



2010

An Historical Analysis of the Chicago Public Schools Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Principals, 1983-2008

Siobhan Marie Cafferty
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cafferty, Siobhan Marie, "An Historical Analysis of the Chicago Public Schools Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Principals, 1983-2008" (2010). *Dissertations*. 60.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/60

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 2010 Siobhan Marie Cafferty

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

AN HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF THE CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS POLICY ON
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SELECTION OF PRINCIPALS, 1983-2008

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

PROGRAM IN CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL POLICY STUDIES

BY

SIOBHAN CAFFERTY

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

DECEMBER 2010

Copyright by Siobhan Cafferty, 2010
All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The successful completion of this study was only possible because of the support and patience of many people. My husband, Christopher Rowney, endured many late nights and heaps of paper all over our study. His support and love were steadfast and very much appreciated. My mother, Anne Durkin, my first teacher, taught me the importance of always finishing whatever I started. She also graciously shared the wisdom she accrued during her 40 years in education. My father, Phelim Cafferty Sr., generously imparted his emigrant work ethic and sense of adventure to me that I tapped into many times along this travel. My sister, Peg and my brothers, Patrick, Phelim and Liam have always been the guardians of my dreams. They were integral in developing my sense of play and imagination. They challenged me to find my voice and always encouraged me in my academic and occupational pursuits and for that I am extremely grateful. I would also like to thank my father-in-law, Dr. Don Rowney, for introducing me to Pierson and Tosh's works and for the discussions we had on the importance of institutional history. Those talks helped me shape the direction of my study.

I would like to acknowledge and thank my committee. Dr. Ann Marie Ryan was a very patient, supportive, calming force throughout this journey. I thank her for her time, understanding, humor and generosity. She was a trusted advisor and a true mentor. Dr. Robert Roemer and Dr. Beverly Kasper not only showed me Rome in the summer of

2003 but also gave their gifts of time, talent and direction, all of which made my study better.

I am forever grateful to the amazing teachers that have shared their time, knowledge and wisdom with me throughout my schooling. Jan Callahan, Dr. Rich Halverson, Dr. Rob Manning, Dr. Len Biallas, Fr. J. J. Lakers and the late Fr. Louis Davino were very kind and tolerant guides and advisors. Dr. Ward Weldon was not only a wonderful teacher but he also opened up his personal archives to me for this study.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge Sr. Cathleen Cahill R.S.M., Mary Agnes Dwyer, Sr. Suzanne Zuercher, O.S.B., Sr. Judith Zonsius, O.S.B., Linda C. Layne, and Patricia Owens for the commitment they all possessed to quality education in the city of Chicago. They each humbly and uniquely moved through Chicago's educational labyrinth with great dignity and compassion. Each one of these women shared their gifts and talents with me and by example inspired me to pursue school leadership as a means to create a better world around me.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my parents, Annie and Phellie,
to my husband, Chris, and my sons, Christy and Packy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
ABSTRACT	ix
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Historical Background	1
Limitations of the Study	15
Significance of the Study	15
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE	17
History of Chicago's School Reform	17
Key Features of the Chicago School Reform Act of 1988	24
Reform Efforts in Vallas Era	26
New Leadership, New Reforms	31
Effective Schools Research	34
Site-Based Management	36
Changing Role of Principalship	39
Research Questions	47
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	48
Method of Research	48
Unit of Analysis	51
Data to be Collected and Sources of Data	52
Data Collection Methods	56
Data Management	56
Data Analysis and Interpretation	56
CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS	58
Introduction	58
Study of Data	58
Policy Changes Over Time	60
Policy Changes on the Requirements for the Selection of CPS Principals in the 1980s	60
Policy Changes on the Requirements for the Selection of CPS Principals in the 1990s	63
Policy Changes on the Requirements for the Selection of CPS Principals in the 2000s	67
Policy and Educational Trends	73
Educational Trends that Influenced Chicago School Leaders 1983-1989	73

Educational Trends that Influenced Chicago School Leaders 1990-1999	79
Educational Trends that Influenced Chicago School Leaders 2000-2008	90
Summary	96
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION	97
Introduction	97
Results	98
Summary	102
Recommendations	109
Further Study	111
Conclusion	112
APPENDIX A: WRITTEN DOCUMENT ANALYSIS WORKSHEET	115
REFERENCES	117
VITA	135

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Chronological Order of Superintendents of the CPS 1983-2008	62
Table 2: Required Competencies for CPS Principals in the 1980s	62
Table 3: Required Competencies for CPS Principals in the 1990s	67
Table 4: Required Competencies for CPS Principals in the 2000s	71
Table 5: CPS Success Factors for Principals in the 2000s	71
Table 6: Requirements for Selection of CPS Principals 1983-2008	72
Table 7: CPAA Conference Themes in the 1980s	73
Table 8: Educational Trends at CPAA Conferences in the 1980s	74
Table 9: CPAA Conference Themes in the 1990s	80
Table 10: Educational Trends Highlighted at CPAA Conferences in the 1990s	80
Table 11: CPAA Conference Themes in the 2000s	91
Table 12: Educational Trends Highlighted at CPAA Conferences in the 2000s	91

ABSTRACT

This historical analysis provided an opportunity to appreciate Chicago's course in the national school reform landscape. This study helped to understand the effects school reform efforts had on school leadership policy in Chicago. It verified a roster of superintendents in Chicago during 1983-2008, established a chronology of school reform events and assembled an inventory of reform policies, theories and directives that potentially may create the capacity to instruct and inform future initiatives, perspective and debate on the issue of principal preparation at the local level. The analysis of change in local policy echoed and identified national educational trends in this time period.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Like all major urban school districts in the United States, the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) struggled to manage the development and recruitment of qualified school leaders from 1983-2008. The policy for selection of principals changed with each new leadership regime in Chicago. This study examined how and why the CPS's Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Principals changed during this 25-year period of time. This historical analysis identified the policy changes and examined the influences, forces, and ideas, which led to these changes. The following research questions guided this study:

1) How has the policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Chicago Public Schools Principals changed from 1983-2008?

2) How did trends in education and educational research influence the changes in the Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Chicago Public Schools Principals?

Historical Background

In the late 70s and early 80s, educators, citizens and policy makers came together to work on public school reform in the United States. Using the research of many of these same individuals, a movement began to form to advocate the findings of this research and to disseminate the findings in schools across the country. This movement became known

as the effective schools movement. The leader of this movement was Ronald R. Edmonds. Edmonds and his colleagues (1979) convinced educators that schools could be changed to become effective for all students.

Edmond's (1979) characteristics of effective schools established the framework for school reform efforts in the late 20th century (Hess, 1991). Edmond's notion that strong leadership leads to instructionally effective schools called for principals to actively guide the instructional level and begin to focus on the world of outcomes and student assessment. Changes in U.S. public schools laid increasing demands on instructional leaders. Research on effective schools identified the principal as the key factor in efforts to improve student instruction and student achievement. No specialized position received more notice, nor given more liberty to articulate a fresh role, than that of the school principal (Bolman & Deal, 1993; Datnow, Hubbard, Mehan, 2002; Murphy & Datnow, 2003).

Public education in the United States during 1980's faced a host of challenges. In April of 1983, Terrell Bell, President Reagan's Secretary of Education unveiled *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* and provoked a national discussion about the purpose and the quality of public education (Hess, 1991; National Commission, 1983). The report contributed to the ever-growing sense that American schools were failing terribly, and touched off a wave of local, state, and federal reform efforts.

A Nation at Risk trumpeted the shortcomings of the U.S. schools solidifying the view that school reform should focus on improving academic outcomes for all students (Elmore, 1990; Kaestle & Lodewick, 2007; Katz, 1980). A new regime was rising.

Education reform advocates agreed that reform needed to infiltrate the classroom and tighten up curriculum. By the late 1980's this consensus had produced a powerful national movement known as standards based reform. Reformers behind the standards based movement believed that schools could raise student achievement by aligning curriculum, classroom instruction and assessment. The theory of action behind this agenda was that educators would respond with more effective teaching when faced with regulation, standardization and accountability for student outcomes (Kaestle & Lodewick, 2007).

With the emergence of this new wave of school reform, American principals assumed a new set of "change implementation functions" ranging from monitoring compliance with federal regulations to designing staff development and providing direct classroom support to educators (Hallinger, 1992, p. 37). In contrast to earlier roles, which were largely to preserve status quo, maintain program development, and manage curriculum, the new role was oriented toward school improvement and change (Murphy, 1998). Due to amplified federal intervention in school policy, principals came to be viewed as catalysts for educational change (Bolman & Deal, 1994; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1992; Murphy & Hallinger, 1992). Principals were enlisted to carry out the regulation, standardization and accountability that standards based reform required. The principalship in the late 20th century had become increasingly complex and challenging. New settings and expectations in education and society joined to create new challenges and perspectives for the role of the principal (Cistone & Stevenson, 2000; Elmore, 1990).

Urban school systems throughout the US continued to be criticized for failing to educate children. Local control of schools became an increasingly common strategy for improving public education (Hess, 1995; Lane, 1992; Ravitch & Viterri, 1997; Sebring & Bryk, 2000). Moving the locus of control from central offices to individual schools was believed to be the change urban schools needed to make. School improvements were believed to be derived from the dominant values in each community (Lane, 1991). In order to give schools more flexibility in meeting the needs of their students, higher levels of governance should focus on defining results and remove constraints on school practices. To achieve these outcomes in Chicago, the Chicago School Reform Act of 1988 was created.

The Chicago School Reform Act has been called the most radical educational experiment in the United States (Rollow & Bryk, 1994; Walberg & Niemiec, 1994). Reformers in Chicago found a way to change the system at its core. The act established local control and accountability that may not have served every school and every student but made significant changes in Chicago's system of schooling (Sebring & Bryk, 2000).

The chief theoretical basis of Chicago's school reform lies in the collective research from effective schools, participatory decision-making, and the site-based school management literature (Ford & Bennett, 1994; Rollow & Bryk, 1993). Chicago school reformers believed that principals would be empowered to exercise the leadership necessary to increase student achievement if bureaucratic sanctions were removed and the locus of control transferred to parents, teachers and community members (Calabrese, 1989; Hess, 1991; Hess, 1995; Katz, 1992). The school reform movement was a

successful public policy campaign that changed the structure and governance of Chicago schools. It drew national attention and rose above the historic limits that constrained the potential for change in urban education (Katz, 1992).

The impetus for school reform in Chicago began with the fiscal crisis during the 1979-1980 school year; the system failed to meet its payroll and required a bailout (Crump, 1999; Katz, Fine & Simon, 1997). Declining enrollments and escalating costs led to both a fiscal meltdown and the creation of the state mandated Chicago School Finance Authority in 1980, to oversee the system's budget. For years education advocacy groups had been calling for reform and reporting on the failings of the Chicago Public Schools. Continuing revenue problems, conflicts with the Chicago Teacher's Union and poor performances on standardized achievement exams contributed to a perception of despair (Bryk et al., 1991; Hess, 1991). *A Nation at Risk* fueled a campaign to adopt statewide school reform in response (Hess, 1991; National Commission, 1983).

In 1982, the Chicago Panel on School Policy and Finance was founded to examine schooling, specifically tracking the Chicago Public Schools revenue and spending. They published reports on various education issues such as parent involvement, student mobility and school finance. In 1985, they exposed Chicago's elementary schools failing to prepare students for high school. The report shed light on Chicago's abysmal retention rate and policy and shockingly high drop out rates (Bryk, Sebring, Kerbow, Rollow, & Easton, 1993; Crump, 1999; Ford & Bennett, 1994; Hess, 1991; Shipps, 1997). Also, in 1985, Designs for Change, a local grass roots organization, found that almost half of Chicago Public School's economically disadvantaged students who entered

high school did not graduate and of those students who did manage to graduate, more than half were reading below the ninth grade level (Crump, 1999; Sebring & Bryk, 2000; Shippy, 1997). Both reports revealed a troubled state of public education in Chicago.

The first piece of state legislation responding to these issues and focusing onto school reform was established in 1985 with the Chicago School Reform Act (Public Act 84-126). The 1985 legislation creating Local School Improvement Councils (LSC) and annual local budget hearings laid the foundation for meaningful citizen involvement in the Chicago Public Schools. PA 84-126 had two components: (1) annual school site budget in each school in which citizens, parents, and teachers vote on proposed school budget for the following year; and (2) the creation of LSCs at each public school with specific rights and duties over curriculum, personnel and budget.

This reform effort contributed to the changing landscape regarding the role of the principal, teacher accountability and community involvement (Crump, 1999). It shared the power to disapprove discretionary spending and hold discussions on the adoption of school budgets (Bryk et al., 1999). Other issues such as early childhood programs and student drop out rates were addressed but, most importantly, the establishment of a district report card was approved within the framework of this legislation. These were significant advances that laid the groundwork for the Chicago School Reform Act of 1988.

In October of 1986, Chicago's mayor Harold Washington reached out to the business community to ask for assistance in tackling some of the problems in public education. Mayor Washington invited community leaders to participate in an education

summit that was first established as a partnership between the public high schools and the Chicago business community. Leaders from nearly 40 universities, unions, businesses and community organizations came together focused on assisting the city in its efforts to improve schools (Crump, 1999; Ford, 1999). The summit worked to establish business and school linkages by establishing an action-oriented plan and agreement (Crump, 1999; Mayor Education Summit Report, 1988; Shipps, 2003). The intent was to replicate the Boston Compact, which had sought to motivate high school students to stay in school with the promise of a job upon graduation (Crump, 1999; Ford, 1999; Shipps, 2003). The plan died however when Chicago's superintendent of schools, Manford Byrd, refused to consider even the first steps without a major commitment of new funds (Crump, 1997; Ford & Bennett, 1992; Shipps, 1997).

The next catalyzing event was the 19-day strike in the fall of 1987. The Chicago Teacher's Union and the Chicago Public School administration were locked in a battle over wages and work requirements (Bryk & Sebring, 1991). It was the longest strike since the union had been granted collective bargaining and the city's ninth strike in eighteen years (Bryk, Sebring, Kerbow, Rollow, & Easton, 1998; Shipps, 1997). Although a settlement was eventually reached, the strike served to galvanize parents who felt angry and marginalized and drive community groups to form a coalition with Chicago business leaders. A settlement was eventually reached and the strike ended. The reform movement was recharged and gained steam.

In the fall of 1987, U.S. Secretary of Education, William Bennett, declared Chicago's Public Schools the worst in the country (Crump, 1999; O'Connell, 1991;

Wahlberg & Niemiec, 1994). Secretary Bennett's statement sensationalized what was an increasingly obvious problem: the failure of Chicago's schools to provide a satisfactory education for most of the children in the city (O'Connell, 1991). Chicago schools were performing poorly by any estimate. Economically disadvantaged and minority children were not being successfully educated (Crump, 1999; Hess, 1995; O'Connell, 1991).

In 1987, Mayor Washington changed gears and appointed a Parent Community Council (PCC) to participate in a second education summit. The PCC was to assist business leaders and the Chicago Public Schools in drafting a proposal for educational reform that the mayor planned to sponsor. During the second year of the summit disgruntled administrators and union representatives refused to participate in any agreements, leaving the reform effort to parents, and community, and business representatives (Crump, 1999; Hess, 1995; Shipps, 1997). Mayor Washington revived the summit process, but died in November of 1987. His death did not halt the mobilization process. It did however produce a power vacuum and paved the way for numerous advocacy groups and community organizations to voice and address the failings of the schools (Bryk et al., 1999; Crump, 1999). Mayor Washington was replaced by acting Mayor Eugene Sawyer who did little to adopt significant educational change and reform.

The reform efforts then shifted from the mobilization phase to the spring legislative session in the state's capitol, Springfield, Illinois. The PCC and the various advocacy groups and community organizations were present with very different drafts of legislation (Bryk et al., 1999). The summit adopted a tentative agreement to expand early childhood programs, establish school based management councils at every school and

pursue ways to enhance teacher professionalism. After far-reaching negotiations behind closed doors in the spring of 1988, the state government voted and passed a reform bill. Amendments were adopted to strengthen the power of LSCs, reduce the size of bureaucracy and reallocate funds to schools with the heaviest concentrations of disadvantaged students (Bryk et al., 1999; Crump, 1999; Shipps, 1997). Illinois Governor James Thompson exercised his amendatory veto power and changed the reform package in ways that would allow him power to influence the number of tax dollars given to the Chicago schools (Bryk, Sebring, Kerbow, Rollow, & Easton, 1999). The fall legislation session brought long deliberations and the governor and the legislature reached agreement on several issues like the “supernumerary of teachers as well as the powers and composition of an oversight authority” (p. 20). After much debate and inquiry, a compromise bill passed in December of 1988. Katz (1992) described this bill as the most radical attempt at school reform in the last hundred years.

With the Chicago School Reform Act of 1988, the city of Chicago embarked on an historic effort to restructure its failing public school system (Wong & Shen, 2003). Chicago’s school reform efforts aimed “to reverse poor academic performance, better serve disadvantaged and minority students, and lower drop out rates by employing school-based management, teacher empowerment and community involvement” (Crump, 1999, p. 20).

From the highly centralized bureaucratic system that it was the Chicago School Reform Act of 1988 focused on reclaiming initiative and power for parents, community members, teachers and principals. The restructuring established by the law sought to

create a unified energy to drive school improvement in school communities (Bryk et al., 1993). It was believed that such energy would give birth to organizational changes and raise student achievement (Hallinger & Heck, 1998). This unified force was supposed to instigate “expanded engagement of local participants in the work of the schools that would sustain attention and provide substantial support for improvements in classroom instruction and in student learning” (Bryk et al., 1993, p. 75). The type of academic success that parents wanted to see did not seem to happen with this wave of reforms.

In April, 1989, directly following the passage of the Chicago School Reform Act, Richard M. Daley was elected mayor of Chicago. He was elected with strong support from nearly all the constituencies that had been instrumental in passing P.A. 85-1418. The new mayor was immediately confronted with major issues related to the operation of the school system. The poor academic performance of Chicago’s 430,000 plus students presented a fundamental problem. The Chicago School Reform Act mandated that the current School Board be immediately replaced with an interim board while the Mayor selected a new permanent board (Public Act 84-126).

In 1995, researchers and reform advocates reported dissatisfaction with progress of the 1988 reforms. After several years, there was little evidence that the decentralization reforms had made a serious impact on the quality of schooling and student achievement. State politicians and Chicago’s Mayor Richard J. Daley were also concerned with the state of the school system. Researchers noted that student achievement had improved at some schools (30%), declined at others (30%) and stayed constant at the remainder (30%)

(Bryk et al., 1999; Edge, 2000).

The general public was not confident in the quality of Chicago's schools. Many of the LSCs had not experienced an increase in parental influence and involvement regarding school-based management. The LSCs had a great deal of autonomy but it was not balanced with responsibility (Edge, 2000). For example, LSCs received State Chapter I funding for educational support and resources but it was the Board of Education ultimately accountable to the state for its use (Edge, 2000). Researchers noted that principal turn over rates were very high during this period of time as a result of local constituencies influencing the LSCs' selection of principals (Ford, 1992). All the while, financial issues continued to plague the school system (Bryk et al., 1999; Russo, 2004). Designs for Change and other advocacy groups continued to rally for change and published reports documenting the need for continued progress and change in school financing, teacher recruitment, and curriculum development.

The 1995 reforms successfully redistributed the education power structure between the LSCs and the Board. The goal of the 1995 reform was to craft a more efficient system of schools that would provide for increased student achievement and set and preserve more rigorous standards for teachers, principals and LSCs (Edge, 2000; Russo, 2004). The reform created parameters within which schools and LSCs could exercise authority while being held accountable for student learning achievement as well personnel and financial choices (Edge, 2000).

In 1995, the Chicago School Reform Amendatory Act was adopted. This reform effort sought to balance the powers that had been decentralized to the schools by

establishing stronger central office support functions (Edge, 2000). It also created accountability measures managed by the central office. The 1995 Amendatory Act comprised of five important components: mayoral appointment of five person-school board; mayoral appointment of new senior administrative team; development of Chief Executive Officer position; stronger coordination of activities in support of more system-wide objectives, goals and standards; and guidelines holding LSCs accountable to the School Board for system wide standards (Bryk et al, 1999; Edge, 2000; Russo, 2004).

The 1995 law reduced the board's size, gave Mayor Daley the right to appoint anyone to the five member board instead of picking from a community-generated list, and allowed him the right to pick the schools' chief executive officer. The chief executive officer was allowed to choose his chief education officer. This new structure ended the long held position of sole superintendent of schools and created a supervisory power that was shared. The powerful local school councils, a remnant of Chicago's 1980s reform approach of school-based management, remained in place. The 1995 legislation also gave the school board sweeping new powers over individual schools and principals, allowing the board to take over local schools that were in crisis (Crump, 1999; Russo, 2004; Shipp, 1997). The amendments gave the mayor the power to use funds more flexibly. The law curtailed the rights of the teachers union that had long limited what Chicago superintendents could do (Crump, 1999; Russo, 2004.) Chicago teachers were prohibited from striking for at least 18 months and banned from bargaining on a number of issues, including charter schools, privatization, and class schedules (Edge, 2000; Russo, 2004).

During this wave of reform, the central administration under Mayor Richard M.

Daley and new Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the Chicago Public Schools, Paul Vallas, enforced some necessary fiscal and administrative discipline on the system and introduced a high stakes accountability system centered on standardized test performance (Edge, 2000; Russo, 2004). Vallas also arrived at CPS “believing in the mayor’s political rhetoric of getting schools to the basics, only promoting students if they showed they were learning and establishing adult accountability for the successes and failures of the city schools” (Russo, 2004, p. 30).

Most important, for perhaps the first time in Chicago's history, low-performing schools were pressured to do better, and students and their parents encountered a system that did not just pass everyone through regardless of what they learned. The practice of social promotion ended (Bryk et al., 1999; Russo, 2004). It was replaced by a policy that focused on standards of success for school administration, teachers and students. Vallas balanced the budget, rehabbed school facilities and built new ones. Test scores reported to the public climbed nearly every year, multiple union contracts were negotiated without any strikes, and a number of new programs--summer school, after-school programs, alternative schools, new magnet programs--were all created to support the newly established standards for success (Edge, 2000; Russo, 2004).

Vallas’ leadership lasted six years. In his last year, the signs were increasingly clear that he was on his way out. Test scores began to flatten, union leadership changed and relations began to sour and his relationship with the mayor began to crumble (Russo, 2004). Mayor Daley became much more critical of the schools failing to make progress. He criticized Vallas’ reading initiative and introduced his own citywide reading initiative

and related events.

The changing of the guard in 2001 promoted progress and marshaled in new ideas (Klonsky & Klonsky, 2008; Russo, 2004). Those who believed there would be a third wave of reform hoped Chicago would enter “a golden era in which LSCs, community groups and reformers would all work more closely and peacefully” (Russo, 2004, p. 5). They hoped issues like professional development, recruitment and retention would finally be addressed. But, others were not as optimistic. They worried no one could fill Vallas’ shoes. His charisma and structures of accountability and stability for the system were seen as irreplaceable.

The new school leader, Arne Duncan, like Vallas, came from outside of the city’s well-established education circles. The fact that the mayor hired someone who was inexperienced politically and equally as untried in educational leadership added to the growing pessimism (Russo, 2004; Wong, 2003). But Duncan brought optimism and the hope of rejuvenation and progress to Chicago’s schools. He proved to be a cooperative, collaborative leader. He partnered with his chief education officer, Barbara Eason-Watkins and together created an agenda that organized six massive districts into 24 more manageable areas and funded school based reading specialists. In his tenure he continued to move school reform efforts forward. His style was less confrontational and controversial and without scandal. He and Eason-Watkins kept the focus on school improvement.

Instructional leadership was the cornerstone of Duncan’s leadership. He closed low performing schools in the first year of his leadership, changed the accountability

rating system and removed a handful of principals for chronic academic failure (Russo, 2004). The student retention program thrived. He initiated a human capital program, the education initiative, the reading initiative and a district reorganization program (Russo, 2004). Duncan left CPS in January of 2009.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited in several ways. The historical research collected on the changes of Policy on the Selection of Principals in the Chicago Public Schools dealt with events that occurred over 25 years ago. Since written records were relied upon, the data sources were limited to the available written record. These records were limited and found in documents from institutions and grass roots organizations working for or against change in policy intended to further a practical end, usually of a short-term political nature. There was limited documentation of school policy changes in the mainstream press.

Significance of the Study

Schooling is no longer just about students and teachers in the school building, but increasingly about the rules and regulations propagated in state capitals or local municipalities designed to improve student performance and social development as well as the supervision and management of the schools they attend (Sykes, Schneider, & Ford, 2009). Policy has assumed an increasingly central role in education, an increasing number of scholars have turned their attention to the process through which rules are adopted and the cost they impose on the quality of teaching and learning. Almost all

aspects of the educational endeavor are now the objects of policy research (Sykes, Schneider, & Ford, 2009).

The education enterprise is interesting to study because of its role in transmitting cultural heritages and traditions, that is, it forms a means to develop knowledge, understanding and values from one generation to the next (McCullough, 2004). In these ways it is a key dimension in history, albeit one that does not always receive the attention it deserves. This historical analysis provided an opportunity to appreciate Chicago's trajectory in the national school reform terrain. Although studies of past educational reform efforts do not necessarily provide immediate or specific suggestions for improving our present system of education, they do add to a better understanding and appreciation of the complex nature of educational development and change today (Lodewick & Kaestle, 2007).

This study helped to understand the effects school reform efforts had on school leadership policy in Chicago. It established a chronology of events and assembled an inventory of reform policies that potentially may create the capacity to instruct and inform future initiatives, perspective and debate on the issue of principal preparation at the local level. The analysis of change in local policy also echoed and helped identify national educational trends in this time period.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter examined the sources relevant to framing Chicago's historical school reform efforts during the period of 1983-2008. Before exploring effective schools literature and defining site-based management, the history of Chicago's school reform efforts will be reviewed. The chapter concludes with a discussion on the impact reform efforts had on the changing role and expectations of principalship.

History of Chicago's School Reform

Public education in the United States during 1980s faced a many challenges. In April of 1983, Terrell Bell, President Reagan's Secretary of Education unveiled *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* and provoked a national discussion about the purpose and the quality of public education (Hess, 1991; Moore, 1985; National Commission, 1983). The report contributed to the growing sense that American schools were failing terribly, and touched off a wave of local, state, and federal reform efforts.

A Nation at Risk trumpeted the shortcomings of the U.S. schools solidifying the view that school reform should focus on improving academic outcomes for all students (Kaestle & Lodewick, 2007). Education reform advocates agreed that reform needed to infiltrate the classroom and tighten up curriculum. By the late 1980's this consensus had produced a powerful national movement known as standards based reform. Reformers behind the standards based movement believed that schools could raise student

achievement by aligning curriculum, classroom instruction and assessment. The theory of action behind this agenda is that educators will reply with more effective teaching when faced with regulation, standardization and accountability for student outcomes (Kaestle & Lodewick, 2007).

With the emergence of this wave of school reform, American principals assumed a new set of “change implementation functions” ranging from monitoring compliance with federal regulations to designing staff development and providing direct classroom support to educators (Murphy & Hallinger, 1992, p. 77). In contrast to earlier roles, which were largely to preserve status quo, maintain program development, and manage curriculum, the new role was oriented toward school improvement and change. Due to amplified federal intervention in policy, the principal came to be viewed as catalysts for educational change (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; Murphy & Hallinger, 1993). Principals were enlisted to carry out the regulation, standardization and accountability that standards based reform required. The principalship in the late 20th century had become increasingly complex and challenging. New settings and expectations in education and society joined to create new challenges and perspectives for the role of the principal (Cistone & Stevenson, 2000).

Chicago school reformers believed that principals would be empowered to exercise the leadership necessary “to improve student outcomes if bureaucratic sanctions were removed and the locus of responsibility transferred to parents and community [members]” (Stinnette, 1993, p. 5). The school reform movement was a successful public policy campaign that changed the structure and governance of Chicago schools. It drew

national attention and “transcended the historic limits that constrained the potential for change in urban education” (Katz, 1992, p. 58).

The impetus for school reform in Chicago began with the fiscal crisis during the 1979-1980 school year; the system failed to meet its payroll and required a bailout (Crump, 1999; Ford, 1991; Katz & Simon, 1990). Declining enrollments and escalating costs led to a fiscal meltdown and the creation of the state mandated Chicago School Finance Authority in 1980 to oversee the system’s budget. For years education advocacy groups had been calling for reform and reporting on the failings of the Chicago Public Schools. Continuing money problems, conflicts with the Chicago Teacher’s Union and poor performances on standardized achievement exams contributed to a perception of despair (Bryk et al., 1991; Hess, 1990). The research fueled a campaign to adopt statewide school reform in response to *A Nation at Risk* (Hess, 1990; National Commission, 1983).

In 1982 the Chicago Panel on School Policy and Finance was founded to examine schooling, specifically tracking the Chicago Public Schools revenue and spending. They also issued reports on various education issues such as parent involvement, student mobility and school finance. In 1985, they exposed Chicago’s elementary schools failing to prepare students for high school. The report shed light on Chicago’s abysmal retention rate and policy and shockingly high drop out rates (Bryk et al., 1994; Crump, 1997; Ford, 1991; Hess, 1991; Shipp, 1999; Wrigley, 1997). Also, in 1985 Designs for Change, a local grass roots organization, found that almost half of Chicago Public School’s economically disadvantaged students who entered high school did not graduate and of

those students who did manage to graduate, more than half were reading below the ninth grade level (Bryk et al., 1994; Crump, 1999; Shipps, 1997). Both reports revealed a troubled state of public education in Chicago.

The first piece of legislation related to these school reform efforts was established in 1985 with Public Act 84-126. The 1985 legislation creating Local School Improvement Councils (LSC) and annual local budget hearings laid the foundation for meaningful citizen involvement in the Chicago Public Schools. PA 84-126 had two components: (1) annual school site budget in each school in which citizens, parents, and teachers vote on proposed school budget for the following year; and (2) the creation of LSCs at each public school with specific rights and duties over curriculum, personnel and budget. This reform effort contributed to the changing landscape regarding the role of the principal, teacher accountability and community involvement (Crump, 1999). It shared the power to disapprove discretionary spending and hold discussions on the adoption of school budgets (Bryk et al., 1999). Other issues such as early childhood programs, student drop out rates were addressed and most importantly the establishment of a district report card was approved within the framework of this legislation. These were significant advances that laid the groundwork for the Chicago School Reform Act (CSRA) of 1988.

In October of 1986, Chicago's Mayor Harold Washington reached out to the business community to ask for assistance in tackling some of the problems in public education. Mayor Washington invited community leaders to participate in an education summit that was first established as a partnership between the public high schools and the Chicago business community. Leaders from nearly 40 universities, unions, businesses

and community organizations came together focused on assisting the city in its effort to improve schools (Crump, 1999; Ford, 1991). The summit worked to establish business and school linkages by establishing an organized plan and agreement (Crump, 1999; Mayor Education Summit Report, 1988; Shipps, 1997). The intent was to replicate the Boston Compact, which had sought to motivate high school students to stay in school with the promise of a job upon graduation (Crump, 1999; Ford & Bennett, 1994; Shipps, 1997). The plan died however when Chicago's superintendent of schools, Manford Byrd, refused to consider even the first steps without a major commitment of new funds (Crump, 1999; Ford & Bennett, 1994; Shipps, 1997).

The next catalyzing event was the 19-day strike in the fall of 1987. The Chicago Teacher's Union and the Chicago Public School administration were locked in a battle over wages and work requirements (Bryk et al., 1993; Crump, 1999; Ford & Bennett, 1994; Shipps, 1997). It was the longest strike since the union had been granted collective bargaining and the city's ninth strike in 18 years (Bryk et al., 1993, Bryk, Sebring, Kerbow, Rollow, & Easton, 1994; Shipps, 1997). Although a settlement was eventually reached, the strike served to galvanize parents who felt angry and marginalized and community groups to form a coalition with Chicago business leaders. A settlement was eventually reached and the strike ended. The reform movement was recharged and gaining steam.

In the fall of 1987, U.S. Secretary of Education, William Bennett, declared Chicago's Public Schools the worst in the country (Crump, 1999; O'Connell, 1991; Wahlberg & Niemiec, 1994). Secretary Bennett's statement drew attention to what was

an increasingly obvious problem: the failure of Chicago's schools to provide an adequate education for the city's children (O'Connell, 1991). Chicago schools were performing poorly by any estimate. Economically disadvantaged and minority children were not being successfully educated (Hess, 1991; O'Connell, 1991).

Mayor Washington changed gears and appointed a Parent Community Council (PCC) to participate in a second education summit. The PCC was to assist business leaders and the Chicago Public Schools in drafting a proposal for educational reform that the mayor planned to sponsor. During the second year of the summit disgruntled administrators and union representatives refused to participate in any agreements, leaving the reform effort to parents, and community, and business representatives (Crump, 1999; Hess, 1991; Shipp, 2003). Mayor Washington revived the summit process, but died in November of 1987. His death did not halt the mobilization process. It did however produce a power vacuum and paved the way for numerous advocacy groups and community organizations like Chicagoans United to Reform Education (CURE) to voice and address the failings of the schools (Bryk et al., 1999; Crump, 1999). Mayor Washington was replaced by acting Mayor Eugene Sawyer who did little to adopt significant educational reform.

The action then shifted from the mobilization phase to the spring legislative session in the state's capitol, Springfield, Illinois. The PCC, CURE, and the various advocacy groups and community organizations were present with very different drafts of legislation (Bryk et al., 1993). The summit adopted a tentative agreement to expand early childhood programs, establish school based management councils at every school and

pursue ways to enhance teacher professionalism. After far-reaching negotiations behind closed doors in the spring of 1988, the state government voted and passed a reform bill. Amendments were adopted to strengthen the power of LSCs, reduce the size of bureaucracy and reallocate funds to schools with the heaviest concentrations of disadvantaged students (Bryk et al., 1999; Crump, 1999; Shipps, 1997). Illinois Governor James Thompson exercised his amendatory veto power and changed the reform package in ways that would continue his influence over the Chicago schools (Bryk et al., 1999; Sebring, Kerbow, Rollow, & Easton, 1999).

The summit progressed and a larger coalition, the Alliance for Better Schools (ABCs) Coalition, mounted a campaign in Springfield, the state capitol, to secure passage of a law to restructure the Chicago Public Schools. The well-organized ABCs Coalition campaign worked diligently for months to pass their bill in Springfield, supported by the parents, school reformers, business executives and lobbyists. The fall legislation session brought long deliberations and the governor and the legislature reached agreement on several issues like the “supernumerary of teachers as well as the powers and composition of an oversight authority” (Bryk et al., 1999, p. 22).

After much debate and inquiry, the compromise bill was passed, amended with minor changes, passed again, and signed by the governor in December of 1988, to take effect in 1989. In October of 1990 the LSCs were sworn into office, over 5,000 people filled the pavilion at University of Illinois-Chicago, as 3,200 African Americans (56%), 1,000 Latino’s and 870 whites (20%) joined the ranks of elected school officials

nationwide (Designs for Change, 1991). Katz (1992) described this bill as the most radical attempt at school reform in the last hundred years.

Key Features of the Chicago School Reform Act of 1988

The Chicago School Reform Act passed as Senate Bill 1840. It is now known as Public Act 85-1418. It rewrote Article 34 of the Illinois School Code and fundamentally restructured the Chicago Public Schools. PA Act 85-1418 thoughtfully sought to undermine centralized bureaucratic control and replace it with complex local school regulations and politics (Moore, 1990). The law attacked the failures of the Chicago school system. It expanded participation among parents, community members, teachers and the principal by devolving to these local actors important local authority and new resources to solve local problems (Bryk et al., 1999; Moore, 1994). The Chicago School Reform Act contained six major components:

1. Established Local School Councils

The first component of the reform act is the best known, the establishment of school-based management in the form of elected Local School Councils (LSCs) at each school site. These councils were given three responsibilities: to create a school improvement plan; to adopt a spending plan; and to select the principal to lead on a four-year performance contract. The LSC membership consists of six elected parents, two elected community members, two teachers, a principal, (and one elected student on the high school level). The law introduced parents as key decision makers at each local school in Chicago (Moore, 1990).

2. Reshaping the Principalship

The second component of the reform act gave principals greater authority over the school budgets and over the physical plant. Having lost their tenure, principals became accountable to LSCs. Principals gained sole authority to recruit and hire new teachers and some effort was made to shorten the process for removal of incompetent teachers. These changes encouraged principals to direct their efforts toward meeting the concerns of local constituencies.

3. Expanding Influence for Teachers

Teachers were given a voice in selecting and retaining the principal through the two votes on the LSC. They have advisory responsibility regarding issues of school curriculum, instruction and budget through the establishment a Professional Personnel Advisory Committee (PPAC) at each school. The changes expanded teachers' role and influence in school level decision-making.

4. Redirecting School Fiscal Resources

A cap on central office administrative spending was established and school based budgeting is implemented. Equitable allocation of funds to individuals is required under the Act. Increased discretionary revenues are spread to schools with high percentages of disadvantaged students. Greater revenue equity across the system was implemented and new discretionary resources distributed at the school level to foster change and restructuring.

5. Reducing Line Authority of Central Office

The Chicago Board of Education's authority to name principals was eliminated. Central Office control over curricular issues was restricted. Central office control over local school operations was abolished.

6. Establishing a Focus on Academic Improvement

To guide the change process, the Chicago School Reform Act formulated explicit educational goals for children and objectives on which to focus school based efforts at improving school quality and student learning (Bryk, 1994). The requirement of schools to develop and annually update three-year School Improvement Plan was adopted (Bryk, 1999; Bryk et al., 1994; Crump, 1999; Ford, 1991; Moore, 1990).

Reform Efforts in Vallas Era

From the highly centralized bureaucratic system that it was the Chicago School Reform Act of 1988 focused on reclaiming initiative and power for parents, community members, teachers and principals. The restructuring established by the law sought to create a unified energy to drive school improvement in school communities (Bryk & Sebring, 1991). It was believed that such energy would give birth to organizational changes and raise student achievement. This unified force was supposed to instigate increased engagement of local participants in the work of the schools that would sustain attention and provide substantial support for improvements in classroom instruction and in student achievement (Bryk et al., 1999). The type of academic success that parents wanted to see did not seem to happen.

In April of 1989, directly following the passage of the Chicago School Reform Act, Richard M. Daley was elected mayor of Chicago. He was elected with strong support from nearly all the constituencies that had been instrumental in passing P.A. 85-1418 (Russo, 2004). The new mayor was immediately confronted with major issues related to the operation of the school system. The poor academic performance of Chicago's 430,000+ students presented a fundamental problem. The Chicago School Reform Act mandated that the current school board be immediately replaced with an interim board while the Mayor selected a new permanent board.

Researchers and reform advocates reported dissatisfaction with progress of the 1988 reforms (Edge, 2000). After several years, there was little evidence that the decentralization reforms had made a serious impact on the quality of schooling and student achievement. State politicians and Chicago's Mayor Richard J. Daley were perturbed with the state of the school system. Researchers noted that student achievement had improved at some schools (30%), declined at others (30%) and stayed constant at the remainder (30%) (Bryk et al., 1998; Edge, 2000).

The general public was not confident in the quality of Chicago's schools. Many of the LSCs had not experienced an increase in parental influence and involvement regarding school-based management. The LSCs had a great deal of autonomy but it was not balanced with responsibility (Edge, 2000). For example, LSCs received State Chapter I funding for educational support and resources but it was the Chicago's board of trustees ultimately accountable to the state for its use (Edge, 2000).

Researchers noted that principal turn over rates were very high during this period

of time as a result of local constituencies influencing the LSC s' selection of principals (Ford, 1992). Relationships between LSCs and principals were often rocky. The shared power structure imposed in the schools took time to negotiate. Financial issues continued to plague the school system (Bryk et al., 1999; Russo, 2004). Designs for Change and other advocacy groups continued to rally for change and published reports documenting the need for continued progress and change in school financing, teacher recruitment, curriculum development and student achievement.

Mayor Daley believed that the public held him accountable for progress in the schools, but that he lacked significant authority to achieve it (Crump, 1999; Russo, 2004; Shipp, 2003). In 1995 Mayor Daley went to Springfield to campaign for changes in the 1988 School Reform Act. The goal of the 1995 reform was to craft a more efficient system of schools that would provide for increased student achievement and set and preserve more rigorous standards for teachers, principals and LSCs, (Edge, 2000; Russo, 2004). The reform created boundaries within which schools and LSCs could exercise their authority. School leadership was being held more accountable for student learning outcomes and efficient resource use (Edge, 2000).

In 1995, the Chicago School Reform Amendatory Act was adopted. This reform effort “sought to balance the powers that had been decentralized to the schools by establishing stronger central support functions and accountability mechanisms” (Edge, 2000, p. 3). The basic structure of the school-level decision-making was kept in tact; principals were, for the first time, given clear authority over school custodians and food service staff. However, the state legislature gave Chicago’s mayor a major role in making

key system wide decisions.

The 1995 Amendatory Act comprised of five important components: mayoral appointment of five person-school board of trustees; mayoral appointment of new senior administrative team; development of CEO position; stronger coordination of activities in support of more system-wide objectives, goals and standards; and guidelines holding LSCs accountable to the School Board for system wide standards (Bryk et al., 1999; Edge, 2000; Russo, 2004).

The 1995 law reduced the board's size, gave Mayor Daley the right to appoint anyone to the five member board of trustees instead of picking from a community-generated list, and allowed him the right to pick the schools' chief executive officer. This new structure ended the long held position of sole superintendent of schools and created a supervisory power that was shared. The local school councils, a remnant of Chicago's 1980s reform approach remained in place. The new legislation also gave the school board sweeping new powers over individual schools and principals, allowing the board to take over local schools that were in crisis (Crump, 1999; Russo, 2004; Shipps, 1997). The board was given much more flexibility to fund its initiatives. The law curtailed the rights of the teachers union that had long limited what Chicago superintendents could do (Russo, 2004; Shipps, 2003). Chicago teachers were prohibited from striking for at least 18 months and banned from bargaining on a number of issues, including charter schools, privatization, and class schedules (Crump, 1999; Russo, 2004; Shipps, 2003).

During the next wave of reform efforts, Chicago's Mayor Daley appointed his former Budget Director, Paul Vallas, as the school system's CEO and his former Chief of

Staff, Gery Chico, as President of the school system's new five person board of trustees. The central administration under Mayor Richard M. Daley and chief executive officer of schools, Vallas, enforced some necessary fiscal and administrative discipline on the system and directed the introduction of a high stakes accountability system centered on standardized test performance (Crump, 1999; Russo, 2004; Shipps, 2003). Vallas also arrived at the Chicago Public School's Central Office "believing in the mayor's political rhetoric of getting schools to the basics, only promoting students if they showed they were learning and establishing adult accountability for the successes and failures of the city schools" (Russo, 2004, p. 104).

Most important, for perhaps the first time in Chicago's history, low-performing schools were pressured to do better, and students and their parents encountered a system that did not just pass everyone through regardless of what they learned. This marked the end to social promotion (Russo, 2004). It was replaced by a policy that focused on standards of success for school administration, teachers and students. What Vallas and the Chicago reform program were most known for was the pressure they placed on schools and students to meet district-wide standards of accountability (Wong, 2003). Vallas pursued a three pronged strategy of accountability: 1) to hold students accountable for their academic performance, 2) to hold schools accountable for their performance, and 3) to restore the central office's ability to intervene in failing schools (Wong, 2003).

Vallas balanced the budget, rehabbed school facilities and built new ones. Test scores reported to the public climbed nearly every year, multiple union contracts were negotiated without any strikes, and a number of new programs--summer school, after-

school programs, alternative schools, new magnet programs--were all created to support the newly established standards for success (Edge, 2004; Russo, 2004).

Chicago's central office intervention in school decision making was further aided by subsequent legislation under Vallas leadership, signed by the governor in August of 1996, allowing the central board to set qualifications and performance requirements for the initial hiring and rehiring of principals by Local School Councils. Under the 1988 School Reform Act, LSCs were previously free to select as their principals anyone who held Illinois certification as an administrator.

New Leadership, New Reforms

Vallas' leadership lasted six years. In his last year, the signs were increasingly clear that he was on his way out. Test scores began to flatten, union leadership changed and relations began to sour and his relationship with the mayor began to crumble (Russo, 2004; Wong, 2003). Mayor Daley became much more critical of the schools failing to make progress. He criticized Vallas' reading initiative and introduced his own citywide reading initiative and events as well as announced a first day of school attendance campaign without Vallas being present (Russo, 2004).

Vallas was criticized by advocacy groups for poor implementation of too many programs, misconceived ideas about how to make schools more successful, and a chronic under use of the many school reform resources and community organizations that existed in the city. The weakening economy was also a struggle for the Vallas reforms. Many people also cited his inability to think beyond accountability. He was a top down manager who rarely looked after educational priorities and focused merely on political

and managerial spheres of the school system (Russo, 2004; Wong, 2003).

In June of 2001, Paul Vallas stepped down as Chief Executive Officer of the Chicago Public Schools. This ended his six-year stint as the architect of school reform. In an article confirming Vallas' resignation, The *Chicago Tribune* wrote that the mayor was frustrated with the state of the schools and suggested that Daley believed Vallas had become complacent in his job (June, 7, 2001). Vallas' announcement ended the growing speculation about his future with the Chicago Public Schools.

The changing of the guard in 2001 promoted progress and marshaled in new ideas (Russo, 2004). Those who believed there would be another wave of reform hoped Chicago would enter "a golden era in which LSCs, community groups and reformers would all work more closely and peacefully" (p. 5). They hoped issues like professional development; recruitment and retention could finally be addressed. But, others were not as optimistic. They worried no one could fill Vallas' shoes when it came to power struggles with the mayor. His charisma and structures of accountability and stability for the system were seen as irreplaceable.

The new school leader, Arne Duncan, came from outside of the city's established education circles. The fact that the mayor hired Duncan who was inexperienced politically and equally as untried in educational leadership added to the growing pessimism (Russo, 2004). But Duncan brought optimism, rejuvenation and progress to Chicago's schools. He proved to be a cooperative, collaborative leader. He partnered with his chief education officer, Barbara Eason-Watkins and together created an agenda that organized six massive districts into 24 more manageable areas and funded school based

reading specialists. In his tenure he continued to move school reform efforts forward. His style was less confrontational and controversial and without scandal. He and Eason-Watkins kept the focus on school improvement.

Instructional leadership was the cornerstone of Duncan's leadership. He closed low performing schools in the first year of his leadership, changed the accountability rating system and removed a handful of principals for chronic academic failure (Russo, 2004). The student retention program thrived. In an analysis of Duncan's legacy, Karp, Williams, Forte, and Myers (2008) highlight Duncan's signature initiatives during his tenure:

Reforming High Schools

Duncan used three strategies to fix the high schools in Chicago: Close them down and replace them with new, smaller schools (Renaissance 2010); fire school staff and reopen under new management (Turnaround Strategy); or infuse classrooms with new curriculum and materials (Transformation). The implementation on all three fronts was rocky. Long ignored schools got needed attention and education experts lauded the focus but test scores remained stagnant.

School Choice and Competition

Renaissance 2010: The idea was to close low performing schools and replace them with smaller entrepreneurial schools, many of them free from union contracts and state regulations. Duncan presided over 75 new such schools, 42 of them in areas as most in need of better schools. The *Catalyst* (2008) found that of the students who were displaced by these closings, only 2% were enrolled the

next fall in new Renaissance schools. Nearly half of the displaced students landed at schools that were on academic probation.

Accountability and Performance Culture

Duncan created a data-driven, performance based culture that rewarded well ran schools and their teachers and leaders and penalized schools that made no progress. He initiated teacher bonus pay and granted more flexibility and autonomy to high performing schools.

Early Education

Duncan expanded early education programs and filled more seats in the system's pre-kindergarten program.

Little was done to shed light on district spending decisions particularly construction and renovation budgets during Duncan's tenure. The district also stalled on its attempts to revamp budgeting practices that created inequalities across schools during Duncan's seven years with the Chicago Public Schools (*Catalyst*, 2008).

Effective Schools Research

The chief theoretical basis of Chicago's school reform lies in the combined research from effective schools and site-based school management literature (Bryk et al., 1999; Ford & Bennett, 1991; Hess, 1990). In the late seventies and early eighties, a group of educators, citizens and policy makers came together to work on public school reform. Using the research of many of these same individuals a movement began to form to promote the findings of this research and to share the findings in schools across the country. This movement became known as the effective schools movement. The leader of

this movement was Ronald R. Edmonds. Edmonds (1979) and his colleagues convinced educators that schools could be changed to become effective for all students.

The frameworks for school reform efforts were established by the collective research of Edmonds (1979), Brookover and Lezotte (1979) and Purkey and Smith (1983). These scholars identified characteristics that were common in effective schools (Hess, 1990). Edmonds research on successful schools surmised that differences among schools do shape students' academic outcomes and disputed previous research that found unequal academic achievement to be chiefly a function of family background and related variables (Coleman, 1966; Jenks, 1972; Purkey & Smith, 1983). Effective schools were characterized by high expectations for student outcomes on the part of the school staff members and strong instructional leadership on the part of the school leader (Purkey & Smith, 1983).

Edmonds (1979) identified five factors of effective schools: high expectations for achievement, a school environment conducive to learning, emphasis on skill acquisition, frequent monitoring of student progress and strong administrative leadership. His conclusion that strong leadership leads to instructionally effective schools called for principals to earnestly guide on the instructional level and begin to focus on the world of outcomes and student assessment. Changes in U.S. public schools laid broadening demands on school leaders (Fullan, 1991). Research on effective schools determined the principal as the key factor in efforts to improve student instruction and boost student achievement.

Some of the most recognized characteristics of effective schools named by Hess (1995) were a common school vision, specific student expectations, high standards for students, maximized time spent learning, aligned curriculum, instruction and assessment, consistent student behavioral management and strong instructional leadership. To have instructionally effective schools, proponents of effective schools literature have hypothesized that there must be:

1. Clear, focused mission
2. Strong instructional leadership by the principal
3. High expectations for the students and staff
4. Frequent monitoring of student progress
5. A positive learning environment
6. Parent/community involvement
7. An emphasis upon student attainment of basic skills (Bamburg & Andrews, 1990).

Site-Based Management

Site-based management, which included teacher empowerment and stakeholder involvement, had become more of a focus in effective schools research (David, 1994; Hess, 1995; Lashway, 1999). In the late 20th century, Americans were rethinking the way in which schools should be most effectively organized and operated through the process known as restructuring (Fiske, 1995). One of the most frequently used approaches to school reform was site-based management (SBM) (Mohrman, 1994).

Site-based management is a technique of restructuring the decision making process in districts and school. It permits but does not guarantee a change in the locus and distribution of authority. Site based management redistributes the power over matters that can have effects on the work of staff and students (Purkey, 1990). The major objective behind the SBM approach was to move decision-making control from the central office of a school system to the local level (David, 1989; David, 1994; Short & Greer, 1997). This new style allowed those in the trenches to respond to local needs and promoted diversity of thought and flexibility within the system. SBM brought budget authority and decision making power down to the school level.

Central to the implementation of site-based management was the participation of school stakeholders (i.e., teachers, parents, administrators, staff and community and business members) in the decision-making process. Site-based management was intended to address those people closest to the problems, issues and situations in decision-making at the local school level (Goodman, 1994; Sirotnik & Clark, 1988). Edicts would no longer be handed down from central office administrators who were divorced from life in the schools.

Site-based management goes by many different names including school-based management, school site autonomy, school site management, school-centered management and administrative decentralization (Clune & White, 1988). School-based management also refers to school restructuring (Fullan, 1993). In addition to its many names, it also has many definitions. Because of the varied definitions of site-based management, it is set differently in various locations (David, 1989; Short & Greer, 1997;

Sirotnik & Clark, 1988). Site based management is generally described as an alteration in school governance that increases the authority of all stakeholders at the school site and in the school community (Malen, Ogawa & Kranz, 1989).

Despite the differences in definitions of site-based management and its varied implementation, the overall philosophy underlying the definitions and implementations is quite similar (Clune & White, 1988). Two central themes, school autonomy and shared decision-making are at the center of these types of educational reform initiatives (David, 1989). Site-based management focuses on changing systemic thinking and emphasizes the need for the decentralization of decision-making from the upper echelon of the school district to the local campus level (Ford, 1992).

SBM is implemented in a variety of ways in districts and schools across the United States. One of the reasons for the differences in implementation is a variation in focus. According to Clune and White (1988), many districts judge SBM as more of a mind set than a structured system. Even when all stakeholders are actively involved in the decision making process, representation still varies from school to school (Murphy & Beck, 1993).

Stakeholder involvement can include simply the offering of opinions by committee members to the administrator through to the complete involvement in making of final decisions (Wagstaff & Reyes, 1993). What is true for the scope of the stakeholder involvement also holds true for SBM (Murphy & Beck, 1993). The SBM model being implemented in one school is likely being implemented differently at another school. No customary mode of SBM exists. Operating under the umbrella of SBM, schools have

varying degrees of control over and involvement in decisions regarding curriculum, budgeting, instruction and personnel (Wagstaff & Reyes, 1993).

Few school districts bought into the theory of SBM more wholeheartedly than Chicago. In 1988, with Illinois state legislature's passage of the Chicago School Reform Act, the SBM theory was joined with the idea that schools would better serve their constituents if their constituents were given more power. The premise of this reform act assumed that increased local authority involving the most highly invested constituents would improve CPS (Moore, 1990). The new law created an 11 member local school council at each of the district's 550 schools. The councils were made up of parents of children in the schools and were given the power to make decisions regarding budget issues, curriculum, professional development, school mission and goals as well as hiring personnel. The power of Chicago's central office was diminished. The 1988 reform shifted the power to the schools (Wong & Shen, 2003).

Changing Role of Principals

One area overlooked through successive waves of school reform, was the role of the principal. On the heels of organizational and governance changes in urban public schools, came a clear call for principals to change the manner in which they organized and managed their schools. Current research in the areas of school effectiveness, reform, restructuring and improvement often focused on the critical role of the school principal in making change happen (Hallinger, 1992). Since the birth of school reform movements there was a plea for increased attention to the study of educational leadership across contexts and cultural settings (Heck, 1998). The realization of the diversity in schooling

practices within and across different societies as well as the tremendous progress in the world of communication assisted in the mounting interest (Heck, 1998).

Over the past 20 years there has been an increase in the development of approaches toward educational policy and instructional leadership across nations aimed at solving educational problems (Hallinger & Leithwood, 1996). Studies on school leadership and effective schools have expanded in scope conceptually, methodologically and geographically (Heck, 1998). Many of the studies in this review use one or more methodologies: interview, observation, case study and or survey to identify principal behaviors and perceptions of their changing roles.

Bridging the gap between management theory and practice, Bolman and Deal (1984) crafted four frames of leadership-structural, human resources, political and symbolic-that principals need to adapt to their emerging roles. Each faculty, student body and community creates challenges that compel principals to be flexible leaders, drawing upon a range of skills depending on the organizational situation.

Smith and Andrews (1989) focused on the principal as instructional leader especially in their day-to-day relationships with teachers that ultimately effects student achievement. A professional association for school administrators (American Association of School Administrators (AASA), 1999) had taken a in depth look at leadership and its implications for change. Krug (1990) identified leadership and learning while refining the important aspects of how effective school leaders behave.

Principals who take an active role in implementing and monitoring curriculum innovations are more successful as reported by Bolman and Deal (1993) and Rutherford

(1983). Educators involved in institutional change are referred to as change facilitators by Hord (1987), which requires a rethinking of the way change is introduced and carried forth. Principals are also emerging as the key player in staff development arena as reported by Kline (1988), Leithwood and Montgomery (1982), and Thiessen (1989).

A comprehensive study of the principalship in Chicago conducted by Morris and his colleagues (1984) through extensive shadowing of principals' daily work routines offered insight into the changing roles of school leaders. Drawing from what they learned through the literature and comparing this with observational data, the research provided detailed descriptions of principaling, which were contrary to prevailing theories of administrative knowledge of that period. In midst of school reform, principals were redefining their roles from instructional leader to manager, viewing the school community as source of support and seeking external support for special projects.

A 1990 national educator opinion poll conducted by Educational Research Service (ERS) reported on personal dissatisfaction with the principalship (AASA, 1999). Based on the random sample of principals that yielded a 46% response rate, 76% of responding principals reported general career satisfaction as good; nearly 21% as fair; and 2% as poor. The typical responding principal could be described as follows:

Deriving most satisfaction from helping others learn

Assessing the quality of interactions as good

Considering the position a good one

Less satisfied with salary level and amount of recognition received from the superintendent and school board

Considering the principalship her career

After leaving the principalship, will retire from education and start a new career (ERS, 1990).

Another national survey reported by Boothe (1994) assessed the working life of school administrators over a five-year period and how job changes have affected morale. From a stratified random sample of 6,200, 900 responses were received from school administrators (70% were principals), yielding a response rate of approximately 14.5%. The research findings could be summarized as follows:

Pressures are keen and the path is not always clear.

Legislative arguing in the statehouse over funding of education affects schools and their plans.

Administrative turnover follows major school reform efforts.

Logging more work hours to implement district reforms.

High job satisfaction reported by 71 percent.

Satisfaction with compensation: 40 percent are mostly satisfied and 36 percent are dissatisfied.

Seventy-five percent are not considering a job change.

State legislatures have had the biggest influence on school reform.

Survey analysts concluded “revolutions are sometimes hardest for those who are on the front lines” (Boothe, 1994, p. 40).

New settings and expectations in education and society joined to create newly emerging challenges and perspectives for the contemporary role of the principal (Cistone

& Stevenson, 2000). Schools, far from being self-contained and secluded structures, are organizations with multiple connections to their environments. In addition to the teachers, staff and students inside the school building, parents, community members, school personnel and other external entities affect education. The principal's role is unique in relation to other occupations in that it spans the boundary between internal and external environments (Goldring, 1990). Policy makers regard principals as "linchpins in plans for educational change" and as a preferred target for school reform (Murphy & Hallinger, 1992, p. 78).

Principals of the 1990s found themselves under great scrutiny (Fowler, 1991); barraged by changing expectations, policies and responsibilities and often finding themselves without the requisite knowledge or experience to effectively address such challenges (Lane, 1992; Richardson & Lane, 1994). The traditional concept of principal as tired busy manager had grudgingly given way to a perception of the administrator as an energetic, participatory leader and learner (Prestine, 1991). The 1990's depicted a principal who was challenged to facilitate administrative vision, exhibit concern for student learning processes and connect and interact with faculty, staff and community in a cooperative environment (Fowler, 1991; Lane, 1992). New demands required principals to employ new approaches and styles for guiding and managing change and school transformation.

Over the past few decades, major changes in the role of the American principal have taken place. The K-8 Principal, a recent study conducted by the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), confirmed that the principalship

is a much more demanding job than it used to be (Ferrandino, 2001). The study further stated that the typical principal today is putting in longer hours (an average of 9 hours a day and 54 hours a week), leading larger schools (an average of 425 students) and supervising more people (an average of 30 teachers and 14 other staff members) than the typical principal of past decades (Ferrandino, 2001). Ferrandino acknowledges that school leaders are expected and challenged to provide a learning environment for a highly diverse and changing population, lead and motivate teachers and students, integrate into their schools a new generation of sophisticated technology, restore the concept of community school and most importantly collaborate and build consensus.

The U.S is a society with diversities in race/ethnicity, religion, culture and language. The idea of the United States as a melting pot changed to awareness, preservation and celebration of the differences in people. A growing expectation of school principals emerged to develop the instructional methods, provide the materials and programs and develop the teaching force necessary to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse group of students (Tirozzi, 2001).

School reform efforts called principals to integrate a new generation of technological advances into school curriculum and teaching strategies school principal. An educational leader must be aware of new technologies and be able to decipher the implications for curriculum and instruction (Tirozzi, 2001). Developing a technology driven staff, development plan, making effective technology purchasing decisions and integrating technology into school mission and vision are issues principals face and are called to manage.

Successful principals in the 21st century have been instructed by school reform efforts to collaborate and build community consensus. Participatory leadership and highly developed interpersonal skills are extremely important. Principals have become more consultative, more open and more democratic (Hallinger, 2005). Principals are challenged to build consensus and be team players. They must create a shared vision for improvement (Ferrandino, 2001).

Given the importance of a school's leadership as identified by effective school leadership research, the Chicago School Reform Act attempted to strengthen the principalship by clearly specifying the prerogatives of the principal under reform. School reform efforts caused rapid changes in leadership throughout the Chicago Public Schools. This changing landscape drove principals to play a variety of new roles and deal with a multitude of conflicting demands (Tirozzi, 2001). Educational reform promised to fundamentally alter the role as well as societal expectations of urban principals (Hess, 1991).

Changes launched by school reform have laid increasing demands on instructional leaders. Research on effective schools and the recent movement toward site-based management has identified the principal as the key factor in efforts to improve student instruction and student achievement. It is imperative therefore that competent people be attracted to and prepared for a career in school administration (Quality of Candidate Committee, 1994).

As Edmond's influence spread in the late 1970's and the early 80's, the face of American the principalship flushed with confusion. Edmond's notion that strong

leadership leads to instructionally effective schools called principals to actively guide on the instructional level and begin to focus on the world of outcomes and student assessment (1977; 1979). During the 1980's, no specialized position received more notice, nor was given liberty to articulate a fresh role, than that of a school principal (Bolman & Deal, 1993).

With the emergence of school reform, Chicago principals assumed a new set of “change implementation functions” ranging from monitoring compliance with federal regulations to designing staff development and providing direct classroom support to educators (Hallinger, 1992, p. 37). In contrast to earlier roles, which were to preserve the status quo, maintain program development and manage curriculum, this new role was oriented toward school improvement and change. Due to amplified federal intervention in policy, principals came to be viewed as catalysts for educational change (Hallinger, 1992; Hallinger, 2005; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1992; Moore, 1990; Moore, 1991; Murphy & Hallinger, 1992).

Effective school leaders create effective schools. Effective leadership is about change. Change is a constant reality of educational leadership (Lemley, 1997). Ferrandino (2001) points out that the principalship in the 21st century requires an extensive compilation of skills. It requires the ability to lead others and to stand for student achievement and community development. As the world has moved from an industrial age to an informational age, “the significance of education has intensified drastically” (Guthrie, 1990, p. 125). Unlike earlier eras, “the educational intelligence and creativity of its citizens are becoming a nation’s most significant economic assets” (p.

127). Nothing has assisted to drive the spotlight on to education policy as much as the entry into the age of information and technology (Murphy & Hallinger, 1992).

Research Questions

This study examined how and why the CPS's Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of CPS Principals changed during 1983-2008. The literature review created a historical, political and philosophical context to begin to analyze the influences, forces and ideas, which led to these changes in policy.

1) How has the policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Chicago Public Schools Principals changed from 1983-2008?

2) How did trends in education and educational research influence the changes in the Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Chicago Public Schools Principals?

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Method of Research

The Chicago Public Schools (CPS) struggled to manage the development and recruitment of qualified school leaders from 1983-2008. The policy for selection of principals changed with each new leadership regime in Chicago. This study examined how and why changes in the CPS's Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of CPS Principals took place over this 25-year period of time. This historical analysis identified the policy changes and examined the influences, forces, and ideas, which led to these changes.

The following research questions guided this analysis:

1) How has the policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Chicago Public Schools Principals changed from 1983-2008?

2) How did trends in education and educational research influence the changes in the Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Chicago Public Schools Principals?

Education is a social enterprise, consisting of an intricate set of social arrangements and interactions, which qualitative methods are well suited to illuminate (Lodewick & Kaestle, 2007). Qualitative study presents rich, varied portraits of schooling and reveals perspectives and powerful portraits of actors in the school arena that previously have not been widely known or well understood. Qualitative study reveals

much in their detail about school context, cultures and social systems, and about how individuals appreciate their lives within these institutions and it has greatly enhanced our knowledge of the unfolding of school politics and social processes (McCullough, 2004; Pierson, 2004; Seidman, 1998; Tosh, 2006; Tosh, 2008).

Historical analysis is a method of discovering what has happened using records and accounts. Its qualitative nature assists in establishing a baseline or background for the past event or combination of events and is most useful in obtaining knowledge of unexamined areas and in reexamining questions for which answers are not as definite as desired. A history is an account of some past event or combination of events. Historical analysis is, therefore, a method of discovering, from records and accounts, what happened in the past (McCullough, 2004). In historical analysis, researchers consider various sources of historical data such as historical texts, newspaper reports, diaries, and maps to gain insights into social phenomena (McCullough, 2004).

Historical recreation has value primarily as a preliminary to historical explanation and the types of explanation that matter are those that relate to questions of social concern (Tosh, 2006). Historical research is defined as the process of examining record and artifacts of the past (Gottschalk, 1969). Histiography is the imaginative reconstruction of the past from the data derived from that process and the historian attempts to reconstruct as much of the past of mankind as he can (Gottschalk, 1969).

Because this study dealt with political events that had occurred over a 25-year period, the most effective research method was that of historical analysis. This study examined how and why the CPS's Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of CPS

Principals changed during the period of 1983-2008. This historical analysis identified the policy changes and examined the influences, forces and ideas that led to these changes.

Contemporary history can be roughly defined as the period since 1945 and it can be argued that scholars today are too close to the events of this period to achieve adequate distance and that they are further handicapped by their limited access to records. Tosh (2006) suggests that academic neglect of contemporary history can be dangerous. He further states that it is the recent past that people draw most for historical analogies and predictions and it has also been a rich breeding ground for crude myths (2006). The public's understanding of the limits as well as the possibilities of education is informed by the knowledge gained by analyses of education. This supports the need for further study in contemporary educational research. Educational leadership is one of the more critical topics in public discourse today.

The core of an historical study must be a story, a story of what has happened in the past (Elton, 1970). Elton defines political history as the study of specific history that has relevance to the organizational aspects of society. One of the underlying features of any political history is power and how it is applied and distributed by various groups and individuals.

Power is the fundamental theme of political history (Elton, 1970; Lipman, 2003). It goes without saying that educational policies are created within a political context. It is essential to understand the political dynamics involved in policy development and implementation. This study examined the agents of power and their role in the changing

of the Chicago Public School's Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of CPS Principals from 1983-2008.

Unit of Analysis

The unit of analysis utilized was the Policy on Requirements for the Selection of CPS Principals. Chicago's policy was analyzed over a 25-year period.

The study examined the ideas, institutions and agents that helped shape and change Chicago's Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Principals. Several major players that were studied were the various governmental agencies and actors but the polity extends beyond them to include interest groups, public opinion, journalism, and other forms of civic participation, such as national trends in education reform.

As the research progressed, it became evident that there were other influential players that acted as forces upon the major ones. These active forces were derived from the greater political environment of the period studied. For example, Terrell Bell's unveiling of *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* provoked national discussion that coincided with Chicago's local debate about the purpose and quality of public education. This report affected Chicago's school reform movement, including its discussion on the principal's role and expectations in the school community. National education movements and trends influence educational policy at local and state levels and interconnect in resourceful ways with formal policy making (Kaestle & Lodewick, 2007).

Data to be Collected and Sources of Data

Because this is historical research, the data used were historical artifacts from a variety of sources. According to Elton (1970), the first question that must be asked of any piece of historical evidence is by whom and for what purpose was the material produced. First, looking at the author of the information can help determine the validity of an artifact. Second, knowing the intended audience is also crucial in trying to find what biases may be present.

The historical data used for this study came from an array of sources. All sources were a variety of written records. Riley (1963) observes several areas in which documents are fundamental to a study. One of the main situations is historical studies in which the events no longer can be observed and the participants may not recall or be available for recounting. Merriam (1988) states that the benefit of using documents in a study is stability. Different from interviewing or observation, the researcher has no possible impact on the events being studied or on the person retelling an event as an observer or interviewer might.

Gottschalk observes four rules for evaluating written records:

1. The time lapse between the observation of an event and the time of the writing of the document is important. Generally, the less time between two events the more reliable the record will be.
2. The purpose of the document must be addressed. A document written for personal reflection should be viewed much differently than one that was written for propaganda purposes.

3. The number of people that a document was intended for is important. In general, the fewer number of people for whom a document was intended, the more reliable it will be.
4. The expertness of the author is important (Gottschalk, 1969). In this study someone who had a true understanding of school leadership or Chicago politics would be much more likely to have reliability reporting the events than a casual observer.

A number of written artifacts were used for this study including national and local newspaper accounts. As leadership regimes and policy changed, many of the events and discussions were covered in various newspapers. Gottschalk (1969) says that newspaper reports are reasonably reliable because time lapse between the event and recording is usually very short. He does however recognize that this type of artifact often does not look at the larger context or provide an analysis since it is a very immediate recording of events.

Both primary and secondary sources were also used. Griggs (1991) states that the primary source is the key concept of historical method. Primary sources are the documents in which the information is a first-hand account of the event, idea or situation being described. They have the most objective connection to the past. They are the source material that is closest to the information, event or period of time. Primary sources serve as our direct knowledge of an event or period of time.

Secondary sources are the documents in which the information is taken from primary sources. All of the secondary sources have been provided and discussed in the

literature review. The literature review categorized and analyzed the secondary sources. The literature review assisted in the analysis of the primary sources. The educational themes and trends reviewed helped shape the analysis of the data collected.

Journal publications were also used. These differed from newspaper accounts, in that they were written for an intended audience and are biased in nature. For example, the perspectives and data from publications available through Designs for Change, the *Catalyst* and the Consortium on Chicago School Research were very useful in creating timeframe, context and the cast of characters relating to reform efforts but these sources may have reflected bias as these organizations had been historically connected to grassroots mobilization in Chicago schools.

Personal narratives taken from Chicago's newspapers and archives at Chicago's Principals and Administrators Academy were used. They included editorials and chronologies of events from either participants or observers. According to Elton (1970), it is very important to ascertain the writer's background and level of participation in the events or process. The writer's purpose and affiliation is key to validity.

Legislative records were used when available. A legislative history exists on each law passed in Springfield. These records are considered very reliable. Policy adopted in Chicago by the Board of Education was also easily available and very reliable. Institutional records from the archives in the Chicago Public Schools were analyzed. What little was available in the CPS's archives was very accessible. Surprisingly, the institutional records for CPS before 1995 were quite limited. The relocation of CPS's central office took place in the mid 1990's and most historical documents were lost in the

move. Written documents were not found on the discussions of the development of policy and the changes in policy. There were undoubtedly discussions among people that took place in which no one but the participants will know what occurred. The Harold Washington Library, University of Illinois-Chicago and the Chicago Historical Museum provided institutional records for analysis.

Online documents from the Chicago Public Schools, The *Catalyst* and Designs for Change archives were also used for this study. McCullough (2004) states that online documents can furnish valuable evidence for educational researchers. These documents constitute a source that is potentially of immense significance to documentary research but he cautions that it also has significant limitations for researchers. The information that is provided tends to cast the institution in a favorable light.

Personal archives were reviewed and analyzed. Dr. Ward Weldon at the University of Illinois-Chicago provided booklets on policy change and rationales for some of the changes from his personal archives. He was involved and associated with the implementation of the changes on Policy for Selection of Principals as a university/community partner with the Chicago Public Schools. His records assisted in creating context for the changes in policy.

Finally, selected books, articles, dissertations and websites related to Chicago's school reform efforts and school leadership added to the primary and secondary sources for this study. Searches were conducted using databases such as Wilson Select, Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), JSTOR Trusted Archives for scholarship and Ebsco Host.

Data Collection Methods

In order to collect data for this study, library research was conducted. All of the journals and publications used were from Chicago's Historical Society, Harold Washington and Newberry libraries. Archival research was done at the Chicago Public Schools, Designs for Change, Chicago Public Libraries, University of Illinois-Chicago, Chicago Historical Museum and the *Catalyst*. Relevant organizations were tapped to provide useful documents throughout the collection of resources for this study.

Data Management

Historical research requires the researcher to go where data leads. A map was not possible to follow at the beginning of this study. All data was organized chronologically and sorted by relevance to the research questions. All artifacts collected were cataloged in a computer-generated program of inventory as well as evaluated with a hard copy document analysis worksheet (Appendix A). The document analysis worksheet was an adaptation on one designed and developed by the National Archives, Washington, D.C. Copies of all artifacts were kept in a binder organized chronologically by date of occurrence. This allowed for the data to be organized in a way that was beneficial to the study.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

This study dealt with interpretation of facts. Much of the data gathered was from documents of opinion. Each piece of data was evaluated with a hard copy document analysis worksheet (see Appendix A). This required subjective analysis of these sources. The study was put forth in a chronological sequence beginning with the emergence of

school reform on the national platform. The study then traced and analyzed the changes in the Chicago Public School's Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Principals over a 25-year period. The data was examined for themes within the research questions. These themes provided subtopics to help address the larger educational questions. The changes in policy were analyzed in light of the national education trends and the political and social movements in Chicago and in relationship to the research questions.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

Like all major urban school districts in the U.S., the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) struggled to manage the development of qualified school leaders from 1983-2008. The policy for selection of principals changed with each new leadership regime in Chicago. This study examined how the CPS's Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Principals changed during this 25-year period of time and uncovered the educational trends and voices that helped direct the policy changes. This historical analysis identified the policy changes and examined the influences, forces, and ideas, which led to these changes. The following research questions guided this study:

1) How has the Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Chicago Public Schools Principals changed from 1983-2008?

2) How did trends in education and educational research influence the changes in the Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Chicago Public Schools Principals?

Study of Data

This chapter reports the results of the historical analysis of data collected relevant to this study. This study dealt with the interpretation of facts. The study was put forth in a chronological sequence beginning with the emergence of school reform on the national platform. The paper traced and analyzed the changes in the Chicago Public School's

Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Principals over a 25-year period. The data was examined for themes. A documentary analysis worksheet was used to assist in consistent evaluation of the collected data. The themes provided subtopics to help address the larger educational questions. The changes in policy were analyzed in light of the national education trends and the political and social movements in Chicago and in relationship to the research questions. Documentary analysis was used to create the educational themes and to further the understanding of the educational trends that influenced Chicago's Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Principals.

The policy that was reviewed for this paper was gathered from Illinois legislature as well as from Chicago's Board of Education Policy Manual. The data was triangulated with articles from various educational publications in Chicago, non-published CPS pamphlets, CPS press releases. The cornerstone of the research was agendas from the annual conference for the Chicago Principals and Administrators Association (CPAA) that took place during 1983-2008. The annual conferences were a collaborative effort between the Chicago Public Schools and CPAA.

The CPAA annual conference was the single yearly event in this time frame where all of the leadership in the Chicago Public Schools convened to engage in professional development and discussion regarding strategic and pedagogical leadership issues. Through the use of documentary analysis, themes were derived from the data the conference agendas provided. Multiple data sources were used to triangulate and cross check the themes and players in Chicago's school reform efforts. Much of the data

gathered was from documents of opinion. This required subjective analysis of these sources.

Policy Changes Over Time

1) How has the Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Chicago Public Schools (CPS) Principals changed from 1983-2008?

Policy Changes on the Requirements for the Selection of CPS Principals in the 1980s

At the outset of the national discussion on school reform, Chicago's Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Principals required candidates to pass Chicago's Principal Written Exam (Chicago Board Rules, 1982, Sec. 4-22.1). Principals were also obligated to pass an oral exam and sit for an interview with the superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools. Ruth Love's tenure as the superintendent of the Chicago Public School was during 1981-1985 (CPAA Annual Conference Agenda, 1983; CPAA Annual Conference Agenda, 1984). Illinois law compelled the superintendent of schools to recommend a person to the position of principal at a particular school and that the Board of Education to appoint the principal. Community nominating committees made recommendations but they were only advisory in nature.

The Chicago Public Schools' Principals Examination measured 12 general knowledge areas. Principals were expected to have mastery of these 12 areas upon entry into the job position (Chicago Public Schools' Principals Exam Booklet, 1983).

The 12 knowledge areas were: counseling and guidance, curriculum and instruction, educational administration, tests and measurements, evaluation methods and techniques for program and project needs, evaluation methods and techniques for staff, evaluation

methods and techniques for pupil progress, legal rights of students, parents and employees, principles of learning, special education, and public laws and regulations relating to special programs. Each knowledge area consisted of 20 written test questions (Chicago Public Schools' Principals Exam Booklet, 1983).

With the passing of the Chicago School Reform Act of 1988 during Superintendent Manford Byrd, Jr.'s term, hiring and retention requirements imposed by the Board of Education were specifically prohibited (CPAA Annual Conference Agenda, 1988; Senate Bill 1840). The Chicago School Reform Act (passed as Senate Bill 1840), known as Public Act 85-1418, reshaped Article 34 of the Illinois School Code and fundamentally restructured the Chicago Public Schools (Chicago School Reform Act, P.A. 85-1418, 1988 Illinois Legislative Service). Principal tenure was abolished and principals were selected for four-year performance contracts. Local School Councils had the sole authority to select a principal and decide whether his or her contract should be renewed. The district superintendent's recommendations were only advisory. The only requirement for new principals was a state administrative certificate (Type 75). The district superintendent was required to conduct annual advisory evaluations of principals. Chicago's Board of Education could no longer impose additional eligibility requirements on school administrators (Chicago School Reform Act, P.A. 85-1418, 1988 Illinois Legislative Service).

Table 1

Chronological Order of Superintendents of the CPS 1983-2008

Tenure	Superintendent
1981-85	Ruth Love
1985-1990	Manford Byrd, Jr
1990-1993	Ted Kimbrough
1993-1995	Argie Johnson
1995-2001	Paul Vallas
2001-2008	Arne Duncan

Table 2

Required Competencies for CPS Principals in the 1980s

1. Counseling and Guidance
2. Curriculum and Guidance
3. Curriculum and Instruction
4. Educational Administration
5. Tests and Measurements
6. Evaluation Methods and Techniques for Pupils Progress
7. Evaluation Methods and Techniques for Staff
8. Evaluation Methods and Techniques for Program and Project Needs
9. Legal Rights of Students
10. Parents and Employees
11. Special Education
12. Public Laws and Regulations Relating to Special Programs

Note: This information was gathered from the unpublished Chicago's Written Principal Exam Booklet, 1983.

Policy Changes on the Requirements for the Selection of CPS Principals in the 1990s

Ted Kimbrough served the city as superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools from 1990-1993 and ceded the position to Argie Johnson. Johnson served as superintendent in Chicago from 1993-1995. In 1995, the state legislature modified the Reform Act to give Chicago's Mayor Daley more control over Chicago's Central Board and central administration as well as the power to intervene in failing schools (Illinois 89th General Assembly Conference Committee report on House Bill 206, 1995). The Illinois Legislature revised the Reform Act and eliminated district superintendents and gave the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) the responsibility of evaluating principals. The revisions also gave the CEO veto power over the renewal of principals' contracts.

At the lobbying of newly appointed CEO Paul Vallas, Illinois legislature removed the 1988 prohibition on board-imposed requirements for becoming and remaining a principal in the spring of 1996 (Senate Bill 1019, 1996). The 1996 legislation, adopted without public hearings in the closing hours of the legislative session, eliminated the 1988 ban on hiring and retention requirements for principals. This action quickly allowed the extension of the board's Chicago residency requirement to principals and imposed requirements of administrative experience, an unpaid internship and increased college course work on principal candidates (*Catalyst*, December, 1996 and *Catalyst*, February, 1997).

In March of 1997, after many variations, Board Policy 97-0326-PO4 on the Requirements for the Selection and Retention of Chicago Public School Principals was approved. The Chicago Principals and Administrators Academy supported the legislation

(Hawthorne, 1996). The new policy required all principal candidates to have the following:

- A) An Illinois Type 75 certificate and a master's degree.
- B) A cumulative minimum of six (6) years classroom and administrative experience that received an excellent or superior performance evaluation.
- C) Seventy (70) clock hours of administrative course work in the specific areas of teacher observation, coaching and supervision, personnel remediation planning, professional development, conferencing and evaluation. Other course work included: school leadership and management, student centered learning, instructional leadership and parent involvement. *This requirement may be waived for candidates who have previously served as principals for at least four (4) continuous school years since 1990 in a school district.*
- D) An internship of thirty (30) school days performed at a Chicago Public Schools. *This requirement may be waived for candidates who have served previously as a principal for at least one (1) year since 1990 in a school district or who have served as a non-teaching assistant principal.*
- E) Compliance with the current Board of Education Policy on Residency.
- F) Within a reasonable period of time after selection, the principal designee shall complete a four (4) day orientation program, the contents of which shall include the following subject areas: Powers and responsibilities of Local School Councils; School organization and day to day operations; School Improvement Plan; Priority goals and related activities; Budgeting and

management of school finances; Curriculum and instructional program assessment, accountability and strategies; Promotion of a safe school environment; Applicable state and federal laws and policies; Board rules, policies and procedures; Collective bargaining agreements; Leadership models including collaborative and interpersonal skills involving parents, staff, students and community members (About the Principal Review Board, 1997 and Chicago Board Policy 97-0226-PO3).

In October of 1997, the *Catalyst* reported the launching of a principal assessment center (Pick, 1997). In an effort to assist Local School Councils (LSC) in choosing the best candidates for principal, an arm of the Civic Committee of the Commercial Club of Chicago called the Financial Research and Advisory Committee (FRAC) opened an assessment center to screen potential candidates in a number of areas deemed essential for school leadership (Pick, 1997). The assessment center used a one-day simulation where potential candidates played the role of a CPS principal. They were measured on the behaviors they demonstrated (Fornek, 1998). The Principal's Assessment Center was operated by AON consulting and FRAC employed Hazard, Young, Attea and Associates to help recruit candidates from suburban, private and parochial schools (Pick, 1997).

The Chicago Public Schools also initiated a Principal Review Board (PRB) in November of 1997. PRBs primary responsibilities were to review compliance and qualifications of those who sought a position as principal in the Chicago school system and to create a candidate eligibility list (About the Principal Review Board, 1997 and *Catalyst*, December, 1997). Dr. Joan Wilson-Epps directed PRB and her office was

located within the Office of CPS Deputy Chief Education Officer, Dr. Carlos Azcoitia (CPS, About the Principal Review Board, 1997 and *Catalyst*, December, 1997).

By December of 1997, the *Catalyst* reported that the Board now referred to as the School Reform Board (SRB) had created a PRB outside the school system to review the credentials of aspiring principals (Pick, 1997). PRB was being operated by the Chicago Education Alliance, which received a \$50,000.00, six-month contract from the SRB. The Alliance, a consortium of area university education departments underwritten by the Ford Foundation, tapped Roosevelt Professor Al Bennett to serve as chair (Pick, 1997). The Roosevelt Professor George Olsen and Frank Gardner, a former Board of Education president served as other members of the PRB (Pick, 1997). PRB partnered with a non-profit called Partnership to Educate the Next Century's Urban Leaders (PENCUL). PENCUL provided in-depth skill assessments to principal candidates. Cozette Buckney, Chief Education Officer and Dr. Carlos Azcoita sat on PENCUL'S management committee (Lewis, 1998).

In 1998, the Policy on Requirements for the Selection of Chicago Public School Principals was amended again to include pre-registration to the PRB and the hours of administrative course work requirement was increased from 70 hours to 84 hours. Both Vallas and Buckney signed the action (Chicago Public Schools Board Report, 98-0225-PO2).

Table 3

Required Competencies for CPS Principals in the 1990s

1997 Illinois Standards for School Leaders	1997 Chicago Standards for Developing School Leaders	1998 Standards for Developing School Leaders
Facilitating a Vision For Learning	Instructional Leadership	School Leadership
School Culture and Instructional Environment	Student Centered Learning Environment	Parent Involvement and Community Partnerships
Management	Professional Growth and Development	Creating Student-Centered Learning Environment
Collaboration with Families and Communities	School Leadership and Management	Professional Development and Human Resource Management
Acting with Integrity, Fairness and an Ethical Manner	Teacher, Parent and Community Involvement	Instructional Leadership: Improving Teaching and Learning
The Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context	Compliance	School Management and Daily Operations
		Interpersonal Effectiveness

Note: 1997 Chicago Public Schools Publication About the Principal Review Board, Dr. Ward Weldon, Personal Archives, and Principal Selection Legal Requirements, 1999, Chicago Leadership Academies for Supporting Success (CLASS) Handout For Aspiring Principals; 1997 Chicago Public Schools Principal Performance Evaluation and 1997 Principal Performance Contract; 1998 Policy on the Requirements For the Selection of Chicago Public School Principals.

Policy Changes on the Requirements for the Selection of CPS Principals in the 2000s

In October of 2000, the Catalyst reported that the CPAA believed Chicago's current requirements were inadequate (Duffrin, 2000). Negotiations to revamp the Policy on Requirements for Selection of Principals were in high gear. Duffrin reported that Parents United for Responsible Education (PURE), Chicago's School Leadership

Development Cooperative, Designs for Change, Lawyers School Reform Advisory Project, FRAC, and the PENCUL partnership reviewed the proposed policy (*Catalyst*, 2000) and in December of 2000 an updated policy was adopted (Board Report 00-1220-PO1). The new policy required all candidates to register with the PRB, clock 84 hours of administrative coursework in School Leadership; Parent Involvement and Community Partnerships; Creating Student-Centered Learning Environments; Professional Development and Human Resource Management; Instructional Leadership: Improving Teaching and Learning; School Management and Daily Operations; and Interpersonal Effectiveness. All candidates were mandated to go through the Principal Assessment Center and complete a 90 day internship, interview with the Chief Education Officer, seek approval by PRB and then the candidate is eligible to apply and interview for placement and LSC approval. Compliance with the residency requirement was still compulsory. Upon selection, participation in a four day New Principal Orientation as well as ongoing professional development program was requisite (Chicago Public Schools Policy Manual, 00-1220-PO1).

On April 3, 2002, CPS issued a press release describing the newly chosen CEO, Arne Duncan's Human Capital Initiative (CPS Evaluates Its Human Capital, 2002). Duncan's Human Capital Initiative was designed to create a process by which CPS could more effectively recruit and develop school leaders. Through review of system practice Duncan made a few recommendations about school leadership and alluded to more change for the Policy on the Requirements for Selection of Principals. Duncan recommended partnering with the CPAA to shift more of the principal's time from

administrative tasks to instructional leadership, supporting LSC principal selection by exploring the possibility of instituting a principal's exam (CPS press release, 2002).

The Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Principals was again revised in April of 2003 (Chicago Public Schools Policy Manual, 03-0423-PO01). The Catalyst reported that Nancy Laho was appointed the Chief Officer of Office of Principal Preparation and Development (OPPD) and worked to revise the new guidelines (April 2004). CPAA, the Chicago Public Education Fund (an off shoot of the Annenberg Challenge), and FRAC worked closely in assisting with the portfolio piece of the new requirements (*Catalyst*, April, 2004). Participating in the Principal Assessment Center was no longer required for eligibility. The rest of the policy was left in tact. In February of 2004, CPS released a press statement regarding the upcoming change in policy and laid out what was about to be adopted (CPS Raises the Bar for New Principals, 2004).

Duncan's policy was described as performance based in the 2004 press release (CPS Raises the Bar for New Principals, CPS). New principal candidates were to be evaluated on the following criteria: Must pre-register with the new Office of Principal Preparation and Development (OPPD); Must have a Type 75 certificate and a master's degree; Must have instructional and leadership experience beyond the classroom; Must have training in school leadership and day-to-day management; must complete an oral exam, submit a writing cycle and undergo a background check; and Must pass a written exam on key policies of the CPS and Illinois State Board of Education. Eligible assistant principals and other administrators and teachers who were on the eligibility list were required to submit a portfolio that demonstrated their instructional leadership and

managerial experience to remain on the eligibility list (Developing Aspiring Principals Pamphlet, 2004).

In June of 2006, Arne Duncan approved an agreement between the Chicago Public Schools and the Chicago Principals and Administrators Association (CPAA) for consulting work (Board Report 06-0628-ED13). The agreement hired CPAA to consult with the Office of Principal Preparation and Development to design new programs and retain best practices from previous programs to meet the individual needs of aspiring, new and experienced leaders (06-0628-ED13). Laho retired from OPPD and Gail Ward, a former CPS Principal, was hired to fill the leadership seat in OPPD (CPS Press Release, October 19, 2006).

In December of 2008, at the close of Arne Duncan's tenure with the Chicago Public Schools, he signed and adopted a new policy on the Eligibility Requirements for the Chicago Public Schools Principalship (Chicago Public Schools Policy Manual, 08-1217-PO2). The revised Principal Eligibility Process requires candidates to demonstrate proficiency in the CPS Principal Competencies and Success Factors. Candidates must have a valid Type 75 or equivalent administrative certificate in order to apply. There are four steps in the new policy:

1. Application and Accomplishment Review
2. Principal Scenario Exam
3. Interview Assessment: Case Study, Instructional Observation, Behavioral Interview
4. Background Check

Table 4

Required Competencies for CPS Principals in the 2000s

CPS Principal Competencies Required in the 2000s
Develop and Articulate Belief System Through Voice and Actions
Engage and Develop Faculty
Assess the Quality of Classroom Instruction
Facilitate and Motivate Change
Balance Management

Table 5

CPS Success Factors for Principals in the 2000s

CPS Success Factors for Principals in the 2000s
Strategic Thinking
Service Leadership
Impact and Influence
Team Leadership
Developing Others
Instructional Leadership
Accountability
Driving for Results
Leading and Managing Change
Building and Maintaining Collaborative Relationships
Operational Excellence
Planning and Organizing

Table 6

Requirements for Selection of CPS Principals 1983-2008

YEAR	Prin's Exam	Masters Degree	TYPE 75*	MINIMUM Years of Experience	Additional Coursework	Internship	City Residency	Registration with PRB*	Interview with CEO	Orienta-tion Program	Continued Profess Dev	Participa-tion in Principal Assess Center	Portfolio Req to Support Compet	Writ-ing Sample
1983	X		X						X					
1988	X	X	X				X		X					
1997		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X				
1998		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
2000		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
2003		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
2004	X	X	X		X		X	X	X		X		X	X
2008	X	X	X				X		X				X	X

Note: Type 75 refers to the State of Illinois General Administrative Certificate. **PRB** is the abbreviation for Chicago's Principal Review Board.

Policy and Educational Trends

2) How did trends in education influence the changes in the Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Chicago Public Schools Principals?

Educational Trends that Influenced Chicago School Leaders 1983-1989

Three major educational concepts were highlighted during 1983-1989 at the Chicago Principals and Administrators Association (CPAA) Annual Conferences. Using documentary analysis, the yearly conference themes and the small and large group seminar topics were analyzed and categorized. Effective School Leadership, Decentralization and Leadership and School Management were the educational trends and concepts that dominated Chicago's school leaders' discussions and professional development during this period.

Table 7

CPAA Conference Themes in the 1980s

Year	Conference Theme
1983	Survival: Principal Strategies for the Eighties
1984	Principals: Effective Leaders, Effective Schools
1985	Schools: Dilemmas and Decisions
1986	Research, Reform, Reality
1987	Redesign, Re-Examine, Repossess
1988	Mission For Today, Vision for Tomorrow
1989	School Reform: Pedagogy or Politics

Note: 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989 CPAA Annual Conference Booklets.

Table 8

Educational Trends at CPAA Conferences in the 1980s

Effective Schools	Decentralization	Leadership and School Management
Developing a Positive School Climate	Educational Reform in 1985	Site Based Management
Tools of Leadership: Environment for Learning	Changing Face of Urban Education	Consulting Teachers
What Makes Effective Schools?	Educational Reform in IL	Time Management
Teacher Effectiveness: Teacher Supervision and Evaluation	Strategies for Implementing Reform	Teacher Evaluation
	School Reform: Promises and Pitfalls	Community Outreach
	Reform Local School Improvement Councils	

Note: 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989 CPAA Annual Conference Booklets.

With the use of documentary analysis, three educational trends were identified in the CPAA Conference Agenda Booklets. Chicago principals, administrators and educators were discussing effective school leadership, decentralization and Leadership and School management at the CPAA annual conferences in the 1980s.

Effective School Leadership

The literature on school effectiveness concluded that differences among schools shaped students academic achievement and challenged previous research that found unequal academic achievement to be chiefly a function of family background and related variables (Coleman, 1966; Jencks, 1972; Purkey & Smith, 1983). Effective schools were characterized by high expectations for student achievement on the part of the school staff members and strong instructional leadership on the part of the school principal (Purkey &

Smith, 1983). In light of these conclusions, school leadership soon became the focus of educational research and debate.

Edmonds (1979) identified five factors of effective schools: high expectations for achievement, a school environment conducive to learning, emphasis on skill acquisition, frequent monitoring of student progress and strong administrative leadership. His conclusion that strong leadership leads to instructionally effective schools called for principals to earnestly guide on the instructional level and begin to focus on the world of outcomes and student assessment. Changes in U.S. public schools laid broadening demands on school leaders. Research on effective schools determined the principal as the key factor in efforts to improve student instruction and boost student achievement.

The Chicago School Reform Act was designed to foster the development of these characteristics in every city school. Reformers believed that principals would be empowered to exercise the leadership necessary to improve student achievement if bureaucratic obstacles were removed and the weight of responsibility shifted to parents and community (Hess, 1991). If principals could choose faculty, allocate monies for school improvement, reformers felt they could raise expectation levels and outcomes for students (Hess, 1991).

The following topics regarding school effectiveness were also discussed among school leaders at the CPAA Conferences in the 1980s:

- Developing a Positive School Climate
- Teacher Effectiveness: Teacher Supervision and Evaluation
- Tools of Leadership: Environment for Learning

- What Makes Effective Schools?

Decentralization

Debate about the proper role of government led to more emphasis on the concepts of free markets, competition and even privatization (Fiske, 1995). Decentralization of schools was a complex process that resulted in major changes in the way school systems create policy, generate revenue, spend monies, train teachers, design curriculum and manage local schools (Fiske, 1995). Inherent in such changes are fundamental shifts in values that underpin public education-values that concern the relationships of students and families to schools, the relationships of communities to central government and the very meaning and purpose of public education.

Decentralization rests upon two major assumptions. The first is that by moving decision-making and accountability closer to the child and classroom, education will improve (Smith & Purkey, 1985). Shifting decision-making to local schools means redistributing power among various groups--principals, teachers, and parents--who have a legitimate stake in the content and quality of education. Proponents of decentralization believe that the reallocation of power to these key stakeholders make schooling more responsive to the unique needs of local communities and will capitalize on the knowledge, creativity, and energy of leaders at the school and in the community (Murphy, 1998).

The second major assumption underlying decentralization is that the most relentless troubles in education can be attributed to the structure of schooling (Stinette, 1993). The deeply embedded ways of systematizing and delivering educational services,

often reinforced by long-standing statutes and regulations, must change fundamentally if education is to progress. Reformers who see the structure of schools at the origin of education's problems have proposed revisions in the ways in which school systems are governed and organized, the roles adults play in schools, the content and direction of the educational programs, and the processes used to educate children (Stinette, 1993).

The following areas of education were also discussed at the CPAA Conferences in the 1980s regarding decentralization:

- Educational Reform in 1985
- Changing Face of Urban Education
- Reform Local School Improvement Councils
- Educational Reform in IL
- Strategies for Implementing Reform
- School Reform: Promises or Pitfalls

Chicago's initial reform law was a powerfully decentralizing force (Elmore, 2004). The law was anti-bureaucratic and anti-professional at its roots and heavily focused on harnessing support from LSCs, parent and community involvement to the improvement of neighborhood schools (Elmore, 2004). The law was based on the theory that increasing direct accountability between schools and their neighborhood constituencies would enhance engagement between teachers and students and eventually improve academic achievement (Elmore, 2004).

Leadership and School Management

Research in the 1980s in the areas of school effectiveness, reform, restructuring and improvement often focused on the critical role of the school principal in making change happen (Hallinger & Heck, 1998). Principals who take an active role in implementing and monitoring curriculum innovations are most successful as reported by Bolman and Deal (1984) and Rutherford (1983). Educators involved in institutional change are referred to as change facilitators by Hord (1987), which requires a rethinking of the way change is introduced and carried forth. Principals are emerging as the key player in staff development arena as reported by Kline (1988), Leithwood and Montgomery (1982), Thiessen (1989). Policymakers regard principals as “linchpins in plans for educational change” and as preferred targets for school reform (Murphy & Hallinger, 1992, p. 78).

Other educational ideas discussed at CPAA Conferences in the 1980s regarding leadership and school management were:

- Site Based Management
- Consulting Teachers
- Time Management
- Teacher Evaluation
- Community Outreach

Site-based management, which includes teacher empowerment, community engagement and stakeholder involvement, has become more of a focus in effective

schools research (David, 1994; Hess, 1994). In the late 20th century, Americans began rethinking the way in which schools should be most effectively structured and managed through the process known as restructuring (Fiske, 1995). One of the most frequently used approaches to school reform was site-based management (SBM) (Mohrman, 1994). Site based management redistributes the power over matters that affect the work and time of staff and students (Purkey, 1990). This style allowed those in the trenches to take action when it came to local needs and encouraged diversity of thought and flexibility within the system. SBM took budget authority and decision making power down to the school level and brought teachers, parents and community into the fold.

Educational Trends that Influenced Chicago School Leaders 1990-1999

Four major educational concepts were highlighted during 1990-1999 at the Chicago Principal and Administrators Association (CPAA) Annual Conferences. Using documentary analysis, the yearly conference themes and the small and large group seminar topics were analyzed and categorized. Decentralization, Instructional Leadership, Standards Based Management and Restructuring Schools were the educational trends and concepts that dominated Chicago's school leaders' discussions and professional development during this period.

Table 9

CPAA Conference Themes in the 1990s

Year	CPAA Conference Theme
1990	Chicago School Reform: Where are we now? Where are we going?
1991	Principals: Catalysts for Change
1992	Toward the 21 st Century
1993	Trends in Evaluation and Assessment
1994	The Quest for Quality Schools
1995	Visions and Revisions
1996	Accountability
1997	School Leadership
1998	Linking Professional Development to Student Achievement
1999	Leadership with Soul

Table 10

Educational Trends Highlighted at CPAA Conferences in the 1990s

Decentralization	Instructional Leadership	Standards Based Management	Restructuring Schools
Reform: Chicago Style	Time Management	Accountability	Essential Schools
What Can be Learned from the History of Decentralization	School Climate and School Culture	Setting High Standards	Small Schools
Restructuring Schools	Aligning Technology w/School Improvement	Principal and Professional Standards	Comer Schools
Doing Schools Differently	Professional Development	Using Standards to Support Whole School Change	Dual Language Academies
	Effective Leadership	Portfolio Assessment	
		Alternative Evaluation and Assessment	

Through the use of documentary analysis, four educational trends were identified in the CPAA Conference Agenda Booklets during 1990-1999. Chicago principals, administrators and educators were discussing decentralization, instructional leadership, standards based management, and restructuring schools at the CPAA annual conferences in the 1980s.

Decentralization

The decentralization of Chicago's school system continued to be an issue of discussion and debate at the CPAA Conferences in the 1990s. A few of the topics discussed regarding decentralization were the History of Decentralization; Reform: Chicago Style; Chicago's business Community Looks at School Reform: Restructuring Schools; Doing Schools Differently. Educational ideas also discussed at the CPAA Conferences in the 1990s regarding decentralization were:

- Reform: Chicago Style
- What Can Be Learned From the History of decentralization?
- Restructuring Schools
- Doing Schools Differently

Instructional Leadership

Instructional leadership means expert teaching, specializing in the understanding of student learning. It is supported by focused professional development that is standard driven and data driven (Elmore, 2000; Spillane et al., 2004). Lashway (2003) summarizes the National Associations for Elementary School Principals' (NAESP) view on instructional leaders. He asserted that instructional leaders must fill six roles: making

student and adult learning a priority; setting high expectations for performance; gearing content and instruction to standards; creating a culture of continuous learning for adults; using multiple sources of data to assess learning; and activating the community's support for school success (Lashway, 2003).

Changes in leadership theory and many facets of school leadership continued to be discussed and debated at the CPAA Conferences in the 1990s some topics explored were:

- Time Management
- School Climate and School Culture
- Aligning Technology with School Improvement Efforts
- Professional Development
- Effective Leadership

Leadership actions taken by principals often catalyze the school improvement efforts of teachers, staff, parents and community members. In order for these actions to become automatic for aspiring principals they must develop competence in three areas: building high performing teams, coordinating the work and time of others, and developing school improvement plans that fully implement the vision (Chicago Standards for Developing School leaders, CLASS, 1998).

Standards Based Management

Historians will identify this decade as the time when a concentrated force for national education standards emerged (Glaser & Linn, 1993). The success of any organization is contingent upon clear, commonly defined goals (Schmoker & Marzano, 1998). A well-articulated focus unleashes individual and collective energies. A common focus clarifies understanding, accelerates communication and promotes persistence and collective purpose (Rosenholtz, 1991). Standards based management requires school leaders to examine the importance of collecting and interpreting multiple sources of data to identify barriers to student achievement and teacher performance, spot areas in need of improvement, design effective classroom lessons, re-evaluate school goals and determine opportunities for professional development. Educational concepts discussed at the CPAA conferences in the 1990s regarding standards based management were:

- Accountability
- Setting High Standards
- Principal and Professional Standards
- Using Standards to Support Whole School Change
- Portfolio Assessment
- Alternative Evaluation and Assessment

A Nation at Risk trumpeted the shortcomings of the U.S. schools solidifying the view that school reform should focus on improving academic outcomes for all students (Elmore, 1990; Kaestle & Lodewick, 2007; Katz, 1980). A new regime was rising.

Education reform advocates agreed that reform needed to infiltrate the classroom and tighten up curriculum. By the late 1980's this consensus had produced a powerful national movement known as standards based reform. Reformers behind the standards based movement believed that schools could raise student achievement by aligning curriculum, classroom instruction and assessment. The theory of action behind this agenda was that educators, principals and teachers, would respond with more effective teaching and leading when faced with regulation, standardization and accountability for student outcomes (Kaestle & Lodewick, 2007).

Restructuring Schools

Several voices were louder and more influential in the restructuring of the Chicago Public Schools in the 1990s. It is prudent to briefly and concisely address the legacy of the Chicago Annenberg Challenge as it played a crucial role in Chicago's School Reform in the 1990s. The Chicago Annenberg Challenge was a Chicago Public School reform project from 1995 to 2001 that worked with approximately half of Chicago's public schools and was funded by a \$49.2 million, 2-to-1 matching challenge grant over five years from the Annenberg Foundation. The grant was contingent on being matched by \$49.2 million in private donations and \$49.2 million in public money (Annenberg Grant Proposal, 1994).

In their initial proposal for the grant (November 8, 1994), Dr. William Ayers of the University of Illinois at Chicago and Anne Hallett of the Cross City Campaign for Urban School Reform acknowledged Chicago's attempt at the most radical system wide urban school reform effort in the country. They addressed the "unprecedented

opportunity” the Annenberg Challenge would provide the city of Chicago to concentrate the “energy of the reform into an educational renaissance in the classroom” (Cover Letter to the Annenberg Grant, 1994). Argie Johnson, Chicago’s Superintendent, signed a letter of support for the grant proposal (August 17, 1994). He shared their commitment to the restructuring of the city’s schools. Mayor Daley, Illinois Governor Jim Edgar, Deborah Lef of the Joyce Foundation, Jean Rudd of the Woods Fund and Adele Simmons of the Macarthur Foundation also wrote letters of support for this grant (Annenberg Grant Proposal, 1994).

The goal of the Annenberg Challenge in Chicago was to “increase student learning and achievement in Chicago schools” (Annenberg Proposal, Introduction, p. 1, 1994). In their cover letter, Ayers and Hallett tackled the three goals of the proposal: 1) support schools working with external partners already making significant progress, 2) support and help schools working with an external partner that are failing, and 3) system wide reform of policy, contracts and central office support (1994).

Reforms aimed at classrooms had been growing in Chicago. Ayers and Hallett specifically named and highlighted the influence of the Coalition of Essential Schools and the Comer Project as they discussed Chicago’s early restructuring efforts for the context portion of the grant proposal (Part II, p. 15). Restructuring schools to enhance student achievement was the highlight of this grant proposal. The proposal for the grant was accepted.

In May, 1996, Ken Rolling, the Executive Director of the Chicago Annenberg Challenge Grant, provided the Annenberg Foundation with Chicago’s first program

report (Memo, 1996). In this report, Rolling summarized the Implementation Grants awarded by the Chicago Annenberg Challenge in 1995. These implementation grants were designed to assist external partners in restructuring and supporting schools. Dual Language Academies and Small Schools were among the Implementation Grants discussed in the memo.

Essential Schools in Chicago

A handful of essential high schools were created in Chicago to help address student achievement. The Coalition of Essential Schools was founded in 1984 with the financial support of several national foundations as a secondary school reform organization. It built on the research conducted during the preceding five years by Theodore Sizer and Arthur Powell, and their colleagues in *A Study of High Schools*, research that was cosponsored by the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the National Association of Independent Schools. The Coalition was based at Brown University where Sizer was a professor and served as its chairman (Cushman, 1995). Lef, president of the Joyce Foundation, mentioned her financial commitment to Sizer's work in Chicago in her letter to support the proposal for the Annenberg Grant.

The Coalition of Essential Schools (CES) is at the forefront of creating and sustaining personalized, equitable, and intellectually challenging schools. Essential schools are places of powerful learning where all students have the chance to reach their fullest potential.

By coaching for cultures of continuous improvement and powerful professional learning communities focused on student achievement, CES works

with educators to support and promote innovative and effective teaching. CES works with school districts and other entities to shape the policy conditions that support and promote schools characterized by personalization, democracy and equity, intellectual vitality and excellence, and graduates who experience success in all aspects of their lives: educational, professional, civic, and personal (Coalition For Essential Schools, 2010).

Comer Schools in Chicago

This was an educational approach used in a handful of Chicago schools to restructure the governance and practices of individual schools, initiated by psychologist James Comer in the mid-1970s (Anson, Cook, Habib, Grady, Haynes & Comer, 1991). This method of restructuring hinged on Comer's theory of how children develop and learn, and the reasons that disadvantaged, minority children do not learn in schools (Comer, 1988).

Comer believed that children followed a developmental continuum. They are born, totally dependent, into a family that is part of a social network with beliefs, attitudes, activities, and lifestyles. Parents become mediators who tell children what is important. Children gradually learn to manage their feelings and impulses, in essence, to control themselves. Development occurs in speech and language, cognition, intellectual and academic understanding, and moral, psychological, and social dimensions. To learn, children must imitate and identify with authority figures, in other words, internalize attitudes and values by relating emotionally to others (Anson, Cook, Habib, Grady, Haynes & Comer, 1991).

Basic Elements of Comer Schooling and Leading

- Changed School Governance—Parents, community members, teachers, administrators, and school staff collaborate in making key educational decisions.
- Creation of a Social Skills Curriculum—Schools needed developmental programs for young children who did not learn certain types of skills at home. Typically, a social skills curriculum covered politics and government, business and economics, health and nutrition, and spiritual and leisure activities.
- Adoption of a Developmental Perspective Toward Children and Their Learning—This perspective incorporated three beliefs: All children are capable of learning; Learning is best achieved through the collaborative participation of all involved adults; Students enter school at different points along a developmental continuum (Anson, Cook, Habib, Grady, Haynes & Comer, 1991).

Restructured school days allowed time for teachers to participate in network wide activities. Intense-relationship building created a personalized environment for kids to get to know teachers and other adults in the community. School Planning and management teams and parent Programs developed community involvement and partnership (Memo, to Annenberg Foundation, 1996).

Small Schools in Chicago

Dr. Ayers, a radical reform activist and professor at the University of Illinois at Chicago's College of Education founded the Small Schools Workshop in 1991. The Workshop's mission was to support teacher's restructuring efforts in large, overcrowded schools. Its work also consisted of developing a research base to support that work (Klonsky & Klonsky, 2008). Its research findings included a strong correlation between large school size and low student achievement; high dropout rates; increased violence; use of drugs, alcohol and tobacco on the part of adolescents; and other anti-societal and self-destructive behaviors (Ford & Klonsky, 1994; Klonsky, 1995).

A great deal of research suggests that smaller schools contribute to student achievement, attainment and sense of wellbeing (Fowler, 1995; Howley, 1994; Lee & Smith, 1995). Working directly with researchers, policy makers, and groups of public school teachers and advocates, the Workshop helped to create an incubator for new schools and heightened public awareness of the benefits of these new smaller learning communities (Klonsky & Klonsky, 2008). Large schools have implemented a myriad of programs to restructure and downsize: house plans, mini-schools, learning communities, learning clusters, charters and schools within schools. The framework for Small Schools was implemented in elementary, middle and high schools across the city of Chicago.

By their nature, small schools reduced teacher/student ratios. Small schools attracted more student teachers and created greater student to student ratio. This fosters increased collaboration. Small Schools Networks actively fostered partnerships among schools as well as increased collaboration between researchers, scholars and practitioners

(Memo to the Annenberg Foundation, 1996).

Dual Language Academies in Chicago

The primary objective of the dual language program in Chicago was to implement cultural and linguistic developmentally appropriate curriculum in grades pre-K through third grade, where all students develop their first language and learn a second language through a rigorous academic program. Together, native English speakers and English language learners engage in rich educational experiences to achieve three principal goals: Students develop high levels of proficiency in the first and second language; Students perform at or above grade level in academic areas in both languages; and Students demonstrate positive cross-cultural attitudes and behaviors (Soltero, 2000).

Restructured school days created additional time necessary to enhance teacher instruction. Tutors and team teaching allowed for smaller group and increased the number of adults in the school the kids got to know. Planning sessions with parents, teachers, LSC members increased community partnerships (Memo to Annenberg Foundation, 1996).

Educational Trends that Influenced Chicago School Leaders 2000-2008

Three major educational trends were highlighted during 2000-2008 at the Chicago Principal and Administrators Association (CPAA) Annual Conferences. Using content analysis, the yearly conference themes and the small and large group seminar topics were analyzed and categorized. Leadership, Accountability, and Professional Development were the educational trends and concepts that dominated Chicago's school leaders'

discussions and professional development during this period. National Board Certification and the No Child Left Behind Act were outliers in the analysis.

Table 11

CPAA Conference Themes in the 2000s

Year	Conference Theme
2000	Planning: Blue Print for Educational Success
2001	Communication: the Key to Community
2002	Transforming Teaching and Learning
2003	Collaborative Leadership Improves Learning
2004	Great Expectations: Meeting and Exceeding Standards
2005	Successful Schools in Changing Times
2006	ABCs of Professional Learning Communities
2007	Closing the Achievement Gap
2008	Stakes, Stakeholders, Expectations and Achievement

Table 12

Educational Trends Highlighted at CPAA Conferences in the 2000s

Instructional Leadership	Accountability	Professional Development
Planning For Improved Instruction	Data Driven Goals	Team Building
Planning to Promote Equity and Achievement	Analysis of Data	Team Approach
Collaborative Leadership	Standards Aligned Classrooms	Building Learning Capacity
Creating a Learning Centered Environment	No Child Left Behind Act, 2001	Creating Learning Communities

With the use of documentary analysis, three educational trends were identified in the CPAA Conference Agenda Booklets during 2000-2008. Chicago principals,

administrators and educators were discussing instructional leadership, accountability and professional development at the CPAA annual conferences in the 1980s.

Decentralization was not reflected in the leadership discussions during the conferences.

Instructional Leadership

The instructional leadership movement was driven by the growth of standards based accountability in schools. Evidence of student achievement as well as standards driven teaching and learning sent instructional leadership to the front of the line again (Lashway, 2003). Although, instructional leadership remains in the front of the line very few principals or district level administrators have in-depth experience in instructional leadership.

Instructional leadership of the past was principal-centered. Elmore (2000) says that instructional leadership is distributed across the school community, with principals, superintendents, teachers and policy makers having balancing and corresponding responsibilities. Instructional leadership must lead teachers to produce results and meet accountability standards. Instructional leaders must have a strong sense of vision, clear working balance of mandate and empowerment and model learning (Lashway, 2003). Effective school leadership must combine the traditional school leadership duties such as teacher evaluation, budgeting, scheduling, and facilities maintenance with a deep involvement with specific aspects of teaching and learning. Effective instructional leaders are intensely involved in curricular and instructional issues that directly affect student achievement (Cotton, 2003). Research conducted by King (2002), Elmore (2000), and Spillane, Halverson, and Diamond (2000) confirms that this important role extends

beyond the scope of the school principal to involve other leaders as well.

The key players in instructional leadership include the following: central office personnel (superintendent, curriculum coordinators, etc.), principals and assistant principals and instructional coaches.

Educational theories discussed at the CPAA conferences during the 2000s regarding instructional leadership were:

- Planning for Improved Instruction
- Planning to Promote Equity and Achievement
- Collaborative Leadership
- Creating a Learning Centered Environment

In 2002, Mayor Daley laid out his Every Child, Every School Initiative. It was Daley's educational plan for Chicago's schools. One of the goals of the educational plan was to build instructional capacity and develop high quality teaching and learning. CPS intended to provide students with challenging curriculum and strong instructional programs. They wanted students to be able to acquire skills that they needed to reach high academic standards and be successful in society. Strong communities of learning where teams work to create a work and school environment with effective instructional programs and collaborative professional development was his goal (Every Child, Every School, September, 2002).

Accountability

Increasingly, policymakers, educators and the public are demanding that schools and districts be held accountable for student performance. In response, states are

developing accountability systems that are standards driven. In a standards-based system, the state role changes from ensuring compliance with regulations and processes to measuring results, providing incentives, imposing sanctions and providing assistance to build school capacity. The district role also changes and becomes one of support and technical assistance. In return for greater accountability, schools and professional staff ideally receive more flexibility and autonomy to make strategic decisions. With accountability, state officials prescribe outcomes and leave choices about instructional methods and practices to professional educators in the schools. An effective accountability system requires that all actors in the states educational system accept responsibility for the accomplishment of specific results.

Educational themes discussed at the CPAA Conferences in the 2000s regarding accountability were:

- Data Driven Goals
- Analysis of Data
- Standards aligned classrooms
- NCLB

Long time Chicago Public School principal Philip Hansen served from 1995-2002 as an important force on Paul Vallas' education team. In *Establishing Accountability for Chicago Schools* (2004), Hansen wrote that the notion of accountability spread beyond principal and began to include teachers, students and parents. The Vallas team initiated system wide analysis of student, teacher and principal performance (Hansen, 2004). They identified low-performing schools based on low Iowa basic scores and provided strong

support for schools that were struggling to meet new accountability standards. Standards were spelled out and curriculums were aligned to the rising standards. Ending social promotion was seen as a companion policy to the establishment of school accountability that focused on standards of success for school faculties, principals and teachers (Hess, 2004). In 2001, President Bush signed the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). Like Vallas' program, the NCLB is a standard based education reform. It is based on the notion that setting high standards and establishing measurable goals can improve individual outcomes in education.

Professional Development

Professional Development examines the importance of providing quality, team-based professional development. Highly qualified teachers and principals can produce greater leaps in student achievement when schools invest in teacher learning and provide opportunities for teachers to work, plan, and think together. Some educational topics of at the CPAA Conferences in the 2000s that were also discussed regarding professional development:

- Team Building
- Team Approach
- Building Learning Capacity
- Creating Learning Communities

In 2002, Mayor Daley laid out his Every Child, Every School Initiative. It was Daley's educational plan for Chicago's schools. The plan stated that professional development is most effective when it demonstrates its impact on the ultimate goal-

improving student learning. It supports high quality teaching, learning, and leadership by helping participants build knowledge, refine skills, practice new learning, obtain feedback and receive coaching support. Effective professional development is curriculum focused, student-centered, data-driven, coherent, continuous, results oriented, creates learning communities, shared leadership and provides access to resources.

Summary

A documentary analysis was conducted to achieve a contextual understanding of the policy development environment within which Chicago school leaders were developed and selected during 1983-2008. National educational trends were identified and local themes were cataloged to assist in informing the narrative and history of the expectations of school leaders during this time. This study helped to frame the effects school reform efforts had on school leaders and traced the leadership selection policy in Chicago.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Introduction

This concluding chapter of the dissertation restates the research problem and reviews the chief methods used in the study. The final and major section of this chapter summarizes the results and findings.

This historical analysis provided the opportunity to appreciate Chicago's course in the national school reform landscape from 1983-2008. This study helped to understand the effects of school reform on school leadership policy in Chicago. It verified a roster of superintendents during this period, established a chronology of events and assembled an inventory of reform policies, theories and directives that potentially have the capacity to instruct and inform future educational initiatives, perspectives and debates on the issue of principal preparation at the local level.

The analysis of change in local policy echoed and identified national educational trends in this era. It analyzed the historical sequences and considered the unfolding of processes over time. These policy changes are not static occurrences taking place at a single, fixed point rather they are processes that unfold over time and in time (Pierson, 2004). As a result, this historical analysis incorporated considerations of the temporal structure of events.

This documentary analysis aimed to contextualize the policy development environment within which Chicago school leaders were developed and selected during 1983-2008. Relevant documents were obtained and analyzed. The relevant documents included policy statements, school board reports, CPS memos, press releases and principal regulations and standards. Reports related to school leadership and development from regional, provincial government offices as well as educational professional organizations were also reviewed and studied.

Like all major urban school districts in the U.S., the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) struggled to oversee the training and recruitment of qualified school leaders from 1983-2008. This study analyzed how and why the CPS's Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of principals changed during this 25-year period of time. This historical analysis documented the policy changes and examined the influences, forces, and ideas, which led to these changes. The following research questions guided this study:

1) How has the policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Chicago Public Schools Principals changed from 1983-2008?

2) How did trends in education and educational research influence the changes in the Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Chicago Public Schools Principals?

Results

Research Question #1: How has the Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Chicago Public Schools Principals changed from 1983-2008?

Between 1983-1987, no policy changes were made. During this time, Chicago's Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Principals required candidates to pass

Chicago's Principal Written Exam. Principals were also obligated to pass an oral exam and sit for an interview with the superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools before (s)he was appointed to a position. In 1988, with the adoption of the Chicago School Reform Act (P.A. 85-1418), the first change in Chicago's Policy on the Selection of CPS Principals occurred. The policy was amended to increase the Local School Councils (LSC) power of principal selection. LSCs were given sole power to select and retain principals and Chicago's Board of Education could no longer impose additional eligibility requirements on school administrators.

In 1996, at the petitioning of the newly appointed CEO Paul Vallas, the Illinois legislature removed the 1988 prohibition on board-imposed requirements for becoming and remaining a principal (Senate Bill 1019, 1996). The 1996 legislation eliminated the 1988 ban on hiring and retention requirements for principals. This action created the change and reform environment for principalship selection in Chicago. This set in motion six policy overhauls in an 11-year period.

These policy changes are not the substance of real change and improvement. In 1997, the *Chicago Tribune* reprinted an article Pauline Lipman wrote for the *Catalyst*. In the article, Lipman summarized and commented on the school reform efforts in Chicago from 1983-1997. She said that constructing policy and distributing information were the easiest parts of the restructuring of Chicago's system that helping to develop skills was the more challenging act. The greatest of policies on principal preparation and selection could not develop and grow school leaders. Implementing new policy, creating hoops and barriers does not grow or support top quality school leaders.

In 1997, when the Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Chicago Public Schools Principals began to take shape and different forms, it reflected the standards driven “buck stops here” verbiage that was so commonly and enthusiastically expressed during the Vallas era. Accountability and standards awareness not only dominated teacher evaluation and student achievement but it also strongly influenced the discussion of growing and, developing Chicago’s school leaders. Standards were developed and levels of accountability were being assembled for school leaders. These standards were vague conceptions of leading and managing infused with educational and leadership buzz words and showed very little connection to how leaders were actually going to improve teaching and learning.

Arne Duncan’s 2001 arrival to the CPS set into motion more change in the Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Chicago Public Schools Principals. Carrying on Vallas’ innovations would have created a caretaker role concerning developing leadership in Chicago. His Human Capital Initiative (HCI) was designed to recruit, induct, develop and manage teachers and school leaders (CPS Evaluates its Human Capital, 2002). HCI established his reputation and created the image of sweeping changes or a mindful overhauling in developing Chicago’s school leaders.

In a 2003 press release, Duncan’s office announced that CPS had aligned its organizational structure (CPS Streamlines for Greater Efficiency, Accountability, 2003). The new structure’s intent was to bring clarity to lines of authority and the areas of responsibility, thereby increasing the school system’s efficiency and accountability. The Office of Principal Preparation and Development (OPPD) was created “to recruit and

train the best and brightest educators to become principals in CPS” (CPS Streamlines for Greater Efficiency, Accountability, 2003). This furthered Duncan’s image of reformer and fighter for better schools and better teaching at every school, for every child.

In 2004, in its continuing efforts “to raise standards and student achievement across the system, the CPS proposed stronger requirements for the selection of new principals, focusing more on their instructional experience and proven leadership skills” (CPS Raises the Bar for New Principals, Press Release, 2004). Arne Duncan stated, “We want principals with a proven track record in improving classroom learning and school leadership. We want to see performance, rather than service time” (CPS Raises the Bar For New Principals, Press Release, 2004). The list of performance based standards laid out different expectations of behaviors for Chicago’s developing and aspiring principals. Duncan’s plan lacked “the how to” element for school leaders. He did not craft a plan to improve teaching and improve student achievement; his plan listed desired behaviors quality leaders needed to perform in a successful school setting.

Before Duncan’s tenure was over, he adopted yet another change in policy, late in 2008. The five guiding activities required of principals that drove this policy were laid out in the 2008 CPS Principal Competencies and Success Factors Booklet (OPPD, 2008): Lead others in setting strategic direction and vision for the school; Build and maintain a highly qualified, motivated team of teachers and other staff; Provide an instructional leadership to improve student achievement; Create a positive school climate that supports the needs of the “whole student” to enable educational outcomes; and Manage operations

and resources to support educational achievement. These were vague descriptions of behaviors that might enable better student achievement.

Duncan initiated a great deal of activity as a superintendent. His final act was again an effort to compile a list of performance-based standards required for aspiring principals. His list proved not to make any connection to how leaders were going to improve teaching and student learning. Ron Huberman appointed by Mayor Daley to follow Duncan in 2009, was left to manage the implementation of the 2008 policy.

Summary

The policies in the 1980s as well as the required competencies for principalship were very task oriented. They resembled a collection of daily or monthly managerial tasks. The competencies were perfunctory in nature and very straightforward. In 1988, with the adoption of the Chicago School Reform Act (P.A. 85-1418), the first change in Chicago's policy on the Selection of CPS Principals occurred. The policy was amended to increase the Local School Councils authority in principal selection. LSCs were given the lone power to select and retain principals and Chicago's Board of Education could no longer impose additional eligibility requirements on school administrators. After Vallas petitioned for the removal of the 1988 prohibition of board-imposed requirements for becoming and remaining a principal in the spring of 1996 (Senate Bill 1019, 1996), an environment of change and reform erupted from Chicago's central office for principalship selection.

The Board was allowed "to establish or impose academic, educational, examination and experience requirements and criteria in addition to those required for the

issuance of a Type 75 certificate as prerequisites for the nomination, selection, appointment, employment of a person as principal of any attendance center” (Board Policy 97-0226-PO3, p. 1). Vallas’ initial policy changes were designed to “ensure that a pool of qualified principal candidates were available for Local School Council” selection (Board Policy 97-0226-PO3, p.1 and Board Policy 98-0225-PO2, p. 1).

The policy changes that occurred during Vallas’ tenure reflected the effective school research and up to date research on instructional leadership. The “Vallasese” of accountability and standards were also peppered in the policies; pamphlets, press releases and CPS sanctioned write-ups on the Policy on the Requirements for Selection of Chicago Public School principals. The principal competencies required in the 1990s reflected the effective school research, instructional leadership; standards based management and restructuring, remodeling taking place at the time. The competencies reflected the new expectations of the school leaders in the restructured environment. As opposed to the 1980s, the required competencies in the 1990s were more nuanced, theory based and standards driven.

The competencies required for principalship in the 2000s were again reflective of the research from instructional leadership and the desire for accountability and results in student achievement. The Duncan team created a very elaborate assessment structure as a regulatory barrier for potential candidates for principalship. There were many layers of screening. Centralization began to slowly reveal its beginnings again. Academic, educational, examination and experience requirements and criteria were imposed on candidates for principalship. The period of 1996-2004 was a time when a great deal of

policy change took place. Many barriers were created to regulate the candidates for selection of principals in Chicago. Duncan left the impression he was improving school leadership, thus positively impacting student achievement. But, in 2008, the system of eligibility for the principalship was streamlined and closely resembled the 1988 version of the policy.

The language of change in the Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Principal during 1983-2008 was nebulous. The implementation of the adopted policy changes and the impact of the implemented policies were not measured. There was no mention of a rubric or any measuring tool to evaluate or endorse any of the policies. Measurement may have been difficult for political as well as technical reasons. None of those responsible wanted negative results or discussions about their policy change. The catalog of policies was never described as failures and no concrete evidence of success or failure for any of the policies was produced. But, with the environment of change came the impression of better schools for Chicago's children.

In the accountability crazed and standards driven environment these policies were created, it is difficult to believe a measurement tool wasn't included in the development of the many policies and made public. Were the policies in place long enough to properly be assessed? There is a perception that Chicago's schools have been gradually improving over time. Change in policy, new structures and media blitzes about the changing education environment created an impression of improvement and change, yet the policies themselves were rarely vetted.

Do these requirements produce quality leaders? How does Chicago define a quality school leader? Who are Chicago's successful school leaders? What education, training and professional development did Chicago's top-flight school leaders acquire? Where and with whom did Chicago's successful school leaders acquire their educations, experiences and professional development and support? How long does it take to develop a school leader? Is there a learning curve for school leaders? The literature review and documentary search and analysis executed for this study failed to answer the above questions.

Research Question #2: How did trends in education and educational research influence the changes in the Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of Chicago Public Schools Principals?

The compendium of skills and roles required for principalship in 1983-2008 expanded greatly. Chicago's Policy on the Requirements for Selection of Principalship changed as the new expectations of principals emerged and changed. The structure of schooling altered and shaped a broad set of principal's roles and responsibilities. These new roles and responsibilities addressed many of the workplace needs of teachers, students, parents and the school community at large.

Chicago's Policy on the Requirements for Selection of Principalship in all of its various forms aimed to raise standards and student achievement across the system. With the use of documentary analysis, the agendas from the Chicago Principals and Administrators Association's (CPAA) annual conference during 1983-2008 were analyzed. The following educational themes were identified as noteworthy in Chicago's

leadership discussions and debates during this period of time: Effective School Research, Decentralization, Instructional Leadership, Standards-Based Management, Restructuring Schools, Accountability, Professional Development.

The foundation of the Chicago School Reform Act lies in the research and understandings of both Effective School Research and Decentralization. Edmonds (1979) identified five factors of effective schools: high expectations for achievement, a school environment conducive to learning, emphasis on skill acquisition, frequent monitoring of student progress and strong administrative leadership. His conclusion that strong leadership leads to instructionally effective schools called for principals to push on the instructional level and begin to focus on the world of outcomes and student assessment. The 1997 Chicago Standards for Developing Leaders reflected all of Edmonds' beliefs about effective schools and effective leaders. This challenged Chicago's principals to change their style of leadership and their understanding of their role as head teacher.

Shifting Chicago's center of power meant redistributing power among various groups--principals, teachers, and parents--who had a legitimate stake in the content and quality of education. Chicago principals were called to facilitate these changes. This changed their roles and the expected behaviors and skill sets of aspiring principals. The theories of decentralization and effective school research laid the groundwork for what was to be expected of Chicago's principals in this era of school reform. The 1998 Standards for Developing School Leaders reflected the goals of decentralization and site-based management. All of these standards closely accommodated all of Edmonds' recommendations for effective schooling.

Chicago's superintendents and the Board of Education also responded to the changes that instructional leadership, standards based management, accountability and the work and spirit of restructuring schools, by imposing regulatory policy on potential candidates for principalship. Up to date research was constantly shaping the superintendents agendas for developing principals. Lashway (2003) asserted that instructional leaders must assume six roles: make student and adult learning a priority; set high expectations for performance; gear content and instruction to standards; create a culture of continuous learning for adults; use multiple sources of data to assess learning; and activate the community's support for school success (Lashway, 2003). Again, Chicago's Policy for the Selection of principalship laid these prerequisites out as criteria for developing and aspiring principals.

Standards based management required school leaders to study the importance of collecting and interpreting multiple sources of data to classify and examine barriers to student achievement and teacher performance, spot areas in need of improvement, design successful classroom lessons, re-evaluate school goals and establish opportunities for professional development. Reform efforts focused on student performance by prescribing standards that each student must obtain. In return for better accountability, schools and professional staff ideally received more flexibility and autonomy to make strategic decisions. With accountability, state and city officials prescribed outcomes and left choices about instructional methods and practices to professional educators in the schools. Chicago used professional development requirements to help educate practicing and aspiring principals about the increasing demands of standards driven decisions and

the demands of accountability for the academic achievement of all students.

Professional development was at the heart of all of Vallas' and Duncan's changes in the policy for selection of the principalship. Professional development was needed to address the new skills sets required for principals in this changing environment. Vallas and Duncan both appreciated staying up on current research and using that research to inform their policy changes. The coursework for eligibility for principalship reflected the knowledge, skill and vision the superintendent and school interest groups believed were necessary to lead schools. Monitoring student progress through varied and effective measurements took time and preparation. Collaboration with other principals allowed for exchanges of ideas and the transfer of important knowledge necessary for improvement and both Vallas and Duncan valued this type of professional development.

Schools that embrace significant and lasting changes engage in a process of reculturing in which new expectations, structures and patterns emerge to support initiatives (Fullan, 2001). Principals play critical roles as facilitators in restructuring efforts. Their commitment and leadership provide support and reassurance for teachers, students and community about the value of their efforts (Fullan, 2001). The last 25-years represented a period of remarkably intense change in Chicago. The cycle of policy changes reflected the intense evolving environment of school leadership. The rapid-fire policy changes expose Chicago's hurried and varied understandings of school leadership.

The implementation of a new policy creates the patina of change, but authentic transfer of knowledge, skills, and vision was difficult to monitor and assess. Chicago became very astute at adopting the rhetoric of innovation and change. Chicago used the

research of effective schools, decentralization, restructuring schools, standards based management, accountability and professional development to inform, design, and reform the Policy on the Requirements for Selection of Chicago Public School Principals.

Reform became a symbolic endeavor to reassure the public and local community. Reform and adoption of new innovative theories and practices were visible evidence that failing schools or mediocre student achievement was not tolerated. A catalog of educational trends and theories was easily traced in the Chicago Public School Policy Manual, press releases, CPS pamphlets and booklets and CPAA annual conference agendas. They were all embedded with educational buzzwords and concepts. The latest educational trends were neatly weaved into the writings in the CPAA annual conference booklets, as well as the materials concerning district required classes and seminars for aspiring and developing principals.

A cacophony of reform efforts and school restructuring had caused a great deal of racket and commotion during the era of 1983-2008. Very little substantive change had taken place in Chicago's urban setting. Reformers come in many forms, some may want to restructure a particular school, some may want to overhaul the entire systems, others argue for a particular pedagogy or curriculum (Hess, 1999). Chicago has been host to all types.

Recommendations

It is difficult to believe that in this standards driven and accountability charged environment that the Chicago Public Schools did not create a measurement tool to monitor the effectiveness of the implementation of each of the adopted policies. The

measurement tool must be related to increased student achievement, specifically achievement test scores. Creating a tool to assess implementation is recommended. A continuous improvement model for evaluation focusing on the assessment of implemented policy and its directives must be established to further the development and growth of Chicago's leaders.

One assumes that stronger requirements for the selection of new principals would equate with better leadership and increased student achievement. Increasing student achievement was the ultimate goal of all of the policy changes. In a recent report, published on student learning in Chicago's public schools by the Civic Committee of Alliance (CCA), formerly known as FRAC (2009), recent gains in the reported number of CPS elementary school students who meet standards on State assessments appear to be due to changes in the tests made by ISBE, rather than real improvements in student learning. This same report found that most of Chicago's students drop out or fail and that the vast majority of Chicago's elementary and high school students do not prepare their students for success in college and beyond (CCA, 2009).

CCA (2009) pitches for transparency and credibility when it comes to reporting student achievement. In order to drive real improvement and student success in CPS, reporting performance fairly to the public is required. A credible source of information on student achievement is a measurement required to properly assess the failure or success of selecting school leaders. Designating an outside auditor for this assessment and creating published reports is a great starting point for driving real change and improvement.

Decentralization entails fundamental changes in the way decisions are made and resources are distributed. In genuine decentralization, funds are allocated directly to local schools or, at the very least, schools exercise authority over key resources. It means little to adopt site-based management, for example, without concurrently releasing authority over the materials needed and human resources required to actualize school-initiated improvements. This prevents local educators from making the kinds of systemic changes that might improve teaching and learning.

Chicago has embraced the rhetoric of decentralization without doing a lot of the tough work of (a) redistributing authority over the budgeting process and over decisions about professional development and curriculum innovation, and (b) building the leadership and decision-making capacities for the new roles that decentralization implies. Decentralization is taking a back seat in Chicago's most recent reform efforts. Top down Chicago authority continues to micromanage professional development and curriculum and teaching decisions due to the standard driven and accountability fueled environment. Budget limitations, staff restrictions, overcrowded schools and classrooms serve as real impediments to the opportunity to grow in house leaders and distribute leadership. Centralization has unapologetically reappeared on Chicago's platform.

Further Study

My study was limited to the documentation available to provide an historical policy analysis on the changes in Chicago's Policy on the Requirements for Selection of principals during 1983-2008 while also identifying the educational trends that influenced those changes.

Additional research could be done in a variety of ways. A researcher could study:

- 1) Principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of the policy.
- 2) LSCs' perceptions of the effectiveness of this policy.
- 3) Parents' perceptions of the effectiveness of the policy.
- 4) The effects the policy has had on student achievement.
- 5) The policy on the selection of principals at other large, urban school districts.

Conclusion

This historical analysis provided the opportunity to trace Chicago's path in the national school reform arena from 1983-2008. This study helped to understand the effects school reform efforts had on school leadership policy in Chicago. It verified a roster of superintendents during this period, established a chronology of events and assembled an inventory of reform policies. The analysis of change in local policy echoed and identified national educational trends in this era.

This documentary analysis was aimed at contextualizing the policy development environment within which Chicago school leaders were developed and selected during 1983-2008. Relevant documents were obtained and analyzed. The relevant documents included policy statements, school board reports, CPS memos, press releases and principal regulations and standards. Reports related to school leadership and development from regional, provincial government offices as well as educational professional organizations were also reviewed and studied.

The last 25 years represented a period of amazingly intense change in Chicago. This cycle of policy changes reflect this ever evolving environment of school leadership. The implementation of new policies created the impression of change. Chicago became very astute at adopting the rhetoric of transformation and change. Chicago used the cutting edge research of effective schools, decentralization, restructuring schools, standards based management, accountability and professional development to plan, devise and reform the Policy on the Requirements for Selection of Chicago Public School Principals in the era of 1983-2008.

Hess (1999) argued that local politics create incentives for districts to engage in behavior that is antithetical to improving teaching and learning. Hess (1998) noted the pressure on school districts to initiate lots of activity and change whether productive or not, as evidence of an energetic and dedicated leadership in the face of intractable problems. “Policy churn” takes the place of improved performance (Hess, 1998). The shelf life of Chicago’s many leadership policies has impeded proper implementation, evaluation and assessment of the value added.

One key outcome of “policy churn” is the erosion of trust and commitment among teachers and administrators, who cease to believe that new policy initiatives will persist long enough to make a difference for students, schools and the community at large. Rather than look at new and improved educational trends and remedies for low student achievement, Chicago needs to increase their emphasis on providing, focused, consistent leadership that cultivates expertise and community and emphasizes policy longevity. Establishing policy longevity would provide school leaders with the opportunity to

properly evaluate and assess implementation and progress. Reformers should focus on institutional changes that encourage school administrators, policy makers and community members to implement research-based strategies known to result in authentic student achievement.

APPENDIX A
WRITTEN DOCUMENT ANALYSIS WORKSHEET

WRITTEN DOCUMENT ANALYSIS WORKSHEET

1. Type of document (check one):

CPS Policy CPS Press Release CPS Board Report
 Article from Prof. Organization CPAA Conference Agenda
 Newspaper Magazine IL Policy
 CPS Pamphlet Job Advertisement CPAA Publication
 Other (describe) _____

2. Date(s) of document _____

3. 1980s _____ **1990s** _____ **2000s** _____

4. Author (s) _____

5. For what audience was the document written? _____

6. Important Document Information:

A. List important pieces of information presented in the document.

B. Why was the document written?

C. What evidence in the document helps you to determine why it was written?

D. What policy, action, event(s) does this document refer or pertain to?

E. Write a question to the author that is left unanswered by the document.

F. Where was the document found?

REFERENCES

- American Association of School Administrators. (1999). *An educator's guide to schoolwide reform*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. A report to the nation and the Secretary of Education, United States Department of Education. (1983). Washington, DC: National Commission on Excellence in Education.
- An Education Plan for the Chicago Public Schools* [Pamphlet]. (2002). Chicago, IL: Chicago Public Schools.
- Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (2004). *47th Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Anson, A., Cook, T. D., Habib, F., Grady, M. K., Haynes, N., & Comer, J. P. (1991). The Comer School Development Program: A Theoretical Analysis. *Urban Education*, 26(1), 56-82.
- Ayers, W., & Hallett, A. (1994, November 8). [Chicago Annenberg Challenge Grant Proposal]. Unpublished raw data.
- Bamburg, J., & Andrews, R. (1990). Instructional leadership, school goals, and student achievement: Exploring the relationship between means and ends. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1984). *Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1993). *The path to school leadership: A portable mentor* (Roadmaps to success: The practicing administrators' leadership series). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1994). *Becoming a teacher leader: From isolation to collaboration*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Boothe, J. W., & Others, A. (1994, February 1). This working life. *Executive Educator*, 16(2), 39-42.

- Brookover, W. B., Lezotte, L. W., & Michigan State University, O. T. (1979). Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement. *Occasional Paper No. 17* (Tech).
- Bryk, A., Sebring, P., & Consortium on Chicago School Research, I. (1991). Achieving School Reform in Chicago: What We Need To Know. A Research Agenda. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Bryk, A., & Others, A. (1994, September 1). The state of Chicago school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76(1), 74-78.
- Bryk, A. S. (2010, April 1). Organizing schools for improvement. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 91(7), 23-30.
- Bryk, A. S., Hill, P., Shipps, D., & Casey, A. E. (1999). *Improving school community connections: Moving toward a system of community schools*. Baltimore, MD: The Anne E. Casey Foundation.
- Bryk, A. S., Consortium on Chicago School Research, I., & And, O. (1993). A view from the elementary schools: The state of reform in Chicago. *A Report of the Steering Committee, Consortium on Chicago School Research* (Tech).
- Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Kerbow, D., Rollow, S., & Easton, J. Q. (1998). *Charting Chicago school reform: Democratic localism as a lever for change*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Calabrese, R. L. (1989, December 1). The principal's role in community building through staff development. *Journal of Staff Development*, 10(1), 18-20.
- The *Catalyst*. (2008). Duncan's track record. Chicago, IL: Authors.
- The *Catalyst*. (1997). Steps to become a principals in the Chicago Public Schools. Chicago, IL: Authors.
- Characteristics of Improved School Districts. *Research Brief* (Tech). (2006).
- Charting School Reform: LSC Local Leadership. (n.d.). *Consortium on Chicago School Research*. Retrieved September 29, 2010, from http://ccsr.uchicago.edu/content/publications.php?pub_id=104
- Chicago Board of Education Consulting Services Agreement (06-0628-ED13). (2006). Chicago, IL: CPS.

- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (1983). *26th Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Principal and Administrators Association. (1984). *27th Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Principals and Administrator's Association. (1985). *28th Annual Chicago Principals and Administrator's Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (1986). *29th Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (1987). *30th Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (1988). *31st Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (1989). *32nd Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (1990). *33rd Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (1991). *34th Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (1992). *35th Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (1993). *36th Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.

- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (1994). *37th Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (1995). *38th Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (1996). *39th Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (1997). *40th Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (1998). *41st Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (1999). *42nd Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (2000). *43rd Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (2001). *44th Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (2002). *45th Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (2003). *46th Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (2004). *47th Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.

- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (2005). *48th Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (2006). *49th Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (2007). *50th Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. (2008). *51st Annual Chicago Principals and Administrators Association and the Chicago Board of Education Conference Agenda Booklet* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Public Schools. (1988). *Examination booklet for Chicago principals examination* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Public Schools. (1996). *Duties of a principal* [Brochure]. Author.
- Chicago Public Schools. (1996). *Uniform principal performance contract* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Public Schools. (1997). *1997 CPS principals contract* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Public Schools. (1997). *Principal selection legal requirements* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Public Schools. (1997). *Procedural guidelines for principal performance evaluation* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Public Schools. (2000). *Requirements for the selection of Chicago Public School principals* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Public Schools. (2008). *OPPD: Preparing for principalship* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Chicago Public Schools and Administrator's Academy Resource Booklet. (1996). *Rules of the Board of Education* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.

- Chicago Public Schools, Office of Communications. (2002, April 4). *CPS evaluates its human capital* [Press release]. Retrieved October 27, 2008.
- Chicago Public Schools, Office of Communications. (2003, August 5). *CPS streamlines for better efficiency and Accountability* [Press release]. Retrieved October 20, 2005.
- Chicago Public Schools, Office of Communications. (2004, February 20). *CPS raises bar for new principals* [Press release]. Retrieved October 20, 2005.
- Chicago Public Schools, Office of Communications. (2006, October 19). *Duncan yaps Payton College Prep Principal to head up school system's principal training and development office* [Press release]. Retrieved October 27, 2008.
- Chicago Standards for School Leaders* [Pamphlet]. (1998). Chicago, IL: Chicago Public Schools.
- Chicago School Reform Act. (1988). Public Act 85-1418. Springfield, IL: General Assembly of the State of Illinois.
- Cistone, P. J., & Stevenson, J. M. (2000, August 1). Perspectives on the urban school principalship. *Education and Urban Society*, 32(4), 435-42.
- Clune, W. H., & White, P. A. (1988). *School-based management institutional variation, implementation, and issues for further research*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education.
- Clune, W. H., & Witte, J. F. (1990). *Choice and control in American education*. London: Falmer.
- Coalition of Essential Schools. (2010). *Coalition of essential schools*. Retrieved from <http://www.essentialschools.org>
- Coleman, J. S. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.
- Comer, J. (1988). Educating poor minority children. *Scientific American*.
- Cotton, K. (2003). *Principals and student achievement: What the research says*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- CPS Competencies and Success Factors* [Pamphlet]. (2008). Chicago, IL: Chicago Public Schools.

- CPS Office of the Deputy Chief Education Officer. (1997). *About the Principals Review Board* [Brochure]. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Crump, D. (1999). *Road to school reform: The Chicago model*. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Cuban, L. (1990, January 1). Reforming again, again, and again. *Educational Researcher*, 19(1), 3-13.
- Cushman, K. (n.d.). Using time well: Schedules in essential schools. *Coalition of Essential Schools*. Retrieved September 29, 2010, from <http://www.essentialschools.org/resources/11>
- Datnow, A., Hubbard, L., & Mehan, H. (2002). *Extending educational reform: From one school to many*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- David, J. L. (1989, May 1). Synthesis of research on school-based management. *Educational Leadership*, 46(8), 45-53.
- David, J. L., & Area, R. G. (1994). School-based decision making: Linking decisions to learning. *Third-Year Report to the Prichard Committee* (Tech).
- Designs for Change. (1991). *Closer look*. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Developing Aspiring Principals: Policy, Experience and Performance* [Pamphlet]. (2004). Chicago, IL: Chicago Public Schools.
- Edge, K. (2000). *Decentralization and school based management resource kit-Case studies*. Education Reform Management Thematic Group. HDNED. World Bank.
- Edmonds, R. (1979, October 1). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Edmonds, R. (1984, September 1). School effects and teacher effects. *Social Policy*, 15(2), 37-39.
- Edmonds, R. R., & Others, A. (1977). *Search for effective schools; The identification and analysis of city schools that are instructionally effective for poor children* (Tech). Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Eligibility for Principalship* [Pamphlet]. (2008). Chicago, IL: OPPD: Chicago Public Schools.

- Elmore, R. F. (1990). *Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Elmore, R. F. (2000). Building a new structure for school leadership. *The Albert Shaker Institute*.
- Elmore, R. F. (2004). *School reform from the inside out: Policy, practice, and performance*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Elton, G. R. (1970). *Political history: Principles and practice*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ferrandino, V. L. (2001, 02/01). Challenges for 21st-century elementary school principals. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(6), 440-42.
- Fiske, E. B. (1995). Systemic school reform: Implications for architecture. In A. Meek (Ed.), *Designing places for learning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Ford, D. (1992). *Chicago principals under school based management: New roles and realities of the job*. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Ford, D., & Bennett, A. (1994). The changing principalship in Chicago. *Education and Urban Society*, 26(3), 238-47.
- Ford, D., & Chicago Panel on Public School Policy and Finance, I. (1991). *The school principal and Chicago school reform: Principals' early perceptions of reform initiatives*. Monitoring and Researching the Effects of School Reform in Chicago.
- Fowler, W., & National Center for Education Statistics (ED), W. (1991). *What are the characteristics of principals identified as effective by teachers?* Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Fullan, M. G. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M. G. (1993). Innovation, reform, and restructuring strategies. In *Challenges and Achievements of American education: The 1993 ASCD yearbook*, 116-33. Alexandria, VA: Association for supervision and Curriculum Development
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Glaser, R., & Linn, R. (1993). Foreword. In L. Shepard (Ed.), *Setting performance standards for student achievement* (pp. xiii-xiv). Stanford, CA: National Academy of Education, Stanford University.
- Glickman, C. (1990). *Supervision of instruction: A development approach* (2nd ed.). Toronto, ON: Allyn and Bacon.
- Goldring, E.B. (1990). Elementary school principals as boundary spanners: Their engagement with parents. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 28(1), 53-62.
- Goodman, J. (1994). External change agents and grassroots school reform: Reflections from the field. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 9(2), 113-35.
- Gottschalk, L. R. (1969). *Understanding history: A Primer of historical method*. New York: Random House Inc (T).
- Grigg, S. (1991). Archival practice and the foundations of historical method. *The Journal of American History*, 78(1) Published by: Organization of American Historians.
- Guthrie, J. W. (1990, 01/01). The evolving political economy of education and the implications for educational evaluation. *Educational Review*, 42(2), 109-31.
- Hallinger, P. (1992). The evolving role of American principals: From managerial to instructional to transformational leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 35-48.
- Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4(3), 221-239.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9(2), 157-91.
- Hallinger, P., & Leithwood, K. (1996). Culture and educational administration: A case of finding out what you don't know you don't know. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 34(5), 98-116.
- Handbook of Education Policy Research* (1st ed.). (2009). New York: Routledge.
- Hansen, P. (2004). *Accountability in school reform in Chicago: Lessons in policy and practice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Pub Group.

- Hawthorne, M. (1996). Legislature gives board power to add hiring requirements. *The Catalyst*. Chicago, IL.
- Heck, R. (1994) Public school restructuring. *Equity and Excellence*, 25(24), 50-52.
- Heck, R. (1998). Conceptual and methodical issues in investigating principal leadership across cultures. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 51-80.
- Henry, D. E. (1993). The path to school leadership: A portable mentor: By L. Bolman, & T. E. Deal. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press. *NASSP Bulletin*, 77(554), 102-103.
- Hess, F. (1999). *Spinning wheels: The politics of urban school reform*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Hess, F. (1998, October). As the policy churns: Toil and trouble for urban school reform. *The Education Digest*, 64(2), 8-14.
- Hess, G. (1995). Reallocating resources for SBM: Creating an engine for school reform. *School Business Affairs*, 61(5), 32-41.
- Hess, G. (1991). *School restructuring, Chicago style*. Newbury Park, CA: Crown Press.
- Hess, G. (1995). *Restructuring urban schools: A Chicago perspective*. The Series on School Reform. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Hess, G. (1994). School-based management as a vehicle for school reform. *Education and Urban Society*, 26(3), 203-19.
- Hess, G. (1991). School reform in Chicago: Where's the reality?. *Illinois Schools Journal*, 71(1), 10-17.
- Hord, S., Southwest Educational Development Lab., A., Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, A., & And, O. (1987). *Taking charge of change*. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Howley, C. (1994). *The academic effectiveness of small-scale schooling* (ERIC Digest). Charleston, WV: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 372 897).
- Illinois School Leaders* [Pamphlet]. (1998). Chicago: Chicago Public Schools.
- Illinois 89th General Assembly Conference Committee Report* (Committee Report on House Bill 206). (1995). Springfield, IL.

- Initiatives: Still Left Behind. (n.d.). *Civic Committee*. Retrieved September 29, 2010, from <http://www.civiccommittee.org/initiatives/education/index.html>
- Jencks, C., & And, O. (1972). *Inequality: A reassessment of the effect of family and schooling in America*. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Kaestle, J. R., Lodewick, C. F., & Henig, A. E. (2007). *To educate a nation*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas.
- Karp, S., Williams, D., Forte, L., & Myers, J. (2008). CATALYST CHICAGO: News. (n.d.). *CATALYST CHICAGO: Independent reporting on urban schools*. Retrieved September 28, 2010, from <http://www.catalyst-chicago.org/news/index.php?item=2530&cat=5#>
- Katz, M. (1980). Reflections on the purpose of educational reform. *Educational Theory*, 30(2), 77-87.
- Katz, M. (1992). Chicago school reform as history. *Teachers College Record*, 94(1), 56-72.
- Katz, M., Fine, M., & Simon, E. (1997). Poking around: Outsiders view Chicago school reform. *Teachers College Record*, 99(1), 117-57.
- King, D. (2002). The changing shape of leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 59(8), 61-63.
- Kline, W. (1988). Developing principals' leadership skills. *Journal of Staff Development*, 9(2), 52-57.
- Klonsky, M. (1995). Small schools: The numbers tell a story. *A Review of the Research and Current Experiences*. Chicago, IL: Illinois University. (ERIC ED386517).
- Klonsky, M., & Ford, P. (1994, May). One urban solution: Small schools. *Educational Leadership*, 64-66.
- Klonsky, M., & Klonsky, S. (2008). *Small schools: Public school reform meets the ownership society*. New York: Routledge.
- Krug, S., National Center for School Leadership, U., MetriTech Inc., M., Illinois University, U., & And, O. (1990). *Current issues and research findings in the study of school leadership*. Project Report.
- Lane, J. (1991). Instructional leadership and community: A perspective on school based management. *Theory into Practice*, 30(2), 119-23.

- Lane, B. (1992). Cultural leaders in effective schools: The builders and brokers of excellence. *NASSP Bulletin*, 76(541), 85-96.
- Lashway, L. (2003). *Role of the school leader: Trends and issues*. Eugene, OR: College of Education-University of Oregon.
- Lashway, L., National Association of Elementary School Principals, A., & ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, E. (1999). *Preparing school leaders*. Research Roundup.
- Lee, V. E., & Smith, J. B. (1995). *Restructuring high schools for equity and excellence: What works*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Leithwood, K., & Montgomery, D. (1982). The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement. *Review of Educational Research*, 52(3), 309-39.
- Lemley, R. (1997). Thoughts on a richer view of principals' development. *NASSP Bulletin*, 81(585), 33-37.
- Lenz, L. (1998). New twist on internship needs airing. *The Catalyst*. Chicago, IL.
- Lenz, L. (1997). Overdue help for principal selection. *The Catalyst*. Chicago, IL.
- Lenz, L. (1998). Priming the pump. *The Catalyst*. Chicago, IL.
- Lewis, L. (1997). Master principals find some fault with job criteria. *The Catalyst*. Chicago, IL.
- Lewis, L. (1997). Proposed requirements to be a principal. *The Catalyst*. Chicago, IL.
- Lewis, L. (1997). The history of principal hiring in Chicago. *The Catalyst*. Chicago, IL.
- Lipman, P. (2003). *High stakes education: Inequality, globalization, and urban school reform (Critical social thought)* (1st ed.). New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Lodewick, C. F., Henig, A. E., & Kaestle, J. R. (2007). *To educate a nation*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas.
- McCullough, G. (2004). *Documentary research in education, history and the social sciences* (Social Research and Educational Studies Series, 22) (New edition). New York: Routledge Falmer.

- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mirel, J. (1993). School reform Chicago style: Educational innovation in a changing urban context. *Urban Education*, 28.
- Mohrman, S. (1994). *School based management*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Moore, D., & Designs for Change, C. (1991). *Chicago school reform: The nature and origin of basic assumptions*. Research and Policy Analysis Series No. 7. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Moore, D. (1990). Voice and choice in Chicago. In *Choice and control in American education: The practice of choice, decentralization and school restructuring*, Volume 2. Bristol, PA
- Moore, D. R. (1985). The bottom line: Chicago failing schools and how to save them. *Designs for Change*, Chicago, IL.
- Murphy, J., & Beck, L. (1993). *Understanding the principalship: Metaphorical themes 1920s-1990s*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Murphy, J. (1998). Preparation for the school principalship: The United States' story. *School Leadership and Management*, 18(3), 359-72.
- Murphy, J., & Datnow, A. (2003). Leadership lessons from comprehensive school reforms.
- Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1992). The principalship in an era of transformation. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 30(3), 77-78.
- Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1993). Restructuring schooling: Learning from ongoing efforts.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- O'Connell, M. (1991). School reform, Chicago style: How citizens organized to change public policy. *Neighborhood Technology: The Neighborhood Works*, 48.
- Pick, G. (1997). Outside board will review principals' credentials. *The Catalyst*. Chicago, IL.

- Pierson, P. (2004). *Politics in time: History, institutions, and social analysis*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of CPS Principals* (Chicago Public Schools Policy Manual Board Report 96-1120-PO1). (1996). Chicago, IL: CPS.
- Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of CPS Principals* (Chicago Public Schools Policy Manual Board Report 97-0226-PO2). (1997). Chicago, IL: CPS.
- Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of CPS Principals* (Chicago Public Schools Policy Manual Board Report 97-0226-PO3). (1997). Chicago, IL: CPS.
- Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of CPS Principals* (Chicago Public Schools Policy Manual Board Report 97-0226-PO4). (1997). Chicago, IL: CPS.
- Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of CPS Principals* (Chicago Public Schools Policy Manual Board Report 98-0225-PO2). (n.d.). Chicago, IL: CPS.
- Policy on the Requirements for Selection of CPS Principals* (Chicago Public Schools Policy Manual Board Report 00-1220-PO1). (2000). Chicago, IL: CPS.
- Policy on the Requirements for the Selection of CPS Principals* (Chicago Public Schools Policy Manual Board Report 03-0423-PO1). (2003). Chicago, IL: CPS.
- Policy on the Requirements for Selection of CPS Principals* (Chicago Public Schools Policy Manual Board Report 04-0225-PO1). (2004). Chicago, IL: CPS.
- Policy on the Requirements for the Selection and Retention of CPS Principals* (Chicago Public Schools Policy Manual Board Report 08-1217-PO2). (2008). Chicago, IL: CPS.
- Prestine, N. (1991). Shared decision making in restructuring essential schools: The role of the principal. *Planning and Changing*, 22(3-4), 160-77.
- Public Act 87-630 (1987). Springfield, IL: General Assembly of the State of Illinois.
- Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. S. (1983). Effective schools: A review. *The Elementary School Journal*, 83(4), 427-452.
- Purkey, W. W., & Schmidt, J. J. (1990). *Invitational learning for counseling and development*. Ann Arbor, MI: ERIC Counseling and Personnel Services Clearinghouse, The University of Michigan.

- Quality of Candidate Committee. (1994). The selection of leaders for NC Schools: Admissions Criteria and Employment Procedures.
- Ravitch, D., & Viteritti, J. (1997). New schools for a new century. *The Redesign of Urban Education*.
- Rich, W. C. (1996). *Black mayors and school politics: The failure of reform in Detroit, Gary, and Newark*. New York: Garland Publishers.
- Richardson, M., & Lane, K. (1994). Reforming principal preparation: From training to learning. *Catalyst for Change*, 23(2), 14-18.
- Riley, M. W. (1963). *Sociological research I: A case approach*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.
- Rolling, K. (1996). *Chicago Annenberg challenge memo (Rep.)*. Chicago, IL.
- Rollow, S., & Bryk, A. (1993). The Chicago experiment: The potential and reality of reform. *Equity and Choice*, 9(3), 22-32.
- Rollow, S., Bryk, A., Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, M., & Chicago University, I. (1994). *Politics as a lever for organizational change*. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Rosenholtz, S. J. (1991). *Teacher's workplace: The social organization of schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Rules of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago*. (1983). Chicago, IL: Board of Education.
- Rules of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago*. (1984). Chicago, IL Board of Education.
- Rules of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago*. (1990). Chicago, IL: Board of Education.
- Rules of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago*. (1998). Chicago, IL: Board of Education.
- Russo, A. (2004). *School reform in Chicago lessons in policy and practice*. Harvard, MA: Harvard Education Press.

- Rutherford, W. L., & Others, A. (1984, January 1). Preparing principals for leadership roles in school improvement. *Education and Urban Society*, 17(1), 29-48.
- Schmoker, M., & Marzano, R. J. (1999). Realizing the promise of standards-based education. *Educational Leadership*, 56(6), 21-21.
- Sebring, P., & Bryk, A. (2000). School leadership and the bottom line in Chicago. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81(6), 440-443.
- Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Bryk, A. S., Easton, J. Q., Luppescu, S., & Onchicago, S. R. (2006). *The essential supports for school improvement*. Research Report (Tech).
- Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (3rd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Shirley, D. (1999). By A. S. Bryk, P. B. Sebring, D. Kerbow, S. Rollow, & J. Q. Easton: Charting Chicago school reform: Democratic localism as a lever for change. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105(1), 275-277.
- Shipp, D. (1997). The invisible hand: Big business and Chicago school reform. *Teachers College Record*, 99(1), 73-116.
- Shipp, D. (2003). Pulling together: Civic capacity and urban school reform. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(4), 841-878.
- Short, P. M., & Greer, J. T. (1997). *Leadership in empowered schools: Themes for innovative efforts*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Sirotnik, K. A., & Clark, R. W. (1988, May). School centered decision making and renewal. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69(9), 660-664.
- Sizer, T. R. (1985). *Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school*. Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Smith, W., Andrews, R., & Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, A. (1989). *Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference*.
- Soltero, S. (2000). Dual language immersion: Profile of Chicago's program. *ACIE Newsletter*, 4(1).

- Spillane, J., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. (2004, January 1). Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36(1), 3-34.
- Stinnette, L., & North Central Regional Educational Lab, O. (1993). Decentralization: Why, how, and toward what ends? *Special Policy Report*, No. 1. Policy Briefs Series. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Sykes, G., Schneider, B. L., Plank, D. N., & Ford, T. G. (2009). *Handbook of education policy research*. New York: Routledge.
- Thiessen, D. (1989). The leadership development network: Lessons learned from a field-based program for principals. *Journal of Staff Development*, 10(1), 26-30.
- Tirozzi, G. (2001). The artistry of leadership: The evolving role of the secondary school principal. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(6), 434-439.
- To Educate a Nation: Federal and National Strategies of School Reform (Studies in Government and Public Policy). (2007). Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Tosh, J. (2006). *The pursuit of history* (4th Edition). New York: Longman.
- Tosh, J. (2008). *Why history matters*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wagstaff, L. H., & Reyes, P. (1993). *School site management*. Report presented to the Educational Economic Policy Center). Austin, TX: University of Texas, College of Education.
- Walberg, H. J., & Niemiec, R. P. (1994, May). Is Chicago school reform working? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 713-715.
- Wang, M. C., & Harertem, R. (1994, April). Walberg models of reform: A comparative guide. *Educational Leadership*, 55(7), 66-71.
- What is the Principal Eligibility Process?* [Pamphlet]. (2008). Chicago, IL: Chicago Public Schools.
- Wong, K. (2003). The big stick. *Education Next*, 3(1), 44-49.
- Wong, K., & Shen, F. (2003). Big city mayors and school governance reform: The case of school district takeover. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 78(1), 5-32.

Wrigley, J. (1997). Chicago school reform: Business control or open democracy?
Teachers College Record.

VITA

The author, Siobhan Cafferty was born in Chicago, Illinois on May 31, 1971. She attended Saint Columba Elementary School in Chicago, Illinois and Seton Academy in South Holland, Illinois for secondary school. She earned a Bachelor of Arts in Theology and Philosophy from Quincy College in Quincy, Illinois in 1993. She completed her Master of Education in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at the University of Illinois at Chicago in 1997.

Siobhan began her career teaching theology and working as the Campus Minister at the Academy of our Lady (AOL) in Chicago in 1994. She later assumed the position of Director of Activities as well as the Director of Counseling position at AOL. In 1997, she became the Director of Pre-Admissions at Saint Scholastica Academy in Chicago, Illinois. In July of 1999, Siobhan accepted the Assistant Principalship at the Austin Career Education Center in Chicago, Illinois. In December, of that same year, she assumed the Assistant Principal position at Brooks College Preparatory Academy in Chicago, Illinois. Siobhan entered the doctoral program in Cultural and Educational Policy Studies at Loyola University in the fall of 2001. She was granted a leave of absence from the ELPS program in 2003. In the fall of 2003, she left Brooks College Prep to participate in a Fulbright Administrative Grant and spent her time teaching teachers in Gaziantep, Turkey. Upon the completion of the Fulbright Grant, Siobhan began working for the National College for School Leadership (NCSL) in London,

England as an Educational Consultant. During her time at the NCSL, she served as a Deputy Head Teacher at both Islington Arts and Media in Finsbury Park as well as at Hurlingham and Chelsea in Chelsea. Siobhan coached teachers and supported the Head Teachers at Tamworth Manor High School in Mitchum and at Highbury Grove in Islington during her tenure with the NCSL. In the fall of 2005, Siobhan returned to Chicago and established a weekly story time for Maria's Shelter, a residence for homeless women and their children. She is currently working on her first children's book and at home raising her two sons, Christopher and Cathal.

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

The Dissertation submitted by Siobhan Cafferty has been read and approved by the following committee:

Ann Marie Ryan, Ph.D., Director
Associate Professor, School of Education
Loyola University Chicago

Robert Roemer, Ph.D.
Professor, School of Education
Loyola University Chicago

Beverly B. Kasper, Ed.D.
Associate Dean, School of Education
Loyola University Chicago