (2003). *Transforming principal preparation*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

LeCompte, M. D., & Schensul, J. J. (1999). *Designing and conducting ethnographic research.* London: AltaMira Press.

Levine, A. (2005). *Educating School Leaders*. Retrieved April 13, 2005 at http://www.edschools.org/pdf/Final313.pdf

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lofland, J. & Lofland, L. (1984). *Analyzing social settings*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Lucas, S. (2001). *The effect of transformational principal and teacher leadership on school culture.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia, December, 2001.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. (1995). *Designing qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park: Sage.

Martin, P. Y. and B. A. Turner. (1986). "Grounded Theory and Organizational Research," *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science,* 22(2), pp. 141-157.

Maxwell, J. (1996). *Using qualitative research to develop causal explanations*. Harvard University: Harvard Project on Schooling and Children.

McAdams, R. P. (1998). Who'll run the schools? The coming administrator shortage. *American School Board Journal, 29*(8) 37-39.

McCarthy, M. (1999). *The evolution of educational leadership programs*. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), Handbook of Research on Educational Administration (pp. 119 – 139). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McCarthy, M. (2002). Policy considerations based on the findings, literature, and existing policy related to Indiana principals, superintendents and school board presidents. *Recruitment, retention & professional development needs.* Indianapolis, IN: The Indiana Promise Consortium.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach.* California: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Milstein, M.M. (1993). *Changing the way we prepare educational leaders.* Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Milstein,M. (1990). *Rethinking the clinical aspects in administrative preparation: From theory to practice.* In S. L. Jacobson & J. Conway (Eds.), Educational Leadership in an age of reform (pp. H 9-130). New York: Longman.

Milstein, M.M., Bobroff, B.M., & Restine, L.N. (1991). *Internship programs in educational administration: A guide to preparing educational leaders*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Mitgang, L. (2003, June). *Beyond the pipeline: Getting the principals we need where they are needed most.* The Wallace Foundation.

Murphy, J. (1998). What's ahead for tomorrow's principals. *Principal, 78*(1), 13-14.

Murphy, J. (2002, April). Reculturing the profession of educational leadership: New Blueprints. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(3), 65-83.

Murphy, J. (2005). Unpacking the foundations of ISLLC standards and addressing concerns in the academic community. Educational *administration quarterly, 41(1)*, 154-191.

Murphy, J. & Forsyth, P.B. (1999). *Educational administration: A decade of reform*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J., & Vriesenga, M. (2004). *Research on preparation programs in educational administration: An analysis.* Columbia, MO: University Council for Educational Administration.

National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP). (1998). In search of qualified applicants: Report validates principal applicant shortage. *NewsLeader, 45*(8) 1-12.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (n.d.). FAQs about Standards. Retrieved April 16, 2006, from http://www.ncate.org/public/faqStandards.asp.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative of Educational Reform.* Washington, DC: National Governor's Association.

National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. (1987). *Leaders for America's schools.* Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (1989). Improving the Preparation of School Administrators. *Notes on Reform No. 2*. Charlottesville, VA: Author, 26 pages. ED 313 772.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2001, July). *Recognizing and encouraging exemplary leadership in America's schools: A proposal to establish a system of advanced certification for administrators.* Retrieved from the web on April 6, 2006, at http://www.npbea.org/projects/able_project.htm

Newton, R. M. (2001, Summer). *A recruitment strategy: Retooling the principal's role*. *AASA Professor, 24*(4), 6-10.

Norton, J. (2002) Preparing school leaders: It's time to face the facts. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board, 2002.

Ogawa, R. T., Goldring, E. B., & Conley, S. (2000, August). Organizing the field to improve research on educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 36*(3), 340-357.

Osterman, K. F. & Kottkamp, R. B. (1993). *Reflective practice for educators: Improving schooling through professional development.* Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Portin, B., Schneider, P., DeArmond, M., & Grundlach, L. (2003). *Making sense of leading schools: A study of the principalship*. Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education.

Pounder, D. G. (2000, August). A discussion of the task force's collective findings. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 36(*3), 465-473.

Powell, A. (1976). University schools of education in the twentieth century. *Peabody Journal of Education, 54*(1), 3-20.

Schatzman, L. & Strauss, A. (1973). *Field research: Strategies for a natural sociology.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Seidman, I. (1989). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Senge, P.M. (1990). The *fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning business*. London: Century Business.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1991). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Slavin, R.E. (1992). *Research methods in education* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Spradley, J. (1980). *Participant observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Strauss, A.L. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualtitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Tillman, L. (2001, Winter). Success for all children: Implications for leadership preparation programs. *UCEA Review*, 10-12.

Tingley, S. (1996). Pooling our resources: Why are there so few candidates for superintendent? Maybe we're looking in the wrong places. *Education Week*, Commentary, pp. 38, 48.

Tucker, P. & Grogan, M. (2001, Spring). Contextual responsiveness in administrative internships. *UCEA Review*, 9-11.

UCEA Strategic Planning. (2002, Fall). Mission statement, values, goals, and vision. *UCEA Review*, 6-7.

U.S. Department of Education. (1991). *America 2000: An Education Strategy*, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of Education. (1994). *Goals 2000: Educate America Act*, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of Education. (2002). *No Child Left Behind.* Retrieved March 25, 2006,from http://www.nochildleftbehind.gov/start/ facts/yearly.html

Wildman, L. (2001). Research on the preparation of school administrators. Paper prepared for the Board of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, Bakersfield, CA, August, 2001.

Williamson, R. & Hudson, M. (2001). The good, the bad, the ugly: Internships in principal preparation. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, Houston, TX, August, 2001.

Wilmore, E.L. (2002). *Principal leadership: Applying the new educational leadership constituent council standards.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Wylie, V.L. & Michael, R.O. (1991). *Career assessment as a guide to administrator preparation and evaluation*. In R.C. Wendel (Ed.), Reform in administrator preparation programs: Individual perspectives. The UCEA Monograph Series.

Young, M. D. (2001, Winter). From the director…Building national ties. *UCEA Review*, 6-7.

Young, M. D. (2001, Spring). From the director…Broad analysis needed. *UCEA Review*, 6-7.

Young, M. D., Petersen, G.T., & Short, P.M. (2002). The complexity of substantive reform: A call for interdependence among key stakeholders. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(2), 137-175.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. Please describe and discuss history of your overall preparation program
2. Please discuss the standards under which your overall preparation program operates.
3. Please talk to me about the history of inclusion of the internship into the overall preparation program.
4. Please discuss the context of your internship program with reference to where it falls in the course sequence, the number of hours required for successful completion, breakdown of the hours, and course requirements beyond the time commitment (e.g. portfolio, projects, journals, etc.).
5. Please discuss how your program provides evidence of students' ability to perform through the collection of data within the internship experience.
6. Please talk to me about how the overlying standards are integrated into the internship experience.
7. Please discuss any other areas that we have not yet covered that might lend greater understanding to the structure and implementation of your internship experience.

APPENDIX B

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS GUIDE

(Based upon the model of Hess & Kelly, 2005)

1. To what degree is the role of analysis of data evidenced in the document?
2. How is the role of managing personnel approached in the document?
3. How is technical knowledge including school law, school finance, and facilities management supported in the document?
4. How is experience in the environment beyond the setting, including board meetings, community partnerships, and school politics evidenced in the document?
5. How are the roles of norms and values indicated in the document?
6. How is instructional leadership verified in the document?
7. How is school culture approached in the document?
8. What other areas are evidenced in the document that are worthy of note?