

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

Vol. 19 No. 4



The Journal of the International Society for Educational Planning 
PROMOTING THE STUDY AND PRACTICE OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING



International Society for Educational Planning

EDITORIAL REVIEW BOARD

Marvin Bartell University of Manitoba	Ori Eyal Hebrew University Of Jerusalem	Linda Lemasters The Geo Washington University	Mark Yulich Kansas City, Missouri School District
Robert Beach Alabama State University	Russell O. Mays Georgia Southern University	Carleton Holt University of Arkansas	Ronald Lindahl Alabama State University
George Crawford University of Kansas	C. Kenneth Tanner University of Georgia	Dan Inbar Hebrew University of Jerusalem	Tak C. Chan Kennesaw State University

Editor
Virginia Roach
The George Washington University
Associate Editor
Karen Crum
Old Dominion University
Assistant Editor
Ori Eyal
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Reprints: Articles and reviews are available from the editor. Please contact the editor for availability and costs.
Translations: *Educational Planning* will attempt to provide readers with major language translations of journal articles.
Interested members should contact the editor regarding availability and costs.

©2010 International Society for Educational Planning
All Rights Reserved

Educational Planning is the refereed journal of the International Society for Educational Planning (ISEP). *Educational Planning* is published quarterly by ISEP, which maintains editorial offices at 2134 G Street, Washington, DC 20052.

The Journal is assigned ISSN 1537-873X by the National Serials Data Program of the Library of Congress. All material in the Journal is the property of ISEP and is copyrighted. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form by any means electronically or mechanically including photocopy, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system without written permission from the publisher. Permission to use material generally will be made available by the editor to students and educational institutions upon written request. For manuscript submission and membership information please see last pages.

For more information visit our web site: www.isep.info

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

A JOURNAL DEDICATED TO PLANNING, CHANGE, REFORM, AND THE
IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATION

VOLUME 19

2010

NUMBER 4

Preface	ii
About The Authors	iv
Consequences of Excessive Educational Planning Guy Benveniste	1
An Examination of Leadership Development in Colleges Holly Catalfamo	8
Faculty's Perceptions of a Performance-Based Educational Leadership Program Tak Cheung Chan	32
National Challenges, Educational Reforms, and their Influence on School Management: The Israeli Case Ori Eyal and Izhak Berkovich	44
Invitation to Submit Manuscripts	65
Invitation to Fall Conference	66
Membership Application	67

*EDUCATIONAL PLANNING is indexed in H.W.Wilson, and available in Google Scholar, and
EBSCO Information Services.*

PREFACE

Virginia Roach

This edition of *Educational Planning* marks the end of our year-long celebration of the 40th anniversary of the International Society for Educational Planning (ISEP). To commemorate this milestone year, the journal has run a series of special essays reflecting on planning since the society's inception. Like the ancient Roman god Janus who had two heads, one facing forward and one facing backward, this year-long series, paired with other contemporary manuscripts, has provided us an opportunity to gain new perspective on the field of planning. It is through this historical reflection that we can better understand the origins, past successes, and failures of educational planning. Innovations and milestones can be separated from fads, and those planning principles and theories that stand the test of time can be revisited for new applications. It is in this spirit that our final special series installment is an essay published in 1974, the first volume of *Educational Planning*, entitled, "Consequences of Excessive Educational Planning" by Guy Benveniste. The title of this essay alone should encourage the reader to reflect on the impact of educational planning, broadly defined, to both value its merits as well as limitations.

At the time of Benveniste's essay, the field of educational planning had enjoyed an unprecedented 30-year period of growth (Guy, 2010). Heavily influenced by economics, a post-World War II world order, and the emergence of super computers to assist sophisticated modeling (Guy, 2010), Benveniste cautioned against overly zealous planning that locked organizations and nations to move toward that which could be "measured" and muted the impact that political discourse could have on public policy. Benveniste recommended four rules to mitigate these tendencies related to, (a) those areas that should be the subject of plans, (b) who should be involved in planning, (c) how planning should be undertaken, and (d) where public planning should take place, that is, the legislative or executive branch.

Eyal and Berkovich's socio-historical analysis of educational reforms in Israel and the impact of those reforms on school leadership provide an excellent extension of Benveniste's thesis. Eyal and Berkovich trace the developments of nation building in Israel and its impact on public education through six distinct historical periods. Each of these periods produces policy that impacts how schools are run and ostensibly the role of the principal in operating schools. Yet, as the two authors posit, policy is "consistently delayed in adopti[on]," thus forcing principals "to respond to the challenges of yesterday instead of focusing on future, and even current challenges." The national education policies fall into two of Benveniste's three "unforeseen consequences." Namely, the policies (a) limit local professional discretion to address issues and (b) reinforce centralization, even when the policy is to decentralize.

Another good example of Benveniste's thesis is Chan's study of the perception of professors of educational leadership related to state-mandated program redesign in the U.S. Benveniste cautioned that excessive planning "limits or shifts participation in decision-making," because of "very real and narrow time constraints which do not allow planners to emulate an electoral or market process." Implementers (in this case educational leadership professors) were not fully engaged in the discussion "because they [planners] do not have a time budget to handle the complex process of interest aggregation and conflict resolution." Indeed, participants in this study, suggested as much. Chan documented the unfortunate outcome of the process driven by constituent representatives versus the mass of practitioners. Faculty reported concern, resistance, and pessimism over predicted success of the performance-based plan.

The third contemporary manuscript in this edition, by Califamo, explored practices related to leadership development in colleges in Ontario, Canada, given the need to anticipate disproportionate waves of retirement in higher education in the future. Califamo concluded that there is interest in leadership development, but "While there are a plethora of activities taking place across Ontario, presently strategic human resource planning, coordination, and communication is lacking system-wide." Califamo recommended an ongoing, participatory, resourced, "strategic, system-wide approach to leadership development that engages all 24 colleges." Her recommendations are

consistent with Benveniste's "rules" insofar as she recommends universal participation at the institutional level and a menu of leadership options, not one "best way." The challenge in many modern institutions is how to raise an issue to garner interest and support without invoking the typical planning response, which is to appoint a committee for redress. As Benveniste cautions, such committees can quickly encourage elitism. Implementers would be wise to respond to *all* Califamo's recommendations to avoid such pitfalls.

As demonstrated, Benveniste's thesis is still relevant today as educators seek to improve practice through planning and policy. His caution to plan, but proceed cautiously, is wise. As contemporary educational planners we are further warned, as the two-headed Janus, look forward and look back. Completing this special series, we hope our readers will continue to draw on the wisdom of "back" editions of the journal and look forward to the future editions where we will continue to explore issues related to all facets of educational planning around the world.

REFERENCE

Guy, A. (2010). *JANUS: Looking back at 25 years of looking forward*. Blacksburg, VA: International Society for Educational Planning.

ABOUT THE GUEST REVIEWERS

Carleton Holt, EdD, has served as a band director, coach, and school administrator in the public schools in Iowa and South Dakota for over thirty years. He has had articles published by the *Educational Research Quarterly* and *School Business Affairs*. In addition, he is the author of a textbook for educational leaders entitled *School Board Success: A Strategy for Building America's Schools*. (cholt@uark.edu)

Russell O. Mays, EdD, is an Associate Professor in the Department of Leadership, Counseling, and Technology Educational Leadership at the University of North Florida. His active research agenda includes school facility design and planning and the affects on student achievement, faculty and staff morale, and community support. (rmays@unf.edu)

Timothy R. Toops, EdD, is an Associate Professor and Chair of the Division of Education at Florida Southern College. He is in demand as a speaker is in the field of reading and curriculum; however, as a former teacher, principal, superintendent, and consultant from the State of Ohio, he has significant expertise in leadership. (ttoops@flsouthern.edu)

ABOUT THE EDITOR

Virginia Roach, EdD, is Associate Professor of Educational Administration and Policy Studies at The George Washington University. She has worked extensively with state and national policymakers in planning and policy development related to governance, inclusion of students with disabilities, and teacher and administrator development. Her current research interests include planning policies and programs related to administrator development, and women in leadership, both in the U.S. and other countries. (vroach@gwu.edu)

ABOUT THE GUEST REVIEWERS

Mahmoud A. Abdeen, PhD, is Professor of Educational Planning, Administration and Economics of Education at Suez Canal University and the founder and Director of the Professional Academy for Teachers (PAT) in Egypt. He has directed a number of projects worldwide related to educational planning and policy. (abdeen_1@hotmail.com)

Shawn Joseph, EdD, is currently a director of school performance for Montgomery County Public Schools in Maryland. He is the 2009 Maryland State Middle Level Principal of the Year. His research interests include principal development and leading for equity. (Shawn_Joseph@mcpsmd.org)

Mike Mitchell, EdD, received his doctoral degree from The George Washington University in 2009. He is currently employed as a special education coordinator at the secondary level for the Bartow County School System in Georgia. (shaggy11@gwmail.gwu.edu).

Abebayeha Tekleselassie, PhD, is Assistant Professor of Educational Administration and Policy at The George Washington University and instructor of educational planning. Research interests include: resiliency among at risk students; job satisfaction and mobility patterns of school principals; educational reform and policy in the international context; and women and minorities in educational leadership. (silassie@gwu.edu)

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Izhak Berkovich is a graduate student at the Policy, Administration and Leadership in Education Division, School of Education, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. His research interests include school leadership, emotional dimensions of education leadership, ethics in school management, social responsibility, and policy making in education.

Holly Seebach Califamo, EdD Is the acting Chair of the School of Community Studies and Co-Director of the Human Resources Program at Niagara College (Canada). She specializes in the study of leadership and leadership development processes. Other areas of research interest include action learning research, studying the benefits of applied research, and the impact of organizational change on organizational culture. (hcatalfamo@niagaracollege.ca)

Tak Cheung Chan, EdD, is a Professor of Educational Leadership at Kennesaw State University in Kennesaw, Georgia (United States) and the 2010 president of the International Society for Educational Planning. His research interests include educational leadership, educational and school facilities planning and school finance. (tchan@kennesaw.edu)

Ori Eyal, PhD, is an Assistant Professor at the Policy, Administration and Leadership in Education Division, School of Education, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. His current fields of interests are school entrepreneurship, school and teacher leadership, innovation in education, ethics in school management and policy making in education. (msori@mscc.huji.ac.il)

CONSEQUENCES OF EXCESSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

Guy Benveniste¹

A model of social reality is an abstraction which captures selected characteristics and relations in the empirical world, and omits others. Good models capture what, at any one time, is believed to be significant. Educational planning has its share of "good" models. But what is less significant at one point in time may become more significant as time passes. Therefore it is logical that the assumptions underlying yesterday's planning models be re-examined.

The central assumption of educational planning is rationalization. The planner is concerned with goal definition and the best, or preferred, means of reaching these goals. The intellectual exercise requires two sets of arbitrary interventions: first, the planner arbitrarily decides how the relevant set of goals will be identified; second, he decides how alternative means to this set of goals will be compared. Educational planners rarely, if ever, question the validity and consequences of these interventions. Yet they are in themselves social events. And another model builder, working on a meta-planning model, will conceive of the planner and his interventions as a social system having reality and, therefore, consequences. This paper deals with planning at this second level of conceptualization.

As the system we call educational planning (composed of planners' reports, field research, etc.) encounters the system we call organization or bureaucracy (composed of authority, rules, communication networks, etc.) there can arise unforeseen consequences. In this paper three are analyzed:

- Educational planning reorients collective action within organizations toward measurable outputs. Such a displacement effectively downgrades collective action toward hard-to-measure educational values. Yet such values may be deeply shared, desired outputs within and outside of the educational system.
- Overt statements about the future reduce secrecy and limit professional discretion in performing educational tasks. Yet professional discretion may be far more sophisticated in dealing with educational problems than is recognized under the rationale of the plan.
- Rhetoric to the contrary, planning limits or shifts participation in decision-making, weakening the legitimate roles of legislative and other governing bodies in educational governance. Thus planning accelerates the general malaise of political and bureaucratic structures, and reinforces centralization.

REORIENTATION OF COLLECTIVE BEHAVIOR

In any organization there exists a set of rewards and punishments which orients collective action. When planning becomes operative (i.e., when it is effective) the targets of the plan become part of, or are connected to, this set of rewards and punishment. Only then is collective action re-oriented toward plan targets. This, of course, is what effective planning is all about. There is no point in setting targets if no one pays attention to them. If rewards and punishment within or without the organization are not linked to plan targets, there is no reason to believe that the plan will be implemented. To be sure, there exists a variety of utopian planning where this linkage does not exist. But when planning is intended to make a difference the linkage exists, and if the linkage exists the planning will have the effect of reorienting collective action. The question, therefore, is how to think about the success of planning.

We can easily imagine situations when planning is very successful, when the measured targets of the plan are taken very seriously, but the targets of the plan, as translated into measurements, have little to do with desired objectives. For example, the plan target for a classroom is a score above a given norm in a reading comprehension test. The teacher is evaluated positively according to how the

¹ This article first appeared in the October, 1974 (volume 1, number 2) edition of *Educational Planning* and was one of the papers of the ISEP/AAAS Mexico City Conference, June 1973.

children perform on standardized tests. That is, a direct linkage between the plan target and the reward system exists. What will likely be the consequences of this? Teachers formerly spent a great deal of time introducing children to reading material while also teaching reading comprehension the idea being that the child who is introduced to books while he learns to read will want to read after school. But with the plan we are discussing, which links teacher rewards specifically to the target of reading comprehension, the teacher will not turn to other reading activities until *after* the measured tests have been taken. The planner does not question the value of introducing children to literature; but the plan targets are unlikely to include this as an important objective because there probably is no standardized way of measuring it.

The point I wish to emphasize is that the planner must use the reward system to manipulate behavior and, therefore, whether he wishes it or not, the entire pattern of teacher behavior will be modified to fit the plan. The very success of planning, i.e., the imposition of a rational mould carries the seeds of its own demise if the mould fails to capture an important reality. This is not a new problem; all important decisions affect the behavior of the players in the system. But it will become more acute as planning is actually allowed to influence decisions. As long as planners had little impact and were not central to decision-making, the effect of the planning activity itself was of little importance. But in some countries this is no longer the case and the planning profession can no longer ignore these issues. Unfortunately, their implications are not a simple matter. It is easy to agree at the conceptual level that qualitative issues must be taken into account in the preparation of plans and the choice of educational targets, but the contrast between what is called quantitative and what is called qualitative has distinct operational results. By definition, the qualitative cannot be easily measured otherwise it would be called quantitative.¹ Therefore, at any point in time what is called qualitative planning cannot be operationalized at acceptable costs. That is not to say, of course, that the definition of qualitative does not change over time, so that what we cannot measure at one time we learn to measure (i.e., we understand what is involved in its measurement) at a later date.

This discussion suggests that a different kind of consideration should be introduced into our planning methodologies. Before an element of a plan is introduced and linked to organizational rewards and punishments, some assessment should be made of the extent to which desirable behavior will be modified as well as undesirable behavior. When it is judged that a measure will displace desirable behavior, it is necessary to consider whether the target might not be achieved by some other means.

EROSION OF PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOR

Any specific overt statement about the future is a behavior rule which says, in effect: Whatever happens, try to come out this way. The planner has used his models to predict a number of futures; the desirable one has been chosen and the prescription imposed. To be sure, the prescription tries to take into account significant events and values, and it may have been intrinsically desirable, at least at the time it was established. But any stated rule introduces rigidity by reducing the secrecy of the future. Rules reduce, even eliminate, levels of discretion and choice of persons who might, at a later date and in full knowledge of the particular situation, have interpreted reality differently. Rules, therefore, have the tendency to convert professionals into functionaries. To use examples from other fields, they convert doctors into orderlies and social workers into civil servants. This problem has two aspects: First, there is a cost-benefit notion between the ultimate desirability of earlier decisions made by planners working in a predictive situation, *versus* later decisions made by professionals working in the actual problem situation. Second, there is what might be called the efficiency question of the planners making consistent decisions comprehending a set of related problems and conditions, versus the professionals making a set of unique and individual decisions about the elements of a related set of problems such that each has the effect of nullifying the other. Third, and as important, there is the secondary effect which attempting to work within a plan will have on the perceptions of self as a professional. This is particularly important for those who work in education.

The relative desirability of planning decisions versus postponed professional decisions is amenable to rational calculus to the extent that the problem is predictable. But it would be folly to select a planning approach without paying attention to the third effect. Educational organizations are highly dependent on the professional ethos which prevails in them. Since, thus far, all attempts to define a production function for education have been rather sterile, it follows that conventional bureaucratic structures appropriate to other sectors of public service are not appropriate to educational institutions. Moreover, since there is no well-established science of education, the professional claims of educators are not as firmly rooted in professional consensus as are those of such older professions as medicine or engineering. The professional defenses of educators are easily breached. The impact on such a weak professional body, of plans which give them no room to exercise professional judgment, may well be disruptive. Yet, all we know of the actual teaching/ learning process itself suggests that a problem-solving, non-routinized approach to the interaction is inherently desirable. Replacement of professional responsibility with arbitrary rules seems to lead to professional alienation. When professional alienation prevails, the rules are used to avoid risky action and responsibility, and to justify passive behavior. The teacher no longer plays the role of facilitator of learning, adapting his knowledge to the specific problems. Instead he takes refuge in the anonymity provided by the rules. He becomes a paper pusher, a filler of forms and assigner of marks - just as under some forms of bureaucratic health delivery systems, the family doctor becomes primarily a signer of prescriptions.

Let me give an illustration from my own university: The administration is diligently introducing measures of productivity. Graduate departments are to be measured according to how the courses of study of their candidates for higher degrees are decided. An instrument has been devised to measure the productivity of graduate departments based on the time taken to select students who will be allowed to continue after admission, and the time taken to complete the Ph.D. or other degree requirements. The instrument penalizes departments whose students take a long time to complete their work, and those which have students who drop out before completing their programs, after having been enrolled for several years. However, the instrument does not take into account whether the students are full-time or are studying part-time while holding jobs elsewhere. Nor does it take account of the private lives of the students which might affect their progress (details which the professor cannot disregard when he is working with a graduate student). In addition, it takes no account of the different philosophies of departments as to what is the appropriate background for its advanced work, and how much remedial education is reasonable and justified. In short, the instrument is a poor one and it is being used to impose a rational mould which disregards some of the realities of graduate education. Its net effect will be to remove discretion from the faculty.

Preliminary results of this measurement exercise are starting to emerge. While it is too early to generalize, two patterns of behavior can be identified: The faculty, aware that the instrument is arbitrary, attempts nevertheless to apply it since the reward system is tied to it. One way of handling slow students is to permit a lower quality of work and push them on to successful completion. Another way is to insist on maintaining standards, even be severe, since they now have time constraints. This leads faculty to eliminate students who experience difficulties early in the program, i.e., students who are poorly prepared. These tend to be minority students, those from social class backgrounds which are less oriented to academic work. They include students whose academic background is too poor to win fellowships but whose economic background is too poor to permit full-time study. So those who need most time to try to repair their background deficiencies, in fact, must try to study and work concurrently. If their initial performance is poor, they are eliminated. The proper criticism, of course, is not of the attempt to introduce a rational mould by means of planning, but of the poor instrument used to implement the plan. But we must also be aware that any instrument will have some inhibiting effect on the free exercise of professional judgment.

EROSION OF LEGISLATIVE RESPONSIBILITY

The participation in educational planning of persons other than planners and senior officials has recently been receiving attention in international planning circles.² The current rhetoric is to praise the

need for, and advantages of “participatory” planning:

Thus, educational planning may be approaching the very demanding objective to create a planning process for education which has meaning in terms of how it relates to pupils, students and teachers as they are daily engaged in education. . . . Participatory planning . . . would be usefully defined as: the organization of a sustained social process, in which participation is both the very essence of the process and its major operational objective, characterized by an increasing engagement in policy and autonomy in action for the individuals lowest in the organizational scale. . . .³

The facts are not as encouraging as these well-meaning words suggest. Planning involves some very real and narrow time constraints which do not allow planners to emulate an electoral or market process. Some participation is possible in the development of plans and targets; and some participation is essential for plan implementation. But the extent of participation is dictated by the logic of the politics of the planning process, and is limited to that minimum coalition of supporters sufficient to bring about the notion that the plan has a high probability of implementation.⁴ Participation requires that the implementers be organized and in a position to exercise power. Such political factors are relevant to the planner. All others will be disregarded, not because planners are against participation, but because they do not have a time budget to handle the complex process of interest aggregation and conflict resolution. The operating problem of the planner is not the illusion of participatory planning, but how to assure enough time (a strict minimum level of effort) to organize the supportive coalition which will permit the plan to be implemented.

In theory enough time and resources could be allocated to encourage a planning process having many steps of aggregation, starting with wide participation at the bottom of the system hierarchy (or in groups of the society itself). In some cases such a series of consultations are used to define educational goals and targets. Each unit elaborates desirable futures; these are then aggregated, rationalized, coordinated and articulated at convenient control levels. But what of the crucial control part of this process - the aggregation, rationalization, coordination and articulation? How does it occur? Who carries it out? Who influences it? Whatever the resources allocated to planning, there are limits to the information that can be processed. Whatever the time frame, eventually decisions must be taken. In this process only the organized elements that significantly exercise power will have a direct influence on the planner.

Thus the planning activities of officials within the executive branch of government will affect the way the political give and take is transacted. One effect is to shift influence away from legislative bodies to the executive. It is the executive that hires, briefs and controls the planners. Often the plan is *a fait accompli* before legislative participation occurs. At best the legislative branch has a limited power of revision. Even this cannot be properly exercised unless the legislature has a considerable independent research capability. This shift of power reduces the influence of the elected representatives and increases that of the corporate bodies which are close to implementation. This is a process which is not unique to education; it pervades the social, economic, diplomatic and military spectrum of policy making, wherever planning has emerged. In recent years it has been held to be more “democratic” if various *ad hoc* citizen groups “participate” in planning particularly in educational planning, and particularly at the local level (although this is also true of community and town planning and transportation planning). Yet the constraints on such “participation” are even greater than that of members of elected and corporate bodies. In order to be involved and exert pressure, they must be organized. But whom do such citizen activists represent? They are not typical of the uninvolved citizen. They are self elected. They are accountable only to themselves, they speak only for themselves – not even for their organizations since these generally are very loose. There is no mechanism whereby citizen activists can be held *responsible* for their influence, or their influence can be referred to the public poll and endorsed or rejected.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE PLANNING PROFESSION

These three issues raise serious questions about the behavioral norms and moral obligations of planners. Posing such questions does not suggest an anti-planning stance, but it does argue the need for planners to analyze the implications of the consequences of successful planning. Some planning is clearly desirable. But at what societal costs? In considering this question the notion of excessive planning becomes useful. What is excessive planning? From a cost-benefit point of view the answer is simple. Excessive planning is reached when overall societal costs exceed overall societal benefits.

Three distinct costs, among many which might have been included, have been suggested:

- Poor measures that distort collective action or subvert goals, thus reducing the efficiency of educational institutions.
- Regulations which erode professional ethos, thus reducing the problem-solving ability of educational organizations.
- Procedures and processes which encourage elitism, thus shifting power from the legally representative and accountable legislative branches of government to the executive or to non-representative and non-accountable corporate, lobby or other informal groups.

Such costs suggest four rules which might become norms for the educational planning profession.

Rule 1: The domain of planning should be limited to variables that may be easily and correctly measured. For example, there are fewer problems in planning student flows, predicting future enrollments and estimating teacher needs, than in planning for “efficiency”. We can count human beings and describe them according to a series of commonly agreed category titles, but we have trouble even describing, let alone measuring, something called educational efficiency.⁵

This rule runs counter to much current thinking in educational planning circles. But until the costs of introducing so called “qualitative” indicators into the planning process are better understood, planners should refrain from such interventions. This does not mean that research on qualitative indicators need be downgraded. On the contrary, there is need to invent, develop and gather new measures and indicators. But a distinction must be made between a Research and Development activity and a Planning activity which is used for policy making. Before we use the indicators in our plans we should have confidence in the measures themselves and that we understand their impact on behavior in the system.

Rule 2: In their work planners often raise issues and problems that professional educators have failed to consider. When this occurs the planner should not attempt to displace the judgment of the professional educator. The second rule states that it is more desirable to engage professional bodies to confront educational issues that are causing problems in the preparation of a plan, than to attempt to by-pass them. Planners can rarely bring about real change in educational systems without the support of educators to show how it can be managed. When educators do not respond favorably to suggested plans, it is not necessarily because they are opposed to change. They may not see how the planned change *can* be accomplished in that organizational complex. Planners who desire to bring about changes in educational practices must study the characteristics of the systems’ rewards and punishments. These motivate educators to behave as they do, and frequently educators themselves can suggest the kind of structural modification which ought to precede the planner’s intervention.

Rule 3: The balance of autonomy and decentralization *versus* centralization and commonality is an endemic problem in all systems. We cannot precisely define which decisions should be made at the centre (and under what conditions) and which can best be delegated to the periphery. But the issues should not be swept under the carpet. Planners can best encourage participation in decision-making by making the distinction between decision-making and planning, and limiting the scope of planning. Participation in planning is limited by the constraints of the process itself. Participation in decision-making depends

upon the degree of decentralization in the organization, not on whether planning is present. The planner is confronted by a question of costs: To what extent do the errors of periphery accrue to the whole? What is it that must be articulated? What can be delegated, considering the capability for upward and downward information flows? Planners should not ask how much can be decided at the centre, but rather how little, without seriously impairing the viability of the whole planned change.

The third rule, therefore, states that the planner should limit the centralized decision-making to the necessary and sufficient main elements of the plan and delegate the detailed planning to the periphery, encouraging as much participation as possible in the details of implementation.

Rule 4: In the last two decades, in country after country, the planning process has become almost exclusively an activity of the executive branch of government. It has even tended to strengthen the central executive vis a vis its own bureaucracy as well as the legislature. Increasingly, legislative bodies have been unable to deal with even the limited options offered in plans, simply because they do not have the time and expertise to analyze and question the content. They have either ratified what is offered, or opposed the plan. They have lacked any real ability to negotiate its elements and modify or manipulate them according to their wishes. Attempts to strengthen the planning ability of legislative bodies have not been successful because they have disregarded the political dimensions of the planning process. It is not a simple matter of adding a non-partisan policy research capability, because policy research has both partisan and non-partisan content. A legislative body is made up of competing factions who represent a range of political ideology and interest. It is within these political factions that the need for "legislative partisan planning" lies. This does not mean that the notion of a non-partisan research arm of the legislature is not desirable - only that it has a limited function. The legislature of the State of California, for example, has developed a rather impressive policy research apparatus under the leadership of its legislative analyst. But a non-partisan research body encounters difficulties in those areas of research where the assumptions underpinning the investigations are heavily influenced by political considerations. Participatory planning implies conflict and, hopefully, conflict resolution. Legislative and governing bodies (such as school boards in the United States) are the legitimate locus for policy adjudication. The fourth rule says, in effect, that planners must become involved in legislative partisan planning. That is, planners must provide the planning component to the policy research needed by partisan groups within the legislature. But before they can attempt to do this, the implications of such a concept of planning must be discussed. This is where such international organizations as UNESCO or the OECD might provide leadership. The problem, of course, is not confined to education. It is really a question of the conduct of the entire public sector. As such it is of interest to scholars of all the social sciences, as well as political scientists, politicians and citizens who take an interest in the viability of political institutions.

ENDNOTES

1. John Vaisey argues that what is called qualitative does not exist.
2. See for example the papers from the conference on participatory planning in education sponsored by the OECD in Paris, January 15 - 16, 1973.
3. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (1972, December). *The participatory planning process for education*. (Document DAS/EID/72.44). Paris, France: Author, p.iii.
4. See discussion in G. Benveniste (1972). *The Politics of Expertise*. Berkeley, CA: The Glendassy Press.
5. To be sure, *caveats* have to be made, since such things as teacher/pupil ratios and size of classrooms have an impact on what goes on in the classroom. But if aggregates for schools or for clusters of schools are used, the level of intervention can be reduced and the extent that planning will distort goals or be permitted to constrain professional autonomy can be minimized.

AN EXAMINATION OF LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN COLLEGES

Holly Catalfamo

ABSTRACT

Throughout North America, and beyond, there are significant challenges facing educational institutions, including the need for leadership. The wave of retirements facing postsecondary institutions, during turbulent and unpredictable times, has the potential to leave significant leadership gaps within these important organizations. Drawing on a predominantly qualitative methodology, this study suggests that leadership development activities do, in fact, influence leaders. Leadership development activities are formal (e.g., pursuit of a Master of Education), nonformal (e.g., workshops), and informal (e.g., on-the-job experience). These activities contribute to the development of personal, interpersonal, and organizational capacity. Barriers are experienced by educational leaders throughout their journeys and these barriers are often found to include work-life balance issues, inadequate institutional resourcing, and at times, organizational politicking. Despite these barriers, leadership development is recognized to be a valuable pursuit for educational leaders. The conclusion provides implications for future research in this area as well as insights for practitioners interested in leadership development in postsecondary educational institutions.

INTRODUCTION

The President of a large college in Ontario sits in his office late one Friday afternoon in early June. He is preparing notes for a convocation address that he will be making in a few weeks. He recently decided that this will be his last formal speech within his institution because he has chosen to retire and move onto another phase in his life's journey. The theme of his address is leadership and lifelong learning. As he contemplates the topic, he becomes reflective of his own leadership development path over the past 30 years. He wonders what pearls of wisdom to share with the students and staff that he has come to treasure over the years. How has his formal education influenced his ability to lead? What experiences have informed his development as a leader throughout his career? Who has influenced him most, by mentoring, coaching, and guiding him through turbulent times and also periods of relative calm and stability? As he puts pen to paper, he smiles broadly. He begins to write what he hopes will prove to be an inspirational address. "It is the collective sum of my experiences and an unwavering commitment to lifelong learning that has created the leader that I am today and the legacy that I leave within this organization. Let me tell you about my journey."

As the baby boom generation ages towards retirement, all sectors of society are being impacted by this demographic shift. The wave of retirement facing the college system has the potential to leave a significant leadership gap. Despite this arguably important challenge facing postsecondary institutions, it has been recognized that leadership and faculty development institutes must do a better job of preparing individuals to meet the challenges of leadership (Boggs, 2003). "Leadership and leadership development are increasingly seen as key to developing the effectiveness of educational organizations across different areas of provision" (Muijus, Harris, Lumby, Morrison, & Sood, 2006, p. 1); however, the literature suggests that it is not clear how, and to what extent, leadership development programs influence either leadership practice or organizational performance (Southworth, 2003). There is an opportunity to gain insight into leadership development as there is a dearth of knowledge in this particular area (Muijus et al., 2006).

The goal of this article is to describe the processes of leadership development within Ontario colleges, and to explore how these activities influence individual, interpersonal, and organizational capacity. Effective leadership is crucial to the long-term viability of the postsecondary system. It is useful and necessary to explore and understand the leadership development activities that prepare the current and future leaders within this system and in other developed nations. Boggs (2003) reported that, in the United States, time was growing near for the most significant transition in college leadership.

Doctoral programs alone are not enough to provide a pool of diverse and qualified administrators to fill senior level vacancies (Valeau & Boggs, 2004). In the United Kingdom, succession planning has been identified as essential by the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education (2004); however, the Foundation also noted that, on the whole, institutions are not very good at it.

This paper begins by providing an overview of the literature that has influenced this study. A brief overview of adult learning theory is presented, followed by a typology of formal, nonformal, and informal learning and a model of personal, interpersonal, and organizational capacity building. These conceptualizations informed the data collection process as well as the analysis of the findings. The literature review will also examine barriers to learning that exist within modern organizations. The research methodology will be presented followed by a summary of the findings. The paper will conclude with a discussion of the research limitations and implications for professional practice.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Conceptualizing Learning Activities

Scholars and practitioners have been intrigued by the phenomenon of adult learning for decades. Inspired by early writers in adult education, Malcolm Knowles introduced the term andragogy in 1968 (cited in Cranton, 1992). Andragogy is defined as the art and science of helping adults learn and the andragogical model is based on the principles that (a) adults are self-directing, (b) adults have many and varied experiences, (c) adults are ready to learn as a result of being at a developmental transitional point, and (d) adults prefer problem-centered or performance-centered learning (Knowles, 1984).

The work of Malcolm Knowles (1984) continues to be examined by other theorists, like Brookfield (1986), who argues that it is essential for all professionals to reflect critically on their own practice, their values and assumptions, to make responsible choices, and through critical thought become aware of and develop their own philosophy or practice. Mezirow (1990), in turn, suggests that adult education is a process of reflection and action. He believes that the process of critical self-reflection leads to a reformulation of the assumptions that are used to interpret experiences. He calls this process transformative learning.

Adult education has been identified by some as the institutionalized system which provides the programs, administrative structures, processes, settings, and resources that facilitate adult learning (Brundage & Mackeracher, 1980). Adult learning, in contrast, refers both to the process which individuals go through as they attempt to change or enrich their knowledge, values, skills, or strategies, and to the resulting knowledge, values, skills, strategies, and behaviours possessed by each individual (Brundage & Mackeracher, 1980).

Formal, Nonformal, and Informal Learning

While these concepts are useful in understanding the nature of adult learning and learning activities, a typology of formal, nonformal, and informal learning was found to be useful throughout this study to help collect and analyze research data in a logical and consistent format. Formal learning includes the institutional learning that takes place from preschool to graduate studies (Schugurensky, 2000). Its characteristics include being highly institutionalized with each level required to prepare learners for the next level. It is hierarchical, with ministries or departments of education at the top of the hierarchy and students at the bottom and at the end of each level graduates are usually granted a certificate or a diploma (Schugurensky, 2000). An example of formal leadership development would be the pursuit of a Master of Education degree.

There is evidence to suggest that formal learning activities are highly regarded across the North American postsecondary system. Valeau and Boggs (2004) noted that a Ph.D. is viewed as a necessity for senior level positions within the U.S. college system. Scholars in Canada have participated in

advancing learner-centered education by participating in doctoral programs in Community College Leadership (Skolnik & Giroux, 2001). A thorough review of the college leadership development literature reveals a strong belief in the value of formal traditional academic programs (Duvall, 2003; McCarthy, 2003; Skolnik & Giroux, 2001; Valeau & Boggs, 2004).

Nonformal learning includes all organized educational programs that take place outside the formal school system and are usually short-term (Schugurensky, 2000). As with the formal system, there are instructors/facilitators or teachers and there is usually a curriculum with various levels of flexibility; however, they do not usually require prerequisites in terms of previous schooling (Schugurensky, 2000). Other forms of nonformal learning that may take place within the workplace include the acquisition of knowledge and skills as a function of participation in authentic tasks, with support and guidance from others more skilled (Smith, 2003). An example of nonformal leadership development would be attending a leadership workshop or conference.

As discussed earlier, Mezirow (1990) recognizes that learning is a fundamental, natural part of human activity and that self-reflection as learning is a critical aspect of creating a learning journey with professional and personal meaning. Livingstone's (2001) definition of informal learning helps to inform Mezirow's conceptualization. He sees informal learning as any activity involving the pursuit of understanding, knowledge, or a skill which occurs without the presence of externally imposed curricular criteria. It may occur in any context outside the pre-established curricula of educative institutions and those who choose to engage in informal learning determine the objectives, content, means, and process of acquisition of learning (Livingstone, 2001). Informal learning may also include an infinitely large set of informal interactions through which one person is trying to help another (Smith, 2003). An example of informal leadership development would be seeking development through an informal mentor.

Building Personal, Interpersonal, and Organizational Capacity

In their work, *Building Capacity for a Learning Community*, Mitchell and Sackney (2001) discuss how personal, interpersonal, and organizational capacities contribute to the development and sustainability of educational learning communities. These domains combine to affect the extent, the nature, and the efficacy of leadership being enacted within a school setting (Mitchell & Sackney, 2001). This research study utilized Mitchell and Sackney's typology to explore the influence of leadership development from a personal, interpersonal, and organizational perspective.

Personal capacity is the amalgamation of all the embedded values, assumptions, beliefs, knowledge, and skills that an individual holds about leadership (Mitchell & Sackney). They argue that building personal capacity involves a confrontation with implicit and explicit cognitive scripts, practical skills, and knowledge bases so as to come to grips with the narratives that shape and constrain professional practice (Mitchell & Sackney). As such, reflective practice is essential in developing personal capacity.

Interpersonal capacity is based on the leader's need to build interpersonal relationships as he or she works with other individuals. Building interpersonal capacity requires giving attention to others, talking with individuals within the organization, supporting others, modeling collegiality, collective reflection, and collaboration (Mitchell & Sackney, 2001). Individuals in modern organizations must work with others. As individuals work together through collaboration, personal identities, roles, and a sense of collective responsibility become enhanced (Lambert, 2003)

Organizational capacity refers to the structural arrangements of the organization and includes: (a) communication patterns and information flow, (b) structures for discourse and dialogue, (c) collaborative decision-making forums, (d) access to outside networks, and (e) agencies and mechanisms for professional learning and growth (Mitchell & Sackney, 2001). Organizational capacity is important to acknowledge and address because without processes to bring individuals together, personal and interpersonal capacities for leadership remain disjointed, incoherent, and impotent (Mitchell & Sackney,

2001).

For many, the aim of organizational capacity building is sustained organizational improvement (Lambert, 2003). Sustainability is characterized by sharing a sense of vision, whereby personal mastery is celebrated, team learning occurs, and systems thinking is embedded in the culture of the organization (Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross, & Smith, 1994). Lambert suggests that the following conditions are necessary for developing and maintaining organizational capacity: (a) a sustained sense of purpose, (b) succession planning and selection, (c) enculturation, (d) a rhythm of development, and (e) conversion of practice into policy.

Additional research in the area of capacity building includes the work of Michael Fullan (1993) when he explores the area of educational change. His research is related to Mitchell and Sackney's (2001) examination of capacity building. Fullan describes specific capacities as foundational for creating the capacity for change. Beginning with the individual, he promotes the notion of personal vision-building to examine and reexamine what difference the individual is trying to make personally. He suggests that inquiry, the formation and enactment of personal purpose, is a perennial quest. Mastery requires individuals to take their new scripts, knowledge, and ideas and become skilled in them (Fullan, 1993; Senge, 1990). Fullan presents collaboration as the capacity essential for individual learning. Collaboration is essential for both personal learning (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991) and for success in modern organizations.

Barriers to Learning and Development

The literature indicates that, in terms of adult participation in learning and development activities, barriers do exist. Cross (1992) identifies barriers that are referred to as being dispositional in nature. Dispositional barriers include attitudes and perceptions about oneself as a learner. An older learner may be worried that he/she is, in fact, too old to learn. A learner with a limited educational background may lack confidence in his/her ability to learn (Cross). Darkenwald and Merriam (1982) describe dispositional barriers including psychological obstacles (i.e., beliefs, values, and perceptions about learning) and informational obstacles, or rather, the lack of awareness of learning opportunities. Van Velsor, Moxley, and Bunker (2004) have found that some individuals resist learning experiences because of inertia and anxiety. They state that "people tend to collude with themselves in rationalizing away learning challenges that fall outside of their comfort zone" (p. 210).

Cross (1992) describes situational barriers as those barriers that arise from the learner's situation in life at any given time. This includes lack of time for the learner to participate in learning activities due to home and job responsibilities. Cross indicates that this is particularly common for those between the ages of 25 and 45 who may face the multiple demands of working and raising a family. A lack of time is frequently cited as a barrier to adult participation in adult education (Arrowsmith et al., 2001).

McDade (1987) argues that learning and development activities can be very demanding for leaders within higher education communities who have family responsibilities. She states that, "at times, even a day or two away can cause a hardship for families. Participation in longer programs requires detailed planning for care of children and, as our society ages, for parents and older relatives" (p. 76). McDade also suggests that there is both a right time and a wrong time for certain types of learning and development activities. She states that "the benefits of a program can be completely lost if the administrator is not in the right career and experience stage" (p. 72).

Institutional barriers are practices and procedures that discourage adults from participating in educational activities (Cross, 1992). This may include scheduling considerations that prohibit adult learners from participating in learning events. In addition, the lack of financial support from institutions is an additional organizational barrier worthy of discussion. It may be assumed that colleges pay for the costs for participation in learning and development activities; however, they are sometimes limited in

their ability to do so (McDade, 1987). McDade indicates that professional development is often one of the first items deleted when budgets are cut back or limited.

An additional institutional barrier may include the belief that after an organization invests time, energy, and money in the learning and development of a leader, that individual will move on to another institution (McDade, 1987). This barrier is also common in other sectors. Byham, Smith, and Paese (2002), in their publication, *Grow Your Own Leaders*, suggest that some organizations do not invest in developing a talent pool of future leaders as they fear that “people who are told that they are high potential will set their sights on even bigger opportunities in other organizations” (p. 12).

The Need for Leadership Development

It is helpful to gain an understanding of the literature related to the need to proactively pursue leadership development in postsecondary institutions. In Canada, there has been a call to action for over 20 years encouraging colleges to develop their next generation of educational leaders. Dennison and Levin (1989) identified human resource development as a prominent issue within colleges in every region of Canada. In 1993, the Association of Canadian Community Colleges (ACCC) published the Human Resources Study of Canadian Colleges and Institutions and recommended that colleges provide leadership development more extensively and more intensively. In 2000, the Association of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology Ontario (ACAATO) published an Environmental Scan encouraging colleges to become involved in succession planning, mentoring programs, and on-the-job learning. Ontario colleges have not sat dormant in responding to the call for leadership development. The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) launched a Community College Leadership Ph.D. program in the early 2000s. Week-long leadership programs and a plethora of workshops and conference events exist for aspiring Presidents, Vice-Presidents, and other academic administrators. However, Polonsky (2003) observes that leadership development approaches in Ontario lack uniformity. In addition, there is a significant gap in the academic literature in Canada that documents leadership development in Ontario colleges.

In the United States, the body of literature in this area is more robust. Boggs (2003) recognized the importance of developing leaders for postsecondary institutions due to the fact that many faculty and administrators who came into community colleges in the 1960s are now facing retirement. Studies by Shults (2001) and Vaughan and Weisman (2003) confirmed that senior level administrators are approaching the age of retirement age, creating what Carroll and Romero (2003) call an “unprecedented demand” for well-prepared leaders. Boggs questions whether colleges give sufficient attention to developing their own leaders and insists that leadership programs must be expanded and improved. Cooper and Pagotto (2003) argue that there is a crisis in community college leadership and that graduate programs alone may not fill the need for leaders in American community colleges. Duvall (2003) believes that “the limited number of doctoral programs specializing in community colleges is not sufficient to meet the national needs in the field, and generalized programs are a pale substitute because they do not recognize the uniqueness of community colleges” (p. 71).

METHODOLOGY

The research design for this study was a mixed methodological approach, although it was predominantly qualitative in nature. Qualitative research provides insight into people’s lives, their stories and behavior, and it also provides an opportunity to examine organizations and relationships (Bouma & Atkinson, 1997). Quantitative research emphasizes the measurement of behavior and the prediction of future measurements; the underlying assumption being that mathematical models exist and need to be uncovered (Anderson & Arsenault, 1998).

The first phase of the study, a survey with both quantitative and qualitative questions, was used to collect only descriptive data related to the leadership development activities that have taken place

within provincially funded Ontario colleges over a 5-year time span. This purely descriptive detail was viewed to be helpful to the researcher by providing a broader understanding of the context of leadership development at Ontario colleges during the second phase of the study, the qualitative interviews.

The survey was developed by the researcher, who had over 15 years experience in training and organizational development in both the public and private sectors in Ontario, and specific experience in the design and delivery of leadership programs. In addition, literature was reviewed to identify the types of development that take place in postsecondary institutions (Boggs, 2003; Boggs & Kent, 2002; Carroll & Romero, 2003; Cooper & Pagotto, 2003; Duvall, 2003; McCarthy, 2003; Piland & Wolf, 2003; Stolzenberg, 2002; Watts & Hammons, 2002). The draft survey was reviewed by two college administrators responsible for professional development as well as three tenured leaders in postsecondary research and leadership at OISE, University of Toronto, Canada.

The respondent colleges identified which of the three occupational groups (administrators, support staff, or faculty) found in Ontario colleges were engaged in various leadership development activities. Administrators are nonunionized and typically hold managerial positions. Support staff and faculty are unionized positions. All 24 of the Ontario colleges were asked to participate and 12 responses were received. Surveys were received from colleges in all of the four regions in Ontario; Northern, Central, Eastern, and Western.

During the survey phase of the study, HR Directors or their equivalents were asked to identify individuals who they viewed to be Ontario college leaders. The HR Directors were chosen as they tend to interact with employees from all occupational classifications in a variety of contexts, within their own institutions and beyond. They were provided with the following definition of a leader. A leader is someone who influences others to participate and engage in moving towards a shared purpose of their educational community (Cooper, 1995). Although more recent definitions of a leader do exist, Cooper's definition was selected as it resonates with this researcher's personal belief that leaders can be found within every occupational category. In a college, a leader may be an administrator, a faculty member or a support staff who is dedicated to providing appropriate learning environments and experiences to support learners (Wilson, 2002).

HR Directors were asked to identify up to 5 individuals within the college system which led to the identification of 27 leaders who were invited to participate in the second phase of the study, the qualitative interviews. Of the 27 leaders identified, 14 agreed to be interviewed. Participants were contacted by telephone and email and asked if they wished to participate in this study. It was made clear to the participants that their participation would be voluntary and that all interviews would be confidential. The leaders were drawn from the Central, Northern, and Eastern regions of Ontario. Interestingly, all those who responded and interviewed were members of the administrative group, at a Director's level or above (i.e., Director, Dean Associate Vice-President, and President). In Ontario colleges, a Director is best described as a member of senior management who is responsible for a major nonacademic service or department (J. Garner, personal communication, September 11, 2008).

The college leaders interviewed were asked to describe their formal, nonformal, and informal leadership development experiences and to indicate how such experiences influenced their personal, interpersonal, and organizational capacity building. The model of formal, nonformal, and informal learning described by Livingstone (2001; 2002) and Schugurensky (2000) and of capacity building (Mitchell & Sackney, 2001) informed the development of the interview guide. The draft guide was reviewed by the same professionals who reviewed the survey instrument described above. The interview guide was semi-structured in nature and open-ended questions were extended to participants to provide rich description of the phenomena they were discussing. Patton (2002) indicates the advantage of interview guides is they make certain the interviewer makes the best use of limited time available in an interview situation.

All interviews took place face-to-face in private offices, with the exception of three interviews that were conducted by teleconference (the researcher was located in a private teleconference room and the participants were in also in personal, private offices with doors closed). Teleconferences were required due to inclement winter weather at the time of the study and the remote location of these participants.

The broad question examined in this study was “How has leadership development contributed to the development of leaders and their organizations within the Ontario colleges?” In order to address this question, the following sub-questions were addressed. “What are the formal, nonformal, and informal leadership development activities taking place within the Ontario colleges and by whom?” “How do leadership development activities contribute to enhanced personal leadership capacity, interpersonal leadership capacity, and organizational capacity?” and “What barriers or challenges are experienced by the leader with respect to leadership development activities?”

Interviews flowed well according to agreed time lines and provided rich descriptive data. Each of the interviews lasted approximately 60–90 minutes. The interviews were tape recorded (with the consent of the interview participant) and transcribed. The respective transcripts were sent to each respondent for verification and acceptance. In terms of analysis, the researcher independently conducted the data analysis process by becoming immersed in the participants’ experiences, reviewing the tapes several times, and then engaging in a time of quiet reflection (Moustakas, 1994). Patterns and connections between the data were categorized (McCracken, 1988) as emergent themes reflective of the typology of learning (formal, nonformal, and informal learning types), capacities developed (personal, interpersonal, and organizational), and barriers encountered.

RESULTS

This section of the paper will highlight the findings of the first phase of the study, the survey, followed by the results of the second phase of the study, the qualitative interviews. The survey data were a small part of the study and provided limited descriptive data regarding the context of leadership development in Ontario colleges.

The responding colleges reported they have staff from all occupational groups involved in formal learning activities including master, bachelor, and college level academic programs. Fewer colleges reported staff involvement in doctoral studies, although there was reported to be more involvement by administrators and faculty than by support staff. All participant colleges indicated they provide some funding for formal learning; however, the survey did not explore the amount of funding, thus, the analysis is recognized to be limited.

In terms of nonformal learning activities, the survey results revealed that colleges offered many types of nonformal leadership development opportunities. The data do not provide specific levels of engagement by way of the number of staff at each college involved in nonformal learning activities. Thus, the analysis is descriptive of the types of activities and not evaluative of the level of engagement within each college. Colleges invest resources in nonformal activities, such as workshops and conferences, and establish professional development infrastructures to coordinate these learning interventions. Interestingly, in addition to workshops and conferences, colleges reported providing experiential learning by way of acting assignments or secondments. Few colleges indicated their involvement in nontraditional learning activities such as job shadowing or formal coaching programs. No colleges reported engaging in job rotation as a developmental opportunity.

Survey respondents provided a broad listing of the types of informal learning activities taking place across campuses, including networking, informal communities of practice, informal mentoring, and participation in committees. Although the data did not break down the activities by specific occupational groups, the types of learning activities identified indicated that survey respondents had an understanding of the concept of informal learning.

Finally, the survey asked respondents to comment on whether colleges had a policy or broad strategic approach to leadership development. The data revealed that there was a developing interest in the college community in leadership development. Only 1 of the 12 responding colleges indicated that they had a strategic approach to leadership development, while 9 of 12 were in the process of developing a strategic approach.

In summary, the survey results provided descriptive data indicating the different types of activity underway in Ontario colleges with respect to formal, nonformal, and informal leadership development. Although all occupational categories reported some level of engagement, particularly by administrators and faculty, there are fewer support staff participating in leadership development activities.

The second phase of the study, the interview findings, provides a rich description of how leadership development activities contribute to the development of college leaders. These data will be presented by discussing the themes that emerged from the interview texts. These themes are not presented in a prioritized format; each theme has significance on its own. In presenting the themes, a sample of direct quotations from the leaders will be provided, to illustrate their experiences. These quotes provide the reader with rich insights into the leadership development journeys of Ontario college leaders.

This section will begin with an overview of the finding that leadership development experiences have indeed contributed to the growth of college leaders. Then, seven themes will explore in more detail how formal, informal, and nonformal leadership development experiences have contributed to the growth of personal, interpersonal, and organizational capacity. Barriers to leadership development will also be described. The themes include: (a) formal programs bring legitimacy and access, (b) informal learning has significant influence, (c) lack of impact in nonformal programs, (d) development of self-awareness, (e) enhancement of interpersonal abilities, (f) growth of organizational capacity, and (g) institutional barriers.

The data reveal that leadership development activities did, in fact, contribute to the development of Ontario college leaders. Learning interventions experienced by the participants included formal, nonformal, and informal learning experiences. The combination of these learning activities built personal, interpersonal, and organizational capacity. Participants grew in each of the aforementioned domains. Such growth was attributed to learning about the “business” of education, experiential-based learning, learning from informal mentors and role-models, interacting with peers, and immersion in a reflective process throughout each type of learning experiences.

Theme 1: Formal Programs Provide Legitimacy and Access

The leaders in this study reported that they learned about leadership in different ways. In terms of formal learning, leaders in this study pursued leadership development through graduate studies in educationally-related fields. Respondents indicated that formal learning, the pursuit of master’s and doctoral degrees in education in particular, was valued and had a positive impact on their growth as leaders. All 14 interview participants have undergraduate university degrees; 12 of 14 have a degree at the master’s level and 5 of 14 have completed doctoral level studies. Of the 12 with master’s degrees, 9 have attained this level in a field related to education (e.g., Educational Leadership). All of the 5 doctoral level studies were completed in the area of education.

Participants indicated that formal leadership learning assisted college leaders to understand both the context and “business” of postsecondary education, providing them with legitimacy and also access to the strategic levels of the organization.

My doctorate work is in postsecondary administration, so, I really have a degree in the business in what I do.

Participants indicated that formal education helped prepare them for a role as a college leader.

Developing subject matter expertise in the area of their work was essential to their development as a leader by gaining the theoretical background to understand the context of education.

[I] did my master's formally and that's what allowed me to get the whole leadership in education piece; it was a Master's of Arts in Educational leadership. The degree really helped springboard me into understanding the role of educational leader.

These findings are supported by the existing literature that suggest that university-level programs related to education are regarded as creating knowledge for understanding as content-led programs (Bush, 2008). Duvall (2003) suggests that the value of the pursuit of doctoral degrees moves beyond content. Doctoral level studies are intended to explore new knowledge, consider new ideas, and to think a different way. As such, learners develop the ability to question, investigate, view issues from differing perspectives, and to understand and accept the prevalence of ambiguity and paradox. There is widespread belief that on a societal level, improving our ability to pursue doctoral degree holders in Canada will help Canada to innovate and compete globally (The Council of the Federation, 2006).

Formal leadership learning also provides access to the senior, strategic tables within colleges where they believed that rich leadership learning can occur.

I'm not sure if it's the degree itself [that] would make me a good leader but it allowed me then to move to the tables where I could learn from others to be a good leader and learn from the situation.

Additionally, many participants commented that the process of attaining their formal degrees gave them confidence through newly found power.

You get a lot of confidence when you have those letters after your name. The other thing there is an attitudinal change toward you when you have your doctorate, especially in the community college system, because there aren't as many around and so people look to you if you have that. That's kind of interesting because a lot of leadership is how people perceive you as a leader or they see you've got this credential, you are automatically heard in a different way that you might not have been.

The literature also suggests that access to key players within the system is often connected to status or credentials within the organization. The respondents in this study indicated that the acquisition of master's and doctoral level degrees provided them with access to forums within the college system that were once beyond arm's reach. Gaining the ability to engage at a higher level, with key decision makers at the strategic table, led to an increase in their confidence and provided a validation of their legitimacy as a postsecondary leader. Acker-Hocevar, Bauch, and Berman (1997) suggest that within bureaucratic organizations, advancement is dependent on the possession of the appropriate credentials and expertise.

Theme 2: Informal Learning has Significant Influence

Leaders in this study were most vocal and excited about their engagement in informal leadership development. This included the immersion in real-life experiences, role-models, informal mentors and colleagues that provided guidance and feedback, and engaging in a reflective process of professional self-discovery.

Several participants who spoke of informal learning included on-the-job challenges, where leaders encountered professionally demanding "stretch" experiences. Sometimes, learning from experience was the result of immersion in a volunteer assignment, such as leading a Board of Directors. Additionally, navigating a difficult work experience, such as a college strike, also provided rich learning.

I think I learn mostly by doing and interacting and I've spent most of my life working really long hours, involved with real work, and, I think that most of my learning has occurred right on the job

or through volunteer experiences.

Van Veslor et al. (2004) have studied leadership learning and their research reveals that a majority of an individual's learning during a career happens when immersed in work experiences while on the job or from life experiences outside the classroom. Weiss and Molinaro (2005) argue that experience provides leaders with a variety of opportunities that enhance their current performance or prepares them to assume future leadership roles.

Respondents also spoke of the importance of role models, mentors and colleagues, in influencing their development as a leader. Role models provided invaluable insight demonstrating what should and should not be done.

I have had the privilege all my life working with these kinds of people, deeply committed, deeply passionate people committed to transforming human lives with education. I've now been sitting at an executive table for 26 years and I still learn all the time from people around me who demonstrate perspectives on leadership and traits on leadership and ways of going about leadership and also [those] who demonstrate what not to do.

Role modeling is living the shared values of the organization and doing simple, but effective things, like making eye contact, smiling, saying good morning, and listening (Polansky, 2003). Chappelow (2004) argues that observing an individual do something well provides an excellent developmental opportunity. Informal mentors in this study also had great influence on respondents, by taking them "under their wing" and guiding them towards leadership roles.

[Mentors] would help guide you to make sure that you know if you started to get off the beaten path, and you know, bring us back. And that was fortunate... because I think from an informal perspective the guidance we get from others can really be lasting and significantly lead to our career growth.

Valeau and Boggs (2004) have recognized that informal mentoring relationships are commonplace in colleges within the United States as a developmental and socialization tool. Additional research on mentoring relationships in organizations provides strong evidence that individuals with mentors are more likely to experience better job performance, have a greater likelihood of promotion, earn greater compensation, and experience other positive outcomes (Groves, 2007).

The reflective process was reported to be pivotal to the learning journey of the leader in growing awareness of self and developing relationships with others. Participants recognized the value of reflection in their own development. Reflection occurred for some on a day-to-day basis as a part of their professional practice; others would reflect during an encounter with a difficult situation.

Well, in some cases, it was really devastating and I would beat myself up terribly. But, in the end, it made me stronger because, what it did, it caused me to reflect and be eager to take the reflection and speak to folks and see if they saw it the same way and take that learning to the next experience and say, OK, I'm not going to have that happen again.

Van Veslor et al. (2004) state that being able to learn from experiences involves being able to reflect on the process of learning in day-to-day life and persisting with attempts to learn, grow, and change in the face of mistakes and setback. Cooper (1995) believes that it is only through reflection on our actions that we are able to clarify and articulate what we know.

Theme 3: Lack of Impact in Nonformal Programs

It was found that there are many nonformal learning activities taking place within colleges and throughout Ontario. The most common types of experiences are workshops and conferences. They

also include professional memberships, communities of practice, and developmental assignments. Respondents indicated that, while they enjoyed the experience of interacting with colleagues at workshops and conferences, they did not find nonformal learning activities had a significant impact on their development as leaders.

I can't say that a lot of them [nonformal learning] have been really transformational.

Some participants indicated that while they support and engage in professional development activities, they found that the material was not overly sophisticated. Others commented that workshops and conferences have typically lacked the type of depth that they either need or desire. One participant who attended an executive leadership program at a prestigious university in the United States commented:

I was quite surprised that the actual content and delivery was not overly sophisticated. It was kind of middle of the road, straight ahead stuff... it wasn't overly challenging. It was a nice 2 weeks, lots of wonderful people. I certainly learned some good stuff, but, it wasn't earth shattering. So, you know, the nonformal leadership development activities were useful, but, not highly impactful.

A philosophical approach to nonformal learning was also expressed.

You take in what you can.

In studies conducted in the United States, Boggs (2003) argues that individual community colleges should do more to develop leadership development programs by expanding and improving professional development programs. He states that, "sadly, support for these is all too unavailable. For institutions that are dedicated to the learning and development of people, community colleges often do not give enough attention to developing their own faculty, staff, and leaders" (p. 23).

Despite the fact that respondents indicated that nonformal learning experiences lacked impact, they did indicate that there was a benefit related to the opportunities that participants have to build relationships and interact with colleagues. Several participants commented on the value of conversations and the ability to bond with others in mid-to-senior management roles from different colleges. Many participants noted that the collegial nature of learning was a significant benefit of college-run leadership programs or university-sponsored executive development programs.

You can learn from one another, so, if you are engaged with a cohort, the advantage is that you are learning from other managers, right, and you're able to have dialogue. So, that aspect of it and, you can maintain those relationships as you go along. So, there's a benefit there.

Engaging with others in a collegial environment provides opportunities for meaningful discourse essential for professional growth. Stoll, Fink, and Earl (2003) suggest that colleagues can help deepen the learning of the educational professional as an essential component of their development.

Theme 4: Development of Self-Awareness

Personal capacity is the amalgamation of all the embedded values, assumptions, beliefs, knowledge, and skills that an individual holds (Mitchell & Sackney, 2001). Building personal capacity involves a confrontation with implicit and explicit cognitive scripts, practical skills, and knowledge bases so as to come to grips with the narratives that shape and constrain professional practice (Mitchell & Sackney, 2001). The findings that emerged from the data reveal how leadership learning contributes to the development of personal capacity.

Self-awareness emerged as a theme along with growth in awareness of one's influence on others. Participants described their sense of self that emerged from the accumulation of learning experiences encountered throughout their leadership development journeys.

You know, what the leadership journey brought with it was a deeper sense of where I get my satisfaction from, what are my personal satisfiers; so knowing where your energy comes from and what works for you and what doesn't work for you.

In addition, a few participants noted that they became increasingly aware of their profile within the organization.

When you work the hours that I do and you're on all the time, you're never NOT on. If you're at a meeting, they're watching you, if you're at the water cooler, they're listening to you. I learned that at an early age... You know, everything you say will be dissected. You learn that. It doesn't make you guarded, it makes you thoughtful, I think.

The literature suggests that such awareness is important in a leader's role. According to Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2001), in an article published in the Harvard Business Review, leaders use self-awareness to gauge their own moods accurately, and they intuitively know how they are affecting others. Within this study, participants became more in tune with their appreciation for others within the organization. One participant commented on becoming more aware of his own strengths and weaknesses and those that others brought to the organizational table. He could see how helpful the abilities of others could be in balancing a specific gap that he himself had.

My best attribute is knowing that I don't know everything and putting good people around you, letting them lead, encouraging them to lead, treating them to lead and giving them the rope to do so and again, watching them; being active in their leadership.

The data from this study suggest that, through leadership development, self-awareness contributes to leader growth as a reflective practitioner.

I think reflection is where you start to learn. You know you learn more from your mistakes or from thinking of better ways of doing something. No matter how well things go, you do something and everybody says, "That was perfect. That was wonderful." I still reflect on it and think how could I have done it better? What could I have done better?

Walker (1995) argues that the goal of leadership is to enhance learning by engaging in the principles of constructivism including reflection and metacognition that contribute to the construction of knowledge and the process of sense-making. Goleman et al. (2001) suggest that learning to become self-aware, the ability to read your own emotions, allows people to know their strengths and limitations and feel confident about their self-worth.

Theme 5: Enhancement of Interpersonal Abilities

Interpersonal capacity is based on the individual's need to build interpersonal relationships with others (Mitchell & Sackney, 2001). Building interpersonal capacity requires giving attention to others, talking with individuals within the organization, supporting others, modeling collegiality, collective reflection, and collaboration (Mitchell & Sackney, 2001). Participants indicated that through their leadership learning journeys, their interpersonal abilities were enhanced. The findings emerging in this area include: (a) the enhancement of interpersonal skills, (b) the development of strong communication skills and the ability to listen, (c) the ability to develop relationships with others, (d) to negotiate and persuade, and (e) the capacity to develop trustful relationships.

Interpersonal skills are defined as: (a) knowledge about human behavior and interpersonal processes; (b) ability to understand the feelings, attitudes, and motives of others from what they say and do (empathy, social sensitivity); (c) ability to communicate clearly and effectively (speech fluency, persuasiveness); and (d) the ability to establish effective and cooperative relationships (Yukl, 2006). Participants commented on how, through their leadership development journeys, they developed strong

communication skills including the ability to listen. One of the participants describes the impact made by a role model who provided him with feedback to which he listened attentively.

You know what, it's much better to listen a lot before we share, because, we get all kinds of information, from others, from what we see, from what we feel, from what we hear and that helps us in making the ultimate decision or takes us in the direction that we want to move toward; but, listening, and getting the input of others is probably as important as anything we do.

Other participants discussed the growth in their ability, as leaders, to foster relationships with others. One participant, in a deliberate attempt to get to know her department better, job shadowed every individual within her department. The resulting effect was the development of strong relationships. She indicated that:

I have found that one little activity, which was intended more as a knowledge gaining ... turned out to be a wonderful connector to people and I've developed this personal relationship with everyone, on a mini-scale, but it's at least a bit of personal connection to every person.

Much of the literature related to education suggests that relationship-building contributes to one's success as a learner. Learners acquire greater depth of understanding when they (a) share ideas with others, (b) engage in the dynamic process of thinking together, (c) consider other points of view, and (d) broaden their own perspectives (Lambert, 2003). Such is the essence of meaningful relationships.

An additional finding related to the development of interpersonal abilities refers to enhanced negotiation skills and powers of persuasion. One participant was very clear in recognizing how his leadership development had contributed to the development of such skills.

It [leadership development] has made me more skillful, it's made me a better listener. It's made me a better mediator; it's made me a better negotiator. Again, there are a bunch of innate underpinnings to all of that, but, there's no question that I am much more skillful in those interpersonal interactions as a result of my leadership path.

When discussing the role of leadership in creating a shared vision, it was noted that communication and persuasiveness were essential.

Creating something compelling is part of your job, but delivering on it is the other half. So working with people ...improving your people skills and your persuasive skills and communication skills and all of those decision-making processes is a very important part of this business.

Negotiation and persuasion are viewed to be integral to interpersonal capacity building. Mitchell and Sackney (2001) argue that the construction of professional knowledge involves a process that is not only an individual pursuit; instead, it is a heavily contested process of negotiation among different people.

A final finding that emerged within the interpersonal domain was the ability to develop trustful relationships. The leader who job shadowed every individual within her department described how that particular exercise contributed to enhancing her department's trust in her.

There were some suspicions when I first started doing it that I was doing it to look at and assess the department ... whether we needed everybody or would I be cutting jobs. And, of course, when each year passed and I wasn't cutting anybody, I think that they realized, oh, she just actually wants to know what we did...it [job shadowing] built a lot of trust.

Another leader shared a situation that demonstrated how she, through what she described as her deep capacity for intimacy and authenticity, has created a climate of trust within her team.

I try to have pretty open communication around that, so, I mean, I just took a couple of whacks in that last meeting, but, at least they feel like they can do that. They can put it out on the table in an open way.

Researchers argue that it is very important that leaders appreciate the perspectives of others and create an environment in which individuals may share their views. Developing a sense of trust and the appreciation of individual ideas provides the foundation which can lead to important interpersonal and organizational growth (Cooper, 1995). In their publication, *The Leadership Challenge*, Kouzes and Pozner (1997) propose fundamental practices necessary to become an exemplary leader. One practice, Enabling Others to Act, emphasizes the importance of building trust with others and promoting collaboration. Outstanding leaders listen closely to diverse points of view and treat others with dignity and respect. They also allow others to make choices, and they support the decisions that they make (Kouzes & Pozner, 1997).

Theme 6: Growth of Organizational Capacity

Organizational capacity deals with the ability (a) to establish communication processes that facilitate discourse and dialogue and collaborative decision-making forums, (b) to provide access to external networks, and (c) to provide opportunities for professional learning and growth (Mitchell & Sackney, 2001). It is argued that without such organizational capacity, personal and interpersonal capacity remain disjointed, incoherent, and impotent (Mitchell & Sackney, 2001). The relationships between personal, interpersonal, and organizational capacity are, therefore, interdependent. The findings related to organizational capacity building include the ability of the leaders to: (a) move the organization forward towards its strategic vision, (b) build the structural capacity of the organization, (c) grow commitment to organizational learning, and (d) enhance organizational culture.

Kotter (2001), in an article published in Harvard Business Review, states that the direction-setting aspect of leadership creates vision and strategies that describe a business, technology, or corporate culture in terms of what it should become over the long term and articulate a feasible way of achieving this goal. Levin (2000) describes the mission or purpose (of an organization) to the intentionality of organizational members and other stakeholders with respect to organizational actions and outcomes. Several of the participants in this study suggested that through leadership learning, they have developed into leaders who are able to move their organizations forward to accomplish organizational goals.

[Leadership development] allows me as a leader at an organizational level or institutional level to prepare the organization to meet its objectives; to keep the vision of what the institution sees as core to its existence.

In order to achieve the vision of the organization, it is reasonable to suggest that building the structural capacity of the organization is essential. Several leaders recognized the role of their leadership learning in making an overall contribution to creating structures for discussion and dialogue and providing decision-making processes that enhance the ability of individuals within the organization to participate in open discourse.

The school was disorganized when I arrived, if that's not too strong a word. I organized it. I put structure in place. They're just a terrific group of people. But the structure wasn't in place. The systems weren't in place so I systemized things, I structured it and I allowed it to function and I gave my support to people. I never look over someone's shoulder.

By creating an open climate and creating avenues for honest dialogue, organizations reportedly benefited.

I boast that I will run the most transparent organization. I mean, here, people are encouraged to ask questions and asking questions, to me, is entirely appropriate at all times.

A commitment to learning and professional growth is considered to be an important aspect of organizational capacity. Stoll et al. (2003) argue that a school is a social learning context and that if the context is not favorable, collective learning will be inhibited, but if the influences are favorable, learning will be enhanced. One leader in this study described his role in creating increased interest and enthusiasm for learning within his institution.

When I came here, the level of participation in professional development was not very high. Within 2 years, it had increased substantially. The culture of learning, of learning together, that it is OK to make mistakes, this has been influential.

Leaders spoke of their role in coaching, mentoring, and building a community of learners within organizations and having a positive impact on learning and professional growth.

I coach, I mentor . . . my role is to coach these individuals when they're here and then they go out and they coach others ... I think that's really important.

It follows, then, that the leader has a role in creating a favorable context to enhance learning. This is consistent with the literature that deals with educational organizations. Stoll et al. (2003) argue that by creating an environment that fosters learning, one outcome will be enhanced capacity to shape the organization's future, to anticipate and deal with problems, create the results you want to create, as well as the things that you have to do, and improve continuously.

Participants indicated that their leadership development journeys resulted in a positive impact on organizational culture. One definition of organizational culture is that it is the essence of an organization—the learned, shared, tacit assumptions on which people base their daily behavior (Schein, 1999). Culture in higher education institutions is sometimes described as a way of doing and behaving by groups within that organization and the community college can be conceived of as a culture composed of subcultures (Smircich, cited in Levin, 2005). Culture building was reported to significantly influence organizational capacity; moving people from the point of compliance to engagement.

I think if you create an environment that people feel that they are doing work that is valuable and meaningful, then they engage more and they give a higher level of productivity. So, what does that lead to? It leads to happier students, it leads to better economics, it leads to better success stories and it eventually leads to more pride in your institution and more personal pride and how you're connected to that institution. What you have now are conversations in place, not about how lousy everything is, but ... isn't it great what we're teaching and what we're doing.

Educational scholars indicate that building such capacity for improving organizational culture provides evidence of challenging and changing inappropriate or harmful norms and replacing them with norms that value and support learning (Stoll et al., 2003). Leadership practices that involve effective communication, the sharing of information, providing up-to-date information to organizational members, and encouraging inquisitiveness lead to a more positive learning culture (Farrell, 2000). Bartlett and Ghoshal (1998) argue that it is essential to build a trust-based culture to support widespread and sustained organizational learning; this requires a common set of values and beliefs that bond diverse organizational members in a sense of shared commitment.

Theme 7: Institutional Barriers

Boggs (2003) has commented that in the United States, there are significant challenges that need to be addressed in developing a pool of leaders within the community college system. It can be argued that a similar observation can be made about the development of college leaders in Ontario. Leaders often faced overwhelming workloads, a lack of resources, structural issues, or organizational politicking that presented institutional barriers for those seeking leadership development.

Leaders commented on having very demanding and busy careers as well as robust involvement in external community and volunteer activities. Thus, finding time for additional leadership learning activities is undoubtedly a challenge. Levin (2001) noted that technology has had a significant impact on the increase of workload and the increased pace of work citing voice mail and electronic mail as a source of significant pressure. The following comment illustrates this point.

This weekend, I was several hundred emails behind ... the majority of them were these newsletters that I used to have a bit more time to read (informal learning) ... and on the weekend I just said, and it kind of broke my heart, but I just went, delete, delete, delete. I'll never get to them, but somehow, I used to have time for a little bit more of that.

An additional quote shows how participants echoed these concerns.

Right now, I'm in the midst of attending to what's in face or what's burning actively, and that's not the way I like to conduct myself ... I guess that for administrators, I don't know how much room there is for our own professional development.

There is always a challenge when managers are faced with increasing workload pressures not only in colleges but in all sectors. With the withdrawal of centralized HR career management, cost-cutting, more entrepreneurial styles of management, and the advent of more transactional psychological contracts between employer and employee, managers are facing heavier workloads and staff responsibility (Mabey & Finch-Lees, 2008). Indeed, in a survey completed by Shults (2001), college leadership stated that they were not prepared for the overwhelming demands of the job which was found to be all-consuming. Many official duties take place in the evenings, weekends, and while on vacation, making it difficult to balance their professional, private, and spiritual lives (Vaughan & Weisman, 2003).

A lack of resources was viewed by participants to include both time (as examined above) and money. This challenge was mentioned by several of the participants.

Budget is a barrier and you know, it's one of those things where I've had to look over the last few years at being smarter at what I do, being innovative around what I do.

There is evidence that investing in employee development benefits an organization in many ways including: (a) improving quality, (b) retaining key employees, (c) meeting the challenges of global competition and social change, and (d) adjusting to new technology and changes in work design; however, Canada still tends to invest less in training and development than other Western countries (Noe & Peacock 2008). In a 2004 study, Canada was rated 20th in an international study of the priority organizations place on employee training (Noe & Peacock, 2008).

The bureaucratic structure of colleges limited the opportunity for development and growth through advancement.

One of the barriers, too, for a long time ...was the lack of movement at the top. For a long time leadership positions were informal because formal ones weren't available.

In addition, organizational politics was viewed by several of the participants to be a challenge to leadership learning. Levin (1997) suggests that there are some colleges where the culture is more political than academic and that in these colleges, organizational histories—and a generation of habits—guide actions. College leaders are found to be, all too often, subjected to incivility within their campus communities including excessive criticism, and occasionally, harassment (Boggs, 2003). Several participants declared organizational politics limited them in their leadership development journeys.

But I definitely will never play the political game the way that some people do, and I'm just not going to... so, that's been an issue, I'd say a little bit of a barrier, not being able to play politics as

well as other people might.

Colleges, like the schools in the elementary and secondary systems, are predominantly hierarchical in nature. Such hierarchy is said to lead to power systems that are inevitable given the hierarchical school system (Acker-Hocevar et al., 1997). Organizational politicking was reported to limit access to learning and development and limit opportunities for career advancements that would provide for expanded leadership growth. Regardless, organizational politicking did not discourage the leaders in this study from pursuing leadership roles. In fact, they indicated that they became reflective and encouraged to find alternate pathways.

DISCUSSION

This research addressed the question, “How has leadership development contributed to the development of leaders and their organizations within Ontario colleges?” The data revealed that college leaders are engaged in a variety of formal, nonformal, and informal learning experiences, and that these activities have considerable value for college leaders and their organizations. Several themes consistently emerged:

- Formal leadership development programs provide legitimacy and access.
- Informal leadership development has significant influence on leader growth.
- Nonformal programs lack impact.
- Personal capacity grows through self-awareness.
- Interpersonal abilities are enhanced through leader development.
- Leader development grows organizational capacity.
- Barriers provide a challenge to leader development.

In essence, there appear to be several points of discussion to highlight. Formal learning is valuable, yet, there is limited support. Colleges invest significantly in nonformal learning activities; however, leaders report the least amount of impact. Informal leadership learning seems to lack the recognition accorded formal and nonformal learning activities. And finally, capacity building contributes to the development and sustainability of educational learning communities.

First, despite the theme that formal learning is valuable to leadership learners, it is important to observe there is modest organizational support for such learning. The survey results revealed limited financial support towards funding formal studies and that the availability of funding varied greatly across colleges. It is likely that senior administrators would point to severe funding constraints that colleges face in Ontario as a justification for limited support. While the evidence supports the value of formal learning as an invaluable part of a leader’s developmental journey, it seems unfortunate that there are limited and fragmented efforts to invest in formal leadership development. Interestingly, research shows that Canada lags behind world leaders in the proportion of the population with graduate degrees and the percentage of Canada’s population with doctoral degrees falls well below the OECD average (The Council of the Federation, 2006).

Second, both the survey and interview data reveal there is significant investment and activity related to nonformal leadership development; however, nonformal learning overwhelmingly lacked the most impact. Leaders were not overly enthusiastic about the influence of nonformal learning. Despite mentioning some very solid programs in leadership preparation (e.g., presidential and vice-presidential preparation programs), participants reported that, overall, most programs lacked depth and breadth.

Therefore, the type of learning that seems to garner the most energy (i.e., nonformal workshops and conferences) is also reported to have the least amount of influence in developing leadership capacity.

Third, it seems problematic that although informal learning is both abundant and influential in developing leaders, it also happens to be the type of learning that is frequently not recognized and supported by institutions (Colley, Hodkinson, & Malcolm, 2002). This is a quandary that presents a challenge to colleges. Livingstone (2002) estimates that nearly 90% of Canadians are involved in some form of informal learning activities that they themselves view as significant. Considerable informal learning takes place in all sectors and all workplaces (Millar, 2005). Despite this fact, not all workplaces acknowledge, value, or recognize this type of learning, and, in some workplaces, informal learning is even secretive or hidden (Millar, 2005).

Fourth, this study demonstrates the fluidity of the capacity building process. All forms of leadership development influence all capacities. Personal capacity building is related to interpersonal capacity-building in that through personal reflection on professional practice, individuals develop in their ability to engage in discourse and dialogue, and to work effectively in teams (Mitchell & Sackney, 2001). The relationship between personal growth and interpersonal growth is reciprocal and fluid. Having a keen understanding of self is critical to building effective relationships. Building interpersonal capacity involves valuing the contributions of colleagues and inviting them to participate in meaningful dialogue (Mitchell & Sackney, 2001). Building organizational capacity requires the establishment of structures, processes, and decision-making forums that foster the growth of interpersonal relationships and trust among organizational members (Mitchell & Sackney, 2001). It is important to give consideration to the capacity building process as it relates to formal, informal, and nonformal leadership development processes. By engaging in leadership development processes that involve reflection, engaging in experiential opportunities, observing role models, and interacting with mentors and colleagues, leaders are able to develop a professional and more confident sense of self and an ability to connect and interact well with others as an organizational leader. As leaders within educational institutions, they have the ability to contribute to the creation of learning communities.

Limitations and Future Research

There are potential limitations to this research related to sample size and the ability to generalize the results. Due to the small sample size, the data may be related to the specific participants and to their specific leadership development experiences. As such, no generalizations can be made. In reporting the data results, it may imply that the findings are, in fact, applicable in general terms, rather than a specific sample or set of circumstances. Generalizability is usually not required, or desired for that matter, in qualitative research. A qualitative study is imbedded in people's unique experiences (Merriam, 1998). It is not an attempt to predict the future, but to understand the nature of the participant's setting, and in the analysis to be able to communicate that faithfully to others that are interested in that setting (Patton, 1985).

Future research could consider other types of leaders found within educational institutions. The college leaders that participated in the qualitative interviews for this study held administrative positions within their respective organizations. According to the definition of leader provided within this study, all individuals within an organization, regardless of their position, can be leaders. Therefore, it would be extremely interesting to explore the leadership development experiences of individuals who are drawn from the other occupational categories; faculty and support staff. Would the formal, nonformal, and informal leadership learning experiences of faculty and support staff be similar to those from the administrative category?

This study examined leadership learning experiences of college leaders. An additional contribution to the broader sector of postsecondary education could be made by examining the experiences of university leaders. University leaders are more likely to have completed a terminal degree in their

subject-matter discipline; achieving a doctorate is typically the benchmark qualification required for hire. Thus, it can be assumed that university leaders may not have formal learning experiences in the business of education. It would be extremely intriguing to examine how the formal, nonformal, and informal learning experiences of university leaders have influenced personal, interpersonal, and organizational capacity.

It is clear that nonformal learning experiences through professional development departments are an important part of the college structure. This study revealed that there are limits to the impact of nonformal learning activities. In the future, it would be useful to study nonformal learning experiences that have been specifically structured to recognize and incorporate the findings of the study. It would be interesting to structure, then study, collegial nonformal learning programs that incorporate opportunities for reflection, mentoring, role models, and active experience. How would participants in this type of nonformal learning program describe their learning experience?

And finally, participants noted that one barrier to leadership learning was their significant work demands. It would be interesting to examine whether they opt out of formal or nonformal learning because of time pressures and are thus more likely to engage in informal learning. Therefore, is informal learning reported to have the significant impact because it is the more likely way to acquire development given the barrier of time?

Implications for Professional Practice

In terms of the implications for professional practice, the following ideas may be worth contemplating. Across Ontario, there seems to be an opportunity to consider the value of a strategic, system-wide approach to leadership development that engages all 24 colleges. A participatory approach might then incorporate the needs of all types of colleges in all regions of Ontario. The coordination of such an initiative would need to be resourced on an ongoing basis. College leaders may find some value in contributing to resourcing such a role. Likewise, the development of a menu of leadership learning options might result in the availability of options that are available for all types of leadership learners with varying levels of leadership experiences. While there are a plethora of activities taking place across Ontario, presently strategic human resource planning, coordination, and communication is lacking system-wide.

If such activities are not feasible, at the very least, colleges may consider the value of strategic college-wide leadership development. Several colleges reported that they are beginning, or are at least interested in, the development of strategic planning with respect to leadership development. It may be prudent for colleges to align leadership development plans with the vision and mission of the organization. They may wish to do so in a manner that is complementary to organizational strategic planning and recognizes the potential value of formal, informal, and nonformal learning in building the capacity of leadership learners and of the organization.

Colleges may wish to consider the possibility of enhanced funding and support of formal leadership learning. There may be untapped funding options available for colleges and partnerships with other colleges and universities that could emerge as beneficial. Boggs (2003) argues that the commitment and responsibility for such support needs to come from present-day leaders in formal organizational roles.

In addition, it would be interesting to include discussions of informal learning in the formal and informal performance management discussions that take place on an ongoing basis within Ontario colleges. It is recognized that tapping into informal learning requires a dedicated effort on the part of learning professionals and organizational managers. Individuals with formal managerial roles may need coaching in terms of how to have conversations with their staff regarding developing personalized learning plans that provide opportunities, not only for workshops and conferences, but experiential learning, reflection, and feedback. Managers have a pivotal role in fostering and reinforcing a culture

of leadership development (Groves, 2007).

And finally, recognizing the barrier of time constraints, leadership learning might be considered something that is not only “nice-to-do” for a leader, but instead, something that is a part of an organizational culture that is committed to building communities of learning. Leadership learning may have enormous potential to transform individuals, as well as colleges, if it is woven into the fabric of an organization and becomes a part of the way that a college conducts its day-to-day operations.

To conclude, the respondents’ experiences have provided insights into the value of leadership development in building the capacities of organizational leaders. The findings of this study provide a clear message for scholars and practitioners involved in the development of postsecondary leaders. Formal, informal, and nonformal leadership development activities all have a role to play in developing the personal, interpersonal, and organizational capacities of educational leaders. It would be helpful to extend the support available to those seeking access to formal learning programs. Colleges need to consider ways to enrich nonformal professional development experiences to create greater meaning for participants. Institutions are challenged to find pathways that embrace all forms of learning and give recognition to nontraditional, informal leadership development experiences. Removal of barriers needs consideration as organizations seek to find creative solutions to the age-old challenge of leaders trying to accomplish too much with too few resources, sacrificing their own professional development along the way. Postsecondary institutions that wish to fully embrace and grow personal, interpersonal, and organizational capacity of their leaders will reflect on their leadership development activities and proactively work towards developing the next generation of educational leaders.

REFERENCES

- Acker-Hocevar, M., Bauch, P. A., & Berman, B. T. (1997, Fall). Emerging constructs of power: Teacher beliefs embedded in practice with implications for school leadership. *Educational Leadership and Administration*, 21-32.
- Anderson, G., & Arsenault, N. (1998). *Fundamentals of educational research*. Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Arrowsmith, S., Berube, G., Murray, S., Oikawa, C., Rubenson, K., Salmon, W., Tuijnman, A., & Zeesman, A. (2001). *A report on adult education and training in Canada: Learning a living*. Hull, QC: Statistics Canada & Human Resources Development Canada.
- Association of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario. (ACAATO). (2000). *Environmental scan 2000*. Retrieved from <http://www.acaato.on.ca>
- Association of Canadian Community Colleges. (1993). *Human resources study of the Canadian community colleges and institutes sector*. Ottawa, ON: Association of Canadian Community Colleges.
- Bartlett, C. A., & Ghoshal, S. (1998, January/February). Beyond strategic planning to organizational learning: Lifeblood of the individualized corporation. *Strategy and Leadership*, 34-39.
- Boggs, G. R. (2003). Leadership for the twenty-first century. In W. E. Piland & D. B. Wolf (Eds.) *Help wanted: Preparing community college leaders in a new century* (pp. 15-25). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Boggs, G. R., & Kent, E. L. (2002). Presidents academy: An evolution of leadership development. In G. E. Watts (Ed.) *Enhancing community colleges through professional development* (pp. 51-58). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bouma, G. D., & Atkinson, G. B. J. (1997). *A handbook of social science research*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Brookfield, S. (1986). *Understanding and facilitating adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Brundage, D. H., & Mackeracher, D. (1980). *Adult learning principles and their application to program planning*. Toronto, ON: Ministry of Education.
- Bush, T. (2008). *Leadership and management development in education*. London, UK: Sage.
- Byham, W. C., Smith, A. B., & Paese, M. J. (2002). *Grow your own leaders*. City, State: Prentice Hall.
- Carroll, C. M., & Romero, M. G. (2003). Leadership development: A collaborative approach. In W. E. Piland & D. B. Wolf (Eds.). *Help wanted: Preparing community college leaders in a new century* (pp. 83-92). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Chappelow, C. T. (2004). 360-degree feedback. In C. McCauley & E. Van Velsor (Eds.) *Handbook of leadership development* (pp. 58-84). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Colley, H., Hodkinson, P., & Malcolm, J. (2002). *Non-formal learning: Mapping the conceptual terrain. A consultation report*. Leeds, UK: University of Leeds Lifelong Learning Institute.
- Cooper, J. E. (1995). The role of narrative and dialogue in constructivist leadership. In J. Cooper, P. J. Ford Slack, M. E. Gardner, L. Lambert, D. Walker, & D. Zimmerman (Eds.) *The constructivist leader* (pp. 121-133). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Cooper, J., & Pagotto, L. (2003). Developing community college faculty as leaders. In W. E. Piland & D. B. Wolf (Eds.) *Help wanted: Preparing community college leaders in a new century* (pp. 27-37). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- The Council of the Federation. (2006, July). *Competing for tomorrow: A strategy for postsecondary education and skills training in Canada*.
- Cranton, P. (1992). *Working with adult learners*. Toronto, ON: Wall & Emerson.
- Cross, P. (1992). *Adults as learners: Increasing participation and facilitating learning*. London, UK: Jossey-Bass.
- Darkenwald, G. C., & Merriam, S. B. (1982). *Adult education: Foundation of practices*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Dennison, J. D., & Levin, J. S. (1989). Responsiveness and renewal in Canada's community colleges: A study of change in organizations. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 14(2), 41-57.
- Duvall, B. (2003). Role of universities in leadership development. In W. E. Piland & D. B. Wolf (Eds.) *Help wanted: Preparing community college leaders in a new century* (pp. 63-71). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Farrell, M. A. (2000). Developing a market-oriented learning organization. *Australian Journal of Management*, 25(2), 201-223.
- Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces*. London, UK: The Falmer Press.
- Fullan, M., & Hargreaves, A. (1991). *What's worth fighting for in your school?* Toronto, Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation; Andover, MA, The Network; Buckingham, UK, Open University Press; Melbourne, Australia, Australian Council of Educational Administration.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2001). Primal leadership: The hidden driver of great performance. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(11), 42-51.
- Groves, K. S. (2007). Integrating leadership development and succession planning best practices. *Journal of Management Development*, 26(3), 239-260.

- Knowles, M. (1984). *The adult learner: A neglected species*. Revised. Houston, TX: Gulf.
- Kotter, J. P. (2001). What leaders really do. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(11), 85-96.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (1997). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lambert, L. (2003). *Leadership capacity for lasting school improvement*. City, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Levin, J. S. (1997, November). *The cultures of the community college*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. Albuquerque, NM.
- Levin, J. S. (2000, April). *The revised institution: The community college mission at the end of the 20th century*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, LA.
- Levin, J. S. (2001). *Globalizing the community college. Strategies for change in the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: PALGRAVE.
- Levin, J. S. (2005). The business culture of the community college: Students as consumers; students as commodities. In B. Pusser (Ed.) *Arenas of entrepreneurship: Where nonprofit and for-profit institutions compete* (pp. 11–26). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Livingstone, D. W. (2001). *Adults' informal learning: Definitions, findings, gaps and future research*. The Research Network for New Approaches to Lifelong Learning. Retrieved from <http://www.nall.ca/res/21adultsifnormallearning.htm>
- Livingstone, D. W. (2002). *Mapping the iceberg*. The Research Network for New Approaches to Lifelong Learning. Retrieved from <http://www.nall.ca/res/54DavidLivingstone.pdf>
- Mabey, C., & Finch-Lees, T. (2008). *Management and leadership development*. London, UK: Sage.
- McCarthy, C. (2003). Learning on the job: Moving from faculty to administration. In W. E. Piland & D. B. Wolf (Eds.). *Help wanted: Preparing community college leaders in a new century* (pp. 39-49). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- McCracken, G. (1988). *The long interview*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- McDade, S. A. (1987). *Higher education leadership: Enhancing skills through professional development programs*. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (1990). *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Millar, R. (2005). *How do workers really learn? Informal and secretive learning in the workplace*. Winnipeg, MA: Centre for Education and Work.
- Mitchell, C., & Sackney, L. (2001). Building capacity for a learning community. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Issues*, 19. Retrieved from <http://www.umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap/articles/mitchellandsackney.html>
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. CA: Sage.
- Muijus, D., Harris, A., Lumby, J., Morrison, M., & Sood, K. (2006). Leadership and leadership development in highly effective further education providers. Is there a relationship? *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 30(1), 87-106.

- Noe, R., & Peacock, M. (2008). *Employee training and development*. Toronto, ON: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.
- Patton, M. Q. (1985, April). *Quality in qualitative research: Methodological principles and recent developments*. Invited address to Division J of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Piland, W. E., & Wolf, D. B. (2003). In-house leadership development: Placing the colleges squarely in the middle. In W. E. Piland & D. B. Wolf (Eds.) *Help wanted: Preparing community college leaders in a new century* (pp. 93-100). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Polonsky, G. (2003). *Moving educational leaders from implicit to explicit leadership: An action research study*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Toronto.
- Schein, E. H. (1999). *The corporate culture survival guide*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Schugurensky, D. (2000). *The forms of informal learning: Towards a conceptualization of the field*. The Research Network for New Approaches to Lifelong Learning. Retrieved from www.nall.ca
- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Senge, P., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R. B., & Smith, B. J. (1994). *The fifth discipline field book*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Shults, C. (2001). *The critical impact of impending retirements on community college leadership*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- Skolnik, M., & Giroux, R. (2001). Advancing learning-centered education at the state or provincial level. *Leadership Abstracts*, 4(4), 1-3. Retrieved from <http://www.league.org>
- Smith, P. J. (2003). Workplace learning and flexible delivery. *Review of Educational Research*, 73(1), 53-88.
- Southworth, G. (2003). Instructional leadership in schools: Reflections and empirical evidence. *School Leadership and Management*, 22(1), 73-91.
- Stoll, L., Fink, D., & Earl, L. (2003). *It's about learning (and it's about time)*. London, UK: Routledge Falmer.
- Stolzenberg, E. B. (2002). Sources and information: Professional development in community colleges. In G. E. Watts (Ed.) *Enhancing community colleges through professional development* (pp. 51-58). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Valeau, E. J., & Boggs, G. (2004). An assessment of the association of California community college administrators mentor program. *Community College Review*, 31(4), 48-61.
- Van Veslor, E., Moxley, R. S., & Bunker, K. A. (2004). The leadership development process. In C. McCauley & E. Van Veslor (Eds.) *Handbook of leadership development* (pp. 204-233). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Vaughn, G. B., & Weisman, I. M. (2003). Leadership development: The role of the president-board team. In W. E. Piland & D. B. Wolf (Eds.) *Help wanted: Preparing community college leaders in a new century* (pp. 83-92). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Walker, D. (1995). *The preparation of constructivist leaders*. In L. Lambert, D. Walker, D. Zimmerman, J. Cooper, M. D. Lambert, M. E. Gardner, & P. J. Ford Slack (Eds.). *The constructivist leader* (pp. 171-189). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- Watts, G. E., & Hammons, J. O. (2002). Professional development: Setting the context. In G. E. Watts (Ed.) *Enhancing community colleges through professional development* (pp. 5-10). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Weiss, D. S., & Molinaro, V. (2005). *The leadership gap*. Mississauga, ON: John Wiley & Sons Canada.
- Wilson, C. (2002, July). Leadership for learning. *Learning Abstracts*, 5(7).
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations*. Toronto, ON: Pearson Prentice Hall.

FACULTY'S PERCEPTIONS OF A PERFORMANCE-BASED EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

Tak Cheung Chan

ABSTRACT

Educational leadership programs in Georgia are undergoing a complete redesign process. A performance-based model was introduced to restructure all the programs in the state. Sixty-two educational leadership faculty involved in the redesign initiative participated in quantitative and qualitative surveys to show their perceptions of the performance-based program. Results of the survey indicated generally unenthusiastic faculty responses to the implementation of the performance-based educational leadership program. Faculty also identified their areas of concern particularly on unfunded issues.

INTRODUCTION

Educational leadership programs in Georgia are undergoing revolutionary changes. By August 2008, all the existing programs sunset and were replaced by a performance-based program highlighted by "rigorous performance requirements during a challenging internship supervised by experts in the field" (Tucker, Dobbs, Eiseman & McGinley, 2008). The new program was initiated to fill the gap between theory and practice as a result of a disconnection between school district needs and program graduates' leadership skills. Under the leadership of Georgia Board of Regents, Georgia Professional Standards Commission, and the Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement, educational leaders from P-12, state, and university levels met to plan for a new educational leadership program needed for future schools of Georgia. As a result of the discussion, a performance-based model of educational leadership program was created. As described by Tucker, Dobbs, Eiseman, and McGinley (2008):

A performance-based educational leadership program provides new school leaders opportunities to practice and demonstrate proficiency in real work, in real time, and in the real school working environment to be supported by a performance coach who provides specific feedback against clear, written performance criteria (p.7).

Special features of the performance-based educational leadership program in Georgia are:

- (1) M.Ed. graduates are awarded a 5-year non-renewable leadership certificate and renewable leadership certificates are issued to candidates at the completion of a performance based Education Specialist program.
- (2) Universities and school systems enter into partnership in the preparation of school leaders.
- (3) A majority of the program assignments are to be performed by candidates in the field.
- (4) A Beginning Leader Candidate Support Team (BLCST) headed by a coach is responsible for supervising a leadership candidate's field experiences.

A performance-based model of educational leadership programs has been posited in professional literature for years. The model was modified and adopted for educational program improvement in different formats. School districts and universities have experienced different degrees of success in implementing performance-based models in their educational programs. In the redesign effort of educational leadership programs in Georgia, performance-based education was selected as a model to implement practicum activities in schools. The rationale was to put theory into practice. This paper is focused on examining the perceptions of university faculty toward performance-based educational leadership program before implementation in Georgia. The findings of this study will help program developers to pursue continuous program improvement.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Performance-based approach to education programs has been in practice for decades in both public school districts and higher education with different levels of success. This review of literature is intended to search for the most related documents in support of a conceptual framework for the study. It is organized by the following themes: application of performance-based education in the states; application of performance-based education by academic discipline; implementation of performance-based approach; and performance-based program vs. traditional program.

Performance-based approach was employed by many states for educational management use. It involves candidates in field work experiences and employs performance outcomes as indicators of success. Nevada used it in teacher licensing process (Wenda, 2000) and in assessing teacher educational technology competence. Connecticut found the approach to be valid and reliable (Archambault, Kulikowich, Brown, & Rezendes, 2002). In higher education, performance-based approach has been used as candidate assessment tools in Arkansas (Sullivan, 2002), California (California Postsecondary Education Commission, 2002), Illinois (Performance Indicator Advisory Committee to the Illinois Board of Higher Education, 2003), Kentucky (Banker, Carter, Evans, & Troupe, 2000), Louisiana (Sharpton, Scott, Scafide & Casbergue, 2002), Washington (Clegg & Ochoa, 1970), Wisconsin (Ragan, 2000), and the United Kingdom (Pugh, Coates, & Adnett, 2005). Many universities have implemented the performance-based approach satisfactorily while some needed modifications to make it work.

In academic discipline, performance-based approach was used specifically to assess candidates in education foundation classes (Dottin, 2001), in early childhood education programs (Sullivan, 2002), in teacher technology competence workshops (Archambault, Kulikowich, Brown, & Rezendes, 2002), and in teacher diversity preparation programs (Kemp, Song, Johnson, & Christiansen, 2002). In addition, Dalsgaard and Godsk (2007), Hancock (2007), and Ryan and Krajewski (2002) reported performance-based assessment practices are commonly employed in teacher preparation programs.

In implementing the performance-based approach, Hendren, Neumann, and Pickrell (2005) stressed the importance of linking program development and delivery as a key factor for program success. Clegg and Ochoa (1970) highlighted the significance of close collaboration between universities and school districts in establishing program objectives and assessment criteria. The use of portfolio as a means of performance-based assessment has become a popular program capstone activity (Dottin, 2001; Ryan & Krajewski, 2002). To facilitate efficient implementation of the performance-based program, program designers needed to develop performance indicators for review by program candidates (Performance Indicator Advisory Committee to the Illinois Board of Higher Education, 2003; Pugh, Coates, & Adnett, 2005; Wenda, 2000).

The traditional model and the performance-based model of teacher preparation were compared by Sharpton, Scott, Scafide, and Casbergue (2002) in the following areas: program of study, course design, faculty role, candidate support, field experience, induction and evaluation. The performance-based model was found to be skill-oriented and practitioner-focused. Over 50% of the learning activities in the performance-based program were actually conducted in the field versus only 10-20% in the traditional program.

In comparing the outcomes of traditional and performance-based programs, Hancock (2007) revealed that students exposed to performance assessment achieved higher than did students evaluated by traditional paper-and-pencil tests.

In summary, a review of literature shows that performance-based approach of program design has been commonly practiced in educational programs in many states. A performance-based educational program needs a strong school-college coalition as a basis of support to be successful (Ragan, 2000). Other key factors for success include program development, implementation and assessment. Comparisons have shown that performance-based programs led to higher student achievement. Despite

the popularity of performance-based educational programs, an evaluation of the Wisconsin University teacher preparation program by Bales (2004) indicated an overall dissatisfaction of the program implementation. The study concluded that teacher education program completers continued to receive the same traditional preparation despite the state's new policies toward implementing performance-based programs. In designing its own performance-based program, Georgia educators need to learn from the many good and bad experiences from other states' implementation of performance-based program to build their own.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

As shown in the paragraphs above, many studies were conducted on the development, the process and the outcomes of performance-based approach to education. However, faculty's perception of performance-based program, which is crucial to program success, has not yet been on any research agenda. Faculty members of educational leadership programs in Georgia have observed the development of the program redesign activities and the proposal of the performance-based educational leadership program. Their perceptions of the performance-based program are based on their years of program development experiences in higher education. Their professional insight could help identify factors to program success and barriers to program development. The purpose of this study is to investigate university faculty's perception of performance-based educational leadership program in Georgia before implementation.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

For the purpose of this study, a major research question was developed:

What are faculty members' perceptions of the performance-based educational leadership program in Georgia?

Sub-questions of this study include:

1. How do faculty members perceive their readiness for the performance-based program?
2. What are faculty members' perceptions of their understanding of the performance-based program?
3. How do faculty members perceive their collaboration with school district personnel in the performance-based program?
4. What are the faculty members' perceptions of resources in support of the performance-based program?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study follows a descriptive design by employing a survey approach which allows research participants to respond uninterruptedly to a preset questionnaire at their own pace (Wiersma & Jurs, 2005). The survey consisted of a quantitative component and a qualitative component to solicit faculty's perceptions of the performance-based program. The quantitative questions were set to solicit specific responses in the format the researcher planned to obtain. Qualitative questions allowed respondents to freely express their opinions by breaking away from the constraints of pre-determined questions (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2008).

Participants

All 80 full-time faculty members of educational leadership programs in the University System of Georgia were invited to participate in the survey. Full-time faculty members included tenured or non-tenured professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and lecturers. Sixty-two faculty members (77.5%) who responded to the survey were the participants of this study.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument in this study was researcher-designed. All 14 survey items derived from the review of current literature fell into four categories (see instrument enclosed). Category I consisted of Items 1, 3, 4 and 6 and was designed to solicit faculty's perception of their readiness for the performance-based program. Category II included Items 2, 8, 9, 10 and 13 and was designed to solicit faculty's perception of their understanding of the performance-based program. Category III contained Items 5, 12 and 14 and was designed to solicit faculty's perception of collaborative effort in the university/school district partnership. Category IV was composed of Items 7 and 11 and was designed to solicit faculty's perception of the resources in support of the performance-based program. Five faculty members from out of state universities were invited to determine the validity of the instrument by carefully examining the appropriateness of the contents, the proportion, the organization, and the language accuracy of the instrument. Revisions to the instrument were made immediately following the reviewers' recommendations. The reliability of the instrument was examined through pilot-testing with ten other out of state educational leadership faculty. Data obtained during the pilot study were tested for internal consistency by using Cronbach's alpha resulting in an overall alpha coefficient of .735. The quantitative section of the instrument was followed by two sections, one soliciting demographic information of the respondents and the other requesting additional comments. (See attached instrument).

Data Collection and Analysis

The Performance-Based Educational Leadership Program Survey was delivered by mail to all 80 full time educational leadership faculty members of the University System of Georgia to solicit their perception of the performance-based educational leadership program in Georgia. A total of 62 faculty members responded after a follow-up request. Participants' quantitative responses were analyzed by using means, standard deviations and percentages. Examination of participants' demographic differences in perceptions was performed by employing Analysis of Variance.

Qualitative data were collected through soliciting additional comments by the survey respondents. More than half of the respondents provided written comments about the performance-based program. All the qualitative data were carefully reviewed, coded and categorized by types of responses. They were then examined by observing their similarities and differences. Particular attention was paid to patterns and themes as they emerged (Creswell, 2009).

FINDINGS

Analysis of participants' demographic information showed that, out of the 62 research participants, 33 (53.2%) were males and 29 (46.8%) females. Ethnicity of the participants consisted of 36 (58.1%) Caucasian Americans, 22 (35.5%) African Americans, 3 (4.8%) Asian Americans, and 1 (1.6%) Hispanic American. In their current ranks, 12 (19.4%) were professors, 19 (30.6%) were associate professors, 27 (43.5%) were assistant professors and 4 (6.5%) were lecturers. Participants' experiences in higher education indicated 38 (61.3%) participants with 1 to 10 years of experience, 17 (27.4%) with 11 to 20 years of experience, and 7 (11.3%) with 21 to 30 years of experience. Demographic information also showed that 13 participants (21%) had no school or district administrative experiences. Other participants' school or district administrative experiences included 15 participants (24.2%) with 1 to 10 years of experience, 25 participants (40.3%) with 11 to 20 years of experience, and 9 participants (14.5%) with 21 to 30 years of experience (see Table 1).

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics –Demographic Information of Participating Faculty

Descriptor	Number	Percentage
Gender:	33 Males	(53.2%)
	29 Females	(46.8%)
Ethnicity:	36 Caucasian Americans	(58.1%)
	22 African Americans	(35.5%)
	3 Asian Americans	(4.8%)
	1 Hispanic American	(1.6%)
	0 Native American	(0%)
	0 Other	(0%)
Current Rank:	4 Lecturers	(6.5%)
	27 Assistant Professors	(43.5%)
	19 Associate Professors	(30.6%)
	12 Professors	(19.4%)
Years in higher education:	38 1-10 years	(61.3%)
	17 11-20 years	(27.4%)
	7 21-30 years	(11.3%)
School/District Administrative Experiences:	13 0 years	(21.0%)
	15 1-10 years	(24.2%)
	25 11-20 years	(40.3%)
	9 21-30 years	(14.5%)

Quantitative Data Analysis

Results of quantitative data analysis indicated that all participants responded to all 14 questions on the survey. With a Likert Scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree), the overall average of participants' responses was 2.48 which was right at the middle range. The two items receiving the highest agreeable responses of 3.13 and 2.87 were item 5 (Faculty members collaborate to ensure efficient program implementation.) and item 1 (Faculty understands how a school/district operates.) respectively. The two items receiving the strongest disagreement of 1.65 and 1.72 were item 11 (Fiscal supports for performance-based program are sufficient.) and item 7 (Faculty resources are sufficient to implement performance-based program.) respectively (see Table 2).

The mean responses of all the questions were arranged in descending order with the highest mean score at the top and the lowest mean score at the bottom. Rank order analysis showed that item 5, *Faculty members collaborate to ensure efficient program implementation*, was associated with the highest agreeable mean (3.13) and item 14, *All stakeholders participate in planning and managing the performance-based program*, was associated with the lowest agreeable mean (2.58). The least disagreeable item with a mean of 2.44 was item 6, *Faculty can adjust to the change of traditional program to performance-based program*, and the most disagreeable item was item 11, *Fiscal supports for performance-based program are sufficient*, (see Table 3).

The quantitative data were also analyzed by category of perceptions. In the first category, faculty members' perception of their readiness for the proposed performance-based program was found to be

2.71 on a 4-point scale. Faculty's perception in understanding the proposed performance-based program was 2.46. Faculty's perception of collaborative effort of the university/school district partnership was 2.70. In the fourth category, faculty's perception of the resources in support of the performance-based program received a rating of 1.69. (See Table 4.)

Analysis of Variance was used to determine if significant differences existed in the faculty perception of performance-based program among the categories of gender, ethnicity, rank, years in higher education, and school/district administrative experiences. Results of the analyses indicated no significant difference in any category of comparisons at the .05 level.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics – Means and Standard Deviations of Faculty Perception of Performance-Based EDL Programs

No.	Statement	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD
1	Faculty understands how a school/district operates.	62	1	4	2.87	1.61
2	Faculty understands how the performance-based EDL program works.	62	1	4	2.76	0.98
3	Faculty has the skills and experiences of coaching and field supervision.	62	1	4	2.71	0.99
4	Faculty is committed to implementing the performance-based EDL program.	62	1	4	2.82	1.06
5	Faculty members collaborate to ensure efficient program implementation.	62	1	4	3.13	1.69
6	Faculty can adjust to the change of traditional program to performance-based program.	62	1	4	2.44	0.66
7	Faculty resources are sufficient to implement performance-based program.	62	1	4	1.72	0.66
8	Faculty travel to schools to serve as supervisor/coach is not a barrier to performance-based program.	62	1	4	2.23	0.60
9	Majority of the program activities are performance-based.	62	1	4	2.75	1.03
10	Performance-based program is a reflection of tailor-made programs for school districts.	62	1	4	2.27	0.51
11	Fiscal supports for performance-based program are sufficient.	62	1	4	1.65	0.52
12	Communications among performance-based program stakeholders are efficient.	62	1	4	2.39	0.67
13	The structure of partnership is fully understood by program stakeholders.	62	1	4	2.27	0.94
14	All stakeholders participate in planning and managing the performance-based program.	62	1	4	2.58	0.83
	Average	62	1	4	2.48	0.91

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics – Rank Order by Means Faculty Perception of Performance-Based EDL Program

Item No.	Item	Mean
AGREE (A) and STRONGLY AGREE (SA):		
5	Faculty members collaborate to ensure efficient program implementation.	3.13
1	Faculty understands how a school/district operates.	2.87
4	Faculty is committed to implementing the performance- based EDL program.	2.82
2	Faculty understands how the performance-based EDL program works.	2.76
9	Majority of the program activities are performance-based.	2.75
3	Faculty has the skills and experiences of coaching and field supervision.	2.71
14	All stakeholders are engaged in planning and managing the performance-based program.	2.58
DISAGREE (D) AND STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD):		
6	Faculty can adjust to the change of traditional program to performance-based program.	2.44
12	Communications among performance-based program stakeholders are efficient.	2.39
10	Performance-based program is a reflection of tailor-made programs for school districts.	2.27
13	The structure of partnership is fully understood by program stakeholders.	2.27
8	Faculty travel to schools to serve as supervisor/coach is not a barrier to the Performance-based program.	2.23
7	Faculty resources are sufficient to implement performance-based program.	1.72
11	Fiscal supports for performance-based program are sufficient.	1.65

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics – Means of Faculty Perception by Category of Perception

Survey Items	Description	Overall Mean
1, 3, 4 and 6	Faculty members' perception of their readiness to work on the proposed performance-based educational leadership program.	2.71
2, 8, 9, 10 and 13	Faculty members' perception of their understanding of the nature and operational function of the proposed performance-based educational leadership program.	2.46
5, 12 and 14	Faculty members' perception of the collaborative effort in the university/school district partnership.	2.70
7 and 11	Faculty members' perception of the resources in support of the performance-based educational leadership program.	1.69

Qualitative Data Analysis

Qualitative data of this study were derived from additional comments made by 35 of the 62 participants. They were coded by nature of the responses and were carefully reviewed and classified by type. Each classification of data was examined to detect emerging patterns of responses. The findings of qualitative data analysis are summarized in the following.

General concerns.

First, participants felt they could use "more time in preparing for the transition" from the traditional approach to the performance-based approach. One participant even expressed that "the short timeline was unreasonable". Second, several faculty explicitly described the performance-based design as an "unfunded mandate" with the Professional Standards Commission "forcing its ideology" on the universities and the school districts. The Professional Standards Commission was in fact "causing the barrier for change." Third, some faculty were "not too sure of the expectation of the performance-based program." They envisioned that school districts would have the same problem in understanding it as well. Fourth, many faculty did not believe that the "majority of the educational leadership program needed to be field-based," going on to state that some skills "could better be taught and assessed in the classroom"

Resistance from university faculty.

The greatest expression of resistance from university faculty was the worry over lowering academic standards. Respondents made remarks such as: "The performance-based proposal does not align with the teaching philosophy of the university," "The fact that the program does not leave room for academic research degrades the academic standard of a graduate school program," and "The program will suffer because academically reputable professors will leave."

Another expression of resistance came from the process of university-school district partnership that calls for joint decision-making for student admission and graduation. University faculty stated that "program admission requirement was a university set standard" which should not be lowered to suit school district needs. Some faculty also expressed "if [a] majority of the program consisted of performance-based activities that needed to be approved by school administrators, [the] university would lose its integrity and control of program quality."

Perceived opposition from school districts.

University faculty participating in the study perceived that school districts would also oppose to the performance-based program. As stated above, school districts did not understand how they were involved since they were not invited to participate in the original design. University faculty proposed that school districts would not be cooperative because of the following reasons. First, the performance-based program was basically a university program. "Agreeing to enter into such partnership could make school district budgeting more difficult." Second, from the school district standpoint, "helping universities to build their educational leadership program was certainly not a high priority" in their decisions to allocate educational resources. Third, the university faculty also noticed that many school districts were "encouraging their potential school administrators to enroll in the existing Leadership Add-on Program" before it expired. This was a clear indication that school districts were not in favor of the proposed performance-based educational leadership program.

Despite a general disagreement with the proposed performance-based program, a few university faculty reported that "negotiation for partnership agreements with school districts were under way". Some also saw this as "a good opportunity to bring about positive changes" in educational leadership programs.

DISCUSSION

Findings of this study, both quantitative and qualitative, have generated interesting points for professional discussion. The qualitative findings are in general agreement with the quantitative findings. However, while faculty members responded on an average agreement level in the quantitative survey, they tended to express more concern over the performance-based program in their open-ended responses. The following observations of the findings deserve the attention of the readers:

First, university faculty expressed great concern over the probability of success of the performance-based program even though they believed in their ability to put this to work. In their frequent contacts with school principals and school district administrators, university faculty did not perceive a keen interest by school district personnel in participating in the proposed performance-based program.

Second, in a recommended partnership agreement, most of the program activities are organized under the direction of a coaching team to consist of university professors and school or district administrators. The coach (leader) of the team will assume major planning and supervisory responsibilities. Training sufficient qualified coaches and providing continuous support to coaching positions and activities is a topic that has not been adequately addressed. Currently, universities and school districts do not have the resources to successfully implement the coaching component of the program.

Third, it is clear that the performance-based educational leadership program is perceived by the respondents to this survey to be an unfunded mandate. The Georgia Board of Regents, the Georgia Professional Standards Commission, and the Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement have provided opportunities for universities and school districts for planning and exchange of ideas about their partnership agreement. Since this is essentially a university program, despite school district's agreement to provide support, the major portion of resources and responsibilities must still eventually be assumed by the universities.

Fourth, performance-based educational programs have been piloted in several states with slightly different models such as supervisor/mentor internship, joint research initiatives, and professor/school administrator co-teaching. Many of these models have experienced varying degrees of success and/or failure. What is presently proposed as performance-based educational leadership program in Georgia is quite revolutionary. It calls for balanced responsibilities between universities and school districts to provide adequate opportunities for candidates to explore the essential areas of educational

administration through a practical approach: real person, real work and real setting. The success of the program will depend on continuous opportunities for fine tuning engagements between universities and school districts. The findings of this study are in agreement with the outcomes of the study by Clegg and Ochoa (1970) which called for close collaborative effort of schools and universities to prepare high quality educators.

Fifth, the performance-based program has a strong practitioner orientation. The research component favored by university faculty does not have the same practitioner focus. Faculty members have expressed concern over the performance-based program not preparing candidates for higher levels of academic challenges.

Sixth, the findings indicated that university faculty rated their coaching skills as average (2.71 out of a 4 point scale). The demographic information also showed that 21% of the current faculty did not have previous school or school district administrative experiences. The concern is how some faculty with average coaching skills and no administrative experiences can be entrusted with the responsibility to deliver a performance-based educational leadership program. Hendren, Neumann, and Pickrell (2005) also expressed similar concern over program development and delivery.

Seventh, university faculties have expressed a limited understanding of the program expectation and a lack of communication among stakeholders. They also had serious concern of the resources in support of the program. It appears that implementation will occur before planning and adequate preparation are complete. It resembles a plane that is flown while under construction.

Eighth, findings of this study have reflected some of the concerns and oppositions expressed by university faculty in Georgia. In a similar Wisconsin case reported by Bales (2004), faculty continued with their traditional approach while the state had declared the implementation of performance-based program. Georgia program developers need to learn from the Wisconsin mistakes.

In summary, the faculties of educational leadership programs in Georgia have frankly expressed their concern over the performance-based approach of the new program. The significant findings of this study will call the attention of program designers to the fact that any practitioner-oriented program requires a strong base of school support to be successful. While each university needs to redesign its educational leadership program to comply with the new state guidelines, it makes better sense for the educational leadership faculty of the state to work on and develop an agreeable performance-based program.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of this study indicate that university faculty in general did not look favorably on the implementation of the performance-based educational leadership program. Issues identified included lack of sufficient resources, unclear outcome expectations, and lowering of academic standards. While responses from faculty varied, the consensus was that, for the performance-based educational leadership program to work, all the stakeholders needed to continue their collaborative network to ensure constructive implementation of partnership activities. Since this performance-based model has not previously been implemented in Georgia, it is recommended that special attention be paid by all parties to nurture its growth and development. The program may need to be re-examined to make sure it fits the real educational settings with real people and real cases in each university. Close attention to key success elements and potential barriers identified by university faculty would facilitate the program's continuous improvement. A plan for assessment needs to be developed to provide both formative and summative assessments to ensure successful program implementation.

REFERENCES

- Archambault, F. X., Kulikowich, J. M., Brown, S. W., & Rezendes, G. J. (2002). *Developing performance assessments to measure teacher competency in the use of educational technology*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED465759)
- Bales, B. L. (2004). *The spandex quality of performance-based standards in teacher education reform*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.
- Banker, B., & Carter, K., Evans, S., & Troupe, M. (2000). *Performance assessment: Statewide accountability*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED440093)
- California Postsecondary Education Commission (2002). *Performance Indicators of California Higher Education, 2001*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED464587)
- Clegg, A. A., & Ochoa, A. (1970). *Evaluation of a performance-based program in teacher education: Recommendations for implementation*. Seattle, WA.: Washington University, College of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED057017)
- Creswell, J. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dalsgaard, C., & Godsk, M. (2007). Transforming traditional lectures into problem-based blended learning: Challenges and experiences. *Open Learning*, 22(1), 29-42.
- Dottin, E. S. (2001). *Standards, outcomes, alignment, performance assessment and candidate learning: Bringing it together in an undergraduate foundations of education course*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED463687)
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2008). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. (7th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Hancock, D. R. (2007). Effects of performance assessment on the achievement and motivation of graduate students. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 8(3), 219-231.
- Hendren, P. G., Neumann, L. A., & Pickrell, S. M. (2005). *Linking performance-based program development and delivery*. Washington, DC: Transportation Research Board Business Office.
- Kemp, L., Song, K., Johnson, P., & Christansen, F. (2002). *Design and implementation of a performance-based assessment system for the preparation of effective teachers for a diverse society*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED473249)
- Performance Indicator Advisory Committee to the Illinois Board of Higher Education (2003). *Establishing performance indicators to assess progress toward meeting the goals of The Illinois Commitment: Final recommendations*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED472316)
- Pugh, G., Coates, G., & Adnett, N. (2005). Performance indicators and widening participation in UK higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 59(1), 19-39.
- Ragan, P. E. (2000). *Collaborative, site-based early childhood teacher preparation program*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED470880)
- Ryan, L. B., & Krajewski, J. J. (2002). The journey toward becoming a standard driven and performance based teacher preparation program: One College's story. *Action in Teacher Education*, 23(4), 59-68.

- Sharpton, W., Scott, R., Scafide, K., & Casbergue, R. (2002). *Adopting a performance-based model of teacher education: Issues and Strategies*. New Orleans, LA: University of New Orleans.
- Sullivan, E. P. (2002). *Developing and teaching instructional units that are NBPTS/performance based*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED469723)
- Tucker, M., Dobbs, R., Eiseman, R., & McGinley, L. (2008). *How will leadership preparation, certification, and training in Georgia change during 2008-2009*. A presentation made to the Metro RESA meeting, March 14, 2008 at Smyrna, GA.
- Wenda, S. (2000). *Reinventing teacher preparation and licensing through performance-based reform in Nevada*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED444982)
- Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (2005). *Research methods in education*. (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

NATIONAL CHALLENGES, EDUCATIONAL REFORMS, AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON SCHOOL MANAGEMENT: THE ISRAELI CASE

Ori Eyal
Izhak Berkovich

ABSTRACT

Considering Cohen, March and Olsen's (1972) "garbage can model," this paper seeks to examine how educational reforms, adopted by Israel from pre-statehood to contemporary times, have impacted the role of principals and whether these reforms have prepared them to address challenges of the system.

Using second-order historical sources, the paper employs a socio-historical based data analysis to examine the complex relationship between policies, structures, and values and their impact on the role of the principal. For each historical period in the Israeli education system the paper discusses the immediate societal challenges, the origins of the adopted reforms, and the influence of these reforms on the role of the school principal and his/her ability to respond to the challenges placed before him/her.

This analysis demonstrates how imported policies and international trends, that are loosely connected to local social, cultural, political and educational contexts and the first fundamental layer of centralized reform adopted in Israel, have impact policy-making and limited the principal's response to contemporary socio-educational challenges. It is consequently argued that because the system is consistently delayed in adopting educational reform, principals have been forced to respond to the challenges of yesterday instead of focusing on future, and even current challenges.

Few studies have employed both the "garbage can model" and a socio-historical perspective for studying policy-making in education and its influence on the evolution of the role of the principal. The present novel study has the potential to fill this gap in our knowledge by analyzing long-term processes and turning points that have simultaneously shaped the principals' ability to face societal challenges.

Israel has seen tremendous change over the last sixty-two years. Evolving from a newly born state seeking recognition to a well-established, world-recognized nation, its original collectivistic social ethos has been replaced by an individualistic one, and its society, formerly an united one, has been broken down into functional fragments. Consequently, these changes have challenged the Israeli educational system. To meet these challenges, schools were reconstructed via system-wide reforms, a powerful method practiced by other nation-states. But when societal turning points are not identified early enough, school reforms can be outdated and incompatible with the actual challenges schools in their dynamic environments face. Under this context, the present paper seeks to examine how school reforms in Israel have impacted the role of principals and whether these reforms have prepared them to address challenges of the system. It is important to note that this article will focus only on state-led reforms regarding the Jewish educational system and on the job of the principal as a by-product of these reforms. It will not focus on the Arab educational system in Israel, which serves Muslim, Christian, Bedouin, Druze, and Circassian students, because it contains different pedagogical characteristics. Moreover, for political reasons, the educational policies in the Arab education system in Israel differ from those in the Jewish system (Nir & Inbar, 2003).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Throughout the decades the role of the school principal has changed and evolved (Kerchner, 1988; Murphy, 1998). It seems it began an ideologically defined role, which evolved into a managerial, bureaucratic role. Following this transition, it adopted a political orientation balancing the interests of many stakeholders. At present principals are expected to demonstrate professional and ethical school leadership, while simultaneously offering effective, business-oriented management (Brundrett, 2001;

Kerchner, 1988; Murphy, 1998). These complicated new expectations present challenging multi-dimensional responsibilities for the principal. In general, contemporary principals face a more complex and nonlinear world (Fullan, 1997; Goodwin, Cunningham, & Eagle; 2005; Patterson, Purkey, & Parker, 1986; Sergiovanni, 1991), and as such their responsibilities, duties, and work load have increased (Cranston, Ehrich, & Billot, 2003).

Investigating the root causes of this role transformation, scholars have first distinguished between deterministic and intentional processes. Deterministic processes relate to social forces that may impact the formation of a principal's role (Kerchner, 1988). For instance, scholars claim that social changes in family structure, in the individualization of society, and society's diversification have made the role of the principal much more complex. Consequently, principals have become responsible for diverse needs that may or may not have been previously fulfilled by prevailing social institutions. (Beck & Muprhy, 1993; Cranston et al., 2003; Goodwin et al. 2005; Gregg, 1969). Still, other scholars consider national and international economic crises, as well as technological innovations and novel managerial thinking as catalysts to this changing role. (Goodwin et al., 2005). These scholars point to the Great Depression, World War II (Callahan & Button, 1964; Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Bennion, 1987), the "bankruptcy" of the welfare state, and globalization as turning points impacting this role (Goodwin et al., 2005; Murphy, 1998). Changes in "management thinking" also deterministically impact changes in the principal's role. For instance, the "scientific management movement" or "total quality management" (Murphy, 1998) are considered two distinct deterministic processes that have impacted public education (Goodwin et al., 2005). Thus, it seems that, historically, neither the governments nor the principals had a choice but to adapt to each new reality as it arose. This might explain why most of the studies examining this deterministic evolution role do not address the interventionist role of national government in reforming the job.

Beyond the deterministic processes influencing school management, treated almost as force majeure, scholars also have identified a few impactful, intentional policy-making processes (Cranston et al., 2003; Goodwin, et al., 2005; Jones, 1999; Southworth, 1988). Education policies and reforms, like the Compulsory Education Acts, the inclusion policy in Special Education, standardization and accountability policies, School Based Management reforms, and school choice (e.g., Kerchner, 1988; Whitaker, 2003), have been claimed to force principals to renegotiate their relationship with the school community, rebalance their leadership and management functions, and change the degree to which principals are held accountable for schools' academic performance (e.g., Catano & Stronge, 2006; Glasman & Heck, 1992; Whitaker, 2003).

At first glance, the impact of these policies on the role of the principal seems to be direct. The policies adopted in order to foster the new role of the principal may be considered an outcome of linear and rational policy-making processes. These processes take root in identifying the need to solve a well-defined problem, then aim towards achieving a specific goal, and all-the-while considering, learning, and evaluating alternative options in accordance to their feasibility and ability to provide a resolution (Meseguer, 2005; Page, 2006).

The opposing position claims the role of the principal transformed not as a result of a rational policy-making process (Goodwin et al., 2005), but in the reflection of layers of policies (Darling-Hammond, 1993) and conflicting political and bureaucratic interests (Cranston et al., 2003). This is not surprising as it is maintained that reforms are never geared towards the principals themselves, but rather towards making the principals better mechanisms for distributing the policies (Cowie & Crawford, 2007). Consequently, even when reforms directly address the role of school principals, some unexpected, undesired, and averse outcomes emerge out of the planned policy. For example, in the case of School Based Management reform, principals claimed that instead of becoming more autonomous and strategic as instructional leaders, the systems' control mechanisms embedded within the reform forced them to accept a managerial, or administrative, role (Brundrett, 2001; Cowie & Crawford, 2007). Moreover, to receive government recognition, it was argued that principals might have ignored local needs (Hulpia

& Valcke, 2004) and not addressed critical, contemporary social issues, like the desegregation in the nineteen fifties or the multi-culturally society of the last few decades (Beck & Murphy, 1993; Goodwin et al., 2005). In fact, it seems that policies shaping the principal's role were seldom a result of a process by which problems were identified, goals were set, and the principal role was structured in order to tackle concrete and future societal challenges. Instead, the evolution of the principal's role may more closely follow the Cohen, March and Olsen (1972) garbage can model of organizational choice.

The garbage can model addresses decision-making in organizational anarchies--organizations characterized by unclear goals, technologies, and fluid participation. Cohen et al. (1972) suggest that choices are oftentimes seeking problems, rather than the more effective reverse situation. They argue that more often than not, irrelevant choices that cannot resolve a specific problem are adopted just for their attractiveness. They also suggest that decision agendas are often organized by an accidental set of participants rather than by a team directly relating to the challenges facing the system.

The garbage can model can be used to explain how, in many cases, local socio-economic policies are emulations of international trends (Meseguer, 2005; Tyack & Cuban, 1995), not always intended or available to resolve a concrete problem. Accordingly, it seems that incidental combination of policy-makers and stakeholders may be responsible for importing the policy from one system to another – a lateral transfer- rather than resulting from a rational or linear policy-making process. Likewise, the garbage can model can also explain the unintended recombination of old and new policy alternatives and their evolution. Similarly, Kingdon (1984) depicts public policy as an evolutionary process rather than one that generates new alternatives. Thus, although social and educational policy may be conceptualized as a mediator between social challenges and organizational operations (Bottery, 2007), the evolution of the principal's role does not follow this rationale (Bottery, 2007; Cranston et al., 2003). Under this context, the present paper seeks to examine how school reform in Israel has impacted the role of principals through the identification of tools available to the principals in order to address the evolving societal challenges. Adopting the conceptual framework of policy-making in organizational anarchies, we intend to examine the relationship between national challenges, educational reforms, and school management.

METHODOLOGY

The present study employs a socio-historical based data analysis method (Schutt, 2006). Accordingly, second order historical sources are used to interpret the sequence of events to postulate causality. The employment of socio-historical perspective for studying policy-making in education is well-established method in research in the field of educational administration (see e.g., Ball, 1990; Gale, 2001; Lawton, 1992, 1994; Mahoney & Rueschemeyer, 2002; Philips & Furlong, 2001). Scholars suggest employing researchers with historical perspective to focus on the reforms and structures that impact policy-making and on the ideologies that can explain it (Philips & Furlong, 2001). Further, it was claimed that the employment of historical methods for studying educational policy can promote a better understanding of the complex relationship between policies, structures and values (Ball, 1990; Gale, 2001; Lawton, 1992, 1994), and their impact on the principal role. To better understand these contextually-specific relationships while simultaneously addressing the international policy trends, we used comparative historical analysis, according to which similarities and differences among cases were identified (Schutt, 2006).

THE ISRAELI CASE

The Jewish educational system in Israel was established prior to the founding of the State of Israel in 1948. In its first years, this system was a decentralized one and only became centralized following the declaration of statehood and the massive waves of immigration, which accompanied it. Nir (2006) maintains that this centralized governance, adopted several years after Israel became an independent state, has since become an embedded paradigm leaving its mark on every educational

reform implemented in Israel.

Some reforms in the Israeli educational system have directly addressed the role of the school principal. Others have sought to advance pedagogical structural changes, and while they did not directly address the role of the school principal, their successful implementation depended on the principal's ability to adapt to his/her role. The reforms attempting to deal with the challenges facing the Israeli educational system were substantially influenced by internationally imported education policies (Shmueli, 2003). Therefore, although school management is most often considered a local product, it is surely influenced, directly or indirectly, by reforms originating in other educational systems- so much so that it is possible to identify "geological layers" of various imported policies in the Israeli educational system (Shmueli, 2003). In effect, it seems that educational policy in Israel has not been rationally formulated but rather has evolved in a haphazard manner (Shmueli, 2003). For example, it was discovered that oftentimes a reform, which may have been popular among Israeli policy makers, was carried out despite the fact that it did not take into account the educational needs and immediate challenges of the system. School principals in Israel have therefore had to cope with the many discrepancies between the adopted policies and those unanswered needs and challenges.

As mentioned previously the present paper seeks to examine the influence of various reforms on the role of the school principal. It also aims to explore the level of compatibility between the demands of the job and the challenges faced by the system during each time period. In reference to the different periods in the history of the Israeli educational system, the paper will discuss 1) the immediate challenges, 2) the origins of the adopted reforms, and 3) the influence of these reforms on the role of the school principal and her/his ability to respond to the challenges placed before her/him.

The historical periods of school management in Israel

The period of national revival and the establishment of Zionist education (until 1949)

Examining the governance structure of the educational system prior to statehood necessitates an understanding of the context under which the State of Israel was formed. In the mid-nineteenth century the Zionist movement, whose goal it was to found a state for the Jewish people in the Land of Israel, was established and gained momentum.

By the start of the twentieth century the Zionist enterprise in the Land of Israel had begun to take shape. The spirit of national and cultural revival guided nationalist education. Key components of this education included: Hebrew language instruction, an emphasis on the connection to the Land, and the importance of productivity and the collective. These components shaped an educational practice whose very essence was the advancement of national revival. In order to disseminate these ideas, community-based and informal activities were initiated (Elboim-Dror, 1999), while a formal educational system was simultaneously founded.

The first formal educational institutions in the country were sponsored by philanthropists who both funded and determined the character of each school. But for the first time, with the establishment of the Hebrew Teachers Union in 1903, a professional body took it upon itself to determine educational policy, produce curricula, supervise teachers, and lay the groundwork for nation-wide education (Elboim-Dror, 1999). Though the Hebrew Teachers Union developed an educational framework, the system was still loosely structured and schools remained under philanthropic sponsorship. At the outbreak of World War I schools were cut off from their philanthropic sources, funding became scarce, and consequently, schools became increasingly financially dependent on the World Zionist Organization¹.

¹ The World Zionist Organization (WZO) was founded in 1897 as an umbrella organization, which unified all the Zionist organizations in the world operating to found a state for the Jewish people in the Land of Israel. In its earlier phases the WZO represented the Jewish assembly to the foreign governments residing in the Land.

This dependence triggered the process of unifying the educational system under one central authority (Elboim-Dror, 1999).

But even united under one central authority, the existence of a centralized administrative policy-making body did not last long. Gradually, each of the political parties operating in the Jewish assembly in Palestine established a separate educational stream to disseminate its distinct ideology. Three educational streams emerged: the socialist, the liberal, and the religious. The bodies overseeing educational matters in each stream gained dominance in the Jewish educational system in the 1930's after the World Zionist Organization withdrew monetary support and transferred the responsibility of education to the National Assembly², an informal governing body directly funded by the political parties (Gaziel, 1999). As a result, the bodies supervising educational matters in each stream became responsible for formulating budgets, hiring teachers and principals, and preparing and overseeing the curriculum (Gaziel, 1999). This situation is described by Lamm (1973) as the "political decentralization" of the parties and the "administrative centralization" of their overseeing bodies.

The administrative centralization of each sector was felt most strongly in the primary schools. Since almost every child in the population attended primary school³ at the very least, these schools became the ideological springboards for each party and were responsible for disseminating ideology and recruiting members. The principal's role in such schools consisted of managing the allocated school budget, maintaining the facility, paying salaries, reporting student and teacher attendance to the respective stream's governing body and implementing its particular curriculum (Bergson & Melamed, 1963). However, the principal was considered primarily a head teacher, the first among equals⁴, and was responsible for the teachers' pedagogical training. The role of head teacher was largely shaped by the influence of the British educational system and the Hebrew Teachers Union, which emphasized the pedagogical aspect of the principal's job (Bergson & Melamed, 1963; Nir & Inbar, 2003). However, since pedagogy was viewed merely as a means for disseminating political ideology, school principals became propagators of an ideologically-oriented vision.

The link between politics and pedagogy during the period of national revival was a notion derived from the Soviet régime, and was introduced by immigrants arriving from republics within the Soviet empire. Following the October Revolution in Russia, Soviet schools became arenas for disseminating party ideology (Zajda, 1980). However, while in the Soviet Union there was only one predominant ideology, in pre-statehood Israel there were several ideologies, each one competing for supremacy. Thus, narrow political interests prevented the institutionalization of a consolidated national educational system, the establishment of which would have been crucial ahead of the massive waves of immigration

² The National assembly was the authority which implemented the decisions made by the elected representatives of the Jewish population during the British mandate in the Land of Israel.

³ The majority of secondary schools in Israel were academic, with a few agricultural and vocational schools dispersed among them. Only the upper class, 5% of the population, attended these schools (See Aharonson, 2001). The schools were exclusive and selective, as their existence was based on tuition set and paid for by the parents of each student.

⁴ At that time, the Israeli school system considered the school principal as first and foremost an excellent teacher (Chen, 1999). Examples of the high esteem in which the figure of the principal was held can be found in the words of former high school students from 1935-1943 who described their principal: "he was a teacher with superior virtue," "he knew how to enthrall everybody with his wonderful orating ability. I anticipated his classes with bated breath" (Aharonson, 2001:82). It was this expertise, which made the principal worthy of being a head teacher.

and great increase in the number of students⁵. School principals operating in the decentralized educational system run by the different streams continued to function as head teachers and pedagogical advisors with ideological orientations rather than as public servants working towards the institutionalization of the educational system. This situation may have also resulted from an anti-managerial culture that developed after years of foreign rule in exile and in Israel (Elboim-Dror, 1988). This anti-establishment culture suited the efforts of the political streams in their attempt to recruit students, with the aim of increasing their influence over the future character of the State (Gaziel, 1999).

Politically decentralized governance was meticulously preserved during the time period immediately following the founding of the State. However, ultimately, fears of the possible dismantlement of the newly established State, along with increasing competition for political hegemony between the sectors, led to a reconsideration of the governance structure.

The period of the establishment of a national-public school system (1949-1962)

The founding of the State of Israel in 1948 as an independent political entity required the establishment of a single centralized government. Although the groundwork for establishing a national public school system was a system already developed and functioning, it was ideologically and organizationally divided (Elboim-Dror, 1999). This factious system struggled to deal with the challenges it was facing. The massive wave of immigration of Jews from Eastern Europe, Middle Eastern and North African countries within the first few years of independence, forced the education system to confront not only the vast increase in number of students but also the accompanying cultural and ethnic disparities among them. Additionally, there was a need to quickly train a large number of teachers (Elboim-Dror, 1988). To illustrate the urgency, between the years 1948 and 1952 the number of students in the educational system tripled from 100,000 to 300,000; the number of educational institutions jumped from 800 to 2,800; and the number of teachers doubled from 5,000 to 10,000 (Tzameret, 2003). The challenges presented by this huge wave of immigration led to the attempt to unify the system.

The aspiration to achieve procedural equality and uniformity was manifested in the Compulsory Education Law, approved by the first parliament in 1949- a year following the declaration of the State. Though this law obligated the State to provide free education for each child in Israel between the ages of 5 and 15, it did not alter the political structure of the system, and the different educational streams persisted (Chen, 1999). The elimination of the streams and the centralization and unification of the system only occurred in 1953, following the adoption of the State Education Law⁶. It appointed the Ministry of Education as the main educational policy-making body in Israel (Gaziel, 1999).

The State Education Law produced pedagogical and administrative centralization and severely diminished the authority of the local municipalities (Gaziel, 1999), all for the sake of the melting pot ideology and procedural equality. These measures were consistent with the nationalist and collectivist ideology, also supported by the socialist party in power, guiding the curriculum (Mathias & Sabar, 2004). Despite the small size of the State, the educational system was divided into districts. The districts

⁵ Between the years 1929 and 1939, 280,000 people immigrated to the Land of Israel, doubling the Jewish population, and significantly increasing the number of students enrolled in the educational system of each stream. This wave of immigration, like others before it, was relatively homogenous (Adler, 1985) and therefore theoretically provided comfortable conditions for institutionalizing the education system. Moreover, even though the pre-state voluntary educational system was divided into three sectors, a centralized administrative framework already existed.

⁶ Despite the fact that the State Education Law eliminated the political sectors, it did not entirely eliminate the separation between different types of education. Accordingly, a separate religious education branch within the public system was approved. Similarly, for coalitional and political reasons, a recognized and funded but independent system of education was approved for Ultra Orthodox Jews from Eastern Europe (Elboim-Dror, 1988).

had been used to give the heads of the system closer involvement in managing local problems and to increase their control (Inbar, 1986).

In those days, school principals were functionaries of the central authority and their position was considered an administrative one. The principals were raised within the system. They were appointed to their posts by the recommendation of a superintendent (Chen, Addi, & Goldring, 1994) without having to compete with other candidates or prove their professionalism (Chen, 1999). Personal agreement between the superintendent and the principal was the decisive factor. Thus, school management was perceived as a job one learned through experience and not through training (Chen, 1999). In effect, the principals were merely bureaucrats fulfilling the rules and regulations dictated by the central authority (Nir & Inbar, 2003). Hence, the principal was expected to deal with the management of teacher assignments, sorting students into classes, and overseeing the daily routine. The aim of the Ministry was to simplify the principals' role as much as possible by keeping them away from complex tasks such as recruiting, promoting, and training teachers, handling fiscal matters, and maintaining the facility (Bergson & Melamed, 1963). One might say that the principals consented to supervising teachers and school activities on behalf of the central authority (Chen, 1999). In this manner, the centralization of the system shaped the principal's role as a bureaucratic and ideological functionary of the central authority.

The transition to a centralized governance structure, which included a new definition for the role of the school principal, is evidence of the continuing Soviet influence on education in Israel. Following the October Revolution in 1917, the Soviet educational system was consolidated. The communist party had high control over education, and as a result a high degree of uniformity of the curriculum, teaching methods, and assessment was evident. Education became a tool for "engineering" the student (Zajda, 1980). The use of education as an instrument of ideological control by the central government was also manifested in the many countries under Soviet influence. In such countries, principals were nominated by the local representatives of the Communist party and formally approved by the Ministry of Education. These appointments did not take professional matters into consideration. Therefore, it is unsurprising that the principal's role was minimal and limited, and that it was essentially confined to implementing the central authority's curriculum (Berzina, 2003). Though the young State of Israel was not a Soviet colony, the pro-Soviet orientation of its leadership was evident in overall decision-making and specifically in educational matters. While prior to statehood Soviet influence was only pedagogical and ideological, the official founding of Israel saw the emergence of a centralized organizational process similar to that which began in the Soviet Union several decades earlier. This process began as an attempt to increase the government's ideological control over the school system.

In effect, the centralized educational reform adopted in Israel failed to deal with the main educational challenge of that time period, i.e., handling the needs of a broad, heterogeneous, and diverse population of students (Adler, 1985). Although it was necessary to create an administrative central body for the newly established country, the "melting pot" policy restricted the ability of the principal to respond effectively to the emerging challenges. In order to adequately respond to the problems raised by the absorption of a massive population of diverse students, the system should have enabled the school principal to proactively be involved in adjusting the pedagogy according to his/her students needs. Instead, principals ended up serving merely as bureaucrats.

The period of distributive justice in education (1963-1976)

The failure of the educational uniformity policy first became evident in 1955 when the Ministry of Education began administering an examination to all eighth grade students. The purposes of the examination were to measure academic achievement levels and to select candidates for secondary education. It turned out that the rigid policy regarding entry into secondary schools led to the exclusion

of many students⁷. The students who were accepted had to excel, and a large number dropped out or completed high school without obtaining a matriculation certificate⁸ (Tzameret, 2003). Not surprisingly, the results of the examination exposed achievement gaps corresponding to social and ethnic backgrounds⁹ (Mathias & Sabar, 2004). It was discovered that students of Afro-Asian origin dropped out of primary schools at very high rates, and that only a minority of this population passed the selection process and enrolled in secondary school (Gaziel, 1999). Moreover, the number of students of Afro-Asian origin who both attained high school matriculation certificates and enrolled in university¹⁰ was disproportionately lower than the students' representation within the population (Tzameret, 2003). The failures of the educational system, both in terms of narrowing the achievement gaps and expanding secondary schooling, required a policy shift from procedural equality to distributive justice.

The educational policy seeking to produce distributive justice implemented its first phase between the years 1963 and 1968. This compensation plan, also referred to as "national protectionism," aimed to address the achievement gap between the various sectors by way of "differential investment," i.e., giving more to the disadvantaged students who came from the weaker segments of society. The compensation and enrichment of the disadvantaged population was manifested in programs which extended the regular school day, sorted students into homogenous learning groups and created enrichment centers and boarding schools for gifted students (Gaziel, 1993). Additionally, the Ministry of Education established new post-primary vocational schools.

The second phase of the policy for developing distributive justice transpired in 1968 when the minister of education promoted a comprehensive reform of the educational system. It was to replace the two-tiered structure (eight years of primary school followed by four years of secondary school) with a three-tiered structure (six years of primary school followed by six years of secondary school, the secondary school being divided into intermediary school and high school). The intermediary schools were designed to ease the transition to the next level of education because entrance to the intermediary schools was automatic (Gaziel, 1999). In this manner, policy-makers hoped to increase the rate of students receiving a secondary education.

Accompanying the structural reform was a proclamation announcing the decision to execute a deliberate, pedagogical, socio-educational integration in the intermediary schools (Resh, 2006). Because of this decision, intermediary schools became the main sources of deliberate integration, and marked the transition from a homogeneous selective educational system to a comprehensive, all-inclusive, and heterogeneous one¹¹.

⁷ In the first year after independence there were only about 10,000 students studying in various secondary institutions (academic, vocational, and agricultural), and about two thirds of these students studied at the academic schools. Therefore, the increase in number of students attending secondary schools posed a central problem in the first decades following statehood (Tzameret, 2003).

⁸ Matriculation examinations were administered upon completion of academic high schools. Success on these examinations earned the student a matriculation certificate, which was a prerequisite and selection mechanism for attending higher education institutions or gaining access to certain jobs.

⁹ In 1948, the Jewish population was mainly homogeneous, consisting of 80% European-American descendents and only 20% Afro-Asian descendants. Due to the massive wave of immigration following the founding of the State, this ratio underwent a drastic change, and by the end of the 1950's 58% of the population was of European-America origin and 42% of Afro-Asian origin (Tzameret, 2003).

¹⁰ By the second half of the 1950's the percentage of Afro-Asian students enrolled in the university was 10%, while their percentage of the total population was nearly 58% (Tzameret, 2003).

¹¹ The reform was not implemented in a top-down fashion, and the choice to participate was left to the local municipalities. Moreover, it permitted various interest groups (teachers unions, wealthy parents, kibbutz schools, and religious schools) to avoid participating. In the absence of a reform law mandating implementation, it took years before the reform was fully adopted. In effect between the years 1968 and 1995 only 70% of the municipalities adopted the reform (Gaziel, 1999).

Since the reform's main goal was pedagogical, it required flexibility in its implementation. However, the school principal's hands remained tied as the Ministry of Education continued to exert control over student registration, the hiring of teachers, school curriculum and its evaluation. Therefore, instead of being responsible for adjusting the new reform to fit his/her students' individual needs, the principal's main task revolved around managing the prescribed national policies at the school level. Principals were now required to make decisions regarding student tracking and teacher placements (Resh & Dar, 1990). Moreover, since integration increased the size of the secondary school, it also triggered specialization, further institutionalization, and bureaucratization (Resh, Adler & Inbar, 1980). As a result, principals mainly engaged in administrative tasks instead of pedagogical ones (Erez & Goldstein, 1981). In effect, the school principal became mainly a coordinator of school activities.

The question is asked: how did this reform originate? Furthermore, why did this reform fail to lead to a modification of the central governing body? Why didn't principals receive the responsibilities and the designated authority to manage the reform's needed changes at the school level?

The applied policy of distributive justice in Israel was strongly related to the growing closeness between Israel and Western countries in light of the Cold War and disappointment with the Soviet Union (Tzameret, 2003). The Israeli reform intending to create heterogeneous intermediary schools was influenced by the desegregation and affirmative action policies adopted by the United States in the 1960's. These policies attempted to integrate students from different racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic groups into one single educational institution (Shmueli, 2003). Simultaneously, Israel was also influenced by the social-democratic educational practices sweeping across Europe at the time. European governments increased their efforts to deal with school dropouts by building comprehensive schools and initiating academic tracking and homogenous learning groups (Shmueli, 2003). The influence of the two contradicting policies led to the phenomena of implementing "segregation within integration" in intermediary schools. In other words, these schools ended up providing one educational framework for "strong" students, and another one for those who were considered "weak." (Resh & Dar, 1990).

Aside from the contradicting Western influences there was also evidence of strong and sustained Soviet influences on the Israeli educational system during this period. These influences were visible in the way school principals were limited in their abilities to impact the implementation of the reform. In other words, the Ministry of Education retained its power and did not delegate any responsibility to the principals regarding the pedagogical matters that were essential to the reform's success.

It seems that it was not absolutely necessary for the Ministry of Education to limit the principal's authority in order to implement the reform. During the same time period Sweden, in fact, adopted a policy to minimize central governance for the sake of social equality while simultaneously expanding the principal's role. It replaced a selective secondary school system with an all-inclusive, integrated community-based system (Shmueli, 2003). The Swedish reform was accompanied by the termination of selective placement of students and of the high school matriculation examinations. These changes paved the way for flexible and adaptable responses to the problems present in the field (Heidenheimer, 1974). Although Sweden only had to deal with socio-economic and not with ethnic or cultural disparities, its efforts to grant principals control over pedagogical matters could have served as a possible alternative to the centralization policies implemented in Israel (Resh & Dar, 1990).

In order to deal with the vast social diversity while remaining attentive to the various crises that arose during the transition from the four-year to the comprehensive six-year secondary school program, principals needed to have pedagogical authority. Nevertheless, the absence of real structural change in the central governance body left the pedagogical authority in the hands of the Ministry of Education. Understandably, the principal's job became unfeasible. The principals were placed in an untenable situation. Whilst having to address particular changes brought about due to economic and social developments, they were not given the necessary authority to effect the changes in their own schools.

The period of educational pluralism (1977-1990)

The expected results from the reforms introduced in the 1960s and 70s were not forthcoming. Centralized practices did not help to mitigate, let alone address, the societal challenges being encountered. The idea that a centralized educational system could not manage a highly diversified population was imported from abroad; however, it aptly suited the circumstances in Israel. The need for decentralization surfaced in light of the failure of the educational system to narrow the scholastic gaps between student populations.

The first policy shift towards decentralization had already occurred in the early 1970's. At that point, the Ministry of Education delegated some of its authority to the district councils, but with the intention that the authority would then be further delegated until it reached the school level. In practice, however, the centralization of the Ministry was simply replaced by the centralization of the district councils, and the districts soon became the new mechanisms for control in the educational system (Gaziel, 1999). Throughout the decade, efforts were made by the Ministry of Education to encourage teacher initiatives, enable flexibility in teaching hours, and provide pedagogical autonomy to schools. Nevertheless, as these efforts were marked by close supervision, inspection, and bureaucracy (Inbar, 1987), it is unsurprising that no significant changes occurred. As a result, the public's objections to governmental social policies increased, especially to its policy regarding educational equality. This dissatisfaction ultimately led to a political turnover in 1977, and the leftist party that had been in power since the founding of the State was replaced by a rightist one.

In theory, the ideology adopted by the rightist government – which originated in the West in the early 1970's and was imported to Israel shortly thereafter and introduced neo-conservative ideas (Ram, 2004) to the Israeli public – should have seen the realization of the decentralization policy in education. It should also have given its stamp of approval to the privatization of education. In practice, however, neither of these phenomena occurred.

In the 1980's, the tension between the central authorities' desire to encourage pedagogical autonomy and their simultaneous need to maintain close supervision continued to flare. This tension gave rise to what was known as the "institutionalized autonomy" policy (Inbar, 1987) under which, for instance, a program specifically designed to introduce curricular autonomy ended up being burdened by the very inspections it should have rendered obsolete. Moreover, the efforts of the Ministry of Education to advance curricular autonomy were accompanied by drastic budget cuts which led to a decrease in school hours and classrooms' overcrowding (Inbar, 1987). These cuts undermined any potential autonomy and rendered the newly granted authority useless.

Although official education policies regarding decentralization were laden with contradictions, privatization did not even become an official policy. Unofficial privatization, however, naturally emerged, both as a result of the system's inability to cope with the demand for scholastic achievement and in light of the budget cuts. The public's disappointment and frustration with its system was manifested in an increase of parental involvement (Inbar, 1987). For instance, parents' organizations were formed, followed by the emergence of "grey education" - supplemental educational services privately acquired by parents (Shmueli, 2003). Subsequently, these parents, who began to pay for educational services, became influential in determining curriculum components. The reality of a "backdoor process of privatization" (Inbar, 1989) was even further manifested by the introduction of school choice in the mid 1980's. Despite the lack of any official policy encouraging choice (Yona, 2000), parents, local municipalities, and interest groups managed to establish de-zoned "autonomous", "community", and "magnet" schools (Gibton, Sabar & Goldring, 2000). Additionally, more schools were established independently of the educational system, such as an ultra-Orthodox "Shas" network of schools for students of Afro-Asia origin (Shamai, 2000), whose parents were in despair over the public educational system.

Two main factors can explain the educational system's failure to "deliver the product" and

the subsequent flight of certain populations from the public school system: (1) The system's use of bureaucracy and supervision to restrain school principals' autonomy (Inbar, 1987), and (2) broad budget cuts. These factors minimized the range of action available to school principals, essentially limiting their role to one of preserving and maintaining core school activities.¹² Studies indicate that during the 1980's principals understood their jobs to be mainly associated with organizing teachers, as well as handling the continuous flow of administrative duties (Gally, 1988; Kremer, 1983). Therefore, it is not surprising that principals have found the new academic training programs for principals in Israel (Chen, 1999), which are similar to those that were developed in England and the U.S. (Brundrett, 2001), to be neither useful nor essential to their jobs. This reaction reflects the conflict between the system's desire to professionally train school principals - a prerequisite for any potential candidate - and the principals' awareness of their very limited autonomy.

Without suitable tools to deal with the increasing diversity in their student bodies and communities, public school principals have been left to fend for themselves, and have been unable to compete with "private schools" for students. These principals should have been granted the administrative authority to become "street level politicians," negotiating contradicting demands as they saw fit. Only then could they have responded effectively to parents and students and kept them in the public school system, while at the same time redefining a social common denominator.

The period of transition to a multicultural educational market (1991-2001)

The call for Israel to become a multicultural state grew louder (Margalit & Halbertal, 1998) during the 1990's. It came as a result of drastic demographic shifts following a massive wave of immigration from the former Soviet Union and the growth of the Arab and ultra-Orthodox populations. The shift of Israeli society from centralized, nationalist and public to capitalist, hierarchical and with an assortment of ethnic communities (Ram, 2004), forced the Ministry of Education to re-examine its policies so as to not be led by these new realities, but rather to help shape them.

The re-examination of education policy led to the adoption of reforms in two fields: (1) school choice and (2) school based management (SBM). The adoption of these reforms was influenced by the popularity of similar reforms in Western countries. Said reforms aimed at increasing all schools' efficiency and accountability by using competition mechanisms and delegating power from the centralized authority to the school itself (Dahan & Yonah, 1999).

The Ministry of Education's school choice policies were shaped by ministerial committees and administrative decisions. In 1991, a ministry-appointed committee examined and approved the already existing magnet schools, thus opening the door to school choice (Dror, 2006). In that same year, the ultra-Orthodox school network "Shas" received state recognition. Thanks to this recognition, the "Shas" network became a legitimate alternative to the regular public schools. Soon after, in 1994, a ministerial committee decided to support the idea of school choice as long as two conditions were met: 1) equivalence regarding the wide dissemination of information about each school had to be guaranteed, and 2) there had to be equal opportunity for each student to attend any school he/she desired (Ministry of Education, 1994a). In accordance with the committee's call to find a balance between choice and equality, and without implementing its actual recommendations, the large municipalities in Israel adopted a "controlled parental choice" model in the 1990's. This model enabled the municipality to partially monitor the selection process of students and the supposed results (Dror, 2006; Haymann & Shapira, 2003).

The advent of school choice arose just as the SBM movement began. In 1996, the Ministry of Education initiated an experimental project to test the implementation of SBM (Dror, 2006). Within the experimental framework, authority regarding the management of the school budget was passed to

¹² Between 1981 and 1986 the number of teaching hours for primary schools was cut by 28.5%. After administrative adjustments, including an increasing class size and a decreasing number of classes, the effect of the budget cut has been reduced to 11.6% (Inbar, 1987).

each school and municipal council, but the authority to hire or fire teachers was withheld. By the end of the 1990's nearly 100 schools were participating in this project (Dror, 2006). To advance efficient and successful implementation of SBM in the educational system, the government switched from a per-class funding method to a per-pupil one (Ministry of Education, 2003). Additionally, the Ministry of Education reasserted its authority by making the implementation of the national curriculum a stipulation for receiving funding. The Ministry hoped this stipulation would create a new common base for a multicultural educational system.

In the 1990's, out of the entry of SBM and the advent of school choice, grew the need for a new training program to prepare principals for their professional and entrepreneurial roles arose. This demand went unmet, and principal training programs continued to focus on administrative and bureaucratic matters (Nir & Inbar, 2003). Not surprisingly, the lack of change in principal training programs corresponded with the lack of actual change in the role of the school principal. This lack of change in the principal's role is reflected in a Ministry of Education memorandum devoted to rewriting the principal's job description (1994b). The memorandum emphasizes the role of principals in managing daily school functions, their obligation in fulfilling Ministry of Education directives, and their ultimate subordination to the superintendent (Chen, 1995).

The Ministry of Education's reluctance to give up its power and control gave birth to the "centralization trap" (Nir, 2006). Under these circumstances, principals had to navigate between contradictory demands. On the one hand they were responsible for implementing Ministry of Education policies, which they had no part in creating. Simultaneously, in light of increased community and parental involvement, they also became obligated to respond to local demands (Nir, 1999). According to Nir's argument, the current job definition of the school principal involves an almost impossible navigation between these demands, as principals lack both the requisite authority and flexibility to please both the government and their constituents. Moreover, the need to negotiate between conflicting demands, restrictions of the state, and competition over registration caused by school choice, has led principals to function as marketing agents (Oplatka, 2002). Thus, instead of principals functioning as expert school managers and professional and public leaders (Gibton & Chen, 2003), they are forced to devote enormous amounts of time to satisfying student and parent preferences (Oplatka, Foskette & Hemsley-Brown, 2002) and to negotiate like "street level politicians" between conflicting interests.

It seems that the lack of autonomy and the centralized control of the education system have made it difficult for principals to focus on developing a unique community vision. The absence of such a vision is especially noticeable in the current multicultural reality where a school is expected to assume a central role in forging the local identity.

The period of standardization and accountability (2002-present)

Some of the challenges facing the educational system at the start of the 21st century are quite similar to those of the previous decade. The educational system has to respond to the individual and group desire for self-expression and fulfillment. In addition, the system needs to deal with the fragmentation of the collective identity and assist in forming a consolidated ethos. Moreover, globalization has triggered a new challenge; the educational system must now prepare students to live in the time of the "knowledge revolution," requiring creative thinking and life-long learning.

In order to deal with the challenges presented by globalization, in 2002 the president of the United States presented the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) educational reform. The NCLB is based on standards and assessment examinations (Fusarelli, 2004). This reform exemplifies the growing strength of the standardization movement amidst worldwide educational reforms. The movement advocates the setting of performance goals to increase accountability. This increased accountability is to be accomplished by applying incentives and sanctions to self-governed schools based on their achievements or failures

at meeting standardized criteria (Watson & Supovitz, 2001). The uses of international achievement examinations, such as TIMSS and PISA, have already been employed in order to compare the educational systems of different countries (Riley & Torrance, 2003). No real evidence exists, however, that matches success on standardized tests to economic growth (Cuban, 2006).

Although buds of assessment and a focus on achievement were already identifiable in Israel due to the 1980's worldwide school effectiveness movement (Shmueli, 2003), it seems that the standardization approach has accumulated mass support over time. In 1998 the Ministry of Education approved a standards-based English language curriculum, and by 2003 it became an overall general policy. That same year the Ministry of Education compiled a core curriculum consisting of uniform standards for all primary schools. In 2005, a committee was appointed whose purpose was to suggest structural changes to the educational system in light of public dissatisfaction with its accomplishments. The Committee for Restructuring the Education System sided with the decision to apply a national core curriculum and set standards. Based on the committee's report, principals would be assessed according to the performance of their schools in national and international standardized examinations. In an effort to increase accountability among school principals, the committee recommended that their role be strengthened in a number of ways: by granting them the authority to hire and promote teachers, by giving them decision-making power regarding pedagogical and administrative matters, by increasing their salaries, and by developing a new principal training course equivalent to a masters degree (Ministry of Education, 2005).

Despite the postponement in implementing the committee's report – due to objections raised by the teachers' union and also due to the change in Ministers of Education – it seems that some significant parts of it were pushed ahead, and their implementation appears to be imminent. For example, a national authority for educational measurement and assessment has been established to oversee the implementation of standards and to aid the educational system in developing greater accountability. Additionally, an experimental training program for school principals which places emphasis on instilling general management skills has been introduced (Yorgan, 2006). Finally, the committee's report became a reference point for future public debates that discussed educational policy. For instance, following the task force's recommendation to change teachers' work conditions, these recommendations were used during negotiations with the Ministry of Finance. According to the new agreement that was finally established and termed "new horizon," teachers will spend more hours at school, teach more lessons, meet pupils individually, and attend staff meetings. In addition, this reform is supposed to augment principals' authority to hire and fire teachers (Zemer, 2008). Although this reform, implemented in 2008, raised students' achievements in mathematics and was reported to improved schools' climate, it was claimed that it increased principals' administrative work load (Kashti, 2010) which, in turn, might decrease the time they have to instruct teachers. In addition, principals have reported dissatisfaction with the authorities and the autonomy they have granted (National Authority for Educational Measurement and Assessment report, 2010).

The implementation of some, though not all, of the recommendations in the report produced by the Committee for Restructuring the Education System and the following reform indicates that performance tests and regulations have become an alternative version of centralized control (Brown, 2000). Moreover, it seems that stressing student performance on tests as key indicators of the principal's success and emphasizing efficiency in principal training programs perpetuate a business, managerial approach for schools. This managerial approach stresses the role of the school in preparing students for employment in a dynamic marketplace, but it does not shape citizens who will actively participate in the democratic process (Cuban, 2004). Under such circumstances principals are likely to be considered "business managers." This short-sighted perspective to schooling and roles expected of both teachers and principals can be a dangerous way of viewing and assessing the principal's role. How this might affect potential and/or prospective principals is left undetermined. These principals as "business managers" are expected to amend the "failing" so-to-speak educational system. But the large regulation in Israel's decentralized system encourages conformity and discourages diversification between schools. The principal is left to balance accountability under heavy regulation and an active leadership role; this

impossible balance is anticipated to fail.

Instead of this anticipatory failure, school principals are faced with a more practical challenge: to function as expert school managers and professional and public leaders (Gibton & Chen, 2003). This balance is fundamental. It is not sufficient for principals to act as business managers focusing on the business aspect of running a school to the exclusion of social and pedagogical considerations (Gibton & Chen, 2003), but rather focusing on social considerations, they ought to become what may be termed social-educational entrepreneurs. Principals who assume the role of social-educational entrepreneurs not only identify and address the existing needs of the community, but also realizing new needs in an attempt to create a common public domain. Such an attempt, which would bring together many groups and individuals, requires that leaders with complex social and educational worldviews will resist efforts to impose conditional uniformity on their institutions (Yonah, 2005). Although these social-educational entrepreneurs should strive to better their societies, however, their main concern should always be the students and the school community. Moreover, pedagogy should remain their main tool, and they should demonstrate their professional skills as educators. Serving as instructional leaders they should “think big but act local;” they should reflect the community spirit but also act as agents of change. They must represent the students’ interests while standing firm in the face of financial, bureaucratic, and societal limitations placed upon them by governments, markets, and communities. Generating new educational practices to serve their students and their societies, as well as to fulfill their own vision, these principals may pave the way towards significant educational leadership.

Although principals serving as social-educational entrepreneurs at times behave as if the system’s restrictions do not apply to them, the system nevertheless needs to be further reformed in order to facilitate their emergence. For instance, deregulation of the system and its reconstruction into a professional body under which professionals supervise schooling and development might provide principals with the qualifications as well as the freedom and support needed to concretize their social-educational dreams. Furthermore, in order to let principals realize their social-educational vision, the system should also free them from a dependence on the market. When a school’s survival depends almost entirely on its ability to satisfy consumer preferences, the principal will tend to adopt well-established and popular educational practices rather than giving precedence to professional or ideological considerations. In order to prevent the occurrence of this phenomenon, the system should fully fund schools so that they will not have to rely on adopting competitive mechanisms instead. And of course, individual needs and a school’s community preferences must be incorporated into the principal’s professional considerations.

To insure that principals will reflect in their professional decisions the spirit of their communities, funding should be given directly to these communities and the system should advocate a generation of community-based self-governed schools. It should also facilitate and promote the formation of informal networks that would connect diverse community-based self-governed schools, in order to prevent the withdrawal of communities from the public sphere. Such networks are needed to enhance continuous public debate regarding education, to expose schools and principals to alternative educational models, and to maintain a common ground among the nation’s schools. This common ground is crucial if the system wishes to promote individual freedom, including the potential for a future move from one community to another or a decision to leave the community and its unique way of life for the larger society.

DISCUSSION

This paper examines the influence of various administrative and pedagogical reforms on the role of the school principal in Israel. Furthermore, it questions the suitability of this role to address the socio-educational challenges facing the Israeli educational system throughout different historical periods.

At first glance, it seems that the school principal’s role has been directly associated with the enacted reforms, each of which was to have met central challenges facing the Israeli educational system.

The initial decision to centralize the system during the period following the declaration of the State, for example, was meant to canonize a public educational system which would inevitably define the principal's job as bureaucratic. A bureaucratic definition was likely to have been considered the most reasonable one in the attempt to establish and institutionalize a national educational system. Similarly, the adoption of the 1990's school choice model and decentralization reforms were seen as essential in a growing multicultural society. Thus, the principal's role evolved into that of salesman and street level politician. Suddenly, he/she was in the position of having to negotiate among the varying demands of different communities.

Looking more closely, however, a much more complex picture emerges. While examining the connection between the challenges facing the system, the reform adopted, and the definition of the school principal's role during different time periods, three central features repeatedly arise.

First, it is fairly evident that the imported reforms, or role definitions, were transformed upon their arrival in Israel and given local flavor. For example, the British definition of school principal as head teacher went from pedagogical leader to ideological one. This transformation occurred prior to statehood, when pedagogy was seen as a means for disseminating ideology. Another example would be the 1960's structural desegregation reform, which was imported from the U.S. This reform was implemented in Israel not only to promote academic achievement for disadvantaged children, as it was in America, but also to foster social integration. The problem, however, was that the principal's role was not adapted to fit the needs that arose out of the reform. The emphasis on the administrative aspects of the job, and the restrictions placed on the principal regarding essential pedagogical decisions, did not leave much room for her/him to serve as a pedagogical leader. In other words, the original source of the reform was foreign, but the local Israeli context reigned supreme in determining, and limiting, the role of the school principal.

Second, it seems as though the initial decision to centralize the educational system, which was made during the crucial phase of its founding, left a significant mark on all subsequent reforms. The Ministry of Education was constantly seeking to preserve its control over the system. Consequently, reforms which were adopted over and over again were not accompanied by fundamental changes in the job description, and no additional authority was given to school principals. These principals were therefore forced to confront the educational challenges before them without having the appropriate tools. The pedagogical autonomy policy of the 1980's, for instance, which was by its very definition a decentralization measure, was of no help to the principals whose hands were in any event tied by the centralized bureaucracy. The principals, aware of the limitations placed on them, avoided deviating from the tasks their authority permitted. As a result, they could not adequately respond to the threat of irrelevancy as certain populations abandoned the public schools. The situation eventually led to unintentional and gradual privatization of the system. As a result, the system weakened and inequality increased.

Third, it seems that the bureaucratic and centralized nature of the system reduced its ability to respond in real time to the incompatibility between a chosen reform and the immediate challenges facing the system. Therefore, a good deal of time passed until the reform's failure became clear, one consequence of which was the delay in redefining the school principal's role. This time lag essentially resulted in binding the school principals to an irrelevant job description which had been developed in response to obsolete educational and social needs. This process marked each and every educational period, prior to the founding of the State until the present time.

During the phase of national revival, the model of the "ideological principal" developed in response to the challenge of building a new nation. This development occurred despite the opportunity to institutionalize a system with a homogeneous population and a pre-existing foundation. If principals had in fact been assigned to a more bureaucratic role at that time, they could have served as a central force in institutionalizing the system. However, the bureaucratic aspects of the job were only adopted later,

during the establishment of the public school system, and the timing couldn't have been more problematic. The "bureaucratic principal" was exactly the wrong model for a heterogeneous and growing population which was then entering an educational system of a newly established state. At that time, the educational system required pedagogical leaders, but pedagogical leadership only became a central component of the principal's job during the period of distributive justice, when they were needed to implement social integration. In reality, however, the job continued to be characterized primarily by administrative duties: a job, that is, which did not allow for flexibility or for the implementation of programs suited to each student. Ironically, the very type of pedagogical autonomy needed during the distributive justice phase was granted to principals only during the educational pluralism period, although even then this so-called autonomy was diluted by institutionalized supervision and budget cuts. An already impossible job was then made even more impossible due to the introduction of alternative options of schooling, at which point principals were forced to become "street level politicians," negotiating between the various demands of their diverse audiences in order to keep students from abandoning their schools. In essence, once the system adopted the multicultural educational marketplace model, the principals had no choice but to become salesmen, a reasonable description given the competition forming in the system. Despite the fragmentation of Israeli society, then, school principals were not encouraged to become community leaders and their job description did not include components for addressing the need to form new local identities.

The tendency to take away the pedagogical aspect of the principal's role has reached a climax during the current period of standardization and accountability. As a result, the school principal will likely become more and more preoccupied with the administrative/business side of running a school. And yet the current age of globalization calls for the school principal to become a social-educational entrepreneur who takes upon a broad social role and bursts through the financial, bureaucratic and societal limitations placed upon her/him by governments, markets and communities.

For years, Israel's principals have had to function according to the challenges of yesterday instead of the challenges of tomorrow. The delay in addressing pressing current social problems has damaged the ability of the school principal to help shape the social circumstances under which it operates. Although these phenomena can be depicted as local and unique to the Israeli system it also illuminates the way policy is made in organizational anarchies (Cohen et al., 1972). Accordingly, it seems that policy making processes may start with an inclination to adopt a preferable policy choice rather than an attempt to recognize a problem and then to search for a solution (Kingdon, 1984); previous policy layers may influence policy maker to prefer certain alternatives over others and/or interpreted a current policy in a biased way (Darling-Hammond, 1993); and, imported policies and international trends, occasionally loosely connected to local social, cultural, political and educational context, may set the principal role definition while not being relevant to the challenges principals face (Meseguer, 2005; Riley & Torrance, 2003; Tyack & Cuban, 1995).

In this context, the current trend in Western nations to adopt standardization and accountability policies in an uncritical manner is worrisome, as it might very well lead to the development of school principals who ignore social considerations and focus solely on the bottom line. It is reasonable to speculate that a school's efficient business management style, as effective as it might be, will not be responsive to the burning needs of the society it serves. For this reason, it is important to define the role of the school principal according to the current challenges and needs of the society rather than dredging up solutions from the garbage can of history (Cohen et al., 1972).

It seems that the employment of socio-historical perspective for studying policy-making in education and its influence on the evolution of the role of the principal may not only help us illuminate the complex relationship between policies, structures and values (Ball, 1990; Gale, 2001; Lawton 1992, 1994), but also shed light on long-term processes and turning points that have simultaneously shaped principals' ability to face societal challenges.

REFERENCES

- Adler, C. (1985). Desegregation in the schools and progress in the Israeli education system. In Y. Amir & S. Sharan (Eds.), *School Desegregation* (pp. 31-54). Tel Aviv, Israel: Am Oved Publishers Ltd.
- Aharonson, I. (2001). *Balfour College – Tel Aviv: The education of social values and curriculum during the period of office of its director Shaul Rieger (1935-1943)* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Tel Aviv, Israel (Hebrew).
- Beck, L. G., & Murphy, J. (1993). *Understanding the principalship: Metaphorical themes, 1920s-1990s*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bergson, G. & Melamed, A. (1963). *The school principal and his school*. Tel Aviv, Israel: Publishing House of the Teachers' Union in Israel (Hebrew).
- Berzina, Z. (2003). Reflections on school headship in Latvia. In L. E. Watson (Ed.), *Selecting and developing heads of schools: Twenty-three European perspectives*. Sheffield, England: European Forum on Educational Administration.
- Bottery, M. (2007). New Labour policy and school leadership in England: Room for maneuver? *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 37(2), 153-172.
- Brown, W. J. (2000). Social, educational, and political complexities of standard setting. In G. Cizek (Ed.), *Standard Setting on Performance Assessments* (pp. 373-386). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Brundrett, M. (2001). The development of school leadership preparation programmes in England and the USA: A comparative analysis. *Educational Management & Administration*, 29(2), 229-45.
- Callahan R. E., & Button H. W. (1964). Historical change of the role of the man in the organization: 1865- 1950. In D.E. Griffiths (Ed.) *Behavioral science and educational administration: Sixty third NSSE Yearbook, Part II* (pp. 73- 92). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Campbell R. F., Fleming T, Newell, L., & Bennion J. W. (1987). *A history of thought and practice in educational administration*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Catano, N., & Stronge, J. H. (2006). What are principals expected to do? Congruence between principal evaluation and performance standards. *NASSP Bulletin*, 90(3), 221-237.
- Chen, M. (1995). Training principals and superintendents for leadership for independent community schools. In Y. Danilov (Ed.) *Planning educational policy: Policy papers (1995-1996), Vol. 2.* (pp. 157-185). Jerusalem, Israel: Ministry of Education (Hebrew).
- Chen, M. (1999). Leadership and management in the education system. In E. Peled (Ed.) *Fifty years of Israeli education* (pp. 301-327). Jerusalem: Ministry of Education (Hebrew).
- Chen, M., Addi, A., & Goldring, E. (1994). The effective school principal: An expert and/or leader. *Directions in Teacher Education*, 2, 173-186 (Hebrew).
- Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(1), 1-25.
- Cowie, M., & Crawford, M. (2007). Principal preparation: Still an act of faith? *School Leadership and Management*, 27(2), 129-146.
- Cranston, N., Ehrich, L., & Billot, J. (2003). The secondary school principalship in Australia and New Zealand: An investigation of changing roles. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 2(3), 159 -188.
- Cuban, L. (2004). Making public school business-like . . . again. *Political Science and Politics*, 37(2), 237-241.
- Cuban, L. (2006). International and historical perspectives on national reforms. In D. Inbar (Ed.) *Toward educational revolution? Van Leer educational conference on Dovrat's report* (pp. 22-34). Tel Aviv, Israel: Hakibbutz Hameuchad Publishing House. (Hebrew).
- Dahan, Y., & Yonah, Y. (1999). The education system during a period of transition: From governmental collectivism to individualism of the citizen: Parents' school choice as an example. In E. Peled (Ed.) *Fifty Years of Israeli Education* (pp. 163-179). Jerusalem, Israel: Ministry of Education (Hebrew).
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1993). Reframing the school reform agenda: Developing capacity for school transformation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 74(10), 753-761.
- Dror, Y. (2006). The past reforms in the Israeli education system. In D. Inbar, (Ed.) *Toward educational*

- revolution? *Van Leer educational conference on Dovrat's report* (pp. 35-61). Tel Aviv, Israel: Hakibbutz Hameuchad Publishing House. (Hebrew).
- Elboim-Dror, R. (1988). Change in the system of education in Israel. *Shevilay Ha-Hinnukh*, 46(3/4), 157-165 (Hebrew).
- Elboim-Dror, R. (1999). The roots of the Israeli school system. In E. Peled (Ed.) *Fifty years of Israeli education* (pp. 24-37). Jerusalem, Israel: Ministry of Education (Hebrew).
- Erez, M. & Goldstein, J. (1981). Organizational stress in the role of the elementary school principal in Israel. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 19(1), 33-43.
- Fullan, M. (1997). *What's worth fighting for in the principalship?* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Fusarelli, L. D. (2004). The potential impact of the No Child Left Behind Act on equity and diversity in American education. *Educational Policy*, 18(1), 71-94.
- Gale, T. (2001). Critical policy sociology: Historiography, archaeology and genealogy as methods of policy analysis. *Journal of Education Policy*, 16(5), 379-394.
- Gally, J. (1988). The structure of administrative behavior: An international dimension in educational administration. *Studies in Educational Administration and Organization*, 15, 41-56 (Hebrew).
- Gaziel, H. (1993). *Educational policy at the crossroads: Between change and continuity: Education in Israel in the last decade*. Jerusalem, Israel: Institute for the Study of Educational Systems (Hebrew).
- Gaziel, H. (1999). Educational Policy in Israel: Structures and processes. In E. Peled (Ed.) *Fifty Years of Israeli Education* (pp. 67-84). Jerusalem, Israel: Ministry of Education (Hebrew).
- Gibton, D., & Chen, M. (2003). Training school principals as public and ethical leaders. In Y. Dror, D. Nevo, & R. Shapira (Eds.) *Turns and returns in Israeli education: Policy guidelines for the 2000s* (pp. 391-406). Tel Aviv, Israel: Ramot-Tel Aviv University (Hebrew).
- Gibton, D., Sabar, N., & Goldring, E. (2000). How principals of autonomous schools in Israel view implementation of decentralization and restructuring policy: Risks, rights, and wrongs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 22(2), 193-210.
- Glasman, N. S., & Heck, R. H. (1992). The changing leadership role of the principal: Implications for principal assessment. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 68(1), 5-24.
- Goodwin, R.H., Cunningham, M. L. & Eagle, T. (2005). The changing role of the secondary principal in the United States: An historical perspective. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 37(1), 1-17.
- Gregg R.T. (1969). Preparation of administrators. In R.L. Ebel (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, (4th Ed.) (pp. 993-1004). London, England: MacMillan.
- Haymann, F., & Shapira, R. (2003). School choice in autonomous schools as a strategy for rebuilding education systems—The Tel Aviv case and the lessons learned. In Y. Dror, D. Nevo, & R. Shapira (Eds.) *Turns and returns in Israeli education: Policy guidelines for the 2000s* (pp. 77-102). Tel Aviv, Israel: Ramot – Tel Aviv University (Hebrew).
- Heidenheimer, A. (1974). The politics of educational reform: Explaining different outcomes of school comprehensivization attempts in Sweden and West Germany. *Comparative Education Review*, 18(3), 388-410.
- Hulpia, H., & Valcke, M. (2004). The use of performance indicators in a school improvement policy: The theoretical and empirical context. *Evaluation & Research in Education*, 18(1-2), 102-120.
- Inbar, D. (1986). Educational policy making and planning in a small centralized democracy, *Comparative Education*, 22(3), 271-281.
- Inbar, D. (1987). Is autonomy in a centralized education system possible? In I. Friedman (Ed.) *Autonomy in Education* (pp. 53-71). Jerusalem, Israel: The Henrietta Szold Institute, the National Institute for Research in the Behavioral Sciences (Hebrew).
- Inbar, D. (1989). A 'back door' process of school privatization: The case of Israel. In W. L. Boyd & J. G. Cibulka (Eds.), *Private schools and public policy: International perspectives* (pp. 269-283). London, England: Falmer.
- Jones, N. (1999). The changing management agenda for primary heads. *The International Journal of*

Public Sector Management, 12(4), 324-337.

- Kashti, O. (2010, March 18). Three years to the "New Horizon" reform. *Haaretz* Retrieved from <http://www.Haaretz.co.il> (Hebrew).
- Kerchner, C.T. (1988). Bureaucratic entrepreneurship: The implications of choice for school administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 24(4), 381-392.
- Kingdon, J. (1984). *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Kremer, L. (1983). The role of the elementary school principal - As perceived by Israeli principals: an attempt at role analysis. *International Review of Education*, 29(1), 37-46.
- Lamm, Z. (1973). *Ideological tensions: Struggles over the aims of education*. Jerusalem, Israel: Ministry of Education (Hebrew).
- Lawton, D. (1992). *Education and politics in the 1990s: Conflict or consensus?* London, England: Falmer.
- Lawton, D. (1994). *The Tory mind on education, 1979-1994*. London, England: Falmer.
- Mahoney, J., & Rueschemeyer, D. (2003). *Comparative historical analysis in the social sciences, Cambridge studies in comparative politics*. Cambridge, England & New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Margalit, A., & Halbertal, M. (1998). Liberalism and the right to culture. In M. Mautner, A. Sagi, & R. Shamir (Eds.) *Multiculturalism in a democratic and Jewish state* (pp. 67-76). Tel Aviv, Israel: Ramot (Hebrew).
- Mathias, Y. & Sabar, N. (2004). Curriculum planning reforms and the forging of the Israeli identity. *Megamot*, 43(1), 84-101 (Hebrew).
- Meseguer, C. (2005). Policy learning, policy diffusion, and the making of a new order. *Annals of the American academy of political and social science*, 598, 67-82.
- Ministry of Education (1994a). *The "School Choice" committee (Inbar report)*. Jerusalem, Israel: Author.
- Ministry of Education (1994b). *Director's general special memorandum (Report No. 6)*. Jerusalem, Israel: Author.
- Ministry of Education (2003). *The report presented by the Committee for Examining the Budgeting System (Shoshani Report)*. Jerusalem, Israel: Author.
- Ministry of Education (2005). *The national education plan (Dovrat Report)*. Jerusalem, Israel: Author.
- Murphy, J. (1998). Preparation for the school principalship: The United States' story. *School Leadership & Management*, 18(3), 359-372.
- National authority for education measurement and assessment (2010) *Evaluation of the implementation the New Horizon reform primary education after two years*. Jerusalem, Israel: Ministry of Education. (Hebrew).
- Nir, A. (1999). Who needs educational autonomy the most? On the role perceptions of the Israeli educational echelons. *Studies in Educational Administration and Organization*, 23, 155-173 (Hebrew).
- Nir, A. (2006). School empowerment and the centralization trap. In D. Inbar, (Ed.) *Toward educational revolution? Van Leer educational conference on Dovrat's report* (pp. 296-309). Tel Aviv, Israel: Hakibbutz Hameuchad Publishing House (Hebrew).
- Nir, A. E., & Inbar, D. (2003). School principals in the Israeli educational system: From headteachers to professional leaders. In L. E. Watson (Ed.) *Selecting and developing heads of schools: Twenty-three European perspectives* (pp. 137-148). Sheffield, England: European Forum on Educational Administration.
- Oplatka, I. (2002). The perception and behavior of high school principals in regard to educational marketing: The case of Tel Aviv. *Studies in Educational Administration and Organization*, 26, 93-121. (Hebrew).
- Oplatka, I., Foskett, N. H., & Hemsley-Brown, J. (2002). Educational marketisation and the head's psychological well-being: A speculative conceptualization. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 50(4), 419-441.
- Page, E. (2006). *How policy is really made*. London, England: Public Management and Policy Association.

- Patterson, J. L., Purkey, S. C., & Parker, J. V. (1986). *Productive schools for a nonrational world*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Philips, R., & Furlong, J. (Eds) (2001). *Education, reform and the state: Twenty-five years of politics and practice*. London, England: Routledge.
- Ram, U. (2004). *The globalization of Israel: McWorld in Tel Aviv, jihad in Jerusalem*. Tel Aviv, Israel: Resling Publishing.
- Resh, N. (2006). Will two walk together, except they have agreed? Reform and integration in the school system. In D. Inbar, (Ed.) *Toward educational revolution? Van Leer educational conference on Dovrat's Report* (pp. X-X). Tel Aviv, Israel: Hakibbutz Hameuchad Publishing House (Hebrew).
- Resh, N., Adler, H., & Inbar, D. (1980). *Educational initiatives and innovations in intermediary schools in dealing with a heterogeneous student population* (Research Report). Jerusalem, Israel: Hebrew University, School of Education, Research Institute for Innovation in Education (Hebrew).
- Resh, N., & Dar, Y. (1990). *Segregation within integration: Educational separation in junior high schools, factors and implications*. Jerusalem, Israel: Research Institute for Innovation in Education (Hebrew).
- Riley, K., & Torrance, H. (2003). Big change question: As national policy-makers seek to find solutions to national education issues, do international comparisons such as TIMSS and PISA create a wider understanding, or do they serve to promote the orthodoxies of international agencies? *Journal of Educational Change*, 4(4), 419–425.
- Schutt, R. K. (2006). *Investigating the social world* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1991). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Southworth, G. (1988). Looking at leadership: English primary school headteachers at work. *Education*, 16(2), 53–56.
- Shamai, S. (2000). Cultural shift: The case of Jewish religious education in Israel. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 21(3), 401-417.
- Shmueli, E. (2003). Influential factors in Israeli educational policy. *Studies in educational administration and organization*, 27, 7-36. (Hebrew).
- Tyack D., & Cuban L. (1995). Policy cycles and institutional trends. In D. Tyack & L. Cuban, (Eds). *Tinkering towards utopia* (pp. 47-54). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Tzameret, Z. (2003). *The development of the education system*. Tel Aviv, Israel: The Open University (Hebrew).
- Watson, S. & Supovitz, J. (2001). Autonomy and accountability in the context of standards-based reform. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 9(32), Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v9n32.html>
- Yonah, Y. (2000). Parental choice in Israel's educational system: Theory vs. praxis. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 19(5/6), 445-464.
- Yonah, Y. (2005). *In virtue of difference: The multicultural project in Israel*. Tel Aviv, Israel: Hakibbutz Hameuchad (Hebrew).
- Yonah, Y. & Shenhav, Y. (2005). *What is multiculturalism? The politics of difference in Israel*. Tel Aviv, Israel: Babel. (Hebrew).
- Yorgan, Y. (2006). *The status of the school principal in the educational system* (Report submitted to the Education Committee of the Israeli Parliament). Jerusalem, Israel: Ministry of Education and Culture (Hebrew).
- Zajda, J. I. (1980). *Education in the USSR*. Oxford, England: Pergamon.
- Zemer, A. (2008, June 10). Teachers will sign on the new work agreement "New Horizon". *Maariv*. Retrieved from <http://www.nrg.co.il> (Hebrew).

INVITATION TO SUBMIT MANUSCRIPTS

The editor of *Educational Planning*, a refereed journal of educational planning issues, invites the submission of original manuscripts for publication consideration. *Educational Planning* is the official journal of the International Society for Educational Planning. The audience of the journal includes national and provincial/state planners, university faculty, school district administrators and planners, and other practitioners associated with educational planning.

The purpose of the publication is to serve as a meeting place for scholar-researcher and the practitioner-educator through the presentation of articles that have practical relevance to current issues and that broaden the knowledge base of the discipline. *Educational Planning* disseminates the results of pertinent educational research, presents contemporary ideas for consideration, and provides general information to assist subscribers with their professional responsibilities. Manuscripts preferred for inclusion are those from practitioners, reports of empirical research, expository writings including analyses of topical problems, or case studies. Unsolicited manuscripts are welcomed.

The following criteria have been established for the submission of manuscripts. **STYLE:** All formatting should adhere strictly to the current guidelines set in the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association.

LENGTH: The manuscript, including all references, figures or illustrations, charts, and/or graphs, should not exceed 20 pages. In addition, an Abstract (between 150-500 words on a separate sheet of paper) describing the focus of the manuscript should be included at the beginning of the manuscript.

WORD PROCESSING: SINGLE-SPACE all text using TIMES NEW ROMAN with a 10 point type. Headings and sub-headings should be in ARIEL with a 10 point type. Provide 1.0 inch margins top and bottom, and 1.5 inch left and right, with 1.0 inch header and 1.0 inch footer. The body of the manuscript must be no wider than 5 3/4 inches to fit the paper. Lengthily tables, drawings, and charts or graphs should be scaled to the dimensions given and should preferably be camera-ready.

FORM of SUBMISSION: Send the manuscript to the Editor electronically in Microsoft Word as an attachment to an email. The email address is: vroach@gwu.edu

The manuscript should include the following:

Title Page

- Title of the manuscript
- Date of Submission
- Author(s) name, mailing address, telephone number, email address, and fax number
- Biographical sketch not to exceed 75 words

Abstract

An abstract not to exceed 500 words on a separate page

Body of the Manuscript

Text of the manuscript not to exceed 20 pages, including references, tables, etc.

If the manuscript does not meet the guidelines exactly, it will NOT be reviewed and will be returned to the author.

Author(s) name or any other identifying information should not be included on the abstract or the manuscript. Authors are responsible for copyright clearance and accuracy of information presented and submission implies that the same manuscript has not been submitted to other publications.

Editorial reviewers and editors will review all manuscripts. Points of view are those of the individual authors and not necessarily of ISEP.

Please send manuscripts to: Dr. Virginia Roach – vroach@gwu.edu

For more information about ISEP go to: www.isep.info

**Forty-First Annual Conference
International Society for Educational Planning**

Global Initiatives of Educational Planning

Budapest, Hungary
October 13-15 2011

Conference Registration Includes:
Registration & Membership
Breakfasts, Luncheons
Journal Subscriptions

To Register Visit:
<https://commerce.cashnet.com.ohioecs.isep>

For further information contact:

Mary Chandler
mmcphd1@gmail.com

Conference Hotel
Danubius Hotel Gellert
Single - €90
Double - €110
Reservations:
judit.faluhelyi@danubiushotels.com
Mention ISEP

FUTURE CONFERENCES

2012 – Kansas City – Mark Yulich mryulich@earthlink.net
2013 – Niagara at the Lake- Holly Catalfamo -
hcatalfamo@niagaracollege.ca & Walt Polka- wpolka@niagara.edu

ORGANIZATION

The Society was founded December 10, 1970 in Washington, DC. Over 50 local, state, national, and international planners attended the first organizational meeting.

Since then its continued growth demonstrates the need for a professions organization with educational planning as its exclusive concern.

PURPOSE

The International Society for Educational Planning was established to foster the professional knowledge and interests of educational planners. Through conferences and publications, the society promotes the interchange of ideas within the planning community. The membership includes persons from the ranks of governmental agencies, school-based practitioners, and higher education.

MEMBERSHIP IN THE SOCIETY

Membership in the society is open to any person active or interested in educational planning and the purposes of the Society. To join the Society or renew a membership please complete and submit the enclosed form.

Please forward check/money order/PO to:

ISEP

Dr. Glen I. Earthman, Secretary/Treasurer

2903 Ashlawn Drive

Blacksburg, VA 24060-8101

USA

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

Dr. Glen I. Earthman
Secretary/Treasurer, ISEP
2903 Ashlawn Drive
Blacksburg, VA 24060-8101
U.S.A.