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THE PRINCIPAL'S WORKDAY:
A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE

Abstract

The responsibilities of principals have increased significantly in the past decade to include the accountability for the success of all students as well as responsibility for school operations. This study explored the nature of the workday tasks performed by elementary principals in schools with varying socioeconomic levels and the congruence of these tasks with the newly revised performance standards, The Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008. While all elementary principals performed tasks related to the standards and functions to varying degrees, principals in schools with higher poverty levels reported spending a significantly greater amount of time on tasks related to ISLLC Standards 1 and 5. Examination of the tasks performed by elementary principals revealed that routine communication tasks were performed with the greatest frequency and duration of time, yet this task is not specifically addressed in the Standards and functions. Implications of this study indicate the importance of alignment of standards with principal practice and the need to take into account the increased responsibilities and complexity of the principalship in order to attract and retain the highly qualified school leaders needed for the future.
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THE PRINCIPAL’S WORKDAY:

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE
CHAPTER 1: THE PROBLEM

Introduction

In an era of nationwide accountability for student achievement, school personnel are held directly responsible for educational outcomes. The impact of principals is considered second only to that of teachers in facilitating student learning (Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). Highly effective principals are considered “the key to initiating, implementing, and sustaining school success” (Tucker & Codding, 2002, p. 253) and “imperative to high student achievement” (Anthes, 2005, p. 1). Principals are expected to promote and develop the school vision, empowering stakeholders to build and maintain the conditions necessary for the success of all students.

The nature of the principalship has changed significantly in the past two decades, from primarily a managerial role to a combined role of management and leadership (Lashway, 2002a; Murphy, 2005; Shellard, 2003; Tucker & Codding, 2002). Despite the current emphasis on principal duties involving instructional leadership, however, principals remain responsible for traditional duties such as facility management, budget, school safety, and student discipline - tasks which continue to absorb a considerable amount of their time (Doyle & Rice, 2002; Lashway, 2002b; Tirozzi & Ferrandino, 2001). Due to the increasing number of responsibilities required of principals, it is not surprising to find that long hours are spent on the job. Elementary principals work an average of 62 hours per week (Groff, 2001), while principals spend successively greater
amounts of time on the job in middle and high schools (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003). The increasing amount of time required of principals in addition to the increasing number of duties and complexity lead some to describe the job as “simply not doable” (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003, p. 47; Tirozzi & Ferrandino, 2001, p. 1). The Institute for Educational Learning (IEL) concurs that the primary responsibility of principals must be student learning (p. 1), but concludes that:

Principalship as it is currently constructed – a middle management position overloaded with responsibilities for basic building operations – fails to meet this fundamental priority...The demands placed on principals have changed, but the profession has not changed to meet those demands and tension is starting to show (2000, p. 3).

Clearly, the expansion of the principal’s job description and shift toward instructional leadership responsibilities has dramatically changed the nature of the role: the principal must first and foremost facilitate student learning while balancing other non-instructional duties. Despite agreement that instructional leadership is a fundamental skill required of principals, however, few school leaders have had the necessary training for this role, particularly in a standards-based environment (Lashway, 2002b).

The Emergence of Principal Performance Standards

In response to the increasing demand for educational accountability, state and federal standards have been implemented in the past decade to monitor student achievement outcomes. Likewise, concerted efforts have been made to
improve the preparation of school leaders through the development of uniform standards specifying the essential knowledge and skills needed by effective principals. While performance standards existed at the state level, the emergence of national standards "could be used to drive the preparation, professional development, and licensure of principals" on a larger scale (Tucker & Codding, 2002, p. 267). Multiple sets of standards emerged in an attempt to clarify the skills needed by school leaders to become highly effective (Anthes, 2005), including those of the Interstate Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), the Education Leaders Constituent Council (ELCC), the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), and Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) (Anthes, 2005).

The Interstate Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards, developed in the mid-1990s by the Council of Chief State School Officers in partnership with the National Policy Board for Education (NPBEA), have been in widespread use during the past decade with the vast majority of states using the standards as a basis for leadership preparation and licensure (Shipman, Queen, & Peel, 2007). Still other states have developed standards apart from, but similar to, the ISLLC standards (Sanders & Simpson, 2005, p. 9). The ISLLC standards became the foundation for the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA), a school leadership assessment required of aspiring school leaders in at least 15 states (Virginia Department of Education, 2004). The six standards included the primary leadership responsibilities, dispositions, and performances expected of
school leaders, and served "as a common language, provide a model for state standards, and have become defacto national leadership standards" (Sanders & Simpson, 2005, p. vi).

Because the standards were written more than a decade ago, they have been recently updated to reflect the increased expectations and accountability for teaching and learning expected of today's school leaders and have been renamed The Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008. The original ISLLC standards were intended to be a broad overview of the skills and abilities needed by principals rather than to "determine action" (Murphy, 2003, p. 31), yet the standards and SLLA have become a central part of school leadership training and assessment. While review of the literature reveals abundant research regarding expectations of principals, significantly less empirical information is available in terms of actual principal practices on the job and the manner in which these practices may vary depending on context. Likewise, the relationship of these practices to state and national performance standards remains largely unexplored.

Statement of the Problem

The purposes of this study were to: (a) examine the nature of tasks and proportion of time spent by principals on work-related responsibilities; (b) determine the degree to which tasks performed by principals differ depending on school demographics; and (c) compare the level of congruence of the tasks routinely performed by principals in relation to the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008, and (d) compare the level of congruence of the tasks
performed by principals during the course of the school year to the self-reported
tasks performed during a sample period of time.

Research Questions

1. What are the nature of tasks and the proportion of time spent by
elementary school principals on work-related tasks during the course of a
school year?

2. In what ways do the tasks performed by elementary principals vary
depending on poverty level, as measured by the percentage of Title I
student enrollment?

3. What is the level of congruence between the tasks performed by
elementary principals and the Educational Leadership Policy Standards:
ISLLC 2008?

4. What is the level of congruence between the tasks in which principals are
reportedly engaged during the school year with tasks in which they are
engaged during a sample workweek?

Significance of the Study

In the past decade, the principal has been increasingly recognized as
having a significant role in promoting student success (Waters & Grubb, 2004b).
According to Leithwood et al, evidence supports two significant claims with
regard to the principal’s role: first, that the effect of school leadership is second
only to that of classroom instruction, and second, that the impact of school
leadership is greatest where it is needed the most – in challenged schools
(2004). While the relationship may be indirect in nature and mediated through
others, a significant correlation exists between principal leadership and student achievement, with an average effect size of .25 for all levels of schooling and .29 for elementary schools (Marzano et al, 2005). Conversely, strong school leaders who misdirect school improvement efforts can produce a negative effect on student achievement (Waters & Grubb, 2004b). Clearly, in an era of accountability for student achievement and school reform, the principal plays a critical role in school success and navigating the challenges required for meaningful 21st century learning for all students. Fullan concluded: “Effective school leaders are key to large-scale, sustainable education reform” (2002, p. 16).

Concurrently, accountability for instructional outcomes has driven the development of standards for both students and school personnel in the past decade. Given the emphasis on instructional leadership, principals are held primarily accountable for positive outcomes in the form of increased student achievement while continuing to manage daily school operations. The newly revised Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008 specify six primary educational leadership responsibilities which include development of a shared vision of school success, promoting a school culture conducive to learning and professional growth, effective management of school operations and resources, community collaboration, ethical leadership, and the ability to understand and influence the external factors which impact school success. It would be anticipated that the tasks performed by principals in practice on a day to day basis would reflect these responsibilities to a significant degree. While
variance in the type of tasks performed and amount of time spent would likely vary depending on the specific needs of the school, the emphasis on instructional accountability evident in state and national standards is clearly indicated as a priority for principals.

Despite the dramatic change in leadership demands and the increasing emphasis on leadership standards, however, there is little evidence that systematic changes have occurred in leadership practices (Elmore, 2005). Likewise, while leadership standards have provided clarification as to what school leaders should know and be expected to do, meta-analysis of research suggests that some leadership practices proven effective in increasing student achievement have been underestimated by the ISLLC standards (Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Myerson, 2005). As empirical evidence accumulates on what specific leadership practices prove most effective in promoting student achievement, Davis et al found that there is a need to re-examine leadership performance standards, licensure criteria, and leadership preparation in response. Clearly, effective principals matter. Therefore, the alignment of performance standards with principal practice is critical for both current and aspiring school leaders.

Definition of Key Terms

*Elementary Principal.* For the purposes of this study, elementary principal will refer to the principal of a public elementary school serving students in any grade level combinations from kindergarten through sixth grade.
Instructional leadership. For the purposes of this study, instructional leadership refers to the tasks, practices, and responsibilities required of principals that have a direct relationship to teaching, learning, and student achievement.

Leadership preparation programs. Leadership preparation programs refer to sequences of coursework in institutions of higher education that meet state and/or national requirements for school leadership positions. For the purposes of this study, this term will specifically to courses of instruction that lead to qualification for the position of principal.

Licensure. Licensure refers to the process by which educators are granted certification to serve in school leadership roles as specified by state and national requirements, specifically in the roles of principal and assistant principal.

Management responsibilities. For the purposes of this study, management responsibilities refers to the tasks and responsibilities performed by the principal that are related to school operation but are not directly related to instruction and student achievement.

Performance standards. Performance standards refer to the written expectations and dispositions composed by an educational authority which are used as a basis for school leadership preparation, evaluation, and practice.

Practices. Practices consist of the actions regularly performed by principals that are related to the principal job description and/or standards.
Principal. Principal refers to a person who possesses the credentials and licensure necessary to have the job responsibility of overseeing the operation of one or more schools.

Responsibilities. Responsibilities are the duties required of principals as specified in job descriptions and/or performance standards.

School leader. School leader refers to the person with designated authority for a school, including its daily operations, instructional and supervision responsibilities. For the purposes of this study, this term is synonymous with “principal.”

Student Achievement. Student achievement refers to those assessment measures used to quantify student progress following a specified period of instruction, as required by state and federal law, as well as other summative indicators of student progress.

Tasks. Tasks are those activities performed by principals during the course their work which may or may not be considered related to the principal job description and/or performance standards.

Delimitations

The results of this study were based on the voluntary participation of elementary principals across the United States and therefore may not reflect a complete range of principal experience.

Limitations

1. The timing of this study was not intended to reflect the entire range of tasks performed by principals during a complete school year. Participants were
therefore asked by survey format to identify the amount of time spent on other job-related tasks that occur during the course of a school year.

2. The nature and relative amount of time spent by principals during workdays was based on self-report and was limited to estimations of the amount of time spent and the tasks actually reported by principals.

Major Assumptions

1. Elementary school principals attempt to perform those responsibilities specified in their job descriptions and performance standards.


3. The proficiencies specified for principals in the ISLLC: 2008 performance standards provide clarity and uniformity to the complex and evolving role of the principal.

4. Principal responsibilities are likely to vary depending on school context: the effective principal must, therefore, be responsive to the unique needs of the school community.

5. Leadership preparation programs in schools of higher education serve as the primary source of training for aspiring school leaders.

6. Principals serve a critical, if indirect, role in facilitating school and student success.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The principal's role in school success has been closely examined in the past two decades. While it is generally agreed that the role has evolved from one of school management to instructional leadership, there is no clear definition of the concept and how contemporary principals should balance the responsibility of instructional leadership with the myriad of other demands on their time (Portin et al, 2003). Regardless of the type or level of school, principals are responsible for leadership in seven critical areas: instructional, cultural, managerial, human resources, strategic, external development, and micropolitical (Portin et al, p. 7). Yet, with multiple competing responsibilities, it comes as no surprise that the principal alone simply cannot perform all of the duties of school operation while prioritizing student learning (NAESP, 2004). In practice, most principals are able to spend little time in classrooms and few are truly able to act as instructional leaders (Fink & Resnick, 2001, p. 1).

The emergence of the standards movement and increased focus on accountability for student achievement created additional demands on what principals should know and be able to do. By the mid-1990s, principal performance standards were created at both state and national levels to clarify the responsibilities of principals and guide university leadership preparation programs in training effective school leaders. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) responded with performance standards based on the premise that “the purpose of leadership is to improve
teaching and learning,” yet evidence is lacking that students gain the in-depth knowledge necessary to meet the increased demands required (Lashway, 2002a, p. 4). After a decade, the ISLLC standards remain the most widely used principal performance standards in the United States and have recently undergone revision. The newly revised standards, renamed the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008, replace numerous performance indicators in the standards with functions aligned to each standard. The standards, however, specify what principals are expected to do rather than what they actually do in practice (Portin et al, 2003). Less is known about how – and how much – principals carry out these functions on a daily basis (Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2000), and how the dozens of “micro tasks” performed by principals are translated into improving teaching and learning (Lashway, 2002a, p. 2).

This literature review examined several areas critical to understanding principal practice and its relationship to school success. These include: (a) the role of the principal in school success; (b) the changing nature of the principalship; (c) the impact of the standards movement on the role of the principal; and (d) the use of principal performance standards, including the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards, as a basis for principal preparation and practice. The conceptual framework depicting the relationship of principal standards to the principal’s role in school success is illustrated in Figure 1.
Figure 1. Conceptual Framework:

The Principal's Workday: A Comparative Analysis of Performance Standards and Principal Practice
The Role of the Principal in School Success

Effective leadership has long been considered a critical element of school success. Despite the large quantity of research on school leadership, however, relatively few studies have quantitatively examined the relationship between principal leadership and student achievement (Marzano et al, 2005). Early research demonstrated the need to consider the model used in examination of principal effects, as it became evident that the effects of leadership are generally indirect and mediated through others. Thus, use of indirect effect models such as the Antecedent with Mediated Effects model described by Hallinger, Bickman, and Davis (1996) or the Reciprocal Effects model (Hallinger & Heck, 1996) appear more appropriate than previous efforts in quantifying a direct relationship between student achievement and principal leadership.

The inherent difficulty in measurement of the indirect effects of leadership resulted in more recent attempts to quantify the relationship through meta-analysis, a statistical method of analyzing large quantities of research from which objective generalizations may be made. While some claim little to no measurable influence of principals on student achievement using this methodology (Witziers, Bosker, & Kruger, 2003), other recent meta-analyses confirm a positive correlation ranging from .17 to .25 (Leithwood et al, 2004; Marzano et al, 2005).

In addition to examining the overall quantitative impact of principal effectiveness, research efforts are illuminating the importance of determining the specific principal practices necessary for school success. Leithwood et al
described three categories of essential leadership skills: setting directions, redesigning the organization, and developing people with specific competencies in each category (2004, p. 8 – 9). Similarly, Cotton identified twenty-five essential principal practices for school success which included the principal’s role as a direction setter, facilitating shared decision-making and sustaining a positive school climate with those in the school community (2003). Meta-analysis by Marzano et al likewise revealed twenty-one leadership responsibilities based on two underlying factors: the need for first-order (incremental) change, and second-order (systemic) change (2005, p. 68).

With the multiple and sometimes conflicting roles demanded of today’s principals, prioritizing these responsibilities to achieve school success can be a daunting task. Identification of school focus areas or “the right work”, therefore, should relate to the nature of change needed in a particular context (Marzano et al, 2005, p. 76). Current school leadership research has confirmed that effective leadership practices are context-specific and depend on many factors, including the setting, organization, and the leaders themselves (Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003). The effective principal must possess the knowledge and leadership skills to diagnose and address the needs of a particular school (Portin et al, 2003). Elmore concluded: “... improvement is more a function of learning to do the right thing in the setting where you work” (2000, p.25).

There is growing recognition, however, that despite the importance of the principal’s role in identification of the right work, sustainable change is not easily accomplished by a single individual. With the realization that increasingly
unrealistic expectations have been expected of principals, some districts have adapted by redistributing non-instructional duties and providing decision-making opportunities for others at the school level (Archer, 2004). Fullan concurred that "...cultivating leaders at many levels [and ensuring leadership succession] "is one of the "key components of sustainability" (2002, p. 19). Clearly, the multiple responsibilities and accountability demands of the contemporary principal demonstrate the need for distributed leadership in the form of multiple formal and informal school leaders.

The Changing Nature of Principal Practice

The evolution of the principal's role from school manager to instructional leader has been well-documented. Historically, principals were expected to be experts in teaching and learning when formal schooling was first established. This role shifted early in the twentieth century when the industrial revolution and the field of behavioral psychology began to significantly impact education. Separation of teaching and school administration roles became an enduring trend lasting until the late 1970s when effective schools research emerged, shifting the role of principal to instructional leader (Tucker & Codding, 2002).

Hallinger noted, however, that "just when the image of instructional leader gained professional currency, it began to be questioned" (cited in Tucker & Codding, 2002, p.46). An additional conceptualization of the principal in the past quarter-century as a transformational or "change leader" emerged, coinciding with an emphasis on student achievement standards in a rapidly changing, technology-oriented society. While the role of the instructional leader expanded,
however, traditional school management responsibilities have not decreased (Lashway, 2002b). As a result, there is increasing recognition "...that the job isn't do-able if principals try to do it as they have done in the past" (Shellard, 2003, p. 58).

Much attention has been focused on desirable school leadership practices, a wide array of duties for which principals “should” be responsible. While held accountable for leadership in multiple areas, it is acknowledged that principals may act through others to meet these responsibilities (Portin et al, 2003). In fact, a seeming paradox for school leaders has resulted from the accountability movement for student success: while there is an increasing demand for results, there is a growing expectation of collaborative leadership (Lashway, 2003). This trend toward “distributed leadership” enables others to serve in a decision-making capacity, an increasing necessity as principals attempt to balance the extensive time demands and increasing expectations of their roles.

The Principal’s Workday

The workday of principals is similar in several respects, regardless of demographic characteristics or whether the principal serves an elementary, middle or high school. Principals work significantly longer hours than their contractual time, with elementary principals averaging more than 50 hours per week and high school principals averaging between 60 and 80 hours per week (Zeitoun & Newton, 2002; DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003). There may be considerable fragmentation of tasks on any given day: interruptions are frequent,
the nature of tasks performed by principals varies widely, and the number of
issues negotiated on any given day is considerable (Manasse, 1985). Principals
refer to themselves as “one minute managers” and, in general, may “expect the
unexpected” (Tucker & Codd, 2002, p. 2). Over two decades ago, a
principal’s school day was described as consisting of “…anywhere from 50 to
over 100 separate events and as many as 400 separate interactions” (Morris,
Crowson, Hurwitz, & Porter-Gehrie, cited in Manasse, 1985, p. 441). The role
of principals has been expanded considerably during this time, including an
emphasis on accountability for student achievement (DiPaola & Tschannen-
Moran, 2003). Currently, the broad range of tasks performed in a principal’s
workday may include, among others, community relations, human resources,
finance, law, and maintenance: while important to daily school operations, few of
these are directly related to improving student achievement (Waters & Grubb,
2004a). It is therefore essential that principals are able to prioritize tasks
necessary for student learning, answering the question “How will all this get
done?” (Shellard, 2003, p. 57).

Despite similarities in the principal’s workday, the tasks performed by
school leaders also vary depending on context. In this respect, choosing the
right work for a particular school and determining how this will be accomplished
becomes the core of the principal’s work (Portin et al, 2003). Such goals typically
are reflected in school improvement plans and are critical to student
achievement: according to Elmore, it is not lack of effort and motivation that
results in low school performance, but failure to choose appropriate goals (2005,
in Marzano et al, p. 76). Thus, the type of principal needed for individual schools may also vary depending on the nature of the school's needs and the level of change needed. Likewise, recent reform efforts to improve student achievement have significantly influenced the type of leadership needed to respond to accountability demands.

The Impact of the Standards Movement on the Principal's Role

Much of the research of the past two decades has illuminated the changing expectations of school principals. Nowhere is this more evident than the responsibility of the principal for improving student achievement. The increased demands from state and federal agencies, including the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), have produced an unprecedented high-stakes accountability requirement at the school level (Tirozzi & Ferrandino, 2001). The impact of these requirements was confirmed in a 2004 survey of 925 elementary and secondary principals, in which 88% indicated that "NCLB has enormously added to the principal's job responsibilities without consideration of needed resources" (Curriculum Review, 2004, p. 8). In addition to the NCLB target of 100% student proficiency, the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirements for student achievement regardless of ethnicity, race, English language status, special needs, or socioeconomic status pose additional challenges with escalating sanctions for schools not meeting the demands of the law (Lockwood, 2005).

Concurrent with the steadily increasing number of principal expectations there has been a growing recognition that school leaders, while critical to establishing the direction and priorities for the school, simply cannot be solely
responsible for school success. Following interviews of more than 150 educators in 21 diverse school settings, Portin and colleagues concluded that principals are responsible for ensuring that leadership occurs in all critical areas, but they do not have to provide it on their own (Portin et al, 2003). The distribution of leadership responsibilities may occur through those with positional power, such as assistant principals, or through other educators within the school. According to Portin et al, however, it is the principal who serves as the “diagnostician” of the school’s needs, seeking and utilizing the necessary resources to meet challenges as they arise.

The Use of Principal Performance Standards for Leadership Preparation and Practice

As the standards movement created increased accountability for student success, a corresponding effort began to more accurately specify the skills and dispositions required for effective school leadership in a rapidly changing society. The most widely used standards were developed in 1996 by the Interstate Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), a collaboration of multiple state educational agencies and professional development organizations. The original six standards for school leaders, which included 184 performance indicators, stated:

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by:
1. Facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

2. Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

3. Ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

4. Collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

5. Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

6. Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996).

In addition to the use of the ISLLC standards as a framework for practicing administrators, the standards have served as a foundation for leadership preparation programs. To date, 46 states have developed leadership standards for administrator certification and preparation programs (Sanders & Simpson, 2005). The standards currently used for assessment of school leadership preparation programs are the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) Standards, developed under the direction of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) for the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) (Shipman et al, 2007).
Shipman et al noted that after integration of the ELCC and ISLLC standards in 2001, educational leadership programs desiring NCATE accreditation must now meet the ELCC standards as part of the review process.

After a decade of use, the ISLLC Standards were recently revised to incorporate updates and reflect policy, political, and social changes since their initial publication. The revised standards, renamed The Educational Leadership Policy Standards, include the six revised ISLLC Standards (ISLLC: 2008) followed by functions that define each standard (Olson, 2008). Presently, the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) based on the standards is being used in at least 15 states to measure the standards-based knowledge required of aspiring school leaders (Virginia Department of Education, 2004). Clearly the ISLLC Standards have become an integral part of school leadership preparation, assessment, and licensure: proposed changes in the standards, therefore, are likely to have significant impact on these areas (Sanders & Simpson, 2005). With most states aligning their leadership standards with ISLLC, the revised standards are likely to influence school leadership preparation to a great degree for the foreseeable future as states establish a common language (Sanders & Simpson). Because the Standards are now a fundamental part of both principal practice and preparation, it is essential that they reflect both the expectations and realities of the daily work of principals.

A summary of the research applicable to the revised ISLLC Standards and functions follows.
**ISLLC Standard 1:**

An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared by all stakeholders.

*Inspiring a Shared Vision.* In order to meet the needs of 21st century learners, schools are experiencing dramatic changes requiring a different kind of leadership (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2000). School leaders make a difference, shaping the direction and goals of the school and facilitating changes that contribute to student learning (Cotton, 2003; Fullan, 2002; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; I.E.L., 2000; Marzano et al, 2005). The development of leadership standards in the past decade has helped to identify important principal responsibilities and practices: the standards alone, however, do not allow leaders to distinguish between important and essential responsibilities (Waters & Grubb, 2004a).

It is therefore crucial that school leaders are able to identify and promote practices that are necessary to improve student achievement (Marzano et al, 2005; Waters & Grubb, 2004a). To encourage others and gain commitment, leaders must first build relationships and foster the trust of others (Cotton, 2003; Fullan, 2001; Leithwood et al, 2005; Tschannen-Moran, 2004). To follow willingly, stakeholders must believe that the leader is honest, forward-looking, competent, and inspiring (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 24). Significantly, the single most important characteristic a leader must possess is "...the ability to work well with others" (2002, p. 31). For leaders to inspire the commitment of others, they must
demonstrate moral purpose, understand the nature of change, build relationships, facilitate knowledge creation and sharing, and provide coherence making (Fullan, 2001, p. 4).

Additionally, a critical element in school success is the ability of the leader to diagnose the needs of the school and determine the manner in which goals may best be met: in other words, to do “the right work” (Marzano et al, 2005, p. 76; Portin et al, 2003). In doing so, school-level, teacher-level, and student-level factors must be considered (Marzano, 2003, p. 10). Because of the difficulty of one leader successfully managing the multitude of essential tasks required for school success, shared and collaborative leadership is necessary. Those within the school, therefore, must act as a purposeful community, defined as “one with the collective efficacy and capability to develop and use assets to accomplish goals that matter to all community members through agreed-upon processes” (Marzano et al, 2005). Such stakeholder involvement then enables the group support required for meaningful and sustainable change.

Data-driven Decision Making. The constructive use of data to drive school improvement and promote student learning is a fundamental characteristic of successful schools (Reeves, 2006; Shellard, 2005). The effective principal ensures that student assessment data is readily available and is shared, discussed, and monitored collaboratively to improve student achievement. Examination of disaggregated data is necessary not only to make effective instructional decisions at the school level but also to determine the school’s Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status under the federal No Child Left Behind
(NCLB) Act (Zavadsky, 2006). Data analysis should include a variety of assessments, both formative and summative (DuFour, 2004; Reeves, 2004; Shellard, 2005). Specifically, review of the practices of successful schools having overcome achievement challenges indicates that multiple forms of data should be used, including student cohort data (Reeves, 2004). When staff members and administrators share responsibility for student achievement and have immediate interventions available when students are not successful, the end result is a professional learning community (DuFour, 2004).

Based on the review of all relevant school data and diagnosis of areas in need of improvement, the school improvement plan is developed, implemented, and monitored according to school district and state guidelines. Development and implementation of the plan, however, is insufficient to facilitate improvement. In fact, several studies have provided evidence that in terms of achievement and equity, implementation, execution, and monitoring are more important that planning and process: the “pretty” plan is not necessarily the best plan (Kannapel, Clements, Taylor, & Hibpshman, 2005; Reeves, 2006). Confirmation of this finding is evident in the Planning, Implementation, and Monitoring (PIM) research in the large Clark County, Nevada school district: frequent monitoring of data was found to be significant variable in improving student achievement and closing the equity gap (Reeves, 2006). Frequent monitoring and adjustment of the plan are key to “the central principle of school improvement” (Kelly & Lezotte, 2003, p. 6) and are a hallmark of successful school leaders (Boris-Schacter & Merrifield, 2000).
ISLLC Standard 2:

An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

Establishing a positive school culture is widely recognized as a critical factor in promoting school success. School culture has been defined as a "...complex pattern of norms, attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, values, ceremonies, traditions, and myths that are deeply ingrained in the very core of the organization" and can significantly influence the beliefs and actions of those within the organization (Barth, 2002, p. 6). Effective school leaders promote both distributed and collaborative leadership within the school, empowering others through shared decision-making (Cotton, 2003). By developing others, effective leaders increase the sustainability of school-level changes while retaining responsibility for school success (Fullan, 2002; Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Portin et al, 2003). Whether leaders hold formal roles of authority or function as informal leaders, they are the direction-setters for the school (Leithwood et al, 2005; Portin et al, 2003). Portin and colleagues concluded:

Leadership is more of a broad characteristic of schools, a distributed capacity in an environment that helps sustain changes that enhance student learning, improve instruction, maximize participation in decision-making, and align resources to the school's vision and purpose. (2003, p. 25).

School leaders promote and sustain such a collaborative culture by aligning their words and actions to diagnose and meet the unique needs of the
school (Portin et al, 2003). In order to inspire the involvement of others, however, the effective school leader must first demonstrate the characteristics of honesty, competency, credibility, and trustworthiness (Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Tschannen-Moran, 2004). An extensive review of the research confirmed several practices and dispositions shared by such leaders:

- Knowledge of curriculum, teaching, and learning
- High expectations and monitoring of student learners
- A norm of continual improvement
- Active involvement and visibility in the school
- Collaborative leadership and positive relationships with staff
- Facilitation of staff development opportunities and discussion by school staff
- Recognition of student and staff achievement (Cotton, 2003; Marzano et al, 2005).

Clearly, relationship-building by school leaders is a key factor in developing and sustaining a positive school culture (Cotton, 2003; Fullan, 2001; Portin et al, 2003). The effective school leader supports staff as professionals and individuals (Cotton, 2003; Fullan, 2001; Portin et al, 2003) while not tolerating ineffective teaching (Fullan, 2003; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003). This facilitates a positive and motivating learning environment based on high expectations for all students. School climate, or atmosphere, therefore impacts school culture – the unspoken norms and expectations regarding school priorities. While continually monitoring teaching and learning, the effective school
leader also remains aware of another critical factor in school success – the students themselves. Principal behaviors perceived to be valuable in establishing a positive school climate among a sample of 123 teachers enrolled in a university principal preparation program included respect for students, support of students, and communication with students (Harris & Lowery, 2002, p. 64 – 65). Specific behaviors noted included treating students fairly, frequent interaction and encouragement, advocacy for students, and providing students with a safe and secure learning environment. Cotton also asserted that caring and love for children is an essential principal trait necessary for a positive school climate (2003).

Beyond creating and sustaining a culture that supports teaching and learning, a crucial element of the principal's work is to serve as the *instructional leader* of the school. While this construct has often lacked definition (Marzano et al, 2005), the research of the past two decades clearly indicates that instructional leadership refers to the collaborative responsibility for school success by those in the school community rather than placing this responsibility solely with the principal (Marks & Printy, 2003; Tucker & Tschannen-Moran, 2002). As Reeves (2006) indicated, “…the prevailing leadership mythology that generally embraces the unitary ‘heroic’ leadership model is unsustainable, unsupportable, and dangerous to individual and organizational health” (p. xi). Fullan concluded:

> We need leaders who can create a fundamental transformation in the learning cultures of schools and of the teaching profession itself. The role of principal as instructional leader is too narrow a concept to carry the
weight of the kinds of reforms that will create the schools that we need for the future. (2002, p. 17).

Thus, the role of the principal as instructional leader is to facilitate and monitor teaching and learning, ensuring that:

- a comprehensive and rigorous curriculum is provided to all students, taking into account a range of student abilities and achievement (Danielson, 2002; Friend, 2007; Marzano, 2003; Schmoker, 2006)
- effective teachers are in place to teach the curriculum and provide feedback to students (Marzano, 2003; Stronge, 2007)
- leadership and decision-making is shared and collaborative (Cotton, 2003; DuFour, 2004; Eaker, DuFour, & DuFour, 2002; Fullan, Bertani, & Quinn, 2004; Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Marzano et al, 2005; Portin et al, 2003; Reeves, 2006; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2001).
- all necessary resources are made available to staff and students (Cotton, 2003; Danielson, 2002; King, 2002; Wilmore, 2002)
- instructional time is maximized (Danielson, 2002; Stronge, 2007)
- regular supervision and monitoring of instruction is provided (Marzano et al, 2005)
- appropriate assessment and accountability systems are in place to monitor student achievement and the school instructional program itself (DuFour, 2004; Reeves, 2006; Shellard, 2005), and
- there is an expectation of continual improvement in the school (Boris-Schacter & Merrifield, 2000; Kelly & Lezotte, 2003).
**ISLLC Standard 3:** An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

*Establishing and Monitoring School Systems.* School administrators are responsible for a wide range of tasks during the school year, many of which may appear to be unrelated to student learning. Maintaining a safe and orderly environment, however, is likely to impact teaching and learning and is therefore a fundamental responsibility of school leaders (Cotton, 2003; Lashway, 2001; Marzano et al, 2005; Shellard, 2003). The effective school leader recognizes the importance of the conditions in which students and staff work and ensures that the condition of the school facilitates a positive learning environment. Likewise, it is the responsibility of school leaders to obtain and efficiently utilize all resources available, including human, fiscal, and technological resources. Even the manner in which time is used during the day and development of the school master schedule may significantly impact the nature and depth of instruction (Danielson, 2002). Similarly, coordination of the school schedule with key school personnel can facilitate meeting the instructional needs of a range of student learners, including those requiring special education services in the least restrictive environment (Friend, 2007).

*Promoting and Protecting the Welfare and Safety of Students and Staff.*

There is no more important responsibility assigned to the school leader than the safety of those within the school: until this is established, it is at best difficult to create an effective learning atmosphere (Stronge, Richard, & Catano,
In a meta-analysis of research, Marzano et al recognized order as one of 21 responsibilities of school leaders, noting that the following specific leadership behaviors are evident: a) establishing routines for the smooth running of the school that staff understand and follow, b) providing and reinforcing clear structures, rules, and procedures for staff, and c) providing and reinforcing clear structures, rules, and procedures for students (2005, p. 57).

The maintenance of a safe and orderly school environment is confirmed by Cotton’s (2003) research findings on effective principal behaviors. Expectations for student behavior are clear, discipline is fair and consistently enforced, input is obtained from students and staff regarding behavior policies, and authority is delegated to teachers to maintain these policies. Clearly, creating and maintaining a safe and effective learning environment is the result of purposeful actions on the part of administrators as well as other stakeholders in the school community.

The implications for school leaders who neglect the responsibility of school safety are significant: the prevention of student injuries is both an ethical and legal obligation (Barrios, Jones, & Gallagher, 2007; Bosher, Kaminski, & Vacca, 2004; Standler, 1999 – 2000; Zirkel, 2001). Because 10 - 25 percent of injuries to children and adolescents occur at school (Barrios et al, 2007), the proactive principal must address and monitor safety issues on an ongoing basis. Even unintentional injury may result in subsequent legal action, resulting in time diverted from other school concerns. In a study of Virginia principals, 88 percent rated legal issues as a highly significant organizational management problem.
(Tucker & Tschannen-Moran, 2002). With an increasing number of major school safety issues publicized by the media in the past decade and adults in the school serving in loco parentis (in place of parents), parental concern regarding the critical responsibility of school safety has heightened, and understandably so.

*Obtaining and Allocating Resources.* Instructional leaders make creative use of all resources – people, time, and money – to support school improvement. To make time for teachers to work together, instructional leaders come up with strategies to add to, borrow from, or rearrange the daily schedule. Their focus on teaching and learning drives every conversation about budget development and every decision about how to use existing resources (King, 2002).

The leadership responsibility for the resources of the school refers to those materials and opportunities necessary for teaching and learning (Marzano, 2005). This includes the managerial and financial responsibility for items such as books, equipment, and technological resources as well as professional opportunities for staff development and professional collaboration (Cotton, 2003). Although in many cases only a fraction of total school expenses may be directly controlled by the principal, school finance remains a critical administrative responsibility subject to local, state, and federal guidelines. It is advisable, however, that the school budgeting and decision-making processes be understood by school staff as well as other stakeholders (Danielson, 2002). While this can be a time-consuming process, the inclusion of stakeholders in these discussions is necessary to protect school funds and ensure that funds and resources are equitable distributed and used appropriately (Stronge et al, in
press). The effective school leader seeks and monitors financial and other available resources that will benefit the school community. When necessary, leaders redesign school structures and allocate resources as necessary – within established guidelines - in order to achieve goals, working with all stakeholders toward accomplishment of the school vision (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003).

In the past decade, acquiring and monitoring the use of school technological resources has become an increasing responsibility of school leaders. Since the 1990s, the availability and use of instructional technology has changed profoundly. Since that time almost all schools in the United States acquired faster and more powerful computers with internet access. The student-to-computer ratio was reduced from 20 to 1 to 5 to 1. Greater numbers of computers were placed in classrooms rather than central labs. Student technology objectives shifted from acquisition of basic computing skills to technology integration with the curriculum. As a result of training, teachers gained increased levels of competency (Wenglinsky, 2005 – 2006, p. 29 – 30).

Despite the rapid increase in the availability of computers, however, until recently there has been little research linking classroom computer use to student achievement (Wenglinsky, 2005 – 2006). Early research described in a 1996 review of over 200 landmark studies revealed a positive impact on student learning, including the following:

- Positive impact on student achievement across subject areas with all levels of students
• Increase in student-teacher interaction, problem-solving, and cooperative learning with appropriate use of computer technology

• Improved student behavior, lower absentee and dropout rates, higher rate of college attendance, and a greater number of college scholarships than in non-computer classrooms, and

• A particularly positive effect of computer use in at-risk populations (Stratham & Torell, 1996, p. 2 – 3).

Additional analysis conducted in 1996 by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) confirmed that the impact of computer use on student achievement in 4th and 8th grade reading, science, and mathematics depended largely on how individual teachers used technology: since less technology training was available for teachers at that time, computers were more likely to be used in simpler ways rather than for higher-order thinking skills (Wenglinsky, 2005 – 2006). Protheroe (2005) warned that because of the rapidly changing nature and use of technology in a relatively short period of time, previous research is unlikely to provide answers to current issues. Nonetheless, several research themes are evident from the extant research and combined in four principles:

1. Teacher training, knowledge of, and attitude toward technology are critical for successful technology integration.

2. Coordination with curriculum design, teaching methodology, and the needs of learners must be considered to make effective use of technology.
3. Technology design determines to a large degree the impact on student achievement, and must therefore be flexible, provide timely and appropriate feedback, and create multiple opportunities for students to be engaged in content.

4. Continued improvement in technology requires ongoing formative evaluation (p. 47).

The school leader, therefore, facilitates the availability, use of, and training needed for successful technology integration. In an era of rapid change and technological advances, the school leader's management of technology resources and how they are used at the school level has become a necessity to develop the skills needed by learners of the twenty-first century.

The Need for Distributed Leadership. The multitude and complexity of responsibilities required of today's principals requires a greater need for the input and involvement of others to facilitate sustainable school change and improvement (Elmore, 2005; Fullan, 2001, 2005; Hargreaves & Fink, 2003, Leithwood et al, 2005; Ruebling, Stow, Kayona, & Clarke, 2004). Simply put, the principal's job, as it exists today, is no longer "doable" in terms of the sheer volume of responsibilities required (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2001; Tschannen-Moran & DiPaola, 2003; Tucker & Tschannen-Moran, 2002). Not only must leadership responsibilities be collaborative in nature, promoting joint decision-making, but they must also be distributed among those within the organization. There is growing recognition, however, that while the principal has a central role in identification of the right work, sustainable change is not easily
accomplished by a single individual. With the realization that increasingly unrealistic expectations have been expected of principals, some districts have adapted by redistributing non-instructional duties and providing decision-making opportunities for others at the school level. Fullan concurred that “...cultivating leaders at many levels [and ensuring leadership succession] “is one of the “key components of sustainability” (2002, p. 19). Clearly, the multiple responsibilities and accountability demands of the contemporary principal demonstrate the need for distributed leadership in the form of multiple formal and informal school leaders.

*ISLLC Standard 4:* An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

The ability of school leaders to foster parent and community involvement is a critical factor in promoting student and school success and involves three related elements: communication, participation, and governance (Cotton, 2003, p. 87). Cotton’s research confirmed the importance of parent and community involvement and outreach as one of 21 characteristics evident in principals of high-performing schools. Decades of research substantiate that strong support of educational cultures significantly improve the likelihood that students will master the curriculum. Research has also confirmed that families of low socio-economic status are more likely to have low expectations of school success; consequently,
collaboration with these families is even more essential (Leithwood et al, 2005, p. 42).

Although community demographics may vary widely, in many cases the school can benefit from resources provided by community stakeholders that otherwise would have been unavailable (Dwyer, Lee, Rowan, & Bossert, 1983, in Manasse, 1985, 452). While it is evident that parent and community stakeholder involvement is invaluable to school success, a review of the literature indicates limited research regarding their role in the planning and implementation of school reform efforts (Doyle & Pimentel, 1983, in Leithwood et al, 2005, p. 49). The principal’s role in parent and community outreach efforts, however, is recognized as an essential practice for school success (Cotton, 2003; Marzano et al, 2005).

ISLLC Standard 5: An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

It is well-documented that leaders must demonstrate honesty, credibility, and trustworthiness in order to inspire the commitment of others (Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Tschannen-Moran, 2004). Effective school leaders promote a vision for the good of the organization as the ability to demonstrate “moral purpose” (Fullan, 2001). In a five year study, Hargreaves and Fink confirmed that “sustainable improvement contributes to the growth and the good of everyone, instead of fostering the fortunes of a few at the expense of the rest” (2003, p.3). Constituents must believe that the school leader will work collaboratively to develop a shared vision with the best interests of the school in mind at all times.
Likewise, it is essential that effective school leaders model legal and ethical practices, establishing a foundation of trust with those in the school community.

Beyond the responsibility of adherence to local, state, and federal policy mandates, school leaders must comply with a multitude of legal requirements on a daily basis. The most basic legal responsibilities include overseeing the safety of those in the school, supervision of the instructional program, hiring and supervision of staff, providing timely communication on school-related issues, and compliance with local, state, and federal policies and procedures (Dunklee & Shoop, 2002). The effective school leader is expected to manage a wide range of situations with legal implications, including student attendance, discipline, health, academic records, and special education instruction, as well as staff-related issues regarding employment rights. Likewise, the responsible school leader must be well-informed of the legal responsibilities regarding constitutional issues, such as freedom of speech, issues related to separation of church and state, and protection against discrimination on the basis of gender, race, or disability.

Second only to effective teachers, the impact of principals is a critical factor in establishing and maintaining high levels of student achievement (Leithwood et al, 2005; Marzano et al, 2005). Principals are considered “the key to initiating, implementing, and sustaining school success (Tucker & Codding, 2002, p. 253) and “imperative to high student achievement” (Anthes, 2005, p. 1). Effective school leaders set high academic expectations for all students, continuously monitoring and evaluating the impact of the school instructional program with teachers (Cotton, 2003; Marzano et al, 2005). In such a
collaborative partnership focused on individual student success, the school functions as a professional learning community, mutually diagnosing and addressing student achievement concerns – with no excuses. The ethical obligation of the principal, therefore, is to ensure accountability for the success of all students by facilitating a norm of continuous improvement within the school (Cottong, 2003).

ISLLC Standard 6: An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

The daily work of school leaders is unquestionably linked with multiple external contexts, most notably local, state, and federal policy. Specifically, the emphasis on accountability for student achievement required by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) has accelerated an unprecedented shift of responsibility for implementation of educational reform initiatives from the local level to the state and federal levels (Leithwood et al, 2005). In addition to the NCLB target of 100% student proficiency, the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirements for student achievement regardless of ethnicity, race, English language status, special needs, or socioeconomic status pose additional challenges with escalating sanctions for schools not meeting the demands of the law (Lockwood, 2005). The challenge for school leaders therefore becomes school-level implementation, which is directly impacted by school district interpretation of state and federal policy. Research and analysis by Spillane (1996; 1998)
provided substantiation that school personnel provide a powerful influence on instructional practices at the district level and in the coherence-making process at the school level (Leithwood et al, 2005). Elmore (2005) confirmed that dependence on external authority can, in fact, make people less effective in their work, and that internal problem-solving will provide solutions to circumstances not considered by policy-makers.

It has long been known that effective school leaders serve as “boundary spanners,” acquiring information through a variety of communication channels and using their position to influence district-level decisions (Manasse, 1983). Likewise, their knowledge and awareness of political contexts allows school leaders some flexibility in implementation: “when to bend policy, bypass procedures, or expand their own discretion” (Morris, Crowson, Hurwitz, & Porter-Gehrie, 1981, in Manasse, 1983, p. 452). Because of the wide range of school needs and availability of resources, considerable evidence exists that different schools have differing leadership needs and site-specific strategies (Manasse, 1985; Portin et al, 2003). The growing list of principal responsibilities in the past decade is clearly not easily managed by one individual. Principal standards developed concurrently in that period, however, reinforced the perception of individual responsibility in school leadership (Fullan, 2005). As principal performance standards are being revised to reflect current practice, it may be anticipated that greater emphasis will be placed on the responsibilities themselves, rather than the position (Fullan, 2005; Marzano et al, 2005).
Alignment of Leadership Preparation, Performance Standards, and Principal Practice

Given the central role of principals in promoting teacher quality and student learning, a continued need exists to develop effective school leaders with the skills necessary to lead in contemporary schools (Mazzeo, 2003). A growing consensus on the characteristics needed by effective principals indicates that “successful school leaders influence student achievement through two important pathways – the support and development of effective teachers and the implementation of effective organizational processes” (Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Myerson, 2005, p. 1). Evidence exists, however, that the changing nature and growing complexity of schooling and the principalship may leave current and future principals unprepared for the challenges that they face (Mazzeo, 2003; Portin et al, 2003). With recognition by policymakers that the leadership policies and regulations developed in the past may be insufficient to produce effective leaders for today’s schools, efforts to align the key areas of principal licensure, preparation, and professional development can be made (Mazzeo, 2003).

As leadership preparation programs are considered the pipeline for prospective school leaders, they serve as a logical starting point for facilitating the necessary skills needed by principals to meet the changing needs of today’s schools. Experienced principals in a recent study, however, expressed dissatisfaction with their leadership preparation which was “poorly aligned with the demands of the job” (Portin et al, 2003, p. 43). With growing recognition of
the need to improve principal preparation, states responded with increased efforts to adopt standards for school leaders and to align them with principal preparation programs with the majority of states using some form of the ISLLC/ELCC standards (Mazzeo, 2003). There is little evidence to date, however, “…that standards adoption has driven meaningful change in preparation programs” (2003, p. 4). Likewise, while there appears to be consensus in the literature and standards regarding the necessary features of principal preparation, little empirical data is available on whether the experiences provided result in more effective principal practice (Davis et al, 2005).
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

The purposes of this study were to: (a) determine the nature of the workday tasks performed by elementary principals across the United States, including the relative amount of time spent on these tasks, (b) explore the relationship between the tasks performed by elementary principals and whether the amount of time spent on particular tasks varies depending on poverty level as measured by the percentage of Title 1 student enrollment, (c) examine the congruence of the tasks performed in principal practice with the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008, and (d) describe the congruence of the tasks reportedly performed by principals during the school year to the actual tasks documented by principals during the workday.

Research Questions

1. What are the nature of tasks and proportion of time spent by elementary school principals on work-related duties during the course of a school year?

2. In what ways do the tasks performed by elementary school principals vary depending on school poverty level, as measured by the percentage of Title I student enrollment?

3. What is the level of congruence between the tasks performed by elementary principals and the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008?
4. What is the level of congruence between the tasks in which principals are reportedly engaged during the school year with tasks in which they are engaged during a sample workweek?

Target Population

The target population for this study was public school principals of schools in the United States containing two or more elementary grades from pre-kindergarten through grade six. The sample included 300 elementary school principals obtained through a randomly selected stratified national sample of 10,000 elementary principals. Subjects for this study were obtained through Quality Educational Data (QED), an independent educational firm that specializes in providing educational data bases. Strata included principals of schools containing less than 50% Title I enrollment and principals of schools containing 50% or higher Title I enrollment.

The Research Participants

Research participants for this study were selected randomly using a specified numerical formula. To facilitate a higher return rate of the research instruments, the researcher attempted to contact participants by phone prior to data collection to obtain verbal consent for participation in the study. For purposes of confidentiality, participants were assigned an identification number, with personal identification information destroyed following data collection.

Instrumentation

A three-part instrument designed and field-tested by the researcher was used for the study. Part I of the study consisted of a brief survey to confirm
school demographic status and characteristics of participants, including gender and amount of experience as a school principal. Part II of the study, entitled The Principal Workday Survey, consisted of a Likert-style multiple choice survey. Participants were asked to estimate the relative frequency and duration of time spent on tasks previously identified by field-study participants as occurring during a principal's workday throughout the school year. The questions were worded to reflect the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008 and functions for each standard. To confirm the congruence of the questions with the ISLLC: 2008 standards and functions, a panel of three experts in educational leadership and performance standards reviewed a Table of Specifications (Table 1) with all experts confirming the alignment of the research questions with the standards and functions. Part III of the study, entitled The Principal Workday Log, consisted of participants completing a short-answer log divided into 15-minute time increments during an eight-hour workday for a period of five designated days during a specified time period. This enabled the researcher to obtain frequency counts of the tasks reportedly performed by principals as well as to obtain the amount of time spent on the tasks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISLLC Standards</th>
<th>Workday Task Emergent Categories (from field study)</th>
<th>Survey Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Facilitates vision of learning shared and supported by the school community | Meetings/conferences  
Communications  
School improvement                                                                 | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5                |
| 2. Promotes school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth | Meetings/conferences  
Climate  
Human resources  
Communications  
Professional development  
Assessment/pacing  
Staff evaluation  
School programs  
Monitor/observe  
School instructional programs  
Achievement/placement | 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 |
| 3. Ensures management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment | Planning/scheduling  
Meetings/conferences  
Human resources  
Communications  
Health/safety  
Building supervision  
Budget/finance  
Paperwork/mail/e-mail  
Transportation  
Facility  
Monitor/observe  
School programs/events | 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 |
| 4. Collaborates with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources | Community relations  
Meetings/conferences  
Resources                                                                 | 22, 23, 24                  |
| 5. Acts with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner                        | Special needs, subgroups  
Community relations  
Human resources  
Student discipline                                                                  | 25, 26, 27                  |
| 6. Understands, responds to, and influences the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context | Meetings/conferences/ policy  
Advocacy for students, families  
Professional development - self                                                      | 28, 29, 30                  |
Data Collection Procedures

The following procedures were used to conduct the study:

1. A sample of 300 participants was obtained from a stratified random sample of 3,000 public elementary school principals in the United States.

2. The researcher attempted to contact selected participants by telephone prior to the distribution of the research instruments to ascertain willingness to participate in the study.

3. When participants were unavailable by phone, the researcher left messages regarding the nature and timing of the study, with the researcher’s contact information and a request for participation provided.

4. The research instrument consisted of a brief survey of school demographic information and principal characteristics, a multiple choice survey, and workday log developed and previously field-tested by the researcher.

5. Numerically coded research instruments were mailed to participants with an explanatory cover letter, permission form with research study contact information, instructions, return prepaid addressed mailing envelopes, and a small monetary incentive for participation along with a note from the researcher thanking them in advance for their time and participation.
6. Participants were instructed to complete the research instruments during a specified two-week period, returning the survey and worklog instruments by mail immediately following completion of each part of the study.

7. Postcards were sent to participants who had not declined to complete the study and who did not return the surveys within a week after the specified completion date.

8. A final postcard reminder was sent to those participants who had not returned the instruments within two weeks of the specified completion date.

The total time period allowed for data collection for both instruments was six weeks from the initial mailing to return receipt by the researcher.

Procedures for Application of Content Analysis

*Emergent Categories*

Due to the multifaceted nature of principals' work, additional coding categories emerged in addition to those derived from the ISLLC Standards and functions and the Principal Workday field study results that were used as a basis for this study. The additional emergent categories were included in the chapter describing the results of the study.

*Test Coding*

For the purposes of this study, content analysis coding was completed by the researcher and one additional trained coder. The qualities of interest in this study were the tasks completed by elementary school principals in relation to the
ISLLC Standards of school leadership performance using theme as the unit of analysis.

*Calculating Frequencies*

Content analysis frequently makes use of frequency counts of the words in text (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 2003). It may then be assumed that higher relative counts, such as proportions, percentages, or ranks reflect greater concerns with a category (Weber, 1990, p. 56).

*Quantitative Analysis*

As previously described, methods of quantitative analysis used in this study included frequency counts, descriptive statistics and comparison of the means of schools with low and high Title 1 enrollment using t-tests for independent means.

*Reliability of Methodology*

Reliability refers to the extent to which a measure yields the same results on multiple trials (Neuendorf, 2002). Weber indicates that three forms of reliability are useful to content analysis:

1. *Stability:* is the extent to which results are invariable over time.
2. *Reproducibility:* also known as *intercoder reliability*, refers to the extent to which the same results are obtained when using more than one coder.
3. **Accuracy**: is considered the strongest form of reliability, and refers to the degree to which analysis of the text corresponds to a norm or standard (1990, p. 17).

Prior to coding all of the documents obtained by participants, test-coding was performed to ensure acceptable levels of reliability by coders. An accuracy rate of 91% was obtained between coders during test-coding.

**Validity of Methodology**

Validity refers to the extent to which a measure represents the intended concept (Neuendorf, 2002). In relation to content analysis, two forms of validity are most relevant: the correspondence between concept and data and the generalizability of the results (Weber, 1990).

**Data Analysis**

The data in this study were analyzed by examining each research question individually using a mixed methods approach including qualitative and quantitative perspectives. Prior to completing the 30 item survey regarding the frequency and duration of tasks in which principals are engaged throughout the year (Appendix C), participants were asked to complete a demographic survey (Appendix B) to confirm the following factors: whether or not their school contained elementary grade levels, the grade levels currently housed at the school, student enrollment, percentage of Title I enrollment, participant gender, participant educational level, number of years as principal, number of years as principal of the current school, the average number of hours worked per week, and ethnicity. These items served to confirm the desired sample characteristics.
and additionally yielded relevant information to the study regarding the nature of the elementary principalship.

**Question 1:** What are the nature of tasks and proportion of time spent by elementary school principals on work-related duties during the course of a workday and school year?

Using a 30 item survey, the SPSS statistical software program, version 14.0, was used to obtain descriptive statistics including the mean frequency and duration of time reportedly spent by principals on particular activities throughout the course of a school year. The survey was aligned with the newly revised ISLLC standards and functions as previously confirmed by a panel of three experts in the field of educational leadership. Frequency counts were obtained on the degree to which principals reported engaging in specific tasks as well as the amount of time spent on each task. The mean frequency of the occurrences of tasks and mean duration of time spent on each task was then determined. The tasks sampled were related to the functions proposed under each standard, analysis of the extant research on principal work, and the tasks reported by central Virginia principals who participated in a previous field study of the Principal Workday Log. The Principal Workday Log field study, conducted in fall 2006, yielded the following themes in three broad categories:

*School Leadership:* Planning/scheduling, Meetings/conferences, Climate, Community relations, Human resources, Communications, Professional development, and Strategic planning/school improvement
Organizational Management: Health/safety, School plant/grounds, Budget/finance, Paperwork/mail/electronic mail, Transportation, Facility management, and Discipline

Instruction: Assessment/pacing, Staff evaluation, Monitor/observe, School programs/events, Student achievement/placement, Resources, and Direct contact with students

Question 2: In what ways do the tasks performed by elementary principals vary depending on school poverty level, as measured by the percentage of Title I student enrollment?

Data obtained in these strata were analyzed quantitatively using the SPSS statistical software program to obtain descriptive statistics and t-tests for independent means for the frequency and duration of tasks performed by principals in low and high level Title I schools. The data were examined to determine whether significant differences between these groups were evident in terms of frequency and duration of time spent on the principal responsibilities surveyed. The t-test for equality of means is a form of statistical analysis that may be used between groups to determine whether significant differences exist (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006). Survey items were grouped to align with the six Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008 and were then analyzed in these six categories, comparing the quantitative data obtained from principals in schools in with low and high poverty rates as measured by the percentage of Title I student enrollment. For the purposes of this study, a low poverty rate was defined as below 50% Title I student enrollment, while a high poverty rate was defined as 50% or higher Title I student enrollment. In order to verify the
accuracy of school poverty rates from the random sample provided, the researcher included a question in the demographic section of the survey asking participants to provide the poverty rate range which applied to student enrollment of the school on September 30, 2007.

**Question 3: What is the relationship between the tasks performed by elementary principals and the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008?**

Data obtained from the Principal Workday Logs (Appendix D) were examined using content analysis to describe and compare the congruence of principal responses to the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008. According to Weber (1990), content analysis is a research method designed to make valid inferences from text. Thus, a thorough analysis of the text of the Workday Logs enabled the researcher to obtain an objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the content provided by principals (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 2003). In order to increase the reliability of the coding process, a second trained coder in addition to the researcher independently analyzed the Workday Logs. Intercoder reliability, or the amount of agreement between two or more coders, is important to provide validation of the coding process (Neuendorf, 2002). Review of the literature has indicated that reliability coefficients of .90 are acceptable to all, with .80 considered acceptable in most situations (Neuendorf, 2002). Using a coding guide developed by the researcher, test coding was performed by the researcher and an additional trained coder until an accuracy rate of 90% was reached between the two coders. The Principal Workday logs were then coded individually by each coder and compared for
accuracy before frequency counts were obtained. Participant responses were most often written in phrases: it was therefore necessary for the coders to read each phrase in its entirety rather than examine key words in order to accurately consider semantic intent during the analysis. When considering the meaning of the phrases, coders attempted to classify each phrase as specifically as possible. The specificity of the coding therefore created eight additional emergent categories in addition to the 30 categories related to the ISLLC Standards and functions (Appendix G).

The Principal Workday Log developed by the researcher (Appendix D) was modified slightly in response to participant comments obtained during previous field testing. The consensus of participants indicated that the Principal Workday Log was most easily used solely as a short answer log of principal activities: due to the overlapping categorical nature of the tasks in which principals are often engaged, attempts to use a previously included checklist to classify tasks made the Workday Log more time-consuming and difficult for participants. Participants also provided feedback to the researcher that the maximum practical amount of time for principals to complete the Workday Log was no longer than a 5-day workweek. The proposed study attempted to capture only a small sample, or snapshot, of the workday tasks performed by principals during the course of a five day workweek. It is acknowledged that due to the nature and timing of principals' work throughout the course of a school year, even the inclusion of a workday log containing longer samples of time would not fully capture all of the tasks routinely performed by elementary school principals.
Because this study made use of paper instruments mailed to participants and was completed by hand, content analysis was completed manually using predetermined and emergent codes. Analysis was completed by the researcher and a second trained coder.

**Question 4: What is the congruence between the proportion of time reportedly spent by principals during the school year to the time reportedly spent during a sample workweek?**

Data from the Principal Workday Survey was compared to data obtained in the Principal Workday Log to determine the congruence between the tasks on which principals report they spend time throughout the course of a year to the time they report spending during an actual workday. Content analysis of the Workday Logs yielded both descriptive and quantitative data in the form of frequency counts and the mean frequency and duration of tasks performed by principals.

The research questions, data collection methods and methods of analysis are summarized in Table 2, with results by participant in Appendix F.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Type of Analysis</th>
<th>Research Instrument</th>
<th>Analysis Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What are the nature of tasks and proportion of time spent by elementary school principals on work-related tasks during the course of a school year?</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics: frequency counts; mean duration and frequency of tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In what ways do the tasks performed by elementary principals vary depending on school poverty level, as measured by the percentage of Title I student enrollment?</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>T-test for independent means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What is the level of congruence between the tasks performed by elementary principals and the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008?</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Principal Workday Log</td>
<td>Content Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What is the level of congruence between the tasks in which principals are reportedly engaged during the school year with tasks in which they are engaged during a sample workweek?</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Principal Workday Log</td>
<td>Content Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ethical Safeguards and Considerations

The study involved a survey of the estimated frequency and duration of time spent during a school year by principals on tasks aligned with the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC: 2008 Standards, as well as a worklog in which principals noted the tasks in which they were engaged during a 5 day period. Analysis included the use of descriptive statistics, t-tests for equality of means, and content analysis and was therefore relatively unobtrusive. Confidentiality of participant responses was provided by assignment of a code number to each participant survey and log, with identifying information destroyed upon receipt of the data. Participants were advised that they could omit any items that they did not wish to answer, and that participation in both the survey portions and worklog portion were voluntary. Because the design of this study was exploratory, no interventions or treatment of human subjects was involved. The study was submitted to the Human Subjects Committee for the School of Education and was waived from formal review prior to the initiation of the study and the beginning of data collection.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Introduction

The primary purposes of this study were: 1) to examine the nature, frequency, and duration of tasks performed by elementary principals in both low and high poverty level schools, and 2) to determine the degree of congruence with the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008. Quantitative methods were used to analyze survey data which asked principals to estimate the frequency and duration of time spent on tasks related to the ISLLC: 2008 standards and the functions associated with each standard. Content analysis methodology was used to analyze Principal Workday logs, in which participants provided written documentation of the tasks in which they were engaged during working hours for a specified five day period. Both quantitative and qualitative methodologies were used to make comparisons of the data obtained from each research instrument in order to determine the degree of congruence between tasks in which principals are reportedly engaged during a school year with those reported in a sample work week. Data obtained in an initial survey of school demographics, principal experience, and time spent on the job were also found to be relevant to the study and were examined using frequency counts and percentages.

Research Study Response Rate

The study was comprised of three parts: the survey, Parts I and II, was mailed together to participants. Part III, the Principal Workday Log, was mailed simultaneously but separately. This enabled the researcher to obtain separate
response rates for Parts I – II and Part III. A random sample of 300 elementary principals was obtained from a sample of 10,000 listed by zip code. The larger sample was randomly selected from a population of approximately 63,000 elementary principals in the United States obtained from Quality Education Data, Inc. The response rates for Parts I – III of the survey were as follows (Table 3).

Table 3. Homogeneity of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample (n = 300)</th>
<th>Response Type</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Title I %</th>
<th>Geographic Distribution:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple choice survey; short answer journal</td>
<td>21.6%: 12% survey; 5-day journal</td>
<td>&lt;50%: 49% (n = 147) &gt;50%: 51% (n = 153)</td>
<td>50 states, District of Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Part I: School and Participant Information (n = 61)</td>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>61 (21.6%)</td>
<td>&lt;50%: 61% (n = 34) &gt;50%: 39% (n = 27)</td>
<td>32 states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Part II: Frequency and Duration of Tasks (n = 61)</td>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>61 (21.6%)</td>
<td>&lt;50%: 61% (n = 34) &gt;50%: 39% (n = 27)</td>
<td>32 states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Part III: Principal Worklog (n = 36)</td>
<td>Short answer: 5-day journal</td>
<td>36 (12%)</td>
<td>&lt;50%: 61% (n = 22) &gt;50%: 39% (n = 14)</td>
<td>24 states</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The geographic distribution of the random sample of 300 participants represented 50 states and the District of Columbia, with more populated states having a higher number of participants selected. Less populated states had proportionately less participants randomly selected and were underrepresented in the survey responses. The random sample consisted of 49% (n = 147) of schools having a lower percentage (<50%) of Title I enrollment and 51% (n =
153) having a higher percentage ≥50%) Title I enrollment. In comparison, of those who responded in the study, 61% had a lower percentage of Title I enrollment and 39% had a higher percentage of Title I enrollment. Due to this discrepancy, the generalizability of the study results may have been adversely impacted.

Findings of the Study: Part I

Part I: Survey of School Demographic and Participant Information

Part I of the Principal Workday Survey asked participants to provide information regarding their school setting as well as information regarding their own levels of education, work experience, age, gender, ethnicity, and hours spent per week on the job. The following responses were obtained from a sample of 61 participants nationwide.

A. Demographic Information (select one response for each item)

1. What is your title?
   
   Elementary principal  ____ other (write in) ______________________

   The majority of administrators surveyed have the title of elementary principal (97%, n = 59), despite a wide range of grade levels served. One participant had the title of “director,” while another who was currently in the role of principal had the title of “assistant principal.” None of the responding principals were therefore removed from the study, although in three cases the principals to whom the survey was sent were no longer at those schools. In two of those cases, the current principal was willing to complete the survey, while in
one case the survey was returned unopened with a notation that the participant was not at the address provided.

2. *What grade levels does your school serve?*

   \[
   K - 5 \quad PK - 5 \quad K - 6 \quad PK - 6 \quad K - 2 \quad 3 - 5 \quad \text{other}\]

   The majority of participants were employed in schools serving grades kindergarten through grade five (n = 20, 33%), while some served additional grade levels of pre-kindergarten and/or grade six. A total of 20% (n = 12) served grades pre-kindergarten through five, 16% (n = 12) served grades kindergarten through six, and 15% (n = 9) served grades pre-kindergarten through six. Other schools with elementary grades (n = 10, 16%) enrolled grades three through five, grades four through six, and in one case grades kindergarten through twelve. All schools sampled met the criteria for inclusion in the study by having at least two elementary grade levels between grade pre-kindergarten through grade five.

3. *What was the student enrollment of your school as of September 30, 2007?*

   \[
   <300 \quad 300 - 499 \quad 500 - 699 \quad 700 - 900 \quad >900
   \]

   Principal participants reported the following levels of student enrollment: 13% (n = 8) reported enrollment of 700 – 900; 28% (n = 17) reported enrollment of 500 – 699; 34% (n = 21) reported enrollment of 300 – 499, and 25% (n = 15) reported enrollment below 300 students.
4. What was the approximate percentage of Title I enrollment in your school as of September 30, 2007?

0 – 20%    21 – 40%    41 – 60%    61 – 80%    80 – 100%

Principal participants reported the following percentages of Title I student enrollment in their schools: 15% (n = 9) reported 81 – 100% Title I enrollment; 15% (n = 9) reported 61 – 80% Title I enrollment; 15% (n = 9) reported 41 – 60% Title I enrollment; 21% (n = 13) reported 21 – 40% Title I enrollment, and 34% (n = 21) reported 0 – 20% Title I enrollment. For the purposes of this study, Title I enrollment rates were examined in two categories: at or above 50% and below 50%. Using these criteria, 61% (n = 34) reported Title I levels of below 50%, with 39% (n = 27) reported Title I enrollment rates of 50% or greater. These rates were verified in the data obtained by the researcher from Quality Education Data.

B. Participant Information

1. What is your gender?

Female____ Male____

Examination of participant gender revealed that 66% (n = 40) were female and 34% (n = 21) were male.

2. What is your highest level of education?

Master’s degree in education____ Master’s degree with additional graduate coursework ____ Educational Specialist (6 year program or equivalent)____ Doctor of Education (Ed.D) ____ Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)____ Other____

The majority of participants (n = 43, approximately 70%) possessed a master’s degree or a master’s degree with additional coursework. Eight
participants (approximately 13%) possessed a degree of Educational Specialist, Ed.S., or the equivalent, while slightly less than 17% (n = 10) possessed or were completing the degree of Doctor of Education, Ed.D., or Doctor of Philosophy, Ph.D.

3. What is your age?
24 – 34  35 – 44  45 – 54  55 – 64  65 or greater

The majority of participants indicated that they were in an age range of 45 – 64 years old (n = 20, 33%), with the highest percentage in the 55 – 64 year old category (n = 22, 36%). A total of 15 participants (25%) were in the 35 – 44 age range, less than 10% of participants (n = 4, 6%) were in the age category of 24 – 34 years of age, and no participants indicated that they were in the age range of 65 or greater.

4. What is the total number of years you have served as a principal?
Less than 1 year  1 – 2 years  3 – 5 years  6 – 10 years  >10 years

Examination of principal experience revealed that the majority of elementary principals surveyed, 34% (n = 21), had over ten years of experience. Approximately 25% (n = 15) reported having between six to ten years experience; 21% (n = 13) reported having three to five years of experience; 7% (n = 4) reported having one to two years experience, and 13% (n = 8) reported having less than one year of experience.
5. For how many years have you served as a principal of your current school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2 years</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 5 years</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10 years</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal participants reported the following number of years of experience in their current schools: approximately 25% (n = 15) reported six to ten years in the school; 36% (n = 22) reported three to five years in the school; 20% reported one to two years in the school, and 20% reported less than one year in the school.

6. What is the average number of hours that you work per week as a school administrator?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours per Week</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 44</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 49</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 54</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 59</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or greater</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Few elementary principal participants reported working the equivalent of a standard 40 hour workweek. The following responses were obtained from principals with regard to the approximate number of hours the work during the course of the school year: 7% (n = 4) reported working approximately 40 – 44 hours per week; 25% (n = 15) reported working approximately 45 – 49 hours per week; 39% (n = 24) reported working approximately 50 – 54 hours per week; 13% (n = 8) reported working approximately 55 – 59 hours per week, and 16% (n = 10) reported working approximately 60 or more hours per week.

7. With which ethnic group would you identify yourself?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White, not Hispanic</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Pacific Islander</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Black, not Hispanic___  American Indian, Alaskan Native____
Other____

Principal participants identified themselves in the following ethnicity categories, with the large majority reporting white (Caucasian) ethnicity: approximately 88% (n = 54) white; 2% (n = 1) Hispanic; 2% (n = 1) Asian/pacific islander; 6% (n = 4) black, and 2% (n = 1) American Indian/Alaskan native.

Findings of the Study Reported by Research Question

Research Question 1: What are the nature of tasks and proportion of time spent by principals on work-related activities during the course of a school year?

Six categories corresponding to the revised Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC: 2008 were utilized to determine the estimated frequency and duration of 30 tasks performed throughout a school year as reported by principals. The 30 items were previously determined to correspond to functions related to each standard by a panel of experts in educational leadership. Participants were asked to rank both the frequency and duration of tasks performed using numbers one through five, with one corresponding to the lowest levels of frequency and duration and five corresponding to the highest level of frequency and duration. The mean scores and standard deviations for both frequency and duration of each item were obtained, allowing the researcher to conduct analysis by item as well as by each ISLLC Standard. The mean scores for the frequency and duration on each item were then compared to the corresponding descriptors used for each rating in the survey as well as for each
Standard. The results are reported in ISLLC Standards one through six by ISLLC function and survey item.

**Standard 1:** An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.

For Standard 1, there were five related survey questions corresponding to ISLLC functions. Each survey question used a five point numerical response scale with the numeral 1 indicating the lowest task frequency or duration and the numeral 5 indicating the highest task frequency or duration. Combining the five survey items based on the functions for ISLLC Standard 1 revealed that over the course of a school year, principals report completing tasks related to school vision and mission with a mean frequency of 3.89 and spend a mean duration of time on these tasks of 3.71. Overall, principals often engage in tasks related to school mission and vision and spend a great deal of time on those tasks throughout a school year. Five functions and survey questions were developed for Standard 1:

**Function A. Collaboratively develop and implement a shared vision and mission.**

**Survey Question 1:** Communicate the school/school district mission/vision of learning with those in the school community (e.g., teachers, parents, community members).

Results of the survey for question 1 revealed a mean frequency of 3.77, SD = .88, and a mean duration of 3.10, SD = .86. Principals indicated that throughout the course of the school year, they often performed tasks related to promoting a vision and mission of learning shared by stakeholders and they
performed these tasks for a *moderate amount of time*. The descriptive statistics for the frequency and duration of time spent by principal participants on tasks in ISLLC 2008 Standard 1 are reported in Table 4.

*Function B. Collect and use data to identify goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and promote organizational learning.*

*Survey Question 2: Analyze or otherwise use data to identify, monitor, and assess progress toward school goals.*

Results of survey question two revealed a mean frequency of 3.87, SD = .62, and a mean duration of 3.79, SD = .76. Principals indicated that they *often* use data to identify, monitor, and assess progress toward school goals, and they performed these tasks *quite a bit of the time*.

*Function C. Create and implement plans to achieve goals.*

*Survey Question 3: Develop and implement a school improvement/strategic plan.*

Results of survey question three revealed a mean frequency of 3.79, SD = .91, and a mean duration of 3.70, SD = .97. Principals reported that they *often* spend *quite a bit of time* on tasks related to developing and implementing a school improvement/strategic plan.

*Function D. Promote continuous and sustainable improvement.*

*Survey Question 4. Engage in other tasks related to promoting ongoing, sustainable improvement.*

Results of the survey revealed a mean duration of 4.14, SD = .39, and a mean duration of 4.44, SD = .92. Principals reported *often* spending *quite a bit of*
time on tasks related to promoting ongoing, sustainable improvement in their schools.

Function E. Monitor and evaluate progress and revise plans.

Survey Question 5: Monitor and assess progress toward school improvement objectives.
Results of the survey revealed a mean frequency of 3.82, SD = .73, and a mean duration of 3.52, SD = 1.27. Principals reported engaging in tasks relating to monitoring progress toward school improvement objectives very frequently, and spent a moderate amount of time on these tasks. Examination of the standard deviation related to duration indicated that there were greater deviations among principals in the amount of time reportedly spent on this task as compared to other items.

Table 4. Survey Results by Question: ISLLC: 2008 Standard 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Task Frequency</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean Task Duration</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1: Vision and mission of learning</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2: Use of data</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3: Develop school improvement plan</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4: Ensure ongoing improvement</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5: Monitor school</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvement plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

**Frequency of task:**

1. rarely/never
2. infrequently
3. occasionally
4. often
5. very frequently - daily/almost daily

**Duration of time spent engaged in task:**

1. no time
2. very little time
3. a moderate amount of time
4. quite a bit of time
5. a great deal of time

Standard 2: An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and professional growth.

For Standard Two there were 10 related survey questions related to ISLLC functions. Each survey question used a five point numerical response scale with the numeral 1 indicating the lowest task frequency or duration and the numeral 5 indicating the highest task frequency or duration.

**Function A. Nurture and sustain a collaborative culture of trust, learning, and high expectations.**

**Survey Question 6: Promote a culture of trust, high expectations, and high levels of learning for students and staff.**

Results of the survey revealed a mean frequency of 4.64, SD = .61 on this task, with a mean duration of 4.33, SD = .88. Principals very frequently - daily/almost daily reported performing tasks related to ensuring a culture of trust,
high expectations, and high levels of learning, and reported spending quite a bit of time on those activities.

Function B. Create a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular program.

Survey Question 7: Engage in tasks related to development, pacing, and/or monitoring of the curriculum.

Results of the survey revealed a mean frequency of 3.67, SD = .77 on this task, with a mean duration of 3.31, SD = .79. Principals often engaged in tasks related to curriculum, and reported spending a moderate amount of time on those activities.

Function C. Create a personalized and motivating learning environment for students.

Survey Question 8: Promote a positive learning environment for/have positive interactions with students.

Results of the survey revealed a mean frequency of 4.77, SD = .45 on this task, with a mean duration of 4.34, SD = .59. Principals reported that they engaged in tasks relating to promoting a positive learning environment for students/having positive interactions with students very frequently – daily/almost daily, and reported spending quite a bit of time on this task. This task included activities such as greeting students at the door during arrival, reward activities for student achievement or citizenship, eating lunch with students, and conversations with students unrelated to discipline.

Function D. Supervise instruction.
Survey Question 9: Formally and/or informally supervise instruction.

Results of the survey revealed a mean frequency of 4.25, SD = .70 on this task, and a mean duration of 4.0, SD = .85. Principals reported that they often engage in tasks related to supervision of instruction, and they spend quite a bit of time on this task. This included time spent in formal and informal teacher observations, including the brief observation visits known as classroom walkthroughs, as well as time meeting with teachers about the observations and time spent writing observation reports for formative or summative teacher evaluation.

Function E. Develop assessment and accountability systems to monitor student progress.

Survey Question 10: Engage in tasks related to student placement and monitoring of student success.

The results of the survey revealed a mean frequency of 3.75, SD = .56, and a mean duration of 3.48, SD = .73. Principals reported that they often engaged in activities related to student placement and monitoring, and they spend a moderate amount of time engaged in this task. This included activities such as placing new students in classrooms, reviewing student records, examination of benchmark testing results, and engaging in discussion with a teacher regarding student progress.

Function F. Develop the instructional leadership capacity of staff.

Survey Question 11: Promote the instructional and/or leadership capacity of the staff.
The results of the survey revealed a mean frequency of 3.85, SD = .78 for this task, with a mean duration of 3.38, SD = .80. Principals reported often engaging in activities to promote the instructional and/or leadership capabilities of staff, and spent a moderate amount of time engaged in this task.

Function G. Maximize time spent on quality instruction.

Survey Question 12: Engage in tasks which maximize and protect instructional time.

Results of the survey revealed a mean duration of 3.95, SD = .86 on this task, with a mean duration of 3.36, SD = 1.07. Principals reported that they often spent time on tasks related to maximizing instructional time, and spent a moderate amount of time on this task. This task was not always clearly evident in the worklogs, however one such task noted was working on the school schedule.

Function H. Promote the use of the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning.

Survey Question 13: Promote the use of effective instructional technology for teaching and learning.

Results of the survey revealed a mean duration of 3.50, SD = .85 on this task, with a mean duration of 3.07, SD = .92. Principals reported that they often engaged in tasks related to use of effective instructional technology for teaching and learning, and spent a moderate amount of time on this task. These tasks included technology software training, meeting with a technology representative, working with staff on computer programs, and updating the school website.
Function 1 under ISLLC: 2008 Standard 2 is *Evaluate the impact of the instructional program*. This task was determined by the researcher to be subsumed under Function E, *Develop assessment and accountability programs to monitor student progress*, and was therefore not used in the survey questions. Two additional survey questions related to this category, however, were included. Question 14 asked participants to estimate the frequency and duration of tasks performed by principals related to staff development activities, and Question 15 asked participants to estimate the frequency and duration of activities related to student assessment.

*Survey Question 14: Plan and implement school/school district staff development activities.*

Results of the survey revealed a mean frequency of 3.90, SD = .58 on this task, with a mean duration of 3.30, SD = .66. Principals reported that they *often* spent a *moderate amount of time* on tasks related to implementation of staff development activities. Such activities included preparation and implementation of in-school staff development as well as attendance at school district staff development/inservice.

*Survey Question 15: Engage in activities related to student assessment.*

Results of the survey revealed a mean frequency of 3.70, SD = .78 on this task, with a mean duration of 3.38, SD = .89. Principals reported that they *often* spent time on this task, and spent a *moderate amount of time* on the task. Such tasks included preparation for testing as well as discussion of student assessment/benchmark testing.
Combining the tasks in ISLLC: 2008 Standard 2 revealed a mean frequency of 4.00, SD = .69, with a mean duration of 3.60, SD = .80. Overall, principals reported often engaging in tasks related to this standard, and spent quite a bit of time engaged in these activities (Table 5).

Table 5. ISLLC: 2008 Standard 2: School Culture and Instructional Program

Mean Task Frequency and Task Duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Mean Task Frequency</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean Task Duration</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 6: Culture</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7: Curriculum</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8: Environment</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9: Instruction</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10: Student placement/monitoring</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 11: Promote leadership capacity</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12: Protect instructional time</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13: Instructional technology</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14: Staff development</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 15: Student assessment</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

Frequency of task

1 rarely/never 2 infrequently 3 occasionally 4 often 5 very frequently-daily/almost daily

Duration of time spent engaged in task....

1 2 3 4 5
(b) no time  very little time  a moderate  quite a bit  a great deal
amount of time  of time  of time

ISLLC: 2008 Standard 3. An education leader ensures management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

For ISLLC Standard 3 there were six related survey questions: two were directly related to ISLLC functions and four survey questions were included by the researcher that were evident under this standard based on the previous field research conducted prior to this study. Each survey question used a five point numerical response scale with the numeral 1 indicating the lowest task frequency or duration and the numeral 5 indicating the highest task frequency or duration.

Function A: Monitor and evaluate management and operational systems.

Survey Question 16: Monitor/attend to school operations: transportation; cafeteria; facility; student attendance; health/safety; arrival/dismissal; building maintenance; grounds.

Results of the survey revealed a mean frequency of 4.37, SD = .96, with a mean duration of 4.11, SD = .79. Principals often engaged in tasks related to school operations, including overseeing the health, safety and attendance of students, and spent quite a bit of time performing these activities. School operations tasks included activities such as the following: meeting with custodians; supervision of transportation, the playground and the cafeteria; conducting emergency drills; overseeing student attendance; assisting in the school clinic; overseeing school maintenance; meeting with law enforcement officials; and completion of building walkthroughs.

Function B. Obtain, allocate, align, and efficiently utilize human, fiscal, and technological resources.
Survey Question 17: Engage in tasks related to human resources: hiring, evaluation, licensure, etc.

Results of the survey revealed a mean frequency of 3.41, SD = 1.04, with a mean duration of 3.35, SD = .82. Principals reported that they occasionally performed tasks related to human resources, and they spent a moderate amount of time engaged in these tasks. Human resource tasks included teacher interviews, reviewing job applications, completing recommendation forms, handling license renewals, meeting with teachers to develop professional goals, and talking with human resource personnel. Examination of the standard deviation for the frequency of tasks indicates that the amount of times that principals reportedly perform this task over a school year varies markedly between participants.

Survey Question 18: Engage in tasks related to school finance: budget, grants, or other resources.

Results of the survey revealed a mean frequency of 3.44, SD = .81, with a mean duration of 3.15, SD = .84. Principals reported that they occasionally engage in tasks related to budget and finance, and spend moderate amount of time performing these tasks. Budgetary tasks included the following: completing payroll, signing checks, meeting with the school bookkeeper, meeting with salespeople, working on grants, reviewing and signing purchase requisitions, working on the school budget, ordering supplies, distributing paychecks, and reviewing bids.

Function C. Promote and protect the welfare and safety of students and staff.
This function was included in survey question 16 in the study.

**Function D. Develop capacity for distributed leadership.**

This function was included in survey question 11 in the study.

**Function E. Ensure teacher and organizational time is focused to support quality instruction and student learning.**

This function was included in survey question 12 in the study.

**Survey Question 19: Planning, scheduling, attending non-academic school events.**

This survey question was not directly related to one of the ISLLC: 2008 functions, but was included due to the presence of these tasks in the field study conducted prior to this study. Results of the survey revealed a mean frequency of 3.16, SD = .94, with a mean duration of 3.21, SD = .89. Principals reported that they occasionally engaged in tasks related to non-academic school events, indicating that they spent a *moderate amount of time* on these tasks. Such tasks included assisting with preparation of and attending school performances, managing school pictures, and collecting fund raising receipts.

**Survey Question 20: Attend school district meetings, workshops, or training.**

This survey question was not directly related to one of the ISLLC functions, but was included due to the presence of these tasks in the field study conducted prior to this study. The survey question was intended to distinguish between the principal professional development tasks in survey question 30 and attendance at obligatory or voluntary school district meetings not directly related to the professional growth of the principal, such as routine principal meetings.
Survey Question 21: Engage in communication tasks unrelated to school instruction (mail, e-mail, phone calls, memos, announcements, etc.).

This survey question was not directly related to ISLLC functions but was included due to the presence of these tasks in the field study conducted prior to this study. Results of the survey revealed a mean frequency of 4.51, SD = .65, with a mean duration of 4.02, SD = .76. Principals reported that they very frequently—daily/almost daily spend time engaged in these tasks during the course of a school year, and they spend quite a bit of time engaged in these activities. Such tasks also included routine paperwork, preparation of memos, and time spent making agendas for meetings or other activities.

Overall for ISLLC: 2008 Standard 3, the mean frequency of tasks was 3.55, SD = .86, with a mean duration of 3.35, SD = .82. Principals reported that they often spent time on these tasks, and engaged in these activities for a moderate amount of time. The range of task frequency was between 3.16, participating in non-instructional school events, and 4.37, engaging in tasks related to school operations. The range of task duration was between 3.07, engaging in routine communication tasks, to 4.11, engaging in tasks related to school operations. The mean task frequency and duration for each item under Standard 3 is reported in Table 6.

Table 6. ISLLC Standard 3: Organizational Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Mean Task Frequency</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean Task Duration</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 16: School Operations</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 17: Human</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Item 18: Finance</td>
<td>Item 19: School Events</td>
<td>Item 20: Meetings/training</td>
<td>Item 21: Routine Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

**Frequency of task**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) rarely/never</td>
<td>infrequently</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>very frequently-daily/almost daily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Duration of time spent engaged in task....**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) no time</td>
<td>very little time</td>
<td>a moderate amount of time</td>
<td>quite a bit of time</td>
<td>a great deal of time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ISLLC: 2008 Standard 4.** An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

Three survey items were related to Standard 4 and the ISLLC functions under this standard. Each survey question used a five point numerical response scale with the numeral 1 indicating the lowest task frequency or duration and the numeral 5 indicating the highest task frequency or duration.

**Function A: Collect and analyze data and information about the educational environment.**

A survey question was not used for this function as it was determined by the researcher that this function was subsumed under ISLLC Standard One, survey question two.
Function B. Promote an understanding, appreciation, and use of the community's diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources.

Survey Question 22: Promote positive community relations within the school community.

Results of the survey revealed that principals engaged in tasks related to community relations with a mean frequency of 4.00, SD = .82, and a mean duration of 3.61, SD = .90. Principals reported performing these tasks often and spending a moderate amount of time engaged in these tasks.

Function C. Build and sustain positive relations with families.

Survey Question 23. Promote and sustain effective parent/caregiver relationships.

Results of the survey revealed that principals engaged in tasks related to promoting and sustaining effective parent/caregiver relations with a mean frequency of 3.95, SD = .97, with a mean duration of 3.48, SD = .99. Principals reported performing these tasks often and spending a moderate amount of time engaged in these tasks.

Function D. Build and sustain productive relationships with community partners.

Survey Question 24. Engage in tasks to facilitate business and community partnerships.

Results of the survey revealed that principals engaged in tasks related to facilitating business partnerships with a mean frequency of 2.75, SD = 1.0, with a mean duration of 2.51, SD = .76. Principals reported performing these tasks often and spending a moderate amount of time engaged in these tasks.

Overall for Standard 4, principals reported often engaging in tasks related to the standard and estimated spending a moderate amount of time on these
tasks. The mean task frequency and duration for Standard 4 is reported in Table 7.

Table 7. ISLLC Standard 4: Family and Community Collaboration

Mean Task Frequency and Task Duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Task Frequency</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean Task Duration</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 22: Community relations</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 23: Parent relations</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 24: Business partnerships</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

Frequency of task

1  2  3  4  5
(a) rarely/never infrequently occasionally often very frequently-daily/almost daily

Duration of time spent engaged in task....

1  2  3  4  5
(b) no time very little time a moderate quite a bit a great deal amount of time of time of time

ISLLC: 2008 Standard 5. An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Three survey questions were related to this standard and the three ISLLC functions. Each survey question used a five point numerical response scale with the numeral 1 indicating the lowest task frequency or duration and the numeral 5 indicating the highest task frequency or duration.
Function A. Ensure a system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success.

Survey question 25. Ensure accountability for the success of a range of student learners; e.g., second language learners, Title I, special education, gifted students.

Results of the survey revealed a mean frequency of 3.92, SD = .61, with a mean duration of 3.23, SD = 1.12. Principals reported that they often spent time engaged in tasks related to ensuring the success of a range of student learners, and spent a moderate amount of time engaged in these tasks. The standard deviation for duration of time was notably high in relation to that on other tasks, indicating greater variation between participants on the amount of time spent on this task.

Two survey questions were included that reflected the intent of ISLLC functions B, C, and D. Survey question 26 was included because it consistently evident in principal practice in the results of the field study conducted prior to this study. This item was not tied to any one function, but rather to all three of the following functions.

Survey question 26. Ensure fair and appropriate disciplinary practices with students and staff.

Results of the survey revealed a mean frequency of 4.10, SD = .96, with a mean duration of 3.84, SD = .99. Principals reported often spending quite a bit of time on disciplinary tasks with students and staff. This one of the highest principal practices on the survey in terms of both frequency and duration: the majority of principal participants, 79%, reported that during the course of a school
year they often or very frequently/almost daily engage in disciplinary tasks and spend quite a bit or a great deal of time on these tasks.

Function B. Model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior.

This function did not have a directly related survey question due to the difficulty in measuring tasks which would correspond with the item. Survey question 27 combined the intent of both functions B and C.

Function C. Consider and evaluate potential moral and legal consequences of decision-making.

Survey question 27: Actively model reflective, ethical, and legal practices with others.

Results of the survey revealed a mean frequency of 4.25, SD = .84, with a mean duration of 3.66, SD = 3.66, SD = .36. Principals reported that they often spent quite a bit of time engaged in tasks related to modeling reflective, ethical, and legal practices with others.

Function D. Promote social justice and ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

This item did not have a directly related survey question due to the difficulty in measuring tasks related to the promotion of social justice. The practice of meeting individual needs was determined to be related to survey questions 25 and 27 and was therefore not included as a separate survey question.

Overall, for ISLLC: 2008 Standard 5 there was a mean task frequency of 4.09, SD = .80, and a mean task duration of 3.58, SD = .82. Principals reported engaging in parent and community relations tasks often, and spent quite a bit of
time engaged in these tasks. There was a task frequency range from 3.93, engaging in tasks to account for a range of student learners, to 4.25, modeling reflective, ethical, and legal practices. The mean task duration ranged from 3.23, accounting for a range of student learners, to 3.84, tasks related to appropriate disciplinary practices (Table 8).

Table 8. ISLLC: 2008 Standard 5: Acts with Integrity, Fairness, and in an Ethical Manner

Mean Task Frequency and Task Duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 25: Accountability for a range of learners</th>
<th>Mean Frequency</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean Duration</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 26: Appropriate disciplinary practices</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 27: Model ethical, reflective, legal practices</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

Frequency of task

1 2 3 4 5
(a) rarely/never infrequently occasionally often very frequently-daily/almost daily

Duration of time spent engaged in task....

1 2 3 4 5
(b) no time very little time a moderate amount of time quite a bit of time a great deal of time
ISLLC Standard 6. An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Three survey questions were related to Standard 6 and the corresponding functions. Each survey question used a five point numerical response scale with the numeral 1 indicating the lowest task frequency or duration and the numeral 5 indicating the highest task frequency or duration.

**Function A. Advocate for children, families, and caregivers.**

*Survey question 28. Provide advocacy for/meet needs of students and families using community resources: e.g., public health, social services, legal, and welfare services.*

Results of the survey revealed a mean frequency of 3.08, SD = .89, with a mean duration of 3.11, SD = .86. Principals reported that they occasionally engaged in tasks related to providing advocacy for/meeting the needs of students and families using community resources, and spent a moderate amount of time engaged in these tasks.

**Function B. Act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning.**

*Survey Question 29: Participate in local, state, and/or national professional organizations or events that promote student success.*

Results of the survey revealed a mean frequency of 2.62, SD = .80, with a mean duration of 2.34, SD = .60. Principals reported occasionally engaging in activities related to participation in professional organizations, and spent very little time on these tasks.

**Function C. Assess, analyze, and anticipate emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt leadership strategies.**
Survey Question 30: Engage in reflective or professional development tasks which assist in development of future leadership strategies, e.g., change leadership, adapting to changing demographics, etc.

Results of the survey revealed a mean frequency of 3.03, SD = .70, with a mean duration of 2.67, SD = .83. Principals reported that they occasionally spent a moderate amount of time engaged in tasks related to principal professional development.

Overall for ISLLC: 2008 Standard 6, there was a mean task frequency of 2.91, SD = .80, with a mean task duration of 2.70, SD = .76. Principals reported occasionally engaging in tasks related to understanding and response to external contexts, and spent a moderate amount of time on these activities. The task frequency ranged from 2.62, involvement in professional organizations, to 3.08, advocacy for students and families. The task duration ranged from 2.34, involvement in professional organizations, to 3.11, advocacy for students and families. The mean task frequency and duration for each question related to Standard 6 is reported in Table 9.

Table 9. ISLLC Standard 6: Understands, Responds to, and Influences the Larger Political, Social, Economic, Legal, and Cultural Context

Mean Task Frequency and Task Duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item Description</th>
<th>Mean Task Frequency</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean Task Duration</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy for students and families</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in professional organizations</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 30:
Principal professional growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3.03</th>
<th>.70</th>
<th>2.70</th>
<th>.76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

**Frequency of task**

1 2 3 4 5
(a) rarely/never infrequently occasionally often very frequently-
daily/almost daily

**Duration of time spent engaged in task...**

1 2 3 4 5
(b) no time very little time a moderate quite a bit a great deal
amount of time of time of time

Overall for Standards 1 – 6, principals estimated that they performed all of
the tasks to some degree for varying amounts of time, and tasks were performed
with greater frequency than duration (Figure 2).
Research Question 2: In what ways do the tasks performed by elementary principals vary by poverty level, as measured by the percentage of Title I student enrollment?

In order to examine whether significant differences between high and low poverty schools were evident in tasks performed by principals, t - tests for equality of means were performed to compare the frequency and duration of tasks for both groups. Examination of the descriptive statistics on task frequency (Table 10) revealed mean frequencies ranging from 2.8 to 4.2, with ISLLC Standard 6 having a lower frequency rate than the other five standards.

Table 10. Descriptive Statistics: Frequency of Principal Tasks for Low and High Title I Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>%Title I</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 1</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequency with which principals estimated task performance related to the Educational Policy Leadership Standards: ISLLC 2008 during a school year is summarized in Table 11.

Table 11. Frequency of Principal Tasks performed by Principals in Schools with Low/High Title I Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 1</td>
<td>-1.560</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>-.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 2</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 3</td>
<td>-.575</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 4</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 5</td>
<td>-.730</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>-.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 6</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at $\alpha < .05$
For the frequency of tasks performed by principals in low and high percentage Title I schools, no significant differences were found on the six ISLLC: 2008 Standards.

Estimation of Principal Task Duration by ISLLC Standard

To determine if a difference in duration existed between the frequency and duration of tasks performed by principals in low and high percentage Title I schools for each ISLLC standard, t tests for equality of means were run. For two of the standards a significant difference was found. Examination of the descriptive statistics for principal task duration for the six ISLLC: 2008 Standards (Table 12) revealed a mean task duration ranging from 2.6 to 4.0, with the lowest duration of time spent on tasks categorized under ISLLC Standard 6 for both low and high percentage Title I schools. Standard 6 states that the school leader “promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context” (CCSSO, 2008, p. 5). For this standard, the mean duration of time was equal for principals in the schools with low and high Title I enrollment, with an average of 2.6. This indicates that principals in the sample reported spending “very little time” to a “moderate amount of time” on tasks related to this standard. For standards 2, 3, 4, and 6, there were no significant differences between principals in schools with low or high Title I enrollment in the duration of time spent on the tasks related to these standards. Significantly, however, examination of the descriptive statistics of the low and high percentage Title I schools revealed a higher mean duration
for high percentage Title I schools on every standard, with the exception of Standard 6, which was the same for both low and high percentage Title I schools.

Table 12. *Duration of Principal Tasks Performed in Schools with Low/High Title Enrollment: Descriptive Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>% Title I</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 1</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 2</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 3</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 4</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 5</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 6</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 reports the results of the t-tests. Standard 1 states that an educational leader "promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders" (CCSSO, 2008, p. 3). For this standard, principals at schools with high Title 1 enrollment spent significantly greater amounts of time ($M = 3.8$, $SD = .66$) than principals at low percentage Title I schools ($M = 3.4$, $SD = .60$), $t = (-2.478, 46.37)$, $p = .017$. Standard 5 states that an educational leader "promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner" (CCSSO,
2008, p. 4). For this standard, principals at schools with high Title I enrollment spent significantly greater amounts of time than principals at low percentage Title I schools (M = 4.2, SD = .59), t = (-2.221, 59), p = .030.

Table 13. Principal Duration of Tasks by ISLLC Standard: Comparison of Principal Responses in Schools with Low and High Title I Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 1</td>
<td>-2.523</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.017*</td>
<td>-.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 2</td>
<td>-1.262</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>-.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 3</td>
<td>-1.579</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 4</td>
<td>-.712</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>-.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 5</td>
<td>-2.221</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.030*</td>
<td>-.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 6</td>
<td>-.300</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at α<.05

Research Question 3: What is the level of congruence between the tasks performed by elementary principals and the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008?

In Part III of the Principal Workday Study, principals were asked to record the tasks in which they were engaged during a five day workweek in a log which was divided into 15 minute time increments. The Principal Workday Log had been previously field-tested by elementary principals, where it was determined that due to the overlapping nature of the tasks in which they engaged that the log was most easily completed by participants in short-answer, paper-pencil format. Participants were instructed to complete the log for a period of five consecutive
workdays and then to return it by mail in a prepaid mailing envelope to the researcher for coding and analysis. A total of 36 logs from 24 states were returned and were then hand-coded by the researcher and a second trained coder using a coding manual developed by the researcher. The frequency of tasks was coded on each participant using a numeric count in each of the 30 categories used in the Workday survey. Task frequency was counted by the number of occurrences, while task duration was counted by hours using time increments of .25 of one hour. With the exception of question 12 related to protection of instructional time, at least one occurrence of each of the 30 items was counted.

Results of Worklog Task Frequency and Duration

Examination of worklog task frequency and duration revealed that the six highest rankings were identical, in the following order:

1. Communication
2. Organizational management
3. Instructional supervision
4. Positive learning environment
5. Discipline, and
6. Accountability for a range of student learners.

During the sample workweek, principals reported most frequently performing tasks related to these categories and spent the most time on the same tasks in order of frequency/duration. Other tasks performed by principals were ranked in the following order:
7. Parent relations  
8. Finance  
9. Student assessment  
10. Community relations  
11. Placement/monitoring  
12. Use of data  
13. Human resources  
14. Principal development  
15. Attend meetings  
16. Staff development  
17. School events  
18. Curriculum  
19. Develop school improvement plan  
20. Instructional technology  
21. (Tie) Culture of trust, high expectations; business partnerships  
23. Ongoing improvement  
24. Professional organizations  
25. Monitor school improvement  
26. Reflective, ethical, and legal practices  
27. Vision and mission  
28. Promote leadership capacity  
29. Advocate – student needs  
30. Protect instructional time  

Ranking of principal task frequency during the sample workweek with the corresponding ISLLC: 2008 standard is provided in Table 14. Principals reported most often performing tasks – and performing these tasks for the longest cumulative periods of time - related to ISLLC Standards 2, 3, and 5: organizational management, school culture and instructional program, and acting with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manner. The frequency of task
performance was consistently higher than the duration with which the tasks were
performed: principals performed a high number of tasks for relatively short
periods of time. In terms of both frequency and duration, ISLLC Standard 4,
family and community collaboration, was ranked between these tasks and those
categorized in Standards 1 and 6, developing a shared vision and mission and
understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social,
economic, legal, and cultural contexts.

Table 14. Principal Task Frequency Worklog Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Worklog: Frequency of Tasks performed during sample school week</th>
<th>rank</th>
<th>question</th>
<th>ISLLC Standard</th>
<th>description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>* 1</td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td>organizational management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>instructional supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>positive learning environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5 6</td>
<td>range of learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4 7</td>
<td>parent relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3 8</td>
<td>finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2 9</td>
<td>student assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4 10</td>
<td>community relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 11</td>
<td>placement/monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 12</td>
<td>use of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3 13</td>
<td>human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6 14</td>
<td>principal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>* 15</td>
<td>attend meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3 16</td>
<td>staff development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>* 17</td>
<td>school events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 18</td>
<td>curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 19</td>
<td>develop school improvement plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 20</td>
<td>instructional technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 21</td>
<td>culture of trust, high expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6 22</td>
<td>ongoing improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1 23</td>
<td>professional organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 24</td>
<td>monitor school improvement plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1 25</td>
<td>reflective, ethical, legal practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 26</td>
<td>vision &amp; mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6 27</td>
<td>promote leadership capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6 28</td>
<td>advocate – student needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As previously noted, the six highest ranked tasks for duration for the sample workweek were identical to the tasks ranked highest in frequency, in the following order:

1. Communication
2. Organizational management
3. Instructional supervision
4. Positive learning environment
5. Discipline
6. Meet the needs of a range of student learners.

Of the remaining tasks performed during the sample workweek, the following tasks were ranked from 7th – 30th in terms of the average amount of time spent:

*Task not specified by ISLLC: 2008 Standards

**Duration rankings 7 – 30.**

7. Attend meetings
8. Parent relations
9. Student assessment
10. Use of data
11. Finance
12. School events
13. Staff development
   Community relations
15. Principal professional development
16. Curriculum
17. Placement/monitoring
18. Professional organizations
19. Human resources
20. Develop school improvement plan
21. Instructional technology
22. Ongoing improvement
   Culture of trust; high expectations
   Business/community partnerships
25. Monitor school improvement plan
26. Promote and sustain a shared vision and mission
   Model reflective, ethical, and legal practices
28. Promote leadership capacity
29. Advocate for student/family needs using community resources
30. Protect instructional time: no instances of this task were noted by principals

The comparison of estimated time spent during a work year and the average amount of time spent during the sample workweek is indicated in Table 15.

Table 15. Principal Task Duration and Worklog Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Workday log: Duration of tasks performed during a sample school week</th>
<th>rank</th>
<th>ISLLC Standard</th>
<th>question</th>
<th>description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>organizational management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>instructional supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>positive learning environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>range of learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>attend meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>parent relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>student assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>use of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>school events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>staff development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>community relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>principal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>placement/monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rank</td>
<td>question</td>
<td>description</td>
<td>rank</td>
<td>question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>organizational management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>instructional supervision</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>positive learning environment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>discipline</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>range of learners</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>parent relations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>finance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>student assessment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>community relations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>placement/monitoring</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>use of data</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>human resources</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>principal development</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>attend meetings</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>staff development</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>school events</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>curriculum</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>develop school improvement plan</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emergent Codes from Principal Workday Logs

Eight emergent codes were evident in the Principal Workday logs (Appendix G). They were classified in the following categories:

1. Facilitate positive staff relationships (total task frequency = 32; total duration = 19.23 hours)

   Tasks in this category included those activities performed by principals of behalf of staff members that were not subsumed in the theme establish positive school climate/positive interactions with students. These tasks were of a more personal, non-instructional nature than tasks related to overall school climate, and were therefore considered an emergent code. Such tasks included preparing lunch for the staff and calling a teacher with a new baby, and of the emergent codes were ranked 5th for both frequency of occurrence and duration of time spent on these tasks during the workweek. The principal’s engagement...
in these tasks provided a message to staff members of caring and approachability. When the principal is able to "encourage the heart" (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 22) of those in the school, shared commitment is facilitated to achieve the vision and mission of the school.

2. *Personal tasks/travel (total frequency = 66; total duration = 34.5 hours)*

   Tasks were included in this category if they occurred during the course of the school day after arrival at school and were not specifically related to work, e.g., travel to a school district meeting during the day and return to school. Inclusion of these tasks as an emergent code enabled the researcher to more accurately quantify the ways in which principals completed multiple school-related tasks even when not at school: e.g., returning to school from a medical appointment, or calling the school office while in the car. Principals seldom consistently reported their own lunchtimes during the day in the workday logs: when lunch was noted, it was usually noted with interruptions and for a short duration. For those who did not note their own lunchtime, it was not possible to determine whether their schedule did not permit lunch or if they omitted this task in the workday logs. These tasks were ranked 4th in both frequency and duration of the eight emergent codes. What was more striking, however, was not the frequency and duration of personal/travel tasks but the relative lack of time with which principals engaged in such tasks. This finding suggested a mentality of servant leadership by principal participants, putting the needs of others first.

3. *Administrative communication (total frequency = 87; total duration = 57.25 hours)*
These were defined as tasks relating to communication between administrators and office staff, other administrators, or school division personnel. This theme referred specifically to interactions with staff or other school administrators specifically related to school operations and/or instructional leadership responsibilities. The tasks in this category were ranked 3rd in frequency and 2nd in duration of the eight emergent codes. It is significant that this task was an additional task related to communication, a recurring theme in the study. While it was a recurring theme in the principal workday logs, the communication between principal and other administrators and/or office staff occurred relatively less often than that between principals, staff, and students. It appeared that principals in this study prioritized communication with teachers and learners. It is also possible, however, that this finding may be related to the relative lack of other administrators in many schools/districts: as recently as 1998, 80% of principals reported that an assistant principal was not assigned to their school (Protheroe, 2008, p. 48).

4. School meetings (total frequency = 118; total duration = 85.75 hours)
   School meetings were defined as in-school meetings held for non-specified purposes, including grade level meetings, staff meetings, and district meetings held in the schools of principal participants. This emergent category received the highest ranking in both frequency of occurrences and duration of time spent by principals during the sample workweek. The purpose of school meetings may be assumed to be communication regarding school-related issues by those in the school community: grade levels, departments, school district personnel, and school administrators. When considered in this context, the
finding that this emergent category had the highest ranking is consistent with the finding that of the 30 workday log categories, communication was also the highest ranked task in both frequency and duration. Simply put: “Words matter.” (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 57).

5. **Informal staff communication (total frequency = 101; total duration = 37.25 hours)**

   This activity was defined as brief interactions between principal and staff members other than in meetings, including phrases with the words *chat, greet,* or *talk with* staff/teachers. This task was performed frequently by principals for short periods of time throughout the day and workweek and ranked 2"nd of the emergent categories for frequency of occurrences and 3rd for duration of time spent engaged in the task. These brief interactions by principals served two major purposes: they promoted a positive school climate and sent a message to staff members of the principal’s accessibility and willingness to engage in communication, however brief. Because effective communication is by nature interactive, the willingness of the principal to listen intently to staff members is equally important in order to encourage the trust of others (Tschannen-Moran, 2004).

6. **Crisis situations (total frequency = 5; total duration = 10.5 hours).**

   Crisis situations involved immediate response by the principal and were related to situations such as the death of a student, loss of electrical power or heat, or the need to contact law enforcement agencies regarding threats to the safety and well-being of those in the school. These were noted sporadically in the workday logs and were unpredictable in frequency of occurrence and
duration of time spent by principals, ranking 7th in frequency and 6th in duration. While these were incidents that could not be anticipated, the manner in which principals respond to such critical incidents sends a powerful message to those in the school community regarding the values and priorities of the principal (Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Stronge et al, in press).

7. *Teaching (total frequency = 1; total duration = 2.00 hours).*

This category included instances in which principals engaged in direct instruction with students, typically evidenced by phrases such as “covered class” or “worked with small group.” This task was performed by only one participant for moderate periods of time, and ranked 8th in both frequency of occurrence and duration of time spent by principals. While it was clear that the workdays of principal participants in this study did not allow time to engage in classroom teaching, it was striking that this task was so rare among participants. It should be noted, however, that this task may have been under-represented due to the small sample size of those who completed the workday logs.

8. *Comments from participants*

This category included any written comments noted in the workday logs by participants that were not included in the coding system (Appendix E). These were not measured in frequency of occurrence or duration of time spent, but provided glimpses into the workdays and school climate of elementary principals. The comments were most often explanatory notes to the researcher regarding why tasks occurred or did not occur, but occasionally provided a touch of humor in a principal’s long and busy workday.
The comparison of task frequency and duration obtained from the Principal Workday Logs for the six standards, emergent codes, and the tasks unrelated to ISLLC: 2008 Standards and functions is illustrated in Figure 3.

Figure 3. Workday Log Task Frequency and Duration by Standard, Emergent Codes, and Non – ISLLC Related Tasks

Results of the Workday Log revealed that Task 21, communication, was more frequently performed than any group of tasks under Standards 1 – 6 as well as those tasks classified as emergent codes or tasks unrelated to the ISLLC: 2008 standards. Principals performed routine communication tasks during the workweek with a high cumulative frequency and a relatively high cumulative duration, with the duration of time spent similar to that spent on tasks under Standards 2 and 3.
Research Question 4: What is the level of congruence between the tasks in which principals are reportedly engaged during the school year with tasks in which they are engaged during a sample workweek?

Comparison of tasks performed by principals during the course of the year as measured by the Principal Workday Survey with tasks performed during a sample workweek as measured by Principal Workday Logs was conducted to determine the level of congruence between estimated time on tasks with actual time spent. Principals reported engaging in all of the 30 tasks included in the survey to some degree during the course of a school year. During the sample workweek, all items were represented to some degree in the Principal Workday logs with the exception of survey question 12, related to protection of instructional time. A comparison of frequency and estimated time spent during the school year and the sample workweek on tasks related to ISLLC functions is provided in Tables 17 and 18.

Table 17. Comparison of Task Frequency: Principal Workyear and Workweek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Yearly Frequency</th>
<th>Weekly Workday Log Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (tie)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (tie)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In comparison, estimated time spent on tasks during the work year with time spent during a workweek is provided in Table 18.

### Table 18. Comparison of Task Duration: Principal Workyear and Workweek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Yearly Duration</th>
<th>Weekly Workday Log Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (tie)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Instructional supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparative Analysis of Survey/Workday log Items and ISLLC: 2008 Functions

Survey/Workday log Task 1: Communicate a shared vision and mission of learning

Principals estimated on the survey that during the course of a school year they often performed tasks related to vision and mission and spent a moderate amount of time on these tasks. During the sample workweek for 36 principals, this task was performed one time, with a total of one hour spent on the task. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample frequency rank for this task was 27 with a duration ranking of 26.

Survey/Workday log Task 2: Use of data to assess progress toward
school goals

Principals estimated on the survey that during the course of the school year they *often* spent time on data analysis and spent *quite a bit of time* engaged in this task. During the sample workweek for 36 principals, this task was performed with a cumulative frequency of 25, with a cumulative total of 29.75 hours spent on the task. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample frequency rank for this task was 12 with a duration ranking of 10.

*Survey/Workday log Task 3: Develop and implement a school improvement стратегический план.*

Principals estimated on the survey that during the course of the year they *often* spent time developing and implementing a school improvement/strategic plan and spent *a moderate amount of time* on the task. During the sample workweek for 36 principals, this task was performed with a cumulative frequency of 13, with a cumulative total of 11.5 hours spent on the task. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample frequency rank was 19 with a duration ranking of 20.

*Survey/Workday log Task 4: Engage in tasks related to ongoing, sustainable improvement.*

Principals estimated on the survey that during the course of the year they *often* spend *quite a bit of time* engaged in tasks relating to ongoing improvement of the school. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, this task was performed with a cumulative frequency of four, with a cumulative total of 3.75 hours spent on the task. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample rank for frequency was 23 with a duration rank of 22.
Survey/Workday log Task 5: Monitor progress toward school improvement objectives.

Principals estimated on the survey that during the course of the year they often monitor progress on school improvement objectives and spend quite a bit of time on this task. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, this task was performed with a cumulative frequency of two, with a cumulative total of 1.75 hours spent on the task. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample rank was 25 for both frequency and duration of the task.

Survey/Workday log Task 6: Promote a culture of trust and high expectations.

Principals estimated on the survey that during the course of the year they often spend quite a bit of time on promoting a positive school culture with high expectations. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, this task was performed with a cumulative frequency of 5, with a cumulative total of 5.25 hours spent on the task. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample rank for frequency was 21 with a duration rank of 22.

Survey/Workday log Task 7: Engage in tasks related to development, pacing and/or monitoring of curriculum.

Principals estimated on the survey that during the course of the year they often engage in tasks related to curriculum and spend a moderate amount of time on these tasks. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, this task was performed with a cumulative frequency of 14 and a cumulative duration of 20.75 hours. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample rank for frequency was 18 with a cumulative duration rank of 16.

Survey/Workday log Task 8. Promote a positive learning
environment/have positive interactions with students.

Principals estimated on the survey that during the course of the year they often spend quite a bit of time engaged in tasks related to providing a positive learning environment for students. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, this task was performed with a cumulative frequency of 159, with a cumulative duration of 82.25 hours. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample rank for both frequency and duration was 4.

Survey/Workday log Task 9: Formal and informal supervision of instruction.

Principals estimated on the survey that during the course of the year they often supervise instruction and spend quite a bit of time on this task. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, this task was performed for a cumulative total of 178 with a cumulative duration of 129.25 hours. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample rank for both frequency and duration was 3.

Survey/Workday log Task 10: Engage in tasks related to student placement and monitoring of student progress.

Principals reported on the survey that during the course of the year they often spend a moderate amount of time on tasks related to student placement and monitoring. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, this task was performed with a cumulative frequency of 29 with a cumulative duration of 18.5 hours. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample rank for frequency was 11 with a duration rank of 17.

Survey/Workday log Task 11: Promote the instructional leadership capacities of staff.
Principals reported on the survey that during the course of the year they often engage in tasks related to promoting staff leadership and spend a moderate amount of time on these tasks. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, this task was performed one time with a cumulative duration of .25 hours. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample rank for both frequency and duration was 28.

Survey/Workday log Task 12: Engage in tasks which maximize and protect instructional time.

Principals reported on the survey that during the course of the year they often spend a moderate amount of time engaged in tasks related to maximizing instructional time. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, this task was not noted in any worklogs and therefore had a cumulative frequency and duration of 0. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample rank for both frequency and duration was 30.

Survey/Workday log Task 13: Promote the use of instructional technology for teaching and learning.

Principals reported on the survey that during the course of the year they occasionally engaged in tasks related to promoting instructional technology and spend a moderate amount of time on this task. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, the cumulative frequency for this task was 16, with a cumulative duration of 10.5 hours. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample rank for frequency was 20 and the duration rank was 21.

Survey/Workday log Task 14: Plan and implement school/division staff development activities.
Principals reported on the survey during the course of the year that they often engaged in tasks related to staff development and spend a moderate amount of time on these tasks. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, the cumulative frequency of this task was 20 with a cumulative duration of 25.5 hours. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample rank for frequency was 16 and the duration rank was 14.

Survey/Workday log Task 15: Engage in tasks related to student assessment.

Principals reported that during the course of the year they often spend time on tasks related to student assessment and spend a moderate amount of time on these tasks. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, the cumulative frequency of this task was 42 with a cumulative duration of 34.5 hours. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample rank for both frequency and duration was 9.

Survey/Workday log Task 16: Monitor and attend to school operations

Principals reported that during the course of the year they often spend a great deal of time on tasks related to school operations. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, the cumulative frequency of this task was 489 with a cumulative duration of 230.25 hours. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample rank for both frequency and duration was 2.

Survey/Workday log Task 17: Engage in tasks related to human resources.

Principals reported that during the course of the year they occasionally engaged in tasks related to human resources and spend a moderate amount of
time engaged in these tasks. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, the cumulative frequency of this task was 24 with a cumulative duration of 13.25 hours. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample rank for frequency was 13 and the rank for duration was 19.

Survey/Workday log Task 18: Engage in tasks related to finance, budget, grants, or other resources.

Principals reported that during the course of the year they occasionally engage in tasks related school finance and spend a moderate amount of time on these tasks. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, the cumulative frequency of this task was 60 with a cumulative duration of 28.5 hours. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample rank for frequency was 8 and the rank for duration was 11.

The following three tasks, numbers 19 through 21, were not directly related to the Educational Leadership ISLLC: 2008 standards or functions but were included due to their emergence in the Principal Workday field study.

Survey/Workday log Task 19: Planning, scheduling, attending non-academic school events.

Principals reported that during the course of the year they occasionally engage in tasks related to non-academic school events and spend a moderate amount of time engaged in these tasks. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, the cumulative frequency of this task rank of this task was 19 with a cumulative duration of 28 hours. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample rank for frequency was 17 with a duration rank of 12.
Survey/Workday log Task 20: Attend school district meetings, workshops, or training

Principals reported that during the course of the year they occasionally attend school district meetings, workshops, or training and spend a moderate amount of time engaged in these tasks. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, the cumulative frequency rank of this task was 23 with a cumulative duration of 48. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample rank for frequency was 23 with a duration rank of 48.

Survey/Workday log Task 21: Engage in routine communication tasks unrelated to instruction.

Principals reported that during the course of the school year they occasionally engage in activities related to communication and spend a moderate amount of time engaged in these tasks. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, the cumulative frequency rank of this task was 767 with a cumulative duration of 276.75 hours. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample rank for both frequency and duration was 1: principals performed communication tasks the most often and spent the most time on these tasks during the sample week.

Survey/Workday log Task 22: Promote positive community relations within the school community.

Principals reported that during the course of the school year they often spend quite a bit of time on community relations tasks. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, the cumulative frequency of the task was 36 with a cumulative duration of 25.5 hours. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample rank for frequency was 10 and the duration rank was 13.
Survey/Workday log Task 23: Promote and sustain effective parent/caregiver relations.

Principals reported that during the course of a school year they often spend a moderate amount of time on parent relations tasks. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, the cumulative frequency of the task was 81 with a cumulative duration of 42 hours. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample rank for frequency was 7 and duration rank was 8.

Survey/Workday log Task 24: Engage in tasks to facilitate business and community partnerships.

Principals reported that during the course of a school year they occasionally engage in tasks related to facilitating business and community partnerships and spend a moderate amount of time on these tasks. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, the cumulative frequency of the task was 11 with a cumulative duration of 5.25 hours. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the workweek sample rank for frequency was 21 and the duration rank was 24.

Survey/Workday log Task 25: Ensure the accountability for the success of a range of student learners.

Principals reported that during the course of a school year they often engage in tasks related to ensuring the success of a range of learners and spend a moderate amount of time engaged in this task. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, the cumulative frequency of the task was 106 with a cumulative duration of 61.75 hours. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the ranks for both frequency and duration were 6.

Survey/Workday log Task 26: Ensure fair and appropriate disciplinary practices with students and staff,
Principals reported that during the course of a school year they *often* spend *quite a bit of time* engaged in disciplinary activities. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, the cumulative frequency of the task was 146 with a cumulative duration of 79.75 hours. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the ranks for both frequency and duration were 5.

*Survey/Workday log Task 27: Actively model reflective, ethical, and legal practices with others.*

Principals reported that during the course of a school year they *often* model reflective, ethical, and legal practices with others and spend *a moderate amount of time* engaged in this task. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, the cumulative frequency of the task was 2 with a cumulative duration of 1 hour. Of the 30 survey/worklog items, the frequency rank was 26 and the duration rank was 27.

*Survey/Workday log Task 28: Provide advocacy for/meet needs of students and families using community resources.*

Principals reported that during the course of a school year they *occasionally* engage in tasks related to providing advocacy and meeting the needs of students and families using community resources, and they spend *a moderate amount of time* engaged in this task. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, the cumulative frequency was 1 and the duration was .25 hours. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the frequency rank was 29 and the duration rank was 28.

*Survey/Workday log Task 29: Participate in local, state, and/or national professional organizations that promote student success.*
Principals reported that during the course of the school year they occasionally engage in tasks related to principal professional organizations and spend a moderate amount of time engaged in these tasks. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, the cumulative frequency was 3 with a cumulative duration of 14 hours. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the frequency rank was 24 and the duration rank was 18.

Survey/Workday log Task 30: Engage in professional development tasks which assist in development of future leadership strategies.

Principals reported that during the course of the school year they occasionally engage in principal professional development tasks and spend a moderate amount of time engaged in these tasks. During a sample workweek for 36 principals, the cumulative frequency was 11 with a cumulative duration of 23.5 hours. Of the 30 survey/workday log items, the frequency rank was 14 and the duration rank was 15.

A comparison of the estimated task frequency during the principals' work year and frequency of tasks during the sample workweek is provided in Figure 4.
A comparison of the estimated task duration during the principals’ work year and the duration of tasks during the sample work week is provided in Figure 5.
Figure 5. Task Duration Comparison: Survey and Workday Log

Survey Versus Worklog Duration

![Bar chart showing task duration comparison between survey and worklog.](chart.png)
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

Being an effective building manager used to be good enough. For the past century, principals were expected to comply with district level edicts, address personnel issues, order supplies, balance program budgets, keep hallways and playgrounds safe, put out fires that threatened public relations, and make sure that busing and meal services were operating smoothly. And principals still need to do all those things. But now they must do more. (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2000, p. 2).

Dramatic changes have occurred in the expectations of principals in the past decade. In an era of accountability for instructional outcomes, principals are held directly responsible for the success of all students and are second only to teachers with regard to their influence on student achievement (Marzano et al, 2005). The results of this study, however, confirm that principals are still highly engaged in managerial activities as well as those related to teaching and learning: they are both building managers and instructional leaders – and much more. While it is evident from the results of the study that principals take their instructional leadership role very seriously, it is equally evident that they do whatever it takes in order to ensure the smooth operation of the school and the well-being of students and staff. This finding was confirmed by both the survey of tasks reportedly performed during the school year as well as by the findings in the weeklong workday logs, a sample of time in the principals’ year. The sample of elementary principals who participated in both parts of this study consistently
painted a picture of dedication to the tasks required in the job – often unexpected
tasks – working long hours, simultaneously engaging in multiple tasks, and
handling situations ranging from humorous to catastrophic in nature. Despite
long hours on the job, most participants then took work home and repeated a
similar pattern over the week and even the year: the principals’ work was never
done.

Conclusions

Part I of the Principal Workday Survey consisted of a brief survey
designed to confirm the homogeneity of the principal participants and the school
demographic conditions in which they worked. The responses confirmed factors
such as the percentage of Title I (poverty rate) in the schools, and the identity of
the principals: when these findings were determined to be accurate, the identity
of participants was concealed by use of numerical codes. Participants also
voluntarily provided personal, professional, and school demographic information
unavailable to the researcher which provided additional relevant data to the
findings of the study.

Additionally, phone conversations with some of the participants or school
office staff members provided rich details regarding the wide variation of schools
and participants. While the majority of principals contacted by phone were
unavailable, usually reported by office staff to be in the building but engaged in
professional responsibilities, those who talked with the researcher provided
information that was sometimes unavailable in the study. Such details included
comments such as having dual roles: serving as principal in two schools, and
serving as elementary principal in the morning and high school band director in the afternoon; having a 45 mile commute to the school; reporting a school enrollment of 91; and comments regarding their own experiences in pursuing doctoral degrees. Several shared that while they were willing to participate in the study in paper form, they would not have completed an online study from an unknown researcher. In no case did a principal verbally refuse to participate in the study, however, several failed to participate after they had verbally indicated that they would do so.

The principal participants in this study represented a range of ages, ethnicity, educational levels, experience, experience in the current school, and hours spent on the job. Most held the formal title of principal, although one had the title of director and another held the title of assistant principal but served in the role of principal. The majority were between the ages of 45 – 64, with the highest percentage in the 55 – 64 year old category: less than 10% were in the age category of 24 – 34 years of age. This finding is consistent with research indicating that the median age of principals has remained consistently near the age of 50 between the years 1968 - 1998 (Protheroe, 2008). Typically school leaders have first gained experience as classroom or resource teachers/specialists before pursuing roles in school administration and therefore enter school leadership roles at relatively later ages. Additionally, the working hours and demands of the job may make the role less appealing to those with young children and family obligations.
The majority of principal participants in this study (66%) were female. This is consistent with the research indicating a steady increase in the number of female principals: between the years of 1968 – 1998 the number of female principals increased from 22% to 42%, approaching a level closer to an equal male – female ratio (Protheroe, 2008). The primary ethnicity of participants was Caucasian (88%), and most (70%) possessed a Master’s degree or a Master’s degree with additional coursework. The remaining 30% reported that they had completed or were enrolled in coursework leading to a higher educational degree: education specialist (13%) or a doctoral degree, either Ed.D. or PhD. This finding is consistent with the research indicating that over four decades, principals have become more highly educated (Protheroe, 2008). Participants in the study generally had considerable experience: 80% noted that they had served from three to ten or more years, with the largest percentage (34%) having over 10 years of experience. The largest percentage of participants (36%) had between three to five years of experience in the current school, with approximately equal numbers reporting greater or less experience in the current school.

Overall, the principal participants in this study reflected the findings of previous extant research regarding principal experience, level of education, age, and gender. In particular, the gender percentages in this study confirmed both the steady increase in female elementary school principals and the upward trend in principal educational levels in the past four decades. Principals were typically middle-aged, experienced educators and administrators with master’s degrees
plus additional graduate level coursework. Despite their long hours on the job, a surprising number were pursuing doctoral degrees. Participants represented diverse ethnicities but were most often Caucasian females. The majority of participants worked in medium-sized schools of several hundred students with a range of grade levels and with less than 50% Title I enrollment. They worked well beyond contractual hours – at school, attending evening meetings or activities, or at home. They confirmed existing research regarding both the demands and increasing expectations of the role – and that it is taking steadily longer hours for elementary principals to meet these demands. In contrast to previous findings, it appeared that the elementary principals in this study are in fact closing the gap in the amount of time spent on the job when compared to secondary school principals: both groups consistently work well beyond contractual hours. In a recent profile of two elementary principals it was concluded that:

Principals have always worn many hats that represent the ever-increasing and complex dimensions of their job. But the tasks today are more challenging than ever as they seek ways to categorize and fit together a plethora of programs, plans, and promises to determine what actually works and what is critical for success (Krajewski, 2008, p. 17).

Research Question 1: What are the nature of tasks and proportion of time spent by elementary school principals on work-related duties during the course of a school year?

To determine the nature and proportion of time spent on work-related tasks during the course of a school year, 30 survey items related to the ISLLC
Standards and functions were completed by 61 elementary principals in 34 states. Items were examined by frequency rank in order of the tasks performed most often to those performed least often, and were examined by duration rank, in order of those performed for the longest periods of time to the shortest periods of time. Four patterns of frequency and duration emerged: tasks were performed often for relatively long periods of time; tasks were performed often for relatively short periods of time; tasks were seldom performed but for relatively larger amounts of time; and tasks were seldom performed and performed for relatively short periods of time.

The difficulty in accurately capturing tasks performed by principals was evident throughout this study. Several reasons for this phenomenon were either noted by participants or were intuitive based on the timing of the study. Tasks performed by principals may fall into one or more of the following categories:

- **Episodic:** tasks which are generally specific to particular times of the year, e.g., hiring/human resources tasks which often occur before the start of a school year; and protection of instructional time, which may be evidenced by performance of tasks such as developing an effective master schedule prior to the start of the school year.

- **Variation by school division and/or state:** tasks which typically occur at times specified by the locality or state and may therefore occur at varying times throughout the year: e.g., budget and finance, student assessment, staff development, and school improvement/strategic planning.
• Tasks which are difficult to observe and quantify, or are subsumed by other tasks: e.g., developing a shared vision and mission; promoting shared leadership; modeling reflective, ethical, and legal practices; promoting ongoing improvement; protection of instructional time; curriculum-related tasks; accounting for the needs of a range of student learners; advocacy/meeting the needs of students and families using community resources; monitoring the school improvement/strategic plan.

• Ongoing tasks: those which recur throughout the year but not during specified times: e.g., instructional supervision; budget/finance; community and parent relations; establishing a positive school climate; facilitating partnerships; promoting the use of instructional technology; disciplinary tasks; school events; meetings; routine communication tasks.

Results of the survey revealed that elementary principals estimated performing tasks related to promoting a positive learning environment most often during the course of a school year, followed by promoting a culture of trust and high expectations, engaging in communication tasks, and engaging in tasks related to school operations. These tasks were also highly ranked for the duration of time spent on the tasks: principals reported often performing these tasks for considerable amounts of time during a school year. Other tasks ranked high for both frequency and duration were:

• supervision of instruction

• modeling reflective, ethical, and legal practices with others;

• sustaining ongoing improvement, and
- engaging in fair and appropriate disciplinary practices.

Overall, principals reported being highly engaged in activities related to establishing and maintaining a positive school climate, high levels of trust, and high expectations for student learning. This finding is consistent with previous research on school climate and culture: it is well-established that there is a positive relationship between school leadership and climate, and that climate is a factor related to school effectiveness (Hallinger et al, 1996; Marzano et al, 2005; Stronge et al, in press). Likewise, principals estimated that during the course of a school year they often spend considerable amounts of time in tasks involving instructional supervision, modeling reflective, ethical, and legal practices, sustaining ongoing improvement, and engaging in disciplinary practices. A common factor in these tasks is that these are activities which are generally completed during instructional hours. Comparison of the yearly frequency and duration reported on these tasks by principals with the reported number of hours worked per week suggests that principals found it necessary to prioritize tasks that must be completed during the school day, saving other tasks for before or after-school hours and thus contributing to a longer workweek.

Significantly, principals reported a high frequency and duration of tasks related to routine communication during the school year: tasks in this category were rated the third-highest of 30 tasks by principals in frequency and the fifth highest in duration, or time spent on these tasks. Principals reported that tasks including phone calls, checking and sending e-mail, and written communications occurred regularly during the year and consumed a great deal of time. Despite a
research-based connection between principal communication and school success (Marzano et al, 2005), however, this task is not specifically reflected in the ISLLC: 2008 Standards and functions.

Some tasks were reported by principals to be performed relatively more frequently but for shorter periods of time. These included:

- actively modeling reflective, ethical, and legal practices with others;
- promoting positive community relations
- promoting positive parent/caregiver relations
- engaging in tasks related to protection of instructional time
- planning and implementing staff development activities
- establishing a vision and mission shared by the school community, and
- promoting the use of instructional technology.

Those tasks related to establishing a positive school/community climate were by nature most likely to be briefer in duration, and included meeting and greeting parents and community members or response to inquiries by those in the school community. The role of school leaders in promoting effective use of instructional technology likewise recurs throughout the school year as “...principals are responsible for adopting and using technology as a seamless part of their instructional programs” (Krajewski, 2008, p. 19). Other tasks in this category were more likely to be episodic in nature: protection of instructional time may be more often performed when planning the next school year during the summer, and staff development dates are often prescribed by the local school district at specified times during the school year. Still other tasks in this category were
difficult to estimate (establishing a vision and mission shared by the school community) or were ongoing for brief and unpredictable periods of time during the year.

Other tasks were reported by principals to be performed relatively less often and for brief periods of time. These included engaging in tasks related to:

- development, pacing, and/or monitoring of curriculum
- budget and finance
- human resources
- providing advocacy for/meeting the needs of students and families using community resources
- principal professional development tasks
- facilitating community and business partnerships
- participation in local, state, and/or national professional organizations.

Some tasks in this category more likely to be episodic, occurring at certain times of the year: principals most often perform tasks related to curriculum development/pacing, school budget and human resources at times of the year specified by the school district. Monitoring of curriculum and meeting the needs of students and families is likely to occur sporadically throughout the year.

Finally, with a finite number of hours in the day principals may simply have been unable to perform all expected responsibilities for significant amounts of time. Something has to give – and it appeared that for participants in the study this most often consisted of tasks related to principal professional development, participation in local, state, and/or national professional organizations, and
facilitating community and business partnerships. As two veteran elementary school principals recently noted, their primary responsibility is to the children in their schools and on excellent teaching, both of which take a considerable amount of time and energy (Krajewski, 2008).

The tasks reported by principals to occur less frequently during the school year for relatively greater amounts of time were:

- use of data to monitor school progress
- develop and implement a school improvement/strategic plan
- attend school district meetings, and
- planning, scheduling, attending non-academic school events.

These tasks were estimated to take considerable amount of principals' time and typically occur at interval throughout the school year specified at either the district level or by the school calendar. While use of data and development of a school improvement/strategic plan are widely considered essential to school success, it is questionable whether the amount of time spent in attendance at routine district meetings and non-academic school events is beneficial to teaching and learning.

*Research Question 2: In what ways do the tasks performed by elementary principals vary depending on school poverty level, as measured by the percentage of Title I enrollment?*

In order to determine whether significant differences existed in the frequency and duration of tasks performed by principals in schools with varying poverty rates, the results of the Principal Workday Survey, Part II, were compared for schools with a Title I enrollment of less than 50% and for those with
Title I enrollment equal to or greater than 50% for the 61 participants. Tasks were examined in their respective ISLLC: 2008 categories between the two groups using t tests for equality of means. The results of this study did not reveal significant differences in the frequency with which principals in low and high percentage Title I schools performed tasks related to the ISLLC Standards. Principals in both low and high poverty schools reported that during the course of a school year, they engaged in these tasks with varying degrees of frequency: there were very few tasks rated with the numeral 1 to indicate that these tasks were "rarely/never performed."

In addition to comparison of the frequency of tasks performed by principals in low and high percentage Title I schools, the duration of these tasks was examined in both groups of schools for each of the ISLLC: 2008 Standards and functions. The results of this comparison revealed no significant differences between the two groups in the amount of time spent (duration) on the tasks in Standards 2, 3, or 6. Significant differences between the two groups were found, however, on ISLLC Standards 1 and 5. For both of these standards, principals in high percentage Title I schools engaged in tasks related to these standards for significantly more time than principals in low percentage Title I schools. Further, every function/survey item under each of these standards was performed for a greater duration of time by principals in high percentage Title I schools.

Standard 1 states that "An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all
stakeholders." The findings for the duration of time spent on tasks in this category confirmed the extant research regarding the principal's role in promoting an unwavering focus on student learning and communicating the ideals/beliefs that learning is the central purpose of schooling (Cotton, 2003; Marzano et al., 2005), which may be even more important in schools facing greater socio-economic challenges. Earlier research suggested that principals in high poverty schools are more likely to function in managerial than instructional leadership roles; however, in schools with low socioeconomic conditions that perform higher than their demographic profile would predict, it is the effective instructional leadership behaviors that make the difference (Cotton, 2003). The results of this portion of the study confirmed that principals in schools with greater socio-economic challenges estimated spending greater amounts of time on tasks related to this standard than did those in low percentage Title I schools.

Standard 5 states that “An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.” The following survey questions were determined to be related to this standard.

- Ensure accountability for the success of a range of student learners; e.g., second language learners, Title I, special education, gifted students
- Ensure fair and appropriate disciplinary practices with students and staff
- Actively model reflective, ethical, and legal practices with others.

Principal participants in schools with a high Title I percentage estimated spending a greater amount of time on all three of these tasks than those in schools with a lower percentage of Title I enrollment. While both groups engaged in these tasks with similar frequency, the greatest difference between principals in low and high
percentage Title I schools occurred on the task related to the estimated amount of time spent to ensure accountability for a range of student learners. This finding suggests that while both groups engage in this task frequently, principals in schools with greater socio-economic challenges must make this task a priority in order to improve academic achievement. Although this finding in the study must be interpreted with caution due to small sample size, it is consistent with more recent research findings regarding the closing of achievement gaps between high and low-performing schools at the elementary level (Fullan, 2005).

Among the strategies found to be successful in promoting student achievement in high poverty schools are an intense focus on improving instruction and achievement (Togneri & Anderson, 2003) and setting high learning expectations for all students (Chief Council of State School Officers, 2002; Marzano, 2000).

It should be noted, however, that comparison of the mean amounts of time spent on the job by principals during the sample workweek did not reveal a greater number of hours spent on the job by principals of high percentage Title I schools. The mean duration of time spent on the job during the sample workweek by principals of lower percentage Title I schools was 52.72 hours, while the mean duration of time spent on the job by principals of higher percentage Title I schools was 49.38 hours. This finding should be interpreted with caution due to the limited response rate of participants and the short period of time sampled.

Research Question 3: What is the level of congruence between the tasks performed by elementary principals and the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008?
In order to determine the congruence between tasks actually performed by principals during a sample time period and the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008, Principal Workday Logs were completed by participants and analyzed by the researcher using codes aligned with the ISLLC standards and functions. Although slightly more than half of the original participants completed the workday log in comparison to the surveys, those who participated in the completion of the workday logs completed the five day log of activities in extensive detail for each of the five workdays during and beyond the designated time period, including activities completed at home that were school-related tasks. Particularly when evening activities occurred such as school board meetings or school performances, it was not unusual for these elementary principals to account for a 12 hour day and beyond – even when the workday log directions asked simply for short phrases or words to describe the standard contractual workday. Through the writing of multiple tasks during short increments of time, it was evident that the principal participants in this study were skilled “multi-taskers,” often performing several work-related activities at once, including when they were attempting to eat lunch. Even after personal doctor’s appointments during the day or a family emergency the night before, these principals returned to school and continued to perform school-related duties ranging from routine tasks to those of a more serious nature, such as handling the death of a student or a managing the logistics of a school power outage.

The results of the workday log portion of this study should be interpreted with caution for several reasons. Reliability issues were likely to exist due to the
short period of time sampled and the time of year in which the study was conducted: however, the sampling of a much longer period of time required to observe all of the tasks in which principals are engaged during a year would be impractical in terms of research methodology. It is less likely that certain tasks, e.g., state-mandated standardized testing, were evident in the workday logs during the middle of a school year. It was for this reason, therefore, that principals were also asked to estimate the amount of time during the entire school year in Part II of the Principal Workday Survey. Likewise, although the participants were randomly selected, the results of this study must be interpreted with caution due to the small sample size and the voluntary status of the participants: these were clearly motivated participants who were detail-oriented in nature and willing to reflect on their professional practices. Conversely, it is impossible to know why other participants who completed the surveys did not complete the workday logs. As the study revealed, the majority of elementary principals in the sample engaged in work-related tasks for much longer periods of time than the standard workday and simply may not have had time available during that period of the year to fully participate during the sample workweek. Regardless, the responses of the principal participants in this portion of the study confirmed that:

Even amidst crisis, the best principals consider the long-term interests of the school, continuously touching on intangibles like vision, mission, and motivation as they proceed to a decision. Ultimately they are grounded in the
broader context of their school’s goals and commitments (Portin et al, 2003, p. 13).

*Congruence of Weekly Workday log Data and Yearly Survey Data*

Workday log themes reflected the 30 Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008, plus eight emergent categories and three tasks which were not directly related to ISLLC: 2008 standards and functions. Using content analysis methodology, these themes were manually counted for each of the 36 participants in terms of frequency, how often they occurred, and duration, the amount of time for which they occurred. The semantic intent of each phrase (theme) was carefully considered by the coders in order to maintain consistency. Most frequently this entailed examination of the entire phrase before coding, e.g., "talked with parent about student discipline issue" was coded according to the intent of the conversation, *discipline*, rather than by the noun/verb combination in the first portion of the phrase, "talked with parent," which would imply use of the code *maintain positive parent relations*. The items were then ranked for all participants for both frequency and duration during the sample workweek and compared to the survey descriptors used in the study.

The highest ranked tasks for both frequency of occurrence and duration of time spent during the workweek were, in order of rank:

1. Communication
2. Organizational management
3. Instructional supervision
4. Positive learning environment
5. Discipline

6. Providing for a range of student learners.

*Communication* tasks were routine written tasks that included phone calls for unspecified purposes, writing memos, and checking/responding to e-mail messages. This was the single highest ranked task for both frequency and duration during the sample workweek, and was also frequently performed while principals were engaged in other tasks, e.g., checking e-mail while talking on the phone. Communication tasks were ongoing in nature, i.e., performed regularly throughout the sample workweek. While it was evident in the workday log sample that these tasks were typically performed for multiple short periods of time, the cumulative duration of time spent on this task also translated to the highest rank in duration. In comparison, communication tasks were ranked third in frequency on the survey estimating the time spent over the course of the year on this task, and were 26th in duration on the survey. Principals estimated that over the course of the year they often performed communication tasks but for relatively small amounts of time: during the sample workweek, however, this task consumed the greatest amount of time. It appeared that principals significantly underestimated the time spent engaged in routine oral and written communication tasks in actual practice.

*Organizational management* (school operations) tasks included a broad range of activities related to the operation of the school but typically not directly related to instruction, such as handling facilities issues, transportation, cafeteria, etc. Tasks in this category received the second-highest ranking in both
frequency and duration during the sample workweek. While typically not directly related to instruction, these tasks were nonetheless important to the health, safety and well-being of students and staff, and therefore were potential or actual disruptions to the instructional day. For this reason, it is likely that the lack of instances reported during the workweek in the category of *protect instructional time* may well have occurred when participants were engaged in these school operations tasks. Participants noted specific tasks in this category that included managing power and heating outages as well as weather-related emergencies causing subsequent transportation issues, vehicular accidents, and other delays to the instructional day. Multiple instances of dealing with student health issues were also noted in this category.

*Instructional supervision* tasks included those related to any form of teacher evaluation, including “formal observations,” “classroom walkthrough,” and engaging in the subsequent conferences and report-writing associated with these tasks. The phrase “classroom walkthrough” was consistently coded under the assumption that this action was related to the brief, multiple classroom observations often made by principals during the teacher evaluation process rather than “class visit,” which was consistently interpreted to mean a brief classroom visitation with students related to *positive learning environment*. This was the third-highest ranking for both frequency and duration during the sample workweek and occurred regularly during the sample workweek for relatively long periods of time, typically 30 – 45 minutes in duration for formal observations, and in some cases was performed again immediately following a previous teacher
observation. Principals in the study were highly engaged in tasks related to instructional supervision: this is a significant finding due to the correlation between monitoring and evaluating instruction and student achievement (Marzano et al, 2005).

*Positive learning environment* included tasks performed by the principal that appeared to have the primary purpose of care for and interaction with students. This included tasks described as “meet and greet students,” “have lunch with students,” “class visits,” and “hand out certificates.” Although these tasks and interactions were typically brief in nature, they occurred on an ongoing basis during the week and ranked fourth in both frequency and duration. An abundance of evidence has connected the establishment of a positive leaning environment with increased levels of student achievement and school success (Cotton, 2003). Principals in this study clearly demonstrated this practice on a regular basis.

*Discipline* was a task evident in virtually every workday log: as might be expected, some principals handled discipline issues to a much greater degree than others. Typically discipline issues were brief in duration but occurred multiple times during the sample workweek. In one instance, a participant noted disciplinary actions toward a teacher. While the handling of disciplinary issues by the principal has often been considered a task which is managerial in nature, it may conversely be considered a task related to maintaining order in the school and protecting instructional time (Cotton, 2003; Marzano et al, 2005). This task had the fifth highest ranking noted in the workday logs for both frequency and
duration: it was often performed during the workweek but is not specifically addressed by the ISLLC: 2008 Standards and functions. It is likely that this task was subsumed under Standard 3, functions C and E: *Promote and protect the welfare and safety of students and staff, and Ensure teacher and organizational time is focused to support quality instruction and student learning*. When disciplinary actions involve staff members, it may be assumed that this task is subsumed under Standards 2 and 5, related respectively to *promoting a culture conducive to student learning and acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner*.

**Accountability for a range of student learners** was the sixth highest ranking in both frequency and duration and included tasks related to meeting the unique learning needs of students. This included tasks related to special education, gifted education, English language learners, and Title I programs. While principals certainly cannot personally perform all of the tasks related to school success, their ability to serve as “diagnosticians” and facilitators in their schools has been deemed critical to school success (Portin et al, 2003).

**Maintaining positive parent/caregiver relations** had a frequency rank of 7 and a duration rank of 8. This task included the regular efforts of principal participants to talk with, meet with, call, or have conferences with parents/caregivers. These interactions were most often short in duration but occurred on an ongoing basis throughout the sample week. This finding was aligned with the extant research regarding the positive relationship between parent involvement in the school and student success (Cotton, 2003).
Budget/finance tasks had a rank of 8 for frequency and 11 for duration during the sample. These included tasks related to payroll, grants, purchase requisitions, working on the school budget, reviewing bids, ordering supplies, and meeting with the school bookkeeper. While school finance tasks were noted regularly during the sample workweek, the annual development of the school budget is likely to vary by the school district or state and therefore was only noted in one workday log. The management of school operating funds and resources—and ensuring that these resources are directed toward teaching and learning—is aligned with ISLLC Standard 3B, related to allocation of fiscal resources, and is an essential responsibility of school leaders (Cotton, 2003; Marzano et al, 2005; Stronge et al, in press).

Student assessment is likewise likely to be dependent on the state and/or local assessment schedule and may have therefore not been noted in many of the workday logs. This task was ranked ninth for frequency and duration, and included test preparations, actual student assessment, benchmark testing, and mathematics testing. As the study occurred in midyear for most of the participants, it is unlikely that student summative assessment would have occurred during this time period. The responsibility of school leaders to monitor formative and summative student assessment results—and what happens when students are unsuccessful—is, however, of crucial importance to promoting the academic success of every student (DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, & Karhanek, 2004; Marzano et al, 2005). While this task is aligned with ISLLC: 2008 Standard 2
related to student learning, it was not specifically addressed in the ISLLC functions.

*Community relations* was ranked 10th for frequency and 13th for duration during the workweek. This task consisted of activities such as meeting or corresponding with P.T.A./P.T.O. representatives, community council, community representatives, and parents regarding school/community issues. As noted by Cotton, principals of high-achieving schools are more likely to work closely with members of the school community than those in lower-achieving schools (2003). This was evident during the sample workweek, and is directly related to ISLLC: 2008 Standard 4.

*Student placement/monitoring* included tasks related to student placement, monitoring the progress of students, reviewing information on new students, reviewing progress of intervention groups, and consultation with other school personnel regarding student progress. This task had a rank of 11 for frequency and 17 for duration, typically occurring multiple times for relatively brief periods of time. This task is related to *ensuring the success of a range of student learners* and ISLLC Standard 2, function E: the continual monitoring of student progress is widely recognized as an effective strategy for ensuring sustainable school improvement (Marzano et al, 2005).

*Use of data* was ranked 10th in both frequency and duration during the sample workweek. This task included the activities of data assessment, review of data with grade levels, individual data conferences with teachers, compilation of writing data, and helping with a technology issue related to student data. Data
analysis occurred regularly for moderate periods of time in principal workday logs during the sample time period. The successful principal is likely to engage in this task throughout the school year and from year to year in order to promote continual improvement in the school.

*Human resources* included tasks related to the hiring or retention of teachers and staff, related to ISLLC: 2008 Standard 2. Activities such as interviewing for job openings, completing personnel recommendation forms, license renewal, and talking with other school district personnel regarding job vacancies were included in this category. The frequency rank of this task during the sample workweek was 13 and the duration rank was 19. Tasks in this category were likely to be sporadic during this sample workweek, as interviewing and hiring of personnel occur more often prior to the beginning of a school year. License renewal tasks were seldom noted during this workweek: these may be time-specific by school district or state, or may be performed by others, such as the assistant principal or office staff. While this task may appear to be managerial in nature, there are few tasks more important for school success than recruitment and retention of effective teachers (Strange, 2007).

*Principal professional development* was related to ISLLC: 2008 Standard 6 and ranked 14th in frequency and 15th in duration during the sample workweek. Principals typically engaged in this task occasionally for relatively short periods of time. This task included activities such as reading professional journals, engaging in professional book studies, reading research from the state Department of Education, and contacting a local university to check on classes...
for school administrators. The engagement of principals in professional
development and professional organizations may have been under-represented
in this study due to the short sample period: pursuit of their own professional
development by principals is likely to occur sporadically throughout the year as
time permits, which may vary widely depending between principals and schools.
Nonetheless, the modeling of lifelong learning and intellectual curiosity is an
important characteristic of effective principals (Boris-Schacter & Merrifield, 2000).

*Attend meetings* was ranked 15th in frequency and 7th in duration.
Principals typically engaged in school district meetings on an occasional basis,
and these meetings consumed relatively long periods of time. These meetings
were most often district or school district meetings and the task was not
determined to be directly related to the ISLLC: 2008 standards and functions.

*Staff development* was ranked 16th in frequency and 13th in duration and
was related to Standard 2: *Sustaining a school culture and instructional program
conducive to student learning and professional growth*. Principals typically
engaged in school staff development activities on an occasional basis and these
activities were most often of moderate duration. This task may have been under-
represented during the sample workweek because of the short time period
sampled and the likelihood that in many cases staff development days may be
determined by the school district. The responsibility of school leaders to provide
meaningful staff development is widely recognized as a key factor in promoting
effective teaching and learning, and is particularly important to facilitate success
in high poverty schools (Fullan, 2005).
School events included activities that were non-academic in nature, such as assisting with school pictures, preparation for school music programs, attending the school play, or picking up fund raiser receipts. This task was ranked 17th in frequency and 12th in duration: principals typically engaged in these activities sporadically and spent moderate amounts of time engaged in these activities. While the activities may have promoted a positive school climate or other tasks, it was unclear whether the school events tasks noted in the study had a direct effect on school or student success. This task was determined not to be directly related to ISLLC: 2008 standards and functions.

Curriculum tasks among the participants included working with curriculum committees, meetings regarding mathematics and language arts activities, meetings regarding curriculum standards and benchmarks, and consideration of foreign language proposals/programs. The principal’s responsibility to promote and monitor school curriculum is related to Standard 2 B, create a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular program, and has been correlated with high levels of student achievement and is therefore an important responsibility of school leaders (Marzano et al, 2005). These tasks ranked 18th in frequency and 16th in duration during the sample workweek and may have been episodic in practice: therefore these tasks may have been under-represented in the results of the study.

Develop school improvement/strategic management plan included tasks of working with the school improvement team or on the school improvement/strategic management plan. These tasks were ranked 19th in
frequency and 20th in duration during the sample workweek, and were typically performed occasionally for relatively short periods of time by principals. The ability of the principal to work collaboratively with those in the school community to develop a strategic plan for the school is widely considered a critical factor in effective school leadership and is closely linked to the vision and mission for the school (Marzano et al, 2005). Without such a strategic plan, it is at best difficult to determine the direction of the school and how to measure progress (Stronge et al, in press).

*Instructional technology* tasks included principal participation in tasks related to software training, meeting with technology representatives, working with staff on computer programs, and updating the school website. These tasks were related to Standard 3 B, *obtain, allocate, align, and efficiently utilize human, fiscal, and technological resources* and ranked 20th in frequency and 21st in duration during the sample workweek. During the sample workweek, principals performed these tasks occasionally for relatively short periods of time. The ability of principals to remain current in instructional technology and promote technology integration within the school has become an increasingly important task for school leaders (Krajewski, 2008). Due to the short period of time and timing of the workweek sampled, this task may have been under-represented in this study.

*Business/community partnerships* were ranked 21st in frequency and 22nd in duration and included principal relationships with local business partners and local universities, related to Standard 4 D: *Build and sustain productive*
relationships with community partners. Principals typically performed these tasks occasionally for short periods of time. These tasks were noted infrequently in the principal worklogs, but may have been under-represented due to the short sample period.

*Developing a culture of trust/high expectations* ranked 21st in frequency and 22nd in duration during the sample workweek and was related to Standard 2 A: *Nurture and sustain a culture of collaboration, trust, learning, and high expectations.* This task was related to development of a positive school culture and the expectation by the principal of ongoing instructional improvement and high levels of learning for all students. In practice, however, it was difficult to quantify such tasks during the sample workweek.

*Establishing a culture of ongoing improvement* was related to Standard 1 D and ranked 23rd in frequency and 22nd in duration of time spent during the sample workweek. The principal's ability to promote ongoing, sustainable improvement in the school is widely considered a hallmark of effective leadership (Cotton, 2003; Fullan, 2005; Marzano et al, 2005). This task was difficult to quantify, however, and therefore may have been under-represented during the sample workweek.

*Participation in professional organizations*, related to Standard 6, ranked 24th in frequency and 18th in duration of the tasks performed by principals during the sample workweek. Principals engaged in tasks related to participation in professional organizations with occasional frequency and moderate duration. This task was striking in its relative absence among participants: in general,
there was minimal evidence during the sample workweek of participation in professional organizations by principal participants in the study. One or more factors may have contributed to this finding: it may have been performed at other times of the year, or principals simply may not have had time available during this specific workweek to engage in their own professional development tasks.

*Monitor progress on school improvement/strategic plan*, related to Standard 1 E, ranked 25th for both frequency of occurrences and duration of time spent by principals during the sample workweek. This task was noted few times by participants during the week for relatively short periods of time with comments such as “worked on school improvement plan” and “met with school improvement team”. It is likely, however, that this task may not have been easily observable in the workday logs and may have been subsumed into other themes: without access to the school improvement/strategic plans of the participants’ schools, it was not possible for the coders to determine which tasks were related to this theme.

*Model reflective, ethical, and legal practices*, related to Standard 5, was ranked 26th in frequency of occurrences and 27th in duration of time spent by principals during the sample workweek. This task was noted several times for a relatively brief period of time by participants and was described as tasks related to legal issues: “documentation for Title IX,” “talked with school board attorney,” and “custody issue.” It is likely, however, that tasks which would be coded as *reflective* and *ethical* were not easily observed in the Worklogs and might be considered as principal dispositions rather than performance standards or
functions. While these are certainly desirable dispositions in principals, they were not easily quantifiable characteristics. Interestingly, one participant noted in the comments section of the workday log that his participation during the sample week had caused him to engage in reflection regarding the tasks in which he was actually engaged during a week in comparison to the tasks in which he had anticipated being engaged during the week. The completion of the workday logs was in itself a reflective professional task for all participants, but was not counted during coding.

*Promote the vision and mission of the school* was related to Standard 1 A, *collaboratively develop and implement a shared vision and mission*, and was ranked 27th in frequency of occurrence and 26th in duration of time spent by principals during the sample workweek. The promotion of a shared vision and mission is widely acknowledged to be a defining characteristic of effective principals (Cotton, 2003; Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Stronge et al, in press), but was likely under-represented in this study. This task was seldom noted in the workday logs and was brief in duration of time spent, most likely because promotion of vision and mission was difficult to observe and quantify and was subsumed in other tasks/codes. Unless the words *vision* or *mission* were used by participants, it was difficult to determine when this task was taking place without access to the vision and mission statements of the participants’ schools.

*Promote leadership capacity*, related to Standard 2 F, was ranked 28th for both frequency of occurrence and duration of time spent on the task during the sample workweek. This task was seldom noted in the workday logs and was
noted for brief periods of time, most likely because it was subsumed in tasks and therefore not easily observed by the coders; e.g., the comment “talked with teacher” may have referred to talking with a staff member enrolled in a university school administration program regarding school leadership or operations, or even appointing leadership duties to that teacher. Without elaboration in the workday logs by participants, this task was not easily quantifiable. The promotion of leadership capacity by principals, or distributed leadership, is well-documented in the literature as a trait of effective school leaders and is most likely under-represented in the workday logs used for this study.

Advocate/meet student and family needs using community resources, related to Standard 6 A, was ranked 28th in frequency of occurrences and 29th in duration of time spent. This task was noted only once by participants for a brief period of time with the notation “called social services.” Tasks in this category were likely to be sporadic in occurrence: it is also possible that tasks in the category were subsumed in other tasks such as phone calls for unspecified purposes.

Protect instructional time, related to Standard 6 G, was ranked 30th in both frequency of occurrence and duration of time spent: there were no notations by participants that were coded for this task. It is well documented that protection of instructional time by principals is a defining characteristic of effective principals (Cotton, 2003; Marzano et al, 2005; Stronge et al, in press), however, this task was likely both episodic and sporadic in nature. Protection of instructional time is likely to occur, for instance, in other tasks during certain periods of the year, such
as creation of an effective master schedule prior to the start of a school year. It may occur sporadically when circumstances such as severe weather situations arise, causing the principal to reorganize the instructional day after a delayed school opening. It is also likely that this task could be easily subsumed in other tasks such as telephone calls or e-mail, when the principal may make decisions regarding whether particular activities are instructional in nature and should be held during the school day. While this is a critical task for the promotion of effective instruction and school operation, it was likely difficult to observe in brief written notations as were used in the workday logs.

Emergent Codes

Eight emergent codes were obtained from the comments of participants in the Principal Workday Logs. These were categories that were unique in nature: while they could have been subsumed in the previous categories, they provided particular insight into the tasks performed by principals during an actual workweek and were therefore coded separately. The following emergent codes were obtained from the workday logs (Appendix E):

1. Facilitate a positive climate with staff
   Principals often noted tasks specifically related to the well-being of staff members, taking a personal interest in their lives as well as their job responsibilities. These tasks were related to Standard 2 but were coded separately because they were not directly related to teaching and learning.

2. Personal tasks/travel
   These tasks were unrelated to the ISLLC: 2008 Standards and functions.
3. **Administrative communication**
Communication tasks were not directly addressed in the ISLLC: 2008 Standards and functions. It was likely that communication tasks were considered to be subsumed under multiple Standards and functions.

4. **School meetings**
Planning and participation in school meetings was not specifically addressed in the Standards, and was likely related to multiple standards and functions.

5. **Informal staff communication**
Brief interactions with staff members throughout the workweek was related to Standard 2 A, *sustaining a culture of collaboration, trust, learning, and high expectations*.

6. **Crisis situations**
Management of emergency situations in the school was related to Standard 3 C, *Promote and protect the welfare and safety of students and staff*. These tasks were coded separately because unlike routine school safety tasks, these required the immediate action of the principal and were more serious in nature.

7. **Teaching**
While few instances of direct instruction by principals were noted, this was a task related to Standard 2. The engagement of school leaders in instructional tasks with students and staff sends a powerful message to others regarding the
importance of teaching and learning. In only one instance did a principal participant report engaging in classroom teaching during the workweek.

8. Comments from participants

Comments from participants were not directly related to ISLLC: 2008 Standards and functions but provided insight into tasks noted in the workday logs and were therefore noted as emergent codes (Appendix E).

In summary, the tasks noted in the workday logs of principals during the sample workweek revealed a positive overall alignment with the ISLLC: 2008 Standards and functions. One major exception to the alignment of the ISLLC: 2008 Standards and functions, however, was the category of communication tasks. Elementary principals clearly engaged in routine communication tasks with the highest frequency and duration of all of the tasks in which they were engaged during the sample workweek. The importance of communication tasks by school leaders is both intuitive and research-based as a necessary component of effective school leadership (Elmore, 2000; Fullan, 2001; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Marzano et al, 2005). The ability of school leaders to use effective communication skills, however, was conspicuously absent in the ISLLC: 2008 principal performance standards and functions.

The 30 ISLLC functions/tasks examined in this study comprise a large part—although certainly not all of—the elementary principal’s workload. It is small wonder, therefore, that the principal’s workday is commonly described as fragmented in nature. This was confirmed by a 1998 survey in which principals serving schools with grades kindergarten through eight indicated that of 56
areas, time fragmentation was most frequently listed (72%) as a major concern (Protheroe, 2008, p. 49). In the past decade the additional requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) have been added to an already fragmented workday, and put "...intense pressure on principals to provide supports that will bring test scores up to adequate levels within specific timelines" (Schomberg, 2008, p. 23). This will likely continue to exacerbate the principal's already fragmented workday.

Research Question 4: What is the level of congruence between the tasks in which principals are reportedly engaged during the school year with tasks in which they are engaged during a sample workweek?

In order to compare the tasks reportedly performed by principals during the school year with those performed during a sample workweek, the rankings of the survey items (Part II) were compared individually with those obtained in the workday logs for both frequency of occurrence and duration of time spent by principals during the sample workweek. Overall, a high degree of congruence was evident among the tasks estimated by principals to be the most often performed – and on which they spent the most time – during the school year and during the sample workweek. Examination of the highest ranked tasks for frequency and duration in the workday logs revealed that during the sample workweek, the following tasks were performed most frequently and for the greatest periods of time, in the following order:

1. Communication

2. Organizational management
3. Instructional supervision

4. Positive learning environment

5. Discipline

6. Providing for a range of student learners.

In comparison, principals rated the following items on the survey as performed most frequently during the course of the school year:

1. Positive learning environment

2. Culture of trust, high expectations

3. Communication

4. Organizational management

5. Instructional supervision; Reflective, ethical, and legal practices (tie).

In terms of duration, principals estimated that during the course of a school year they performed the following tasks for the longest periods of time:

1. Ongoing improvement

2. Positive learning environment

3. Culture of trust, high expectations

4. Organizational management

5. Instructional supervision

6. Discipline.
Overall, four of the six tasks were highly ranked on both the workday logs (measuring a workweek) and the survey (estimating a school year) for frequency: communication, positive learning environment, instructional supervision, and organizational management. For the duration of time estimated over a year and actually spent during a workweek, four tasks were similarly ranked: positive learning environment, organizational management, instructional supervision, and discipline. School leaders clearly prioritized a positive school learning environment, the smooth operation of the school, effective teaching, and an orderly environment free of interruptions to instruction: all of these are research-based qualities of effective principals (Cotton, 2003; Marzano et al, 2005; Stronge et al, in press).

Interestingly, communication tasks, ranked first in both frequency and duration during the sample workweek and third in frequency on the survey, ranked 26th in terms of estimated duration of time spent on the task over a school year. In practice, it appeared that principals spent far more time engaged in communication tasks during the workweek than they had estimated for the course of the school year. Although these tasks may not have individually consumed a great deal of time, the cumulative duration of time spent on the task was considerable. Likewise, two highly ranked tasks estimated to be performed frequently and for considerable periods of time over a school year, ongoing improvement and culture of trust, high expectations received much lower rankings in both frequency and duration for the actual workweek than principals
had estimated. This may well have been a result of the short period of time sampled, the difficulty in estimating and measuring the tasks, or both.

An additional area of interest was the group of six tasks ranked the lowest during the actual workweek in terms of frequency and duration, although not in the same order:

- Monitor school improvement/strategic plan
- Reflective, ethical, and legal practices
- Vision and mission
- Promote leadership capacity
- Advocate for student needs
- Protect instructional time.

Of these tasks, advocate for student needs was the only task predicted by the survey results to be ranked with a low frequency and duration, although shared vision and mission was estimated to be performed for a minimal duration of time. It should be cautioned that this finding does not translate to a conclusion that principals seldom perform these tasks and perform them for minimal periods of time – or that these are not considered important tasks in the principal's workday. More likely, these tasks were difficult to observe in practice, were likely to be performed sporadically and did not occur during this time period, or both.
Recommendations

While the results of this study must be interpreted with caution due to the small sample size and limited time available for the sample workweek, the study confirmed that in addition to the previous job responsibilities assigned to the elementary principal, the responsibility of instructional leadership has become an additional expectation which takes considerable time and effort. Today's elementary principal works exhaustive hours, balancing the demands of multiple stakeholders yet prioritizing a positive learning environment and high expectations for all students. The nature of the tasks is often unpredictable and fragmented, yet it is evident that these school leaders have a guiding vision and mission firmly in place and shared with others. They respond to changing circumstances but are not controlled by them. Most of all, they do whatever it takes to get the job done – from serving as school nurse to engaging in data analysis and strategic planning, from playground duty to supervising instruction. Their schools vary widely but their commitment does not.

Many of the tasks examined in this study were related to the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008, and the functions described within these standards. It is interesting to note that with their widespread adoption in some form by over 40 states during the past decade, the ISLLC Standards became the de facto principal performance standards, which was never intended (Olson, 2008). Given the impact of the standards in principal preparation, assessment, and induction, the intention of this study was to examine the actual practices of principals as compared to performance standards. Of particular
interest was the finding that schools with a higher percentage of poverty, as measured by the percentage of Title I enrollment, exhibited significant differences on ISLLC: 2008 Standards 1 and 5. Standard 1 refers to the responsibility of school leaders to promote a vision and mission shared by all stakeholders. Principals in these schools paid particular attention to developing and monitoring the school improvement/strategic plan, or doing “the right work” (Marzano et al, 2005, p. 76). As concluded by Elmore:

Knowing the right thing to do is the central problem of school improvement. Holding schools accountable for their performance depends on having people in schools with the knowledge, skill, and judgment to make the improvements that will increase student performance. (2003. p. 9)

Standard 5 refers to the need for school leaders to understand, respond to, and influence the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context of the school: principals in these schools paid particular attention to the responsibility of being accountable for a range of student learners. The effective principal attends to these internal and external forces that shape the school and the learners within. Of all of the responsibilities of school leaders, the situational awareness factor has been demonstrated to have the highest correlation to student achievement (Marzano et al, 2005).

Also of interest in this study was the finding that a primary task evidenced in the study – but not directly referenced in the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008 – was principal communication. Effective
communication has been demonstrated to have a high correlation with student achievement and has been described as "...the glue that holds together all of the other responsibilities of leadership" (Scribner, Cockrell, Cockrell, & Valentine in Marzano et al, 2005, p. 46 – 47). The ongoing responsibility of school leaders to effectively communicate with all stakeholders is not addressed in the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008 and was under-estimated by principals, yet it is apparent that engaging in this task is a crucial part of the elementary principal’s work. While certainly this task may be subsumed in other ISLLC Standards and functions, its obvious prominence during the principal’s workweek – and workyear – suggests that effective communication is both a skill and a responsibility of school leaders, one that is essential for school success.

Implications for Future Study

This study was a comparative analysis of principal performance standards in relation to principal practice. One area for future research is a closer examination of those factors that shape principal practice: levels of principal experience, training, gender, and school demographic conditions. Of particular interest would be more in-depth research of effective leadership practices in low and high percentage poverty schools. The use of qualitative case study methodology to compare the practices of effective principals in a variety of school settings such as those sampled in this study would add considerable depth to these findings.

An additional area of interest for further study would be the investigation of some of the specific factors revealed in this study which had a low ranking in
terms of frequency and/or duration: what factors, for example, inhibit engagement in principal professional organizations and principal professional development activities? Protection of instructional time in the school is widely considered an important responsibility of effective principals, yet was difficult to measure and did not appear in the workday logs during the sample workweek. How do principals best manage such responsibilities? Conversely, communication was found to be a task performed with a high degree of frequency and cumulative duration: how do effective principals best ensure effective communication among those in the school community?

Finally, just as effective principals seek continual improvement in their schools, so should policymakers and principal preparation programs seek ongoing understanding and improvement of policies and performance standards which form the framework of principal practice. As aspiring school leaders complete leadership preparation programs and enter the induction phase of school administration, what is the degree of congruence with their classroom and practical leadership preparation experiences? One area not investigated in this study was the role of assistant or vice-principals in carrying out school leadership responsibilities: do they engage in the same tasks as school principals, and does their practical experience in this role translate to the qualities needed by effective principals of the future? Future research in the area of principal practice must consider the rapidity of change facing schools in order to best prepare future school leaders for the challenges ahead.
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Appendix A: Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008

Standard 1: An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.

Functions:
A. Collaboratively develop and implement a shared vision and mission
B. Collect and use data to identify goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and promote organizational learning
C. Create and implement plans to achieve goals
D. Promote continuous improvement
E. Monitor and evaluate progress and revise plans

Standard 2: An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

Functions:
A. Nurture and sustain a culture of collaboration, trust, learning, and high expectations
B. Create a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular program
C. Create a personalized and motivating learning environment for students
D. Supervise instruction
E. Develop assessment and accountability systems to monitor student progress
F. Develop the instructional and leadership capacity of staff
G. Maximize time spent on quality instruction
H. Promote the use of the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning
I. Monitor and evaluate the impact of the instructional program

Standard 3: An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.
Functions:

A. Monitor and evaluate the management and operational systems
B. Obtain, allocate, align, and efficiently utilize human, fiscal, and technological resources
C. Promote and protect the welfare and safety of students and staff
D. Develop the capacity for distributed leadership
E. Ensure teacher and organizational time is focused to support quality instruction and student learning

Standard 4: *An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.*

Functions:

A. Collect and analyze data and information pertinent to the educational environment
B. Promote understanding, appreciation, and use of the community’s diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources
C. Build and sustain positive relationships with families and caregivers
D. Build and sustain productive relationships with community partners

Standard 5: *An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.*

Functions:

A. Ensure a system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success.
B. Model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior
C. Safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity
D. Consider and evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision-making
E. Promote social justice and ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling
Standard 6: An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Functions:

A. Advocate for children, families, and caregivers
B. Act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning
C. Assess, analyze, and anticipate emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt leadership strategies
Appendix B. The Principal Workday Survey

Section I: Survey of Demographic and Participant Information

School Identification number (assigned by researcher): ______________

A. Demographic Information (select one response for each item)
1. What is your title?
   Elementary principal ___ other (write in) ____________________

2. What grade levels does your school serve?
   K – 5 ___ PK – 5 ___ K – 6 ___ PK – 6 ___ K – 2 ___
   3 – 5 ___ other ___

3. What was the student enrollment of your school as of September 30, 2007?
   <300 ___ 300 – 499 ___ 500 – 699 ___ 700 – 900 ___
   >900 ___

4. What was the approximate percentage of Title I enrollment in your school as of September 30, 2007?
   0 – 20% ___ 21 – 40% ___ 41 – 60% ___ 61 – 80% ___ 80 – 100% ___

B. Participant Information
1. What is your gender?
   Female ___ Male ___

2. What is your highest level of education?
   Master's degree in education ___ Master's degree with additional graduate coursework ___ Educational Specialist (6 year program or equivalent) ___ Doctor of Education (Ed.D) ___ Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) ___
   Other ___

3. What is your age?
   24 – 34 ___ 35 – 44 ___ 45 – 54 ___ 55 – 64 ___ 65 or greater ___
4. What is the total number of years you have served as a principal?
   Less than 1 year____ 1 – 2 years____ 3 – 5 years____
   6 – 10 years____ >10 years____

5. For how many years have you served as a principal of your current school?
   Less than 1 year____ 1 – 2 years____ 3 – 5 years____
   6 – 10 years____

6. What is the average number of hours that you work per week as a school administrator?
   <40_____ 40 – 44_____ 45 – 49_____ 50 – 54_____ 55 – 59_____ 60 or greater_____

7. With which ethnic group would you identify yourself?
   White, not Hispanic____ Hispanic____ Asian, Pacific Islander____
   Black, not Hispanic____ American Indian, Alaskan Native____
   Other____
Appendix C. Section II. Principal Workday Survey

Directions: Please indicate (a) the frequency with which you engage in the following tasks during the course of a school year, and (b) the relative amount of time that you spend engaged in the task using the scale of 1 – 5 below, with 1 corresponding to “never” and “no time,” and 5 corresponding to “very frequently – daily/almost daily” and “quite a bit of time.”

**Frequency of task**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) rarely/never</td>
<td>infrequently</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>very frequently–daily/almost daily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Duration of time spent engaged in task....**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) no time</td>
<td>very little time</td>
<td>a moderate amount of time</td>
<td>quite a bit of time</td>
<td>a great deal of time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Communicate the school/school district mission/vision of learning with those in the school community (e.g., teachers, parents, community members)
   (a) Frequency 1 2 3 4 5
   (b) Duration 1 2 3 4 5

2. Analyze or otherwise use data to identify, monitor, and assess progress toward school and/or school district goals
   (a) Frequency 1 2 3 4 5
   (b) Duration 1 2 3 4 5

3. Develop and implement a school improvement/strategic plan
   (a) Frequency 1 2 3 4 5
   (b) Duration 1 2 3 4 5

4. Engage in other tasks related to promoting ongoing, sustainable improvement
   (a) Frequency 1 2 3 4 5
   (b) Duration 1 2 3 4 5

(Continue to next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of task</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) rarely/never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infrequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daily/almost daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of time spent engaged in task....</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) no time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very little time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a moderate amount of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite a bit of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a great deal of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Monitor and assess progress toward school improvement objectives
   (a) Frequency 1 2 3 4 5
   (b) Duration 1 2 3 4 5

6. Promote a culture of trust, high expectations, and high levels of learning for students and staff
   (a) Frequency 1 2 3 4 5
   (b) Duration 1 2 3 4 5

7. Engage in tasks related to development, pacing, and/or monitoring of curriculum
   (a) Frequency 1 2 3 4 5
   (b) Duration 1 2 3 4 5

8. Promote a positive learning environment for/have positive interactions with students
   (a) Frequency 1 2 3 4 5
   (b) Duration 1 2 3 4 5

9. Formally and/or informally supervise instruction
   (a) Frequency 1 2 3 4 5
   (b) Duration 1 2 3 4 5

10. Engage in tasks related to student placement and monitoring of student progress
    (a) Frequency 1 2 3 4 5
    (b) Duration 1 2 3 4 5

(Continue to next page)
### Frequency of task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) rarely/never</td>
<td>infrequently</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>very frequently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of time spent engaged in task....</td>
<td>daily/almost daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) no time</td>
<td>very little time</td>
<td>a moderate amount of time</td>
<td>quite a bit</td>
<td>a great deal of time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Promote the instructional and/or leadership capacities of staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Engage in tasks which maximize and protect instructional time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Promote the use of effective instructional technology for teaching and learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Plan and implement school/school district staff development activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Engage in tasks related to student assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Monitor/attend to school operations: transportation; cafeteria; facility; student attendance, health/safety, arrival/dismissal; building maintenance; grounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continue to next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of task</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) rarely/never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infrequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daily/almost daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Duration of time spent engaged in task....**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) no time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very little time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a moderate amount of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite a bit of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a great deal of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Engage in tasks related to human resources: hiring, evaluation, licensure, etc.

(a) Frequency 1 2 3 4 5

(b) Duration 1 2 3 4 5

18. Engage in tasks related to school finance, budget, grants, or other resources

(a) Frequency 1 2 3 4 5

(b) Duration 1 2 3 4 5

19. Planning, scheduling, attending non-academic school events

(a) Frequency 1 2 3 4 5

(b) Duration 1 2 3 4 5

20. Attend school district meetings, workshops, or training

(a) Frequency 1 2 3 4 5

(b) Duration 1 2 3 4 5

21. Engage in routine communication tasks unrelated to instruction (mail, e-mail, phone calls, memos, announcements, etc.)

(a) Frequency 1 2 3 4 5

(b) Duration 1 2 3 4 5

22. Promote positive community relations within school community

(a) Frequency 1 2 3 4 5

(b) Duration 1 2 3 4 5

(Continue to next page)
23. Promote and sustain effective parent/caregiver relationships
(a) Frequency
1  2  3  4  5
(b) Duration
1  2  3  4  5

24. Engage in tasks to facilitate business and community partnerships
(a) Frequency
1  2  3  4  5
(b) Duration
1  2  3  4  5

25. Ensure accountability for the success of a range of student learners; e.g., second language learners, Title I, special education, gifted students
(a) Frequency
1  2  3  4  5
(b) Duration
1  2  3  4  5

26. Ensure fair and appropriate disciplinary practices with students and staff
(a) Frequency
1  2  3  4  5
(b) Duration
1  2  3  4  5

27. Actively model reflective, ethical, and legal practices with others
(a) Frequency
1  2  3  4  5
(b) Duration
1  2  3  4  5

28. Provide advocacy for/meet needs of students and families using community resources; e.g., public health, social services, legal, welfare services
(a) Frequency
1  2  3  4  5
(b) Duration
1  2  3  4  5

(Continue to the next page)
**Frequency of task**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) rarely/never</td>
<td>infrequently</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>very frequently- daily/almost daily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Duration of time spent engaged in task**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) no time</td>
<td>very little time</td>
<td>a moderate amount of time</td>
<td>quite a bit of time</td>
<td>a great deal of time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Participate in local, state, and/or national professional organizations or events that promote student success

(a) Frequency 1 2 3 4 5

(b) Duration 1 2 3 4 5

30. Engage in reflective or professional development tasks which assist in development of future leadership strategies; e.g., change leadership, adapting to changing demographics, etc.

(a) Frequency 1 2 3 4 5

(b) Duration 1 2 3 4 5

Thank you for your participation in this survey!

Please return the survey portion of the study in the enclosed, self-addressed stamped envelope as soon as it has been completed. Please return the worklog portion of the study immediately after the 5 day work period in which you competed it (January 14 – 18, 2008, or the next available consecutive 5 day work period prior to February 1, 2008).
Appendix D: The Principal Workday Log

The Principal Workday Log

Directions: During the designated time period, please indicate in short answer form (words or phrases) the tasks in which you are engaged during 15 minute increments (e.g., teacher observation, parent conference, check e-mail, classroom walkthrough, Title I meeting, etc.). After completion, please return the Principal Workday Survey immediately in the enclosed, prepaid envelope.

Thank you for your participation!

Please complete the following workday log between the dates of ____________________________ and _____________________________.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of day</th>
<th>(Note task/activities completed &amp; duration below for a one day period).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;7:00 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:15 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>(Continue on back of page)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5:15 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E. Tasks Reported in Workday Logs by Participants

Frequency/duration ranking 1.

**Communication:**
- e-mail
- phone calls
- write agenda
- preparation for meetings
- mail
- paperwork
- write notes
- prepare memos
- draft/send newsletter

Frequency/duration ranking 2.

**Organizational management/school operations:**
- talk/meet with custodian
- walk building/building walkthrough
- bus/car duty
- help school nurse; deal with sick child; check blood sugar of diabetic student; student health issue; substitute for school nurse; helped school nurse check for head lice
- check on substitute teachers
- cafeteria supervision
- playground/recess supervision; remove cats from sandbox
- supervise arrival/dismissal
- fire drill; fire inspection
- find missing student
- monitor safety patrol
- help bus driver
- talk with director of buildings and grounds; talk with Department of Transportation/traffic director about traffic
- unjam copier
- meet kitchen repairman; handle kitchen repair orders
- check out garbage dumpsters not emptied
- work on announcement board
- remove birds from lobby
- check on heat, electrical power
- meet with law enforcement over break-in
- take students home
- tutoring supervision
**Frequency/duration ranking 3.**

*Instructional supervision:*
- formal evaluation
- teacher evaluation conference
- write-up of observation
- classroom walkthrough
- read lesson plans
- work with substitute teachers

**Frequency/duration ranking 4.**

*Positive learning environment:*
- greet students
- class visits
- talk with students
- visit band
- get snacks for tutoring students
- have lunch with students

**Frequency/duration ranking 5.**

*Discipline:*
- office/bus referral
- suspension
- discipline/student behavior issue
- deal with disruptive student
- check on student in detention
- talk with student threatening another student
- deal with bullying issue
- talk with student/parents/teachers/assistant superintendent about discipline
- student refused to do work
- teacher issue with student
- discipline teacher

**Frequency/duration ranking 6.**

*Accountability for a range of student learners:*
- Child Study meeting
- I.E.P. meeting
- Special education meeting; meet with special education department; talk with teachers about special education students
- E.S.L. meeting
- Title I meeting
- Gifted meeting
- Instructional Assistance Team meeting
- met with literacy coach
• signed I.E.P.
• met with tutor

**Frequency Ranking 7.**

*Parent relations:*
- talked with parents
- parent conference
- meeting with parents

**Frequency ranking 8.**

*Finance:*
- completed payroll
- signed checks
- attended budget meeting
- reviewed bids
- handed out paychecks
- met with bookkeeper
- met with salesperson
- worked on grants/grant management
- worked on budget
- signed purchase requisitions
- ordered supplies

**Frequency ranking 9.**

*Student assessment:*
- prepared for standardized testing
- held assessment meeting
- discussed benchmark testing
- discussed math testing

**Frequency ranking 10.**

*Community relations:*
- Met with P.T.A./P.T.O. representative/president
- Met with parent about Silent Auction
- Community Council meeting
- Talk with parent about redistricting
- Wrote newsletter
- Greet and visit with governing board
- American Legion brought flags
• Prepare message for school sign

**Frequency ranking 11.**

*Placement/monitoring of students:*

• placed new students
• updated student assignment groups
• student support team meeting
• discussed student’s program with teacher
• reviewed files of new students
• consult with counselor regarding new student
• teacher conference to discuss student progress
• checked student’s grades
• worked on student report cards
• reviewed intervention groups with reading coach
• student attendance issue
• checked on new student/other students

**Frequency ranking 12.**

*Use of data:*

• data assessment
• reviewed data with grade level
• individual data conferences with teachers
• compiled writing data
• help with teacher issue for student data

**Frequency ranking 13.**

*Human resources:*

• interviewed for staff position
• scanned applications for job opening
• meeting with teacher regarding professional goals
• completed personnel recommendation form
• phone call from Human Resources office regarding new position
• personnel issue
• talk with superintendent regarding personnel issue
• license renewal

Frequency ranking 14.

Principal professional development:
• read professional journal
• professional book study
• research information from Department of Education website
• call to university to check on classes for administrators

Frequency ranking 15.

Attend meetings:
• principal's meeting
• district meeting
• school board meeting
• P.T.O./P.T.A. board meeting

Frequency ranking 16.

Staff development:
• in-service preparation
• plan staff development

Frequency ranking 17.

School events:
• preparation for music program
• school pictures
• attend school play
• pick up fund raiser receipts
• attended basketball game

Frequency ranking 18.

Curriculum:
- curriculum committee
- met with teachers regarding gifted curriculum
- Spanish proposal
- meeting to discuss math day activities
- reviewed language arts lessons
- visited local school to see Spanish program

**Frequency ranking 19.**

*Develop school improvement plan/strategic plan:*
- worked on school improvement plan
- met with team to discuss school improvement plan draft

**Frequency ranking 20.**

*Instructional technology:*
- meet with technology representative
- technology software training
- worked with staff on computer program
- updated website

**Frequency ranking 21 (tie).**

*Business/community partnerships:*
- talked with/met with local business leaders
- thank you note to business partner
- finalized partnership with university
- worked with university to place student teachers, interns

*Culture of trust, high expectations for students:*
- held awards assembly
- handed out certificates
- notes to students

**Frequency ranking 23.**

*Ongoing improvement:*
- work on academic program updates
• adding/relocating classrooms to accommodate new teaching position

Frequency ranking 24.

Professional organizations:
• attended meeting: local principal organization

Frequency ranking 25.

Monitor school improvement plan:
• Met with strategic management team

Frequency ranking 26.

Model reflective, ethical, and legal practices:
• documentation for Title IX
• custody issue
• legal issue

Frequency ranking 27.

Promote and sustain a shared vision and mission:
• Worked on vision and mission statement with school team

Frequency ranking 28.

Promote leadership capacity:
• Worked with administrative intern

Frequency ranking 29. Advocate for student/family needs using community resources:
• Met with social services representative

Frequency ranking 30.

Protect instructional time: no instances of this task were noted by principals.
Appendix F. Results of Workday Logs by ISLLC Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>5 day worklog sample</th>
<th>Survey questions/Worklog codes</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Frequency (counts)</td>
<td>1 Communicate Vision/Mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Analyze Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 School Improvement Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Ongoing Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Monitor Progress of Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Frequency (counts)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration of (hours)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frequency (counts)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration of (hours)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Frequency (counts)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration of (hours)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency (counts)</td>
<td>Duration of (hours)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0 0 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 2 0 0 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 1.25 0 0 0 1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency (counts)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration (hours)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Frequency (counts)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration (hours)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Frequency (counts)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration (hours)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Frequency (counts)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration (hours)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Frequency (counts)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration (hours)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14</strong> Frequency (counts)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration (hours)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong> Frequency (counts)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration (hours)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16</strong> Frequency (counts)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration (hours)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17</strong> Frequency (counts)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration (hours)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency (count)</td>
<td>Duration (hours)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0 3 0 0 0 3</td>
<td>0 1.75 0 0 0 1.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0 4 0 0 0 4</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration (hours)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Frequency (count)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration (hours)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Frequency (count)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration (hours)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Frequency (count)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration (hours)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Frequency (count)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration (hours)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency (count)</td>
<td>Duration (hours)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0 0 1 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 .25 0 .25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0 3 0 0 0 3</td>
<td>0 2 0 0 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency (count)</td>
<td>Duration (hours)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0 0 3 0 0 3</td>
<td>0 0 2.25 0 0 2.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 .5 .5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0 2 0 0 0 2</td>
<td>0 3 0 0 0 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>5 day worklog sample</td>
<td>Survey Questions/Workday log Codes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>frequency 0, duration 0.25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>frequency 0, duration 0.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>frequency 0, duration 0.25</td>
<td>1.5 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>frequency 0, duration 0.25</td>
<td>8 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>frequency 0, duration 0.25</td>
<td>1.75 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>frequency 0, duration 0.25</td>
<td>8 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>frequency 0, duration 0.25</td>
<td>8 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>frequency 0, duration 0.25</td>
<td>13.75 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>frequency 0, duration 0.25</td>
<td>8 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>frequency 0, duration 0.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>frequency 0, duration 0.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ISLLC Standard 2:** Promotes school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and professional growth

- Culture of trust, high expectations
- Curriculum related tasks
- Positive learning environment
- Supervise instruction
- Student placement monitoring
- Promote staff leadership
- Protect instructional time
- Instructional technology development
- Staff development
- Student assessment

**Participant 5 Day Survey Questions/Workday log Codes**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3.75</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>.25</th>
<th>1.25</th>
<th>10.25 hr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>9 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>9.75 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>7.5 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.5 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.25 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.25 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>7.25 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.25 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.75 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>5.75 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.25 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>5 day worklog</td>
<td>16 School operations</td>
<td>17 Human resources</td>
<td>18 Finance</td>
<td>19 School events</td>
<td>20 Meetings/ training</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 frequency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>15.75 hr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 frequency</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>17 hr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 frequency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 frequency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>6.75 hr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 frequency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>18.25 hr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 frequency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>14.75 hr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 frequency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>14.5 hr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.5 hr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>16.75 hr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24.25 hr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>18.5 hr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.75 hr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.75 hr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>20.75 hr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>|   | frequency |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15| 14        | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 22| 38|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 17.75 hr. |
|   | duration  | 8.5| 0 | 0 | .5| 1 | 7.75|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 16| 22        | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 38| 62|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 16 hr. |
|   | duration  | 5.75| 1.25| .25| 0| 0 | 8.75|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 17| 9         | 0 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 19|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 13.5 hr. |
|   | duration  | 3.5| 0 | 2.5| 1| 4.25| 2.25|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 18| 24        | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 25| 50|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 17.5 hr. |
|   | duration  | 8.25| 0 | 0| .25| 0 | 9 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 19| 22        | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 30| 59|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 21.5 hr. |
|   | duration  | 7 | .5| 1.5| 3.5| 0 | 9 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 20| 4         | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 19| 25|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 8 hr. |
|   | duration  | 1 | .25| .25| 0 | 0 | 6.5|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 21| 14        | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26| 40|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 15.75 hr. |
|   | duration  | 7.75| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 22| 22        | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13| 36|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 18 hr. |
|   | duration  | 11.5| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.5| 5 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>19 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>21.25 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>31 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>19.25 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>27.25 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.75 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.25 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.25 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.50 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>7.25 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>21 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>12.25 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>10.25 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>24.75 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>duration</th>
<th>10.5</th>
<th>.75</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>6.25</th>
<th>7.25</th>
<th>24.75 hr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>24.75 hr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>5 day worklog</th>
<th>Survey/Workday log tasks</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22 Community relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 Parent relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 Business partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.5 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>5.25 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.5, 1.5, 0</td>
<td>3 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freq</td>
<td>1, 2, 0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dur</td>
<td>.25, .75, 0</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.25, .75, 1.25</td>
<td>3.25 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freq</td>
<td>1, 5, 3, 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dur</td>
<td>2, .25, 0</td>
<td>2.25 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.25, 0, 0</td>
<td>.25 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freq</td>
<td>3, 1, 0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dur</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5, 1, 0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freq</td>
<td>3, .25, 0</td>
<td>3.25 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dur</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.25, 2.25, 0</td>
<td>2.5 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freq</td>
<td>1, 4, 0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dur</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0, 2, 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freq</td>
<td>0, 1, 0</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dur</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>5-day working</td>
<td>ISLLC Standard 5: Integrity, fairness, ethical behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability/</td>
<td>for range of learners' practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disciplinary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reflective,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ethical, legal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey/Workday log items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC Standard 6: Political, social, economic, legal, cultural context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey/Worklog tasks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant</strong></td>
<td>5 day worklog</td>
<td>28 Advocacy for students, families</td>
<td>29 Professional organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>duration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0 1 1 .25 .25 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0 2 2 .5 .5 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0 1 1 .5 .5 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0 1 1 .25 .25 hr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G. Emergent Codes from Workday Log

1. *Facilitate a positive climate with staff:*
   - Prepare staff lunch
   - Visit teacher in the hospital
   - Call teacher with new baby
   - Have lunch with nurse recovering from surgery
   - Buy donuts and bagels for staff meeting

2. *Personal tasks/travel:*
   - Travel: to meetings, schools, school activities
   - Appointments: medical/other unspecified appointment
   - Family emergency
   - Lunch

3. *Administrative communication:*
   - Consult with assistant principal
   - Meet with superintendent/assistant superintendent
   - Meet with directors, supervisors
   - Talk with office staff

4. *School meetings:*
   - Staff meetings
   - District meeting – in school
   - Grade level meetings

5. *Informal staff communication:*
   - Chat with teacher
   - Talk with teacher
   - Greet teachers
6. **Crisis situations:**
   - Death of a student
   - Loss of electrical power/heat, lights in the building
   - Weather emergency: late buses, car accidents, late teachers
   - Threatening phone calls
   - Calling law enforcement for school emergencies

7. **Teaching:**
   - Worked with small group
   - Covered for teacher
   - Taught class

8. **Comments from participants**
   - Delayed opening
   - Holiday
   - Rarely have time for lunch
   - Rare week with no evening activities
   - Limited funds for technology
   - Small school district
   - 45 mile drive to work
   - Several interruptions
   - Carried disruptive student to class
   - Used to participate [in professional organizations] early in principalship
   - Two hour delay for weather
   - Interesting to see what I do all day compared to what I thought I did.