2011

Riding the Wave of Gentrification: Selected Principals' Perceptions of Gentrification's Impact on Leadership and School Culture

Jose Antonio Jimenez
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

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 © 2011 Jose Antonio Jimenez
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

RIDING THE WAVE OF GENTRIFICATION:
SELECTED PRINCIPALS’ PERCEPTIONS OF GENTRIFICATION’S
IMPACT ON LEADERSHIP AND SCHOOL CULTURE

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

PROGRAM IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

BY

J. ANTONIO JIMENEZ

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

DECEMBER 2011
Copyright by J. Antonio Jimenez, 2011
All rights reserved.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This endeavor would not have taken place without the assistance of my dissertation chair, Dr. Marla Israel. Dr. Israel was my toughest critic and perhaps my most important teacher. I would like to also thank Dr. Beverly Kasper and Dr. Harry Rossi for serving in my committee. Their insight, guidance and support would be forever appreciated. I would also like to thank Loyola University’s School of Education for opening their doors to me and allowing me this grand opportunity.

I owe a great debt to all the practitioners and colleagues that have mentored me through this process. Thank you Chicago Public Schools for enriching my life by allowing me to put into practice what I have learned during this process. Thank you, principal, Carl Dasko, for all the support and encouragement.

I would like to also thank the districts, superintendents, and principals that participated in this study, who shared their wisdom to make this study come to fruition.

Finally, I would also like to acknowledge my wife, Dina, for filling all the voids in my life. She is the epitome of the axiom, behind a good man lies an even greater woman.
DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my father and mother, Jose Antonio and Maria Elena Jimenez and to the love of my life, my wife, Dina and my three sons, Joseph, John, and Jack.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ........................................................................................................ iii

LIST OF TABLES ...................................................................................................................... vii

LIST OF FIGURES .................................................................................................................. xiv

ABSTRACT ............................................................................................................................... xv

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION ................................................................................................... 1
  Gentrification ......................................................................................................................... 1
  School Culture ....................................................................................................................... 4
  Changing School Culture and School Leadership ................................................................. 7
  Statement of Problem ............................................................................................................ 13
  Purpose of the Study .............................................................................................................. 14
  Research Questions .............................................................................................................. 15
  Conceptual Framework ......................................................................................................... 15
  Limitations of the Study ........................................................................................................ 22
  Organization of the Study ..................................................................................................... 22
  Definition of Terms ............................................................................................................... 23

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW ....................................................................................... 25
  Gentrification ......................................................................................................................... 26
  Schools and Gentrification ..................................................................................................... 28
  Leadership Taxonomies for Great Success ........................................................................... 30
  Bolman and Deal’s Typology (Knowledge and Comprehension) ........................................... 32
  Jim Collins’ Good-to-Great Typology (Application and Analysis) ......................................... 36
  Marzano’s Leadership Typology (Synthesis) .......................................................................... 50
  Fullan’s Leadership Typology (Evaluation) ......................................................................... 54
  Summary ............................................................................................................................... 56

CHAPTER III: PROCEDURES .................................................................................................. 61
  Research Questions and Methodology .................................................................................. 61
  Research Procedures ............................................................................................................. 63
  Site Selection ......................................................................................................................... 66
  Data Collection Procedures ................................................................................................. 68
  Informed Consent .................................................................................................................. 69
  Coding Procedures ............................................................................................................... 70
  Limitations ............................................................................................................................. 72
  Bias Minimization ............................................................................................................... 73
  Summary ............................................................................................................................... 74
CHAPTER IV: DATA

Participating Districts’ Demographics and Socioeconomic Indicators ....................................................... 76
Participants’ Demographics ........................................................................................................................... 81
Research Data: The Interviews ....................................................................................................................... 82
Gentrification Analysis ................................................................................................................................. 109
Coding Procedures ....................................................................................................................................... 111
Summary of Good to Great Coding Analysis .................................................................................................. 121
Coding Using Fullan’s (2006) Turnaround Leadership Framework .............................................................. 125
Summary of Fullan’s (2006) Turnaround Leadership Coding ....................................................................... 142
Di Primio (1988) Coding Analysis ................................................................................................................. 144
Summary ....................................................................................................................................................... 166

CHAPTER V: DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION ..................................................................................... 167
Triangulation .................................................................................................................................................. 168
Data Analysis ................................................................................................................................................ 168
Themes ......................................................................................................................................................... 169
Limitations of the Study ................................................................................................................................. 212
Recommendations for Further Study ............................................................................................................. 213
Implications for Leadership Preparation ....................................................................................................... 214
Conclusion ................................................................................................................................................... 215

APPENDIX A: DISTRICT LETTER OF COOPERATION TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH .............................................. 218

APPENDIX B: PRINCIPAL CONSENT LETTER I EMAILED .............................................................................. 222

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL .......................................................................................................... 224

APPENDIX D: PRINCIPAL CONSENT LETTER II .......................................................................................... 227

APPENDIX E: PARTICIPANT REJECTION LETTER ...................................................................................... 230

REFERENCE LIST ........................................................................................................................................... 232

VITA ................................................................................................................................................................. 238
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: The Individualism/Collectivism Framework....................................................... 6
Table 2: Howe and Strauss Generational Divide............................................................ 7
Table 3: Jim Collins’ Level 5 Hierarchy........................................................................ 19
Table 4: Chicago Public School Student Demographics 2005-2009............................... 29
Table 5: State of Illinois Student Demographics 2005-2009........................................ 30
Table 6: Factors in the What Works Model.................................................................. 51
Table 7: Code Families Adapted from Jim Collins Good to Great Level 5 Leadership (2001) 58
Table 8: Michael Fullan (2006) Turnaround Leadership Philosophies......................... 59
Table 9: Di Primio’s Turnaround Corporate Management (1988)................................. 60
Table 10: District One Demographics .......................................................................... 67
Table 11: District Two Demographics.......................................................................... 68
Table 12: District Three Demographics ....................................................................... 68
Table 13: Code Families Adapted from Jim Collins Good to Great Level 5 Leadership (2001) 71
Table 14: Turnaround Leadership Philosophies (Fullan vs Corporate Models)............. 72
Table 15: Di Primio’s Turnaround Corporate Management.......................................... 72
Table 16: District Population and Demographics Expressed in Percentages................. 76
Table 17: Representative Districts’ Economic/Household Indicators Expressed in Percentages ................................................................. 77
Table 18: Representative Districts’ Employment Demographics Expressed in Percentages ................................................................. 78

Table 19: Representative Districts’ Social Indicators Expressed in Percentages .......... 78

Table 20: District General Illinois Report Card Profiles Expressed in Percentages .... 79

Table 21: School Districts’ Enrollment Trends 2005-2010 ........................................ 79

Table 22: School Districts’ Low Income Trends 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages .. 80

Table 23: Districts’ Student Mobility Trends 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages ...... 80

Table 24: Districts’ Student Attendance Trends 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages ... 81

Table 25: Participants’ Profile ............................................................................. 82

Table 26: School A1’s Demographic Trend 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages ........ 85

Table 27: School B2’s Demographic Trends 2005-2010 ........................................... 89

Table 28: School C3’s Demographic Trends 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages ...... 92

Table 29: School D3’s Demographic Trends 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages ...... 96

Table 30: School E3’s Demographic Trends 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages ...... 99

Table 31: School F1’s Demographic Trends 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages ..... 102

Table 32: School G1’s Demographic Trends 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages...... 104

Table 33: School H2’s Demographic Trends 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages..... 107

Table 34: School I2’s Demographic Trends 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages ...... 109

Table 35: Jim Collins (2001) Good to Great Comparison ........................................... 110

Table 36: Jim Collins (2001) Good to Great Comparison ........................................... 124

Table 37: Code Families adapted from Jim Collins Good to Great Level 5 Leadership (2001) ........................................................................... 124

Table 38: Participating Districts’ ISAT Meet/Exceed Comparison Expressed in Percentages ....................................................................................... 126
Table 39: Participating Districts’ 2010 ISAT Percentage of 8\textsuperscript{th} Grade at Each Level ... 127

Table 40: School A1’s ISAT Achievement Gap Between Hispanics versus Whites
Expressed in Percentages.............................................................................................. 128

Table 41: School A1’s ISAT Achievement Gap Between Low Income versus Non
Low Income Expressed in Percentages....................................................................... 128

Table 42: School A1’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Reading Analysis........................................ 128

Table 43: School A1’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Math Analysis............................................. 129

Table 44: School B2’s Percentage of Meets and Exceed of Hispanics ......................... 129

Table 45: School B2’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Reading Analysis........................................ 130

Table 46: School B2’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Math Analysis............................................. 130

Table 47: School C3’s ISAT Achievement Gap Between Black versus White
Expressed in Percentages.............................................................................................. 131

Table 48: School C3’s ISAT Achievement Gap Between IEP versus Non IEP
Expressed in Percentages.............................................................................................. 131

Table 49: School C3’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Reading Analysis........................................ 131

Table 50: School C3’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Math Analysis............................................. 132

Table 51: School D3’s ISAT Achievement Gap Between Black versus White
Expressed in Percentages.............................................................................................. 133

Table 52: School D3’s ISAT Achievement Gap Between Low Income versus Non
Low Income Expressed in Percentages....................................................................... 133

Table 53: School D3’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Reading Analysis........................................ 134

Table 54: School D3’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Math Analysis............................................. 134

Table 55: School E3’s ISAT Achievement Gap Between Black versus White
Expressed in Percentages.............................................................................................. 135

Table 56: School E3’s ISAT Achievement Gap between Low Income versus Non
Low Income Expressed in Percentages....................................................................... 135

Table 57: School E3’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Reading Analysis ........................................ 136

ix
Table 58: School E3’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Math Analysis ............................................. 136
Table 59: School F1’s ISAT Achievement Gap of Hispanic versus White  
Expressed in Percentages ......................................................................................... 137
Table 60: School F1’s ISAT Achievement Gap Between Low Income versus Non  
Low Income Expressed in Percentages ..................................................................... 137
Table 61: School F1’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Reading Analysis ................................. 138
Table 62: School F1’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Math Analysis ...................................... 138
Table 63: School G1’s Achievement Gap Hispanic versus White ............................. 139
Table 64: School G1’s Low Income versus Non Low Income ................................. 139
Table 65: School H2’s ISAT’s Achievement Gap Between Hispanic versus White  
Expressed in Percentages ......................................................................................... 139
Table 66: School H2’s ISAT’s Achievement Gap Between Black versus Hispanic  
Expressed in Percentages ......................................................................................... 140
Table 67: School H2’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Reading Analysis ................................. 140
Table 68: School H2’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Math Analysis ...................................... 140
Table 69: School I2’s ISAT Achievement Gap Between Low Income versus Non  
Low Income Expressed in Percentages ..................................................................... 141
Table 70: School I2’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Reading Analysis ................................. 141
Table 71: School’s I2 2010 Subgroup ISAT Math Analysis ...................................... 142
Table 72: Turnaround Leadership Philosophies ......................................................... 143
Table 73: Participants’ Black Students Exceeding in 2010 ISAT ............................. 143
Table 74: Participants’ Hispanic Students Exceeding in 2010 ISAT ..................... 144
Table 75: Di Primio’s (1988) Turnaround Corporate Management .......................... 145
Table 76: School A1’s Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) Report 2010 ................. 146
Table 77: School A1’s Turnaround Phase ................................................................. 146
Table 78: School A1’s Return on Investment in Reading and Math (Student Per Pupil Expenditure divided by the Average/Composite of Reading and Math ISAT Percent of Students that Met/Exceeded 2010 ISAT) by AYP Subgroups ........................................................................................................ 147

Table 79: School B2’s Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) Report 2010 .................... 148

Table 80: School B2’s Turnaround Phase .................................................................... 148

Table 81: School B2’s Return on Investment in Reading and Math (Student Per Pupil Expenditure divided by the Average/Composite of Reading and Math ISAT Percent of Students that Met/Exceeded 2010 ISAT) by AYP Subgroups ........................................................................................................ 149

Table 82: School C3’s Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) Report 2010 ................. 150

Table 83: School C3’s Turnaround Phase .................................................................... 150

Table 84: School C3’s Return on Investment in Reading and Math (Student Per Pupil Expenditure divided by the Average/Composite of Reading and Math ISAT Percent of Students that Met/Exceeded 2010 ISAT) by AYP Subgroups ........................................................................................................ 151

Table 85: School D3’s Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) Report 2010 ................. 152

Table 86: School D3’s Turnaround Phase .................................................................... 152

Table 87: School D3’s Return on Investment in Reading and Math (Student Per Pupil Expenditure divided by the Average/Composite of Reading and Math ISAT Percent of Students that Met/Exceeded 2010 ISAT) by AYP Subgroups ........................................................................................................ 154

Table 88: School E3’s Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) Report 2010 ................. 155

Table 89: School E3’s Turnaround Phase .................................................................... 155

Table 90: School E3’s Return on Investment in Reading and Math (Student Per Pupil Expenditure divided by the Average/Composite of Reading and Math ISAT Percent of Students that Met/Exceeded 2010 ISAT) by AYP Subgroups ........................................................................................................ 156

Table 91: School F1’s Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) Report 2010 ................. 157

Table 92: School F1’s Turnaround Phase .................................................................... 158
Table 93: School F1’s Return on Investment in Reading and Math (Student Per Pupil Expenditure divided by the Average/Composite of Reading and Math ISAT Percent of Students that Met/Exceeded 2010 ISAT) by AYP Subgroups ...

Table 94: School G1’s Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) Report 2010 ....

Table 95: School G’s Turnaround Phase ...

Table 96: School G1’s Return on Investment in Reading and Math (Student Per Pupil Expenditure divided by the Average of Reading and Math ISAT Percent of Students that Met/Exceeded 2010 ISAT) by AYP Subgroups ....

Table 97: School H2’s Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) Report 2010 ...........

Table 98: School H2’s Turnaround Phase ...

Table 99: School H2’s Return on Investment in Reading and Math (Student Per Pupil Expenditure divided by the Average/Composite of Reading and Math ISAT Percent of Students that Met/Exceeded 2010 ISAT) by AYP Subgroups ...

Table 100: School I2’s Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) Report 2010 ...........

Table 101: School I2’s Turnaround Phase ...

Table 102: School I2’s Return on Investment in Reading and Math (Student Per Pupil Expenditure divided by the Average of Reading and Math ISAT Percent of Students that Met/Exceeded 2010 ISAT) by AYP Subgroups ...

Table 103: Collins (2001), Di Primio (1988), and Fullan (2006) Factors of Turnaround Success ...

Table 104: Participant Demographics and Consensus on Gentrification by Tenure ..... 

Table 105: Border Schools and Percentages of White Population from 2007-2010 ..... 

Table 106: School Districts’ Low Income Trends 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages ...

Table 107: School Districts’ 2010 ISAT Reading (Percent Met/Exceed) Summary of Achievement Gap Groups ...

Table 108: Participants Foxes or Hedgehogs...

xii
Table 109: School E3’s Composite of Reading and Math ISAT Percent of Students that Met/Exceeded 2010 ISAT by AYP Subgroups........................................ 202

Table 110: State of Illinois ISAT Reading by Race 2008-2010.............................. 202

Table 111: E3 White Flight Reversal and 2005-2010 ISAT Exceed/Meet in Percentage......................................................................................................................... 203

Table 112: District Rate of Return in Dollars and 2010 ISAT in Percentages.......... 208
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: High-Performing High-Poverty (HPHP) School............................................... 10

Figure 2: Classical Corporate Turnaround Lifecycle.......................................................... 21
ABSTRACT

Gentrification is primarily viewed as neutral to school leadership and school culture (Freeman 2002; Nyden, Edlynn, & Davis 2006; Merriman 2007). Student displacement is seen as collateral damage for the betterment of the community.

Using qualitative research approach derived from the frameworks of Di Primio (1988), Collins (2001), Fullan (2006), the researcher interviewed nine active principals in Cook County, Illinois to answer the following research questions:

1. What are principals’ perceptions of neighborhood gentrification?
2. In what ways do principals perceive their school culture being affected by gentrification?
3. What strategies do principals implement in response to student changes in enrollment caused by gentrification?
4. In what ways do principals perceive their leadership styles being affected by gentrification?
5. What opportunities for improving instructional environment for students do principals believe that gentrification brings to their schools?

This study showed that the majority of participants relied heavily on strategic hiring and talent acquisition to deal with the rise of diversity brought upon by both internal gentrification and displaced students from Chicago Public schools. The study also raised the awareness that demography matters and that the phenomenon of
gentrification is morphing into a new manifestation that may not be neutral to school leadership and school culture. Hence the definition of gentrification may also need further intellectual amendment(s). The study concludes that the principals who focus on getting the right people on the bus and developing a Hedgehog concept produce the greater good.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Written over 20 years ago, A Nation at Risk report, the National Commission on Excellence in Education stated that:

Principal and superintendents must play a crucial role in developing school and community support for the reforms we propose, and school boards must provide them with the professional development and other support required to carry out their leadership role effectively . . . we believe that school boards must consciously develop leadership skills at the school and district levels if the reforms we propose are to be achieved. (1983, p. 5)

The commission realized that school leaders, primarily principals, were key in erasing the astonishing socioeconomic obstacles and inequalities faced primarily by students of color. One wonders if current school leaders are equipped with the leadership skills necessary to implement the required model of change—especially when dealing with external forces that are beyond their control.

Gentrification

One such phenomenon of externally forced change is the process of urban renewal also known as gentrification. Webster’s Dictionary defines gentrification as “the process of renewal and rebuilding accompanying the influx of middle class or affluent
people into deteriorating areas that often displaces earlier usually poorer residents”
(retrieved May 17, 2007 from www.merriam-webster.com). Loyola University Chicago’s
Center for Urban Research and Learning (CURL) specifically, authors Nyden, Edlynn,
and Davis (2006), have identified factors that contribute to areas targeted for
gentrification:

1. Access to urban centers via proximity or transportation networks.
2. Low housing costs compared to the rest of the real estate market.
3. Interesting architecture and building detail.
4. Large numbers of rental units in an area whose rates can be increased or its
   buildings converted into condominiums. (p. 5)

Nyden, Edlynn, and Davis (2006) also identified the advantages and
disadvantages brought about by gentrification.

Advantages:

1. Housing values increase for homeowners.
2. Tax revenues increase for city services.
3. Reinvestment is made in infrastructure, roads, water mains, local schools.
4. Business expansion serves new populations.
5. Renovations, redevelopment, and upgrades performed to existing housing
   stock.
6. Development of job opportunities.
7. Reduction of commuting time for those working downtown.
8. Concentration of population and public services in existing areas that thereby reduce suburban sprawl. (p. 12)

Disadvantages:
1. Displacement of lower income residents.
2. During transition period, there’s an increase in racial and economic conflict.
3. Urban density and parking problems increase.
4. Established community institutions encounter disruptions. (p. 14)

Freeman (2002) agrees with the CURL study—that gentrification can be beneficial because it rejuvenates the tax base, stimulates mixed income, and increases mixed race communities. In particular, when examining gentrification in Chicago, Davis and Merriman’s (2007) latest research discovered that while the total number of housing units in Chicago remained constant at a little over one million from 1989 to 2004, at least 44,637 (and perhaps as many as 97,894) apartment units were removed from Chicago’s housing stock during this same period. Also, over 100,000 condominium units were added to the housing stock. Loss of small and large apartment buildings was widespread across the entire city in 2007. On average, across the city as a whole, for each 1,000 additional condominium units a community area gained, it lost 27 small apartment buildings and about six large. Condominium growth has been most intense on the Northeast, Near South, and Near West Sides of Chicago (Davis & Merriman, 2007, p. 3). As a form of gentrification, one has to wonder whether or not condo conversions have impacted schools’ culture and school leadership.
School Culture

Elise Trumbull (2005) defines culture as “the system of value, beliefs, and ways of knowing that guide communities of people in their daily lives” (p. 35). Every school has a culture—a positive, healthy one that promotes learning for both the students and the adults in the building; or a negative one that is steeped in conflict and is resistant to change.

Roland Barth (2002) writes:

A school’s culture is a complex pattern of norms, attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, values, ceremonies, traditions, and myths that are deeply ingrained in the very core of the organization. It is the historically transmitted pattern of meaning that wields astonishing power in shaping what people think and how they act. (p. 7)

Terrance Deal and Kent Peterson (1999) contend that “the culture of an enterprise plays the dominant role in exemplary performance” (p. 7). They define school culture as an “underground flow of feelings and folkways [wending] its way within schools” in the form of vision and values, beliefs and assumptions, rituals and ceremonies, history and stories, and physical symbols (p. 8). Deal and Peterson suggests that a strong, positive culture serves several beneficial functions such as:

1. Fostering effort and productivity.
2. Improving collegial and collaborative activities that in turn promote better communication and problem solving.
3. Supporting successful change and improvement efforts.
4. Building commitment and helping students and teachers identify with their school.

5. Amplifying energy and motivation of staff members and students.

6. Focusing attention and daily behavior on what is important and valued. (pp. 7-8)

Marzano (2003) further advises schools to take a proactive approach to establishing a professional culture by clearly defining norms and expectations, creating governance procedures that give teachers an active role in decision making, and ensuring that teachers engage in meaningful professional development focused on improving classroom instruction in the subjects they teach. Nevertheless, research has recognized that conflict arises and educators are becoming the power brokers of values and norms in schools as diversity increases (Rothstein-Fisch & Trumbull, 2008). Table 1 illustrates the distinctions and variations of norms that newcomers are bringing to school versus the historical and traditional norms and values framework schools have adopted that effect culture. Individualism represents the American traditional norms while the collectivism framework is the norms of many of the cultures in the world.
Table 1

*The Individualism/Collectivism Framework*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individualism</th>
<th>Collectivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representative of mainstream United States, Western Europe, Australia, and Canada</td>
<td>Representative of 70% of world cultures (Triandis, 1989), including those of many United States immigrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-being of individual; responsibility for self</td>
<td>Well-being of group; responsibility of group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent; self-reliant</td>
<td>Interdependence/Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual achievement</td>
<td>Family/Group success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-expression</td>
<td>Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>Modesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-orientation</td>
<td>Social orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive intelligence</td>
<td>Social intelligence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Not only has greater diversity increased tensions, but additional research recognizes that norms and values tend to evolve and shift over generations. Neil Howe and William Strauss (2007) have studied past generations and have developed an archetype that, according to the researchers, could impact how future managers lead. They forecast future generations that have differing values and norms, “it will be Boomers, Gen Xers, Millenials, and Homelanders who play the central roles in shaping tomorrow’s social mood” (p. 47). Table 2 summarizes the attitudes of the four main generations that will move forward and have a voice in the developing mainstream culture and perhaps impact school culture in the process. It is quite clear that a high level of school culture understanding can help school leaders develop constructive strategies that build greater harmony and better results.
Table 2

Howe and Strauss Generational Divide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Workplace Values</th>
<th>Community Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1943–1960)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Xers</td>
<td>Alienation, associate self with toughness, grittiness, and practicality. Tendencies to push for efficiency and innovation. Prefer to be free-agents and hired guns. Problem solvers.</td>
<td>Protective of offspring, will spend money to assure high quality and safe schools. Outcomes matter more than money, method, or rhetoric. Moderates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millenials</td>
<td>Hindered by heavy student loans, housing costs, and globalization, this generation will seek greater feedback, and are more confident and teachable. Will be viewed as more pampered, risk averse, and dependent.</td>
<td>Dependent on digital age to communicate and build social networks. Perceived as capable but naïve, more focused on security than monetary awards or incentives. Junior citizens, deeply engaged in civic life. Liberals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1982–2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelands</td>
<td>Accustomed to being tracked by mobile digital and screened by psychological software. They will be viewed as innocent, risk averse, and emotionally fragile.</td>
<td>Too early to forecast, but could become rebels without a cause, aggressive, civic-rights leaders. Just like the World War II veterans, have the potential to break records in student achievement and economic prosperity. Anarchist with split personalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2005–2025)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Changing School Culture and School Leadership**

Regardless of the level of funding provided to school districts and the increase of accountability brought upon by the passing of the 2001 *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB), schools continued to fail, according to 2007 Illinois State School Report Card. Many school leaders spend most of their efforts targeting the accountability of those
funding sources, state legislation, and national policies. How gentrification complicates their jobs is unknown. The issue of gentrification (or the possible changes to the market the school serves) is absent from literature. Yet, school leaders still must continue with their efforts to meet accountability systems that utilize a metric system that expects perfection regardless of external conditions; especially since the number of schools facing a prognosis of failure continues to rise. A recent 2007 meta-analysis by the Mass Insight Education and Research Institute titled, *The Turnaround Challenge*, highlighted that five percent (or 5,000) of America’s 100,000 public schools representing more than 2.5 million students are on track to fall into the most extreme federal designation for failure by 2009-2010 (p. 8). The report calls for a redefinition of the school change concept with a heavy focus on these underperforming schools. Such a change is known as the *Turnaround Model*.

Turnaround is a dramatic, multi-dimensional change process at a chronically under-performing school. Turnaround is understood to be distinct from school improvement because it: a) focuses only on the most consistently under-performing schools—essentially the bottom five percent; and b) involves system-transforming change that is propelled by an imperative—the school must significantly improve its academic outcomes or it will be redefined or removed. Interventions focused on one particular strategy—staff development, a new curriculum, a reconstituted teaching staff—are unlikely to produce the desired result. Turnaround is the integrated, comprehensive combination of fundamental changes in
program, people, conditions, and (sometimes, but not necessarily) management and governance required to interrupt the status quo and put a school on a new track towards high performance. (Mass Insight Education & Research Institute, 2007, p. 71)

In turnaround schools, principals typically have two years to meet state and national accountability standards. These turnaround leaders receive specific training from the Mass Insight Education and Research Institute consultants that focuses on three areas:

1. **Condition.** Create a protected space free of bureaucratic restrictions and overly stringent collective bargaining agreements. Provide incentives to challenge and motivate people to do their best work.

2. **Capacity.** Internally increase capacity of school staffs (especially among school leaders) and externally through a strong marketplace of local providers with the experiences and abilities to serve as lead turnaround partners.

3. **Organization.** Organize clusters of schools (either within a district or across districts) with their own lead turnaround partner providing comprehensive services focused on turnaround. These clusters can be grouped by need, school type, region, or other characteristics. (2007, p. 5)

Figure 1 extrapolates the model used to bring about the required transformation. These steps are eerily similar to the *Corporate Turnaround Model* (DiPrimio, 1988), which first relies on a leadership change (followed by the creation of a leadership team that has greater freedom and less obstacles) to assure success.
Note: From Mass Insight Education & Research Institute, 2007, p. 9.

Figure 1. High-Performing High-Poverty (HPHP) School

Mass Insight Education and Research Institute’s report indicates that the high-performing, high-poverty schools studied:

Tend to reflect characteristics of highly entrepreneurial organizations . . .

These schools are succeeding either by working outside of traditional public education structures [charters]; or by working around those structures, internally; or by operating exceptionally well against the system—with emphasis on exceptionally. (2007, p. 11)

The report lists the following six elements to successful school turnaround:

1. Clearly defined authority to act based on what’s best for children and learning—i.e., flexibility and control over staffing, scheduling, budget, and curriculum.
2. Relentless focus on hiring and staff development as part of an overall people strategy to ensure the best possible teaching force.

3. Highly capable, distributed school leadership—i.e., not simply the principal but an effective leadership team.

4. Additional instructional time in the school day and across the school year.

5. Performance-based behavioral expectations for all stakeholders including teachers, students, and (often) parents.

6. Integrated, research-based programs and related social services that are specifically designed, personalized, and adjusted to address students’ academic and related psycho-social needs. (Mass Insight Education & Research Institute, 2007, p. 11)

This type of turnaround has become the norm for urban districts. These strategies utilized in under-performing schools could also inform leaders in schools experiencing declining enrollment, due exclusively to the return of the gentry or gentrification. History only knows if the turnaround model would prove to be successful—particularly since the literature illustrates that school culture is extremely difficult to change. Fullan (1997) points out that any mandated change is unlikely to be effective. He states, “Mandates alter some things but they don’t affect what matters. When complex change is involved, people do not, and cannot, change by being told to do so” (p. 38). Again, even mandated change will not be implemented if the culture of the school does not support the mandates.

Hargreaves (1997b) remarks that educational change falters (or fails) because:
1. Change is poorly conceptualized and not clearly demonstrated. It is obvious who will benefit and how. What the change will achieve for students is not spelled out.

2. Change is too broad and ambitious (so teachers have to work on too many fronts), or it is too limited and specific (so little real change occurs at all).

3. Change is too fast or too slow for people to cope with. They become impatient or bored and move on to something else.

4. Change is poorly resourced, or resources are withdrawn, once the innovation is over. There is not enough money for materials or time for teachers to plan.

5. There is no long-term commitment to carry individuals through the anxiety, frustration, and despair of early experimentation and unavoidable setbacks.

6. Key staff who can contribute to the change, or might be affected by it, are not committed. Conversely, key staff might become over-involved as an administrative or innovative elite from which other teachers feel excluded.

7. Parents oppose the change because they are kept at a distance from it.

8. Leaders are either too controlling, too ineffective, or cash-in on the early successes of the innovation to move on to higher things.

9. Change is pursued in isolation and gets undermined by other unchanged structures. (p. viii)
Statement of the Problem

According to Senge (2000), a community and its schools are reflections of each other. If one is succeeding or declining so is the other. When it comes to gentrification do those words ring of truth? The phenomenon of gentrification and its impact on school leadership and school culture has been difficult to understand, partly due to the absence of literature on the subject. Ample research exists on the impact of student mobility on student academic progress, test scores, special education referrals, and retentions (Biernat & Jax, 2000; Fowler-Finn, 2001; Kerbow, 1996; Mantizicopolous & Knutson, 2000; Varlas, 2002). The CURL study (2006) found that gentrification and displacement cycles have significant impacts (i.e., enrollment and student achievement) on both the institutions that serve children and the displaced children themselves. In addition, it found that gentrification is typically accompanied by both a drop in the proportion of children in a neighborhood and by a lower population density. A lower proportion of middle-income, young singles (or couples moving into gentrifying neighborhoods) have children as compared to the population being displaced. Additional research analysis published in the Community Renewal Society’s monthly education policy journal, CATALYST, found that in 2002, the number of children who attend public elementary schools dropped 18% between 1995 and 2000 in areas of gentrification. In contrast, in the rest of the city, the number of public elementary school students grew 13% (Weissmann, 2002). The latter research would surmise that gentrification has made an abrupt impact (i.e., lower enrollment and forecasted clientele to be served) in schools as more affluent residents move into neighborhoods. As the working poor are displaced by a different clientele,
school leaders will have to reconsider their role and the services their schools provide. In some neighborhoods, the need for neighborhood schools may disappear (or be diminished and devalued) entirely. Once again, gentrification and its impact on schools are missing from the literature. In essence, there is no clear notion of what school leaders are doing to ride the wave of gentrification.

This research considers that school leadership and school culture will be affected by local student displacement and urban renewal. Mike Schmoker (1996, 2006) claims that the keys to continuous improvement revolve around meaningful teamwork, goal setting, data analysis, and strong leadership and that this will create the enthusiasm or “zest” to remove barriers and promote continuous results (p. 63). Schmoker’s assertion that all educational problems have a solution would therefore set the scene to see if indeed, principals are overcoming perceived challenges of gentrification. The debate over the causes of gentrification will not be the focus of this research rather, the focus will be on how gentrification is impacting schools and what strategies and supports school principals report they are implementing to capitalize on the positive and diminish the negative effects of this external phenomenon.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine principals’ perceptions concerning the phenomenon of gentrification and how they respond to it in three collar districts west of the city of Chicago. As a result of gathering information from multiple settings and sources, the researcher revealed themes of principal perspectives, described the
principal’s role in addressing the impact of gentrification on school culture and leadership, and finally developed a possible agenda for further research.

**Research Questions**

1. What are principals’ perceptions of neighborhood gentrification?
2. In what ways do principals perceive their school culture being affected by gentrification?
3. What strategies do principals implement in response to changes in student enrollment caused by gentrification?
4. In what ways do principals perceive their leadership styles being affected by gentrification?
5. What opportunities for improving instructional environment for students do principals believe that gentrification brings to their schools?

**Conceptual Framework**

Regardless of the theory used, leadership has been regarded as the most crucial function linked to effective organizations (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Collins, 2001; Marzano, 2003). These scholars have linked the effectiveness of school leadership first and foremost on student achievement. For instance, Marzano’s meta-analysis study concluded that leadership plays a role in whether a school is effective or ineffective. Marzano further confirms that students in effective schools (led by transformational leaders) have a 44% difference in their passing rate on standardized tests. The study synthesized the results of 69 other studies which involved 2,802 schools and 1.4 million students. The majority of the studies (36 in total) were derived from elementary schools.
and concluded that school leaders have 21 vital responsibilities, and described the effectiveness of each of those traits. The traits were ranked and a plan for effective leadership developed. However, Marzano’s study made no reference to external factors such as gentrification. This creates a void in research and the opportunity for further research to understand principals’ strategies in addressing issues of gentrification.

Schools will play a pivotal role in determining whether the new residents that gentrification is attracting will stay. Therefore the pace of turnaround would likely need to be accelerated to turn good schools into great if middle class families are going to remain. Principals are in the trenches dealing with the demographic trends that will not show up until the next census. With dramatic changes in enrollment comes quick fix solutions, such as split grade or combined classrooms. The latter is usually not perceived the ideal situation, especially by the newcomers who may frown on the practice. These are the facts that face urban principals in areas that experience gentrification. The leadership required may transcend the traditional authoritative norms and necessitates a leadership style heavily dependent on the collaboration of staff and parents for the sole purpose of galvanizing the community to enhance practice and student achievement. Sergiovanni (2005) recommends that principals build civic virtue, meaning sacrifice self-interest for the benefit of the common good. Michael Fullan (2006) further emphasizes the need for turnaround leadership to weather uncertainty. According to Fullan (2007) the way to ride out these types of waves is to love and value your employees (teachers) as much as your customers (students and parents). Secondly, he suggests that leaders connect peers with a purpose and create the conditions for effective interaction. Third,
one must allow for calculated risks taking. Finally, the leader must create a culture of leaders that inspire continuous improvement and sharing. In essence, schools grappling with accountability targets and at the same time dealing with gentrification will need leaders that are system thinkers and have the capacity of developing other leaders for prolong results.

Therefore to evaluate and analyze what principals are doing in the field, this study will heavily rely on the principles laid out in Michael Fullan’s book, *Turnaround Leadership*. Fullan (2006) proposed 10 key elements for addressing turnaround situations:

1. Define closing the gap as the overarching goal.
2. Initially attend to student’s safety and curriculum needs (i.e. literacy, mathematics, well-being, or the emotional intelligence of students).
3. Be driven by tapping into people’s dignity and sense of respect.
4. Ensure that the best people are working on the problem.
5. Recognize that all successful strategies are socially based and action oriented.
6. Assume that lack of capacity is the initial problem and then continuously work on it.
7. Stay the course through continuity of good direction by leveraging leadership.
8. Build internal accountability linked to external accountability.
9. Establish conditions for the evolution of positive pressure.
10. Use the previous nine strategies to build public confidence. (p. 26)
Fullan (2006) believes that his 10 turnaround elements are not a menu but a meal in itself. His suggestions and concerns will be compared with the strategies reported by school principals in this study. This research will also augment Fullan’s turnaround leadership theory by heavily borrowing concepts and theories from Jim Collins’ (2001) book, *Good to Great: Why Some Companies Make the Leap...And Others Don’t*, Collins found that good to great company CEOs performed at higher levels (see Table 3) and possessed the following descriptors:

1. **Duality of professional will and personal humility** (example Abraham Lincoln).

2. **Ambition for company success** rather than for one’s own personal gain.

3. **Compelling modesty.** When things go well, they give credit to others; when things go badly, they accept the blame.

4. **Unwavering resolve to do what must be done** to make the organization successful. (2005, pp. 25-38)

Fullan (2006) believes Collin’s (2001) findings about private sector leadership are relevant to today’s efforts to transform our public schools from good to great schools. Significant to both researches, Fullan finds:

We can easily see the current principalship across levels 1 through 3 and in a small number of cases, Level 4 . . . Even Level 4, the principal who turns around the failing school and obtains substantial gains in literacy and mathematics, is not building enduring greatness. He or she improves the context but does not change it. Changing the context means that what you
leave behind at the end of your tenure is not so much bottom-line results but rather leaders, at many levels, who can carry on and perhaps do even better than you did. The principals we need are Level 5 leaders . . . there is no greater moral imperative than revamping the principal’s role as part and parcel of changing the context within which teachers and students learn. (2003, pp. 10-11)

Table 3

*Jim Collins’ Level 5 Hierarchy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 5 Executive</th>
<th>Builds enduring greatness through a paradoxical combination of personal humility plus professional will.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 4: Effective Leader</td>
<td>Catalyzes commitment to and vigorous pursuit of a clear and compelling vision; stimulates the group to high performance standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3: Competent Manager</td>
<td>Organizes people and resources toward the effective and efficient pursuit of predetermined objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2: Contributing Team Member</td>
<td>Contributes to the achievement of group objectives; works effectively with others in a group setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1: Highly Capable Individual</td>
<td>Makes productive contributions through talent, knowledge, skills, and good work habits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* From Collins, 2001, p. 20.

Since Fullan (2006) and Collins’ (2001) theories are derived from the corporate world, for data analysis and comparison of the corporate turnaround model, Mass
Insight’s Turnaround Model (2007) will be utilized as a point of reference. Rather than profits, student achievements will be utilized; as well as student enrollment rather than accounts or customers. Corporate Turnaround Model is defined as the process by which, “once-successful firms that experience severely declining performance for a protracted period of time overcome their troubles and return to match or exceed their most prosperous period of the pre-downturn performance” (Pearce II & Robbins, 1993, p. 615). Di Primio (1988) defines corporate turnaround management as a process that involves establishing accountability, conducting diagnostic analyses, setting up an information system, preparing action plans, taking action, and evaluating results.

Turnaround can be introduced at several stages of the corporate cycle. For instance, smart turnaround, primarily the first type of turnaround, is introduced when the firm starts to decline. The second type, just-in-time (JIT) turnaround, is used when the firm is facing continually declining performance and profitability. The third and most drastic type, survival turnaround, is when the organization is already losing profitability and performance for a longer period of time. Under survival turnaround, the organization files Chapter 11—which is a period of reorganization time granted without the burden of having to pay creditors. If survival turnaround fails, organizations have to be liquidated, or file Chapter 7—where a debtor (or creditor) petitions a court to appoint a trustee to collect and liquidate the property to satisfy the claims. Figure 2 illustrates the progression of a typical turnaround lifecycle as it relates to profits. This research identified what stage of turnaround that principals operated in (if any) as it related to gentrification.
Note: From M. Di Primio (1988), Turnaround Corporate Management.

Figure 2. Classical Corporate Turnaround Lifecycle

It is critical to examine the effects of gentrification and displacement on school leadership and school culture especially when the latest trends and analyses are completely focused within the school. This study addresses an external force upon school leadership that has not been probed nor investigated. Again, this research will investigate how gentrification is perceived by principals and if it has any impact on their leadership.

In summary, a school and principal facing a fluctuating student achievement due to the increased student mobility may need to seek out and implement turnaround strategies and leadership. The question is whether the answers lie in the corporate models or Fullan’s (2006) turnaround leadership model. According to Fullan, “the real reform agenda is raising the income bar while closing the gap between the richest and the poorest” (p. 7). Fullan’s turnaround leadership differs from quick-fix solutions. Fullan has been critical of turnaround practices of moving schools from “awful to adequate and
in the odd case adequate to good” (p. 44). One has to ask whether the new residents entering into the schools that are gentrifying will be satisfied with good schools.

**Limitations of the Study**

A total of nine principals were studied in three school districts bordering the City of Chicago. The main criteria for selecting principals, was if they were areas undergoing gentrification as identified by the district superintendent and CURL for the City of Chicago Commission on Human Relations. This small sample size limited the amount of data obtained. Also, the researcher works in an area currently undergoing gentrification. Because of this, information was monitored via a journal kept by this researcher that included notes and potential personal biases. Data for analysis were limited to information collected from the nine in-depth interviews, 2005-2010 school and district’s report cards. Principals’ perceptions were self-reported and validation limited to those individuals. Finally, the research was collected and analyzed by one individual. Therefore, the readers are cautioned not to make generalizations about the principal leadership capacity and the impact of gentrification to other communities.

**Organization of the Study**

In Chapter II, past and current studies focusing on gentrification, theories in school culture, organizational, motivational, and leadership literature, including Fullans’ (2001, 2006) and Collins’ (2001, 2005) works, will be appraised and tied to the study.

Chapter III will describe the methodology used in this study. Criteria for selecting the participants will be defined and the qualitative questionnaire, in-depth interviews, and documents described in detail.
Chapter IV will include analyses of the data displayed from the questionnaire, interviews, and documents (i.e., school improvement plans, school report cards) as they relate to the research questions. Responses from nine principals will be compared with Collin’s (2001) Level 5 leaders’ traits and Fullan’s (2006) turnaround leaders’ tenets to see if there are similarities.

Chapter V will present conclusions based upon the analyses of strategies and behaviors, describe limitations and possible implications of the study, and formulate recommendations for practice and further research.

**Definition of Terms**

*Culture* – The stream of “norms, values, beliefs, traditions, and rituals built up over time” (Peterson & Deal, 1998, p. 30).

*Gentrification* – According to Kennedy and Leonard (2001), gentrification differs from revitalization and is defined as, “the process of enhancing the physical, commercial, and social components of neighborhoods and the future prospects of their residents through private sector and/or public sector efforts” (p. 1).

*Level 5 Leadership* – According to Collins (2001), Level 5 leadership is the necessary requirement for transforming an organization from good to great. These types of leaders build enduring greatness through a paradoxical combination of personal humility plus professional will.

*School Culture* – Elise Trumbull (2005) defines culture as, “the systems of value, beliefs, and ways of knowing that guide communities of people in their daily lives” (p. 35).
Turnaround Leadership – Turnaround leadership is defined by Michael Fullan (2007) as school leaders’ moral imperative to eradicate the achievement gap by increasing academic rigor and building trust.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

The subject of educational leadership has been extensively researched and written about. Yet, new challenges arise every day (i.e., achievement gaps, funding inequities, legal challenges). Leaders of great organizations know there are new storms building beyond every horizon. Great leaders prepare for these new developments by aspiring greatness not just for themselves, but for their organization as well. Sun Tzu (1963) wrote, “The general who advances without counting fame and retreats without fearing disgrace, whose only thought is to protect his country and do good services for his sovereign, is the jewel of the kingdom” (p. 54).

Schools face a constant barrage of change. Although a great deal has been researched about schools that focus on internal change, much has been left uncovered about the complex world (and socioeconomic conditions) that impact schools from its external environment. This study attempts to provide clarification by examining the perceptions of principals as they deal with external change—in particular, the phenomenon of gentrification. Literature on urban gentrification, and its impact on school leadership, is quite limited so an examination of the literature in education and business will be reviewed here. Theoretical and empirical literature on leadership (relevant to this study) will be reviewed and is guided by the following questions:
1. What are principals’ perceptions of neighborhood gentrification?

2. In what ways do principals perceive their school culture being affected by gentrification?

3. What strategies do principals implement in response to student declining enrollment caused by gentrification?

4. In what ways do principals perceive their leadership styles being affected by gentrification?

5. What opportunities for improving the instructional environment for students do principals believe that gentrification brings to their schools?

**Gentrification**

Originated in Great Britain, gentrification is used to describe an entry of one societal group (usually of higher, socioeconomic class) into a community (or area of the community) for the purpose of establishing itself as residents and homeowners, thereby displacing existing residents. In a 2001 Brookings Institution discussion paper, *Dealing with Neighborhood Change: A Primer on Gentrification and Policy Choices*, authors Maureen Kennedy and Paul Leonard define gentrification as, “the processes by which higher-income households displace lower-income residents of a neighborhood, changing the essential character and flavor of that neighborhood” (Kennedy & Leonard, 2001, p. 1).

According to Kennedy and Leonard (2001), gentrification differs from *revitalization*—which is defined as:
The process of enhancing the physical, commercial, and social components of neighborhoods and the future prospects of their residents through private sector or public sector efforts. Physical components include upgrading of housing stock and streetscapes. Commercial components include the creation of viable businesses and services in the community. Social components include increasing employment and reductions in crime. Gentrification sometimes occurs in the midst of the revitalization process. . . . It also differs from reinvestment, which is: The flow of capital into a neighborhood primarily to upgrade physical components of the neighborhood, although reinvestment can also be made in human capacity. (pp. 4-5)

The authors are also clear on what does not constitute gentrification: “Under our definition, gentrification has three specific conditions which all must be met: displacement of original residents; physical upgrading of the neighborhood, particularly of housing stock; and change in neighborhood character” (Kennedy & Leonard, 2001, p. 6). Thus, gentrification does not automatically occur when high-income households move into a lower-income neighborhood. For example, gentrification does not automatically occur when it is at a scale too small to displace existing residents, or in the context of vacant land or buildings. Generally, gentrification is closely associated with urban neighborhoods in large, popular cities—although the phenomenon does occur elsewhere.
Schools and Gentrification

Gentrification has also been associated with student displacement. In some communities, the decline in the proportion of children has translated into declining enrollment in public schools. Research analysis published in the Community Renewal Society’s monthly education policy journal, CATALYST, reports that of the most rapidly-developing census tracts—covering more than 60% of Chicago’s East Village, Lakeview, Lincoln Park, near Southside, and several other communities—found that the number of children who attend public elementary schools dropped 18% between 1995 and 2000 (Chicago Catalyst Magazine, February 2002). In contrast to the rest of the city, the number of public, elementary school students grew 13% (Weissmann, 2002, p. 1).

Another study of public school underutilization found that among Chicago’s prominent communities experiencing a loss of children (and a related underutilization of schools) were the gentrifying communities of the near West Side, Douglas, and the Southside (Leavy, 2005; NCBG 2004).

According to Leavy (2005):

The impact of gentrification in any community is multifaceted. New residential development or increased housing costs can displace some residents while bringing new residents into the community. The demographic structure of the population can change; for example fewer older residents and fewer children may be present in the gentrified community. This demographic shift can change the culture or character of the community, particularly in the case where the community has a
particular racial or ethnic identity that is anchored not only in its residents, but also in a variety of institutions, such as stores, religious institutions, and community organizations. All of these changes can feed tensions and misperceptions among the various groups of community residents. (p. 5)

In the city of Chicago, the cause of displacement of students have been associated with many factors, thus it has been difficult to ascertain. Chicago Catalyst (2010) has analyzed Illinois State Report Card and has concluded that African-American population in particular has dropped by 15% while Latino population has increased 6%. Table 4 illustrates the unexpected high school enrollment decline after the district implemented an eighth grade promotion policy.

Table 4

**Chicago Public School Student Demographics 2005-2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White (%)</th>
<th>Black (%)</th>
<th>Hispanic (%)</th>
<th>Asian (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* From [http://webprod.isbe.net/ereportcard/publicsite](http://webprod.isbe.net/ereportcard/publicsite)

Table 5 depicts the increase of student diversity that the State of Illinois has undergone during the same period of time. While total enrollment has remained flat the percentage of White student population has continued to drop on an annual basis.
Table 5

*State of Illinois Student Demographics 2005-2009*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>White (%)</th>
<th>Black (%)</th>
<th>Hispanic (%)</th>
<th>Asian (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,062,912</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2,075,277</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2,077,856</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2,074,167</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2,070,125</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* From [http://webprod.isbe.net/ereportcard/publicsite](http://webprod.isbe.net/ereportcard/publicsite)

It is uncertain whether gentrification has impacted the decrease of the African-American student population or increased diversity throughout the State of Illinois. Uncertain external forces can provide opportunity for leaders to exploit. Principals clearly can rely on theory and best practices. In summarizing, this research examined 9 principals’ leadership evolution within these changing demographics.

**Leadership Taxonomies for Great Success**

Benjamin Bloom (1956) created a taxonomy of cognitive objectives that consisted of six domains:

1. Knowledge.
2. Comprehension.
3. Application.
4. Analysis.
5. Synthesis.
This classification system can provide pieces of the puzzle necessary to understand the evolution of leadership and continuous improvement of organizations. The following researchers have depicted these leadership domains in the following ways: Bolman and Deal’s (1991) Typology (Knowledge and Comprehension); Jim Collins’ (2001) Good-to-Great Typology (Application and Analysis); Marzano’s (2003) Leadership Typology (Synthesis); and Fullan’s (2006) Turnaround Leadership Typology (Evaluation). Schools can learn a great deal from the private organizations. In private organizations the market conditions change frequently and the public does not supply the vast majority of their funding. Corporate turnaround models have evolved primarily due to increased global competitions and trade (Friedman, 2005). According to Thomas L. Friedman in order to fight the quiet crisis of a flattening world the United States workforce should keep updating its work skills. Making the workforce more adaptable Friedman argues will keep it more employable. Friedman also believes there should be more inspiration for youth to be scientists, engineers, and mathematicians due to a decrease in percentage of these ingrown professionals from America. Logistically and logically the need for turnaround is essential and being forced by external conditions beyond the control of school leaders. But what schools leaders control is the overall quality of their school. Hence, making schools eminent forces in their communities that have the capacity to tackle difficult and complex issues and outlooks, could ease transitions and recovery from internal and external obstacles or developments. The key questions would then be what or whose roadmap should be followed. The answer may lie in a synergy of various plans from both corporate and education perspectives.
Bolman and Deal’s Typology (Knowledge and Comprehension)

The first leadership typology of this analysis focuses primarily on the vital parts of an organization or the key tenets for governance. Bolman and Deal encourage leaders to step back and reassess the operation of their organization through the use of various frames (or windows). These different lenses can bring organizational life into a different (or clearer) focus. They allow the leader to view the workplace from different images in order to make judgments, gather information, and get things done. Bolman and Deal (1991) name four frames to use when assessing an organization’s operational methods. They are: Structural, Human resource, Political, and Symbolic frames. The end result is that the leader learns the importance of stepping back and looking at a situation from more than a single pane of glass. This is vitally important because most individuals have the tendency to look at situations or problems from a limited narrow perspective, and this hinders our ability to be effective and visionary leaders.

The structural frame looks at the structure of work and not simply the individual. Once an organization designates specific roles for employees, the next decision is to group them into working units. Coordination and control of these various groups are achieved either vertically or laterally. The best structural frame depends on an organization's environment, goals, and strategies.

Bolman and Deal (2003) list six assumptions guiding the structural frame:

1. Organizations exist to achieve established goals and objectives.
2. Organizations work best when rationality prevails over personal preferences and external pressures.
3. Structures must be designed to fit organizational circumstances.

4. Organizations increase efficiency and enhance performance through specialization and division of labor.

5. Appropriate forms of coordination and control are essential to ensuring that individuals and units work together in the service of organizational goals.

6. Problems and performance gaps arise from structural deficiencies and can be remedied through restructuring. (p. 45)

The human resource frame is another window used to bring an organization into unique focus. It views an organization like it’s a large extended family. From this perspective, an organization is inhabited by individuals and these individuals have needs, prejudices, feelings, limitations, and skills. The goal of the leader is to mold the organization to meet the needs of its people, and seek to merge peoples’ need to feel good about what they are doing with the ability to effectively get the job done. Bolman and Deal (2003) state that the key to this window is a “sensitive understanding of people and their symbiotic relationship with organizations” (p. 115).

The political frame is a window that looks at the workplace as a jungle—a competitive environment (or contest) where different people compete for power and limited resources. Reframing Organizations (2003) recognizes the work environment as one of continuous conflict engrossed in negotiation, bargaining, compromise, and coercion. The leaders in this frame operate as an advocate—developing a power base and an agenda of change. “The effective leader creates an agenda of change with two major elements: a vision balancing the long term interests of key parties, and a strategy for
achieving the vision, recognizing competing internal and external forces” (p. 205). The
leader thus exercises four key skills: agenda setting, mapping the political terrain,
networking and forming coalitions, and bargaining and negotiation (p. 205). Bolman and
Deal (2003) offer five propositions as a summary of the political frame:

1. Organizations are coalitions of various individuals and interest groups.
2. There are enduring differences among coalition members in values, beliefs,
   information, interests, and perceptions of reality.
3. Important decisions involve the allocation of scarce resources and what gets
done.
4. Scarce resources and enduring differences give conflict a central role in
   organizational dynamics and typically make power the most important
   resource.
5. Goals and decisions emerge from bargaining, negotiation, and jockeying for
   position among different stakeholders. (This is the business and social world
   most of us live in.) (p. 166)

The symbolic frame is a powerful window that builds on cultural and social
anthropology. It views organizations as carnivals, theaters, or tribes—a unique culture
driven by stories, ceremonies, rituals, and heroes. This is in stark contrast to an
organization being driven by rules, authority, or policies. With this theater, various actors
play their respective roles in the drama while the audience forms its own impressions of
what is seen onstage. This frame also looks at team building in a different light. It views
the development of high-performing teams as a spiritual network enhanced by rituals,
ceremonies, and myths. One need not look far to discover these symbols—they exist from the proverbial “corner office” to corporate seals, to the camaraderie of military units (Bolman & Deal, 2003, pp. 268-269).

Bolman and Deal (2003) argue that change agents fail when they rely on a particular frame. Frames need to be integrated to stimulate the success necessary that fits the local circumstances. Bolman and Deal’s integrated model borrows from John Kotter’s 2002 book, The Heart of Change, and describes the eight stages that appear in successful initiatives. They are:

1. Creating a sense of urgency.
2. Pulling together a guiding team with the need skills, credibility, connections, and authority to move things along.
3. Creating an uplifting vision and strategy.
4. Communicating the vision and strategy through a combination of words, deeds, and symbols.
5. Removing obstacles or empowering people to move ahead.
7. Sticking with the process and refusing to quit when things get tough.
8. Nurturing and shaping a new culture to support the emerging innovative ways. (pp. 383-384)
Jim Collins’ Good-to-Great Typology (Application and Analysis)

The second leadership typology of this analysis focuses less on the parts of the organization and more on the philosophy of leadership. In other words, the fifth frame leadership begins to be developed and the focus on hiring and motivating takes precedence. Jim Collins’ (2001) leadership typology (or blueprint) is based around the notion that “good is the enemy of great” (p. 8). Collins’ five year research focused on how good companies became great. Collins’ team reviewed and reduced its initial list of 1,435 companies down to two groups of 11—one representing companies that made the breakthrough to greatness, the other a comparison group which failed to do so. Good-to-great companies were defined as having a history of cumulative stock returns equal to (or below) the general stock market, followed by a breakthrough leading to performance with cumulative returns (at least three times the general market) over 15 years following their breakthrough point. The result of this intensive research answers the question, Can a good company (or organization) become a great one, and, if so, how? According to Collins, good companies and organizations can make the leap.

Schmoker (1986) made a similar assumption. According to Schmoker, “most organizations are only performing between 40 and 60 percent of their capacity” (p. 52). Schmoker identified three keys to continuous improvement: teamwork (or collaboration), clear goals (or targets), and the use of performance data. According to Schmoker, teachers need to work in supportive teams rather than isolation. Once collegiality among teachers is created, an “elevating goal and result driven-structure” gives teamwork meaning, motivation, and effectiveness (p. 17). Finally, data is used to track incremental
improvements, or the spirit of “kaizen, a Japanese word that connotes an ongoing spirit of concern with incremental but relentless improvement however small” (p. 45). In each of the cases studied “schools established goals, tracked them using data to assess or adjust efforts toward better results” (p. 51). In contrast, Collins’ (2001) framework identified seven leadership traits that produced eminence in their sector. They are:

1. Level 5 Leadership.
2. First Who, Then What.
3. Confront the Brutal Facts with Unwavering Faith.
4. Hedgehog Concept.
5. Culture of Discipline.
6. Technology Accelerators.
7. Flywheel and Doom Loop.

**Level 5 Leadership Trait**

Collins (2001) and his team found that the type of leadership did make a difference. Leaders of the good-to-great companies were not high profile, nor celebrity focused. Rather, they demonstrated a personal humility and professional will revealing a deep resolve to do what was best for the company, not the leader. These leaders were labeled Level 5 and encompass much of the vision and intellect of Sun Tzu (1963) generals. They included effective leader, competent manager, contributing team member, and highly capable individual. According to Collins (2001) Level 5 leaders were:

1. Building “enduring greatness” into their organizations.
2. Setting their successors up for success.
3. Talking about the company and others but declining to discuss themselves.
4. Ordinary people producing extraordinary results.
5. Most likely to come from within the company not outside of it.
6. Quick to give credit outside themselves when there was success while at the same time, taking personal responsibility when things went badly.
7. Distinctive in their approach to the people they wanted in the company. (pp. 17-38)

First Who, Then What Trait

What did these Level 5 leaders do first? Set a new vision and strategy? According to Collins (2001), they approached their challenges by “first getting the right people on the bus, the wrong people off the bus, and the right people in the right seat; then they figured out where to drive it” (p. 41). Three simple principles emerged:

1. Adaptability. The right people on the bus make adapting to changing realities much easier. When people are attracted to working with other good people, they will figure out what needs to be done when direction changes.

2. Motivation. The right people are self-motivated. They want to be part of something great. They will do what’s necessary to produce greatness.

3. Selection. With the wrong people on the bus, it doesn’t matter if you’re going in the right direction—it is impossible to have a great company with these leaders. (pp. 41-42)

Furthermore, these Level 5 leaders wanted top players and top effort. They used financial compensation to attract the right people, not as a motivation for their work.
They knew that the right people live with a “moral code that requires building excellence for its own sake” (Collins, 2001, p. 50). These leaders were rigorous, not ruthless, in talent acquisition, regularly using at least three practical disciplines:

1. **Hiring.** When in doubt, don’t hire; keep looking. For a company to become great there must be enough of the right people to sustain its growth.

2. **Act decisively.** When you know you need to make an employee change—act.
   - Know the characteristics of who you need and bring people like that on.
   - Evaluate them quickly and consistently; act to remove them if they do not fit.

3. **Best person/Best opportunity.** Put your best people on your biggest opportunities, not your biggest problems. The question is: Are you going to manage your problems or build your opportunities? (pp. 54-60)

Finally, Collins (2001) has identified three characteristics that executive leaders in the good-to-great companies had to have: *competence, chemistry, and character.*

Competence is defined as the capacity to be the best person in the industry at the job.

Chemistry is the depth of respect and love that allows executive team members to yell and scream, argue and debate, but remain committed to one another and cohesive in what’s best for the organization. Character relates to the implicit values required to fit into the management team. Collins concluded that, “The people we interviewed from the good-to-great companies clearly loved what they did, largely because they loved who they did it with” (p. 62).
Confront the Brutal Facts with Unwavering Faith Trait

According to Collins (2001), good-to-great organizations embody a paradox of facts and faith—unwavering faith that the company will prevail attributable to good-to-great companies’ abilities to confront the brutal facts of the current reality, no matter what they were. Good companies became great through making and executing on good decisions. As these good decisions and their execution accumulated over time, momentum was built to move the good company to the point of breakthrough. In this analysis, it became clear that good decisions required honest assessment of the brutal facts, and the assessment in itself often led to right decisions becoming self-evident. The discipline of paying attention to the brutal facts of reality distinguished Level 5 leaders and good to-great companies. Central to this discipline was a culture that invited people at every level to speak up and be heard. Only as the quietest voice is heard could the truth come out. Gaining that truth was what energized this discipline. Collins’ and his team identified four basic practices for creating a culture where the truth is heard:

1. **Lead with questions, not answers.** The purpose of questions is to gain true understanding not to manipulate. This practice is a further demonstration of Level 5 leaders’ humility—to know they are not solely dependant on themselves to have all the answers.

2. **Engage in dialogue and debate, not coercion.** The goal is to find the best answer. Those involved are committed to whatever it took to get this answer because they were fully engaged for the good of the organization.
3. **Conduct autopsies without blame.** With the right people on the bus and in the right seats, there should be no need to assign blame, even for the biggest mistakes. Rather, what should be done is, a) accepting responsibility for the mistake or failure, b) dissecting it to learn from it, and c) applying this learning to future situations to create a culture of greatness.

4. **Build red-flag mechanisms that can’t be ignored.** Good-to-great companies have no greater access to information than other companies. They’ve just identified ways to trigger adaptive responses to the information they get—whether from customers, employees, vendors, or collaborators. (pp. 74-79)

   Truthfully confronting the brutal facts was found to energize good-to-great companies. It gave them a sense of exhilaration because they believed they would prevail in the end. Because of this attitude, each confrontation made them individually and collectively stronger. Every good-to-great company persevered through significant adversity—requiring acceptance of the brutal facts of reality and maintaining unwavering faith that the company would prevail. Combining these two qualities and not being swayed by unrealistic optimism (nor self-defeating pessimism) characterized these great companies.

   Similar to Collins’ (2001) leadership model is the notion of learning loops for understanding learning (Argyris & Schön, 1996). There are three types of collective learning: *single, double, and triple loop*. Single loop learning occurs when the intervention brings about changes in people’s existing practices without significantly changing their vision, objectives, norms, or values. Changes of behavior are at the level
of more of the same, but better. In double loop learning, changes take place not only in existing practices, but also in underlying insights and principles. It strives to achieve collective knowledge and understanding by learning about assumptions and goals behind routines. Triple loop learning occurs when essential underlying principles are questioned to the extent it includes re-designing the norms and protocols that govern single and double loop learning. Thus, it entails learning about single and double loop learning. These different levels refer to the type and degree of change brought about by the learning process.

**Hedgehog Concept Trait**

*The one big thing an organization can be best at* is the essence of the Hedgehog Concept. “The fox knows many things, but the hedgehog knows one big thing” (Collins, 2001, p. 90). The good-to-great model for getting to the core of this one big thing identifies three overlapping circles. Where all three intersect is where one finds the complexity of the company’s world becoming profoundly simplistic. It is this clarity (or deep understanding) that guides the strategies, goals, and intentions of the company. The key elements for developing the Hedgehog Concept require answering three questions called the *three circles*:

1. **What can you be best in the world at?** The answer to this one is an identity statement defining the character of the company (or organization) and leading to strategies, goals, and intentions that express the identity. This identity is expressed through a set of skills and talents that make the identity evident. As
a result, the answer may not be what you are already good at but rather what you can be great at—really great.

2. What are you passionate about? The idea is to discover your passion, not to get a good idea and try to rev up the passion. It may mean the choice of your Hedgehog Concept is something you can get passionate about. This circle supports the underlying notion that with the right people sharing this passion, you don’t have to motivate them—they are motivated because they share the passion and are energized by the work they’re involved in. But, the passion may be at different levels, e.g. the mechanics of the business, the results it produces, or for what the company stands for.

3. What drives your economic engine? The key to this question is the denominator in a simple equation. In for-profit companies, the equation is profit per $x$. In not-for-profit organizations, it is cash flow per $x$. A further question regarding this idea is: If you could pick one and only one ratio—profit per $x$ or cash flow per $x$ to systematically increase over time—what $x$ would have the greatest and most sustainable impact on your economic engine? The $x$ might be customer visits (Walgreens), mortgage risk levels (Fannie Mae), employees (Wells Fargo), local populations (Kroger), or consumer brands (Kimberly-Clark) (p. 106).

Collins (2001) writes that the Hedgehog Concept is a “turning point in the journey from good-to-great” (p. 112). Collins recommends the following cycles:

1. Get the right people involved over time.
2. Ask the right questions such as the three key circles previously mentioned.

3. Engage in intense debate over these questions.

4. Make decisions.

5. Autopsy the results without blame.

6. Learn from the process and apply what you’ve learned to the next cycle. (pp. 76-77)

Using your understanding of the three circles, one can then define the profound simplicity of the core of the Hedgehog Concept. Christin Stadler’s (2007) study on outstanding European companies found similar findings. He found four main principles for enduring success:

1. Exploit before you explore.

2. Diversify your business portfolio.

3. Remember your mistakes.

4. Be conservative about change. (p. 64)

**Culture of Discipline Trait**

One key to greatness is the subtle but powerful combination of responsibility and freedom. Good-to-great companies create a culture of discipline. They attract disciplined people, reward disciplined thought, and celebrate disciplined action. The three components of discipline follow:

1. Getting self-disciplined people on the bus.
2. People demonstrate the discipline to confront brutal facts and maintain unwavering faith in the ultimate success of the system (as demonstrated most succinctly in understanding their Hedgehog Concept and adhering to it).

3. People express the discipline of action by measuring that action against their Hedgehog Concept. This discipline involves the commitment to do whatever it takes to become great. (Collins, 2001, pp. 120-123)

Collins (2001) and his team found a major distinction between good-to-great companies and their comparisons in the area of discipline. Good-to-great companies developed a culture of discipline where the entire company owned responsibility for their Hedgehog Concept and all the basics of becoming great. Comparison companies most often had highly disciplined leaders but weren’t able to establish a culture that supported that discipline. This takes courage, and great companies demonstrated this type of courage over and over again. Work regarding what moves companies from being good-to-great operates on an enormous presupposition—the idea of right, as in the right people, the right seats on the bus, thinking rightly, and doing rightly (stop doing wrongly). So, how does one get it right? Collins would say there isn’t a single answer, rather it is a systemic understanding of the whole—leadership, people, truth-seeking, focus, discipline, acceleration, and momentum—and continuously operating on this coherent set of interacting principles. The discipline to live this systemic understanding requires:
1. Building a culture that emphasizes freedom and responsibility within the constraints of an intensely focused framework.

2. Populating that culture with self-disciplined and committed people, and able to go to extreme lengths to fulfill their responsibilities.

3. Recognizing that culture is a system, not an individual; that everyone shares in responsibility for greatness, not simply a strong disciplinarian.

4. Adhering with intense concentration to the intersection of the three circles of the Hedgehog Concept while being disciplined to systematically stop doing what doesn’t fit. (pp. 120-129)

Senge (1990) identified that such leaders should hold five disciplines identified as personal mastery, mental models, building a shared vision, team learning, and system thinking. According to Senge, it’s only when the leader has synergized all five traits that greatness is achieved. In studying the internet search engine Google, Bala Iyer and Thomas H. Davenport (2008) wrote a study title, Google Corporation’s Culture Built to Build, where they asserted that “company culture attracts the brightest technical talent, and despite its rapid employee growth, Google still gets 100 applicants for every open position” (p. 59). In addition, Google created a culture (or organizational design) that “requires employees to spend 80% of their time in core business and 20% on technical projects of their own choosing” (p. 64). Hence, with the right culture, an organization can attract the best talent but also ensure rapid growth, innovation, experimentation, and motivated, productive employees.
Technology Accelerators Trait

This trait involves how companies in Collins’ (2001) study viewed technology. According to Collins, companies avoided many opportunities and focused on selection of technologies most applicable to forwarding their Hedgehog Concept or the niche that gives the company a competitive edge. As a result, technology simply became one more accelerator of momentum for these companies. With the deep understanding that came from their focus on the three circles, they all came to be pioneers in the application of technology as it fit with their Hedgehog Concept. Thinking associated with this principle includes the process of asking, Does the technology fit directly with your Hedgehog Concept? If yes, then you need to be a pioneer in the application of that technology. If no, then ask, do you need this technology at all? If yes, then all you need is parity. Collins and his team concluded that the comparison companies could have been given the same technology good-to-great companies used, and still fail to produce equivalent results. That is because this is one more example of the inner drive of a company’s character and culture. Great companies are not driven by fear of the marketplace, of economic circumstances, or technological advances—they are driven by the potential they see and the stimulation of actualizing that potential (p. 143). Technology contributes to this drive, but once again, it is the interaction of principles in the good-to-great model that produces and sustains greatness.
Flywheel and Doom Loop Trait

Good-to-great companies not only have impetus and momentum, but they’ve found a way to exploit it in service of their Hedgehog Concept. The metaphor Collins (2001) uses for this concept is the flywheel. He creates an image of a massive disk rotating on an axle. In the beginning, each incremental push appears to have little effect. However, with many people consistently contributing over time through disciplined thought and action, the flywheel begins to move (ever-so-slowly), increasing its speed until at a certain point, there’s a breakthrough. The force of all the little pushes have created enough energy in moving this gigantic wheel that it takes on tremendous momentum and requires very little energy to keep it moving. The breakthrough occurs when the weight begins to work for you and not against you. The significance of this metaphor comes from respondents at good-to-great companies. Not a single respondent reported there was any significant push that created this enormous force the company was exerting. What looked like an incredible transformation from the outside was, in fact, experienced as everyday life on the inside. A process of moving the flywheel might look like this:

1. Take the time to understand your focus (Hedgehog Concept). Discuss, debate, and dialogue.
2. Recruit the right people, put them in the right seat, and find ways to remove the wrong people (focus on disciplined people, disciplined thought, disciplined action).
3. Keep the faith as momentum builds ever-so-slowly.
4. Act consistently on your focus (Hedgehog Concept) so that each aspect of the company contributes to energy invested in it. Once the breakthrough occurs, continue to identify how much more there is required to continue in greatness.

5. Remember to celebrate along the way.

“In contrast, think of a different picture. You’re driving down the freeway with one requirement. Every time you come to an exit you have to get off and take local roads to the next on-ramp where you can continue your journey . . . until you get off the next off-ramp. Getting from point A to point B becomes totally disrupted” (Collins, 2001, p. 183). This is a picture of what Collins calls a *doom loop*. Companies in the doom loop take all kinds of detours thinking the detours will magically get them to their destination. They don’t realize the negative effect on their momentum, and as a result, what looks like good strategy becomes extremely expensive diversions. The doom loop has four contributing factors:

1. Reaction without understanding.

2. New direction, program, leader, event, fad, or acquisition.

3. No build-up or accumulation of momentum (the opposite—a slowdown of momentum).

4. Disappointing results leading back to reaction without understanding.

(Collins, 2001, pp. 183-184)

By focusing on people, thinking, and acting in a way that facilitates momentum rather than disruption, momentum is initiated and sustained. The challenge is not in being
perfect but in using every situation to give the flywheel another push toward spinning into greatness (Collins, 2001, pp. 170-172).

Marzano’s Leadership Typology (Synthesis)

The third leadership typology of this analysis focuses on the art and science of leading schools and student achievement. Marzano (2003) further refines the leadership frame by focusing on necessary traits and practice. According to Marzano, there are two variables that determine whether school leadership will have positive or negative impacts on student achievement. The first is whether principals have properly identified the focus on improving the school and classroom practices that are most likely to have positive impact on student achievement. The second variable is whether the leaders properly understand the magnitude of change they are leading and adjust their leadership practices accordingly.

In Marzano’s (2003) meta-analysis of 69 studies, his team identified 21 responsibilities with situational awareness having the highest correlation. According to Marzano, there are three levels of his model: School-Level Factors; Teacher-Level Factors, and Student-Level Factors. All three are dependant on the pursuit of achievement.

Table 6 (Factors in the What Works Model) highlights examples of specific factors that can build a model of success in particular schools and lists 11 factors for each level of Marzano’s (2003) proposed research model of What Works in School: Translating Research into Action. This research model is another synthesis of research that names key factors that have been shown by research data to impact student
achievement. Marzano states, “My basic position is quite simple: Schools can have a tremendous impact on student achievement if they follow the direction provided by the research” (p. 4). Marzano includes a review and synthesis of related research spanning 35 years and recommends specific action steps for implementing the findings of that research. Marzano considers the critical role of leadership as the final factor which he says “could be considered the single most important aspect of effective school reform . . . it influences every aspect of the model presented in this book” (p. 172).

Table 6

Factors in the What Works Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS IN THE WHAT WORKS MODEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School-Level Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed and viable curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging goals and effective feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent and community involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and orderly environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality and professionalism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Level Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom curriculum design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Level Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned intelligence and background knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A critical role for school leadership is to guide a school community to examine
the unique, individual strengths and needs of its students, staff, and community. Marzano
(2003) says,

> Just because the research indicates that a particular school-level factor is
important to student achievement doesn’t mean that it is important in a
given school . . . In the new era of school reform, schools will look
carefully at the research, but then determine which factors apply to their
particular context. (p. 158)

Marzano (2003) suggests that to enhance a school’s efforts to improve student
achievement, one should continue collecting data on current school conditions. In
essence, the school becomes an organization that pursues constant innovation and
monitors the latter via data—primarily student achievement data. Marzano also
recommends the principal create a culture of collaboration that includes internal
leadership teams that self assesses all aspects of student achievement, as well as teaching
and learning. Utilizing instructional leadership and data driven decision making,
Marzano’s model assures that teachers know or develop research-based instructional
strategies to design and execute their lessons. Marzano also identifies these instructional
strategies as, “identifying similarities and differences; summarizing and note taking;
reinforcing effort and providing recognition; homework and practice; nonlinguistic
representations; cooperative learning; setting objectives and providing feedback;
generating and testing hypotheses; and questions, cues, and advance organizers” (p. 80).

Once teachers have become experts in instructional practices, a school-wide focus should
be implemented and data should drive the focused on path. For example, a specific group (school, teacher, student) should be chosen as a whole school focus. Then, an action plan and step(s) should be developed by the leadership team. Finally, action research should be implemented to investigate the impact of leadership’s efforts on the achievement of a school’s students.

Marzano’s (2003) plan for effective school leadership involves five steps, eerily similar to Collins’ (2001) and Bolman and Deal’s (2003) research on shaping school culture. The first step of the Marzano (2003) model is to develop a strong leadership team. The second step follows-up the development of a leadership team by distributing responsibilities throughout the leadership team. The third step involves selecting the right work. The fourth step is to identify the order of magnitude implied by the selected work. Finally, the last step is to match the management style to the order of magnitude of the change initiative (p. 98).

The key tenets in Marzano’s (2003) model revolve around the notion of instructional leadership and distributive leadership. The first leadership style has the instructional leader (or principal) providing and managing resources. Student achievement is the focus of the school’s mission and vision and the principal must widely communicate that (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). According to Marzano and his associates, instructional leaders base recognition on performance and results rather than on seniority. These leaders nurture collaboration and create conditions that enable participants to increase organizational capacity. Marzano et al. also identified the ability of instructional ability to protect staff from intrusions, distractions, and external
pressures. Finally, distributive leadership is practiced when principals share or delegate their leadership to other professionals in the school. Advantages of delegating leadership are the improvement of quality decision making, greater commitment from subordinates, and expansion of overall leadership capacity (Yukl, 2002).

**Fullan’s Leadership Typology (Evaluation)**

While Bolman and Deal establishes the structure and frames; Collins (2003) identifies the importance of professional will and passionate employees; Marzano focuses on instructional leadership and second order change; none address socioeconomic inequalities. The last leadership typology of this analysis involves Fullan’s (2006) leadership typology. In his book, *Managing the Nonprofit Organization*, Peter F. Drucker (1999) asserts that the “most important task of an organization’s leader is to anticipate crisis” (p. 9). Drucker proposes a reflective tool (or Socratic protocol) that a leader can utilize to aid in developing appropriate crisis intervention. The Drucker Tool (1993), similar to many of Jim Collins (2001) most salient points, focus on five questions for organizational effectiveness:

1. What is our mission?
2. Who is our customer?
3. What does the customer consider value?
4. What have been the results?
5. What is our plan?

Drucker’s (1999) reflective process consists of two steps. The first is an individual’s self-assessment of the nonprofit organization and their role in it. Step two is
the individual practices in a focus group that creates the “constructive dissent” that results in themes that are shared to the leadership team (p. 3).

Like Drucker (1999), Fullan’s (2006) typology is the judgment and assessment of leadership related to educational leadership, and proposed the most ostentatious vision. Fullan’s vision is centered on social justice and social cohesiveness—the main objective being to eradicate all academic gaps amongst the diverse student population. As was noted in Chapter I of this research paper, but worth repeating, are Fullan’s (2006) proposed 10 key elements for addressing turnaround situations:

1. Define closing the gap as the overarching goal.
2. Initially attend to student’s safety and curriculum needs (i.e. literacy, mathematics, well-being or the emotional intelligence of students).
3. Be driven by tapping into people’s dignity and sense of respect.
4. Ensure that the best people are working on the problem.
5. Recognize that all successful strategies are socially based and action oriented.
6. Assume that lack of capacity is the initial problem and then continuously work on it.
7. Stay the course through continuity of good direction by leveraging leadership.
8. Build internal accountability linked to external accountability.
9. Establish conditions for the evolution of positive pressure.
10. Use the previous nine strategies to build public confidence. (p. 26)
Again, this paradigm is perhaps the most moral archetype proposed and calls for a re-assessment of the current educational system. Concisely, it is common knowledge that tides are caused by the interaction of Earth, the moon, and the sun. Waves, on the order hand, are created by ocean winds that carry vast amount of energies—so much energy that waves can cause erosion and reshape landscapes (Padilla, Miaoulis, & Cyr, 2007).

The impact of gentrification and how it has reshaped educational leadership is limited in research. Therefore this study seeks the strategies and models implemented in schools experiencing a decline in student enrollment caused by gentrification.

Summary

The goal of this chapter is to review the theoretical and empirical literature on leadership applicable to this study. The overall purpose is to understand the possible impact of gentrification on school leadership as perceived by selected principals. Bolman and Deal (2003) discuss the organizational adaptations to change via reframing the major components of an organization. Jim Collins’ (2001) typology focuses on determining how organizations exceed expectations, regardless of market conditions and external environment. Under Collins model, organizations operate under the assumption that they are good, and to become great, leaders must pursue a culture of continuous improvement. Marzano (2003) depicts a similar model of adoption to change (as it relates to schools and school instructional leadership) rather than corporations. Marzano also emphasizes data and student-centered collaboration rather than a specific organizational component. Hence, the focus again is the creation of a culture that seeks innovation and risk taking. Finally, Fullan (2006) proposes the menu schools to create the pinnacle culture for
continuous improvement. At the crux of his model is equity and social justice. Fullan’s model of turnaround focuses on the internal capacity-building necessary to build public confidence in schools, and close all academic gaps impacting needy students.

The rationale for adopting Collins (2005) leadership model and Fullan’s (2006) turnaround leadership principles was based on the fact that their models allow researchers to examine school leaders and culture from a prescriptive model rather than a broad analytical frame. The commonality of both models is long term excellence and leadership commitment to change. Collins (2005) seven common characteristics, level 5 leadership; sound vision after confronting the realities faced; a vision based on the organization’s passion; a culture of discipline; utilization of technology to accelerate change; and an understanding that change is a slow process, will utilized to assess if school undergoing gentrification exhibit these traits. Fullan’s (2006) turnaround leadership and Collins (2001) good-to-great framework will provide the roadmap to analyze principal’s perceptions of how gentrification is impacting the school culture and their leadership. Principals’ words will be used to extrapolate and differentiate the turnaround school that they prescribe to when it relates to gentrification. In essence are their working model adopted from marketing, management, or moral worlds.

There were three rounds of coding of the participant’s transcripts. Neither Marzano (2003) nor Bolman and Deal’s (2004) categories will be used to code the responses of the interview. However, both Jim Collins (2004) and Michael Fullan (2006) have a greater focus on leadership and the impact of external forces. Hence, categories for the first round of coding will be based on an analysis of the responses in relation to
Collins’ characteristics and behaviors of a Level 5 leader. The second round of coding will be based on the examination of Michael Fullan’s theory of *Turnaround Leadership* and its elements of successful change, and finally a third round using Di Primio (1988) turnaround strategies. Related codes will be grouped together in code families. Tables 7, 8, and 9 present the code families that will be applied in this analysis, and turnaround leadership philosophies, respectively. Results will then be compared for commonalities.

Table 7

*Code Families Adapted from Jim Collins Good to Great Level 5 Leadership (2001)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE FAMILY</th>
<th>RELATED CODES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duality of Professional Will and Personal Humility</td>
<td>Acts as a buffer&lt;br&gt;Humble&lt;br&gt;A catalyst&lt;br&gt;Courageous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambition for Success of Company</td>
<td>Puts school first&lt;br&gt;Encourages professionalism&lt;br&gt;Promotes leadership&lt;br&gt;Values building capacity&lt;br&gt;Shows concern for successor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compelling Modesty</td>
<td>Gives credit&lt;br&gt;Takes blame&lt;br&gt;Supports teachers&lt;br&gt;Is under-stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwavering Resolve</td>
<td>Relentless&lt;br&gt;Determined&lt;br&gt;Persuasive&lt;br&gt;Aggressive&lt;br&gt;Persistent&lt;br&gt;Present in classroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Who . . . Then What</th>
<th>Authority to hire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latitude to hire and fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confront the Brutal Facts</th>
<th>Analyzes data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works through problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not submissive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Hedgehog Concept</th>
<th>Has passion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knows what the school can be best at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knows what will make the difference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture of Discipline</th>
<th>Has vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not micromanage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focuses on student achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher freedom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

*Michael Fullan (2006) Turnaround Leadership Philosophies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FULLAN’S MODEL OF TURNAROUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Define closing the gap as the overarching goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend initially to the three basics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be driven by tapping into people’s dignity and sense of respect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that the best people are working on the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize that all successful strategies are socially based and action oriented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume that lack of capacity is the initial problem and then work on it continuously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay the course through continuity of good direction by leveraging leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build internal accountability linked to external accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish conditions for the evolution of positive pressure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build public confidence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

*Di Primio’s Turnaround Management (1988)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUSINESS/CORPORATE TURAROUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Smart Turnaround</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Just-in-Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Survival Model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter III will discuss the method of research to be used, the sampling process, the instruments used, and the coding procedures to answer the following questions:

1. What are principals’ perceptions of neighborhood gentrification?
2. In what ways do principals perceive their school culture being affected by gentrification?
3. What strategies do principals implement in response to changes student enrollment caused by gentrification?
4. In what ways do principals perceive their leadership styles being affected by gentrification?
5. What opportunities for improving the instructional environment for students do principals believe that gentrification brings to their schools?
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Research Questions and Methodology

This chapter will describe the research methods used in this study. A synopsis of the qualitative design, sampling plan, and an examination of the data collection procedures and instruments used will be presented. The qualitative research study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What are principals’ perceptions of neighborhood gentrification?
2. In what ways do principals perceive their school culture being affected by gentrification?
3. What strategies do principals implement in response to changes in student enrollment caused by gentrification?
4. In what ways do principals perceive their leadership styles being affected by gentrification?
5. What opportunities for improving the instructional environment for students do principals believe that gentrification brings to their schools?

According to Creswell (1998), there are five traditions of qualitative research:

1. **Biography.** Used to study a single individual.
2. **Phenomenology.** Used to examine a phenomenon and the meanings it holds for individuals.
3. *Grounded Theory*. Used to generate or develop a theory.

4. *Ethnography*. Used to study the behavior of a culture or group.

5. *Case Study*. Used to examine a case limited to a specific time and place.

To capture the complexity of gentrification and principals’ perceptions, phenomenology is the elected method for this study. Husserl (1931)—credited with the development of phenomenology—described the process as the study of how people describe things and their experiences through their senses. The phenomenon that is the focus may be an emotion, a relationship, a program, an organization, or a culture.

Phenomenology can also be used to gain new perspectives on things already known, or to gain more in-depth information that may be difficult to convey quantitatively (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Guba, 1990; Patton, 2002). This method is the most appropriate in situations where one needs to first identify the variables that might later be tested quantitatively. Marshall and Rossman (1999) further characterize this type of qualitative approach as using in-depth interviewing “to describe the meaning of a concept or phenomenon that several individuals share” (p. 112).

Blumberg (1985) further suggests that methodologies that yield findings with the most impact on practice are also found in qualitative research. Qualitative studies places the foci on the human experience, hence the studies deepens the connection with participants in the study. Principals are eager to learn from the experience(s) of their colleagues. The need for a qualitative method for this study is guided by several other factors. In the review of literature conducted for this study, the researcher has found no studies that examine the influences that gentrification has on leadership of individual
principals as they themselves perceive it. Again a qualitative approach is needed to conduct this study if principal perceptions, experiences, and personally constructed meanings are to be uncovered. Support for this approach is offered by Janesick (1994) who has offered three common rules when undertaking qualitative research:

1. Look for meaning; the perspective of the participants of the study.
2. Find relationships in the structures and occurrences.
3. Recognize points of tension or conflict. (pp. 387-388)

Further support for the utilization of a qualitative method is provided by Maxwell (2005) who states that the, “strengths of qualitative research derive primarily from its inductive approach, its focus on specific situations or people, and its emphasis on words rather than numbers” (p. 22).

**Research Procedures**

After proper consent was granted from Loyola University, Chicago’s Internal Review Board, the researcher requested the districts’ superintendents to approve the research. This included consent from the superintendents of each of the three collar districts directly west of the city of Chicago (see Appendix A). The first investigative process was to purposely identify and select at least three principals from schools located in three collar suburban districts of Chicago that are experiencing gentrification as described in Chapter I. Principals were selected via an interview request form mailed to all public schools in the focused districts (see Appendix B).

A consent letter was offered and approved by building principals prior to the actual interview (see Appendix D). The interview protocol (see Appendix C) for this
study employed in-depth interviewing (Seidman, 1998). This process combined life history interviewing with contextual interviewing. Seidman’s approach calls for three phases of interview questions. In the first phase, the researcher’s job is to ask open-ended questions that require participants to talk about their lives up to the present time. Seidman stresses to, “. . . ask them to reconstruct their early experiences” (p. 11). The focus of the questions was, *How did you become a principal?* rather than *Why did you become a principal?* The second phase of questioning focused on how urban renewal (or gentrification) was influencing their leadership capacities, and discussed what opportunities gentrification brings to their local school. An interview protocol, adopted from Jim Collins’ (2004) meta-analysis study of CEOs, was adapted for this study. The questions it garnered were:

**Phase I**

**DEMOGRAPHIC & OTHER INFORMATION**

1. Length of employment before becoming principal of your current school:
2. Job held immediately before becoming principal of your current school:
3. Length of time in your current school as the principal?
4. Is your school on the academic watch list?
5. Is your school on the academic warning list?
Phase II

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTERISTICS/POPULATION TRENDS

6. Please describe the demographic trends of the neighborhood that your school is located in.

7. Do you believe that gentrification has had any effect on your student population? How?

8. What are the top five priorities for the school? Are these priorities related to gentrification?

Phase III

QUESTIONS

9. Describe the staff of the school in 2009-10.

10. Describe your leadership style.

11. What kind of leadership style would your teachers say you have?

12. Give a brief description of your school’s student demographics and community data.

13. What strategies are being implemented in response to these trends?

14. Describe the history of gentrification in your local school.

15. Describe your viewpoint on gentrification.

16. What opportunities does gentrification bring to your school?

17. What strategies are being implemented to maximize those opportunities?

18. What were the factors that facilitated the implementation of the strategies?

19. What are the barriers to implementing these strategies?
20. What type of assistance and support is provided to your building by central office concerning these issues of demographic change?

21. Describe how your teachers have responded to student mobility in enrollment and neighborhood change?

22. In what ways is your school leadership being impacted by gentrification?

As in Collins’ (2004) research, there is an emphasis on the principal’s perspective and point of view. Just as in latter research, there will be an attempt to zeroing out systemic factors versus whining factors. The third and final phase of Seidman’s (1998) approach involves the interview protocol (see Appendix D) which will be semi-structured and guided by the aforementioned 14-questions from Collins’ research.

Finally, this researcher reviewed 2005 to 2010 School and District Report Cards and Census Data, to help understand more of how urban renewal is impacting principal leadership. These documents allowed the researcher to become more familiar with the principals and their schools. The goal of reviewing these reports and census data were to further connect participants’ perceptions to their practice.

Site Selection

The study includes schools from various geographic areas and communities of varying socioeconomic makeup within Cook County. All of three collar districts had buildings in early childhood, elementary, middle school, and one was a Unit District (K-12). These districts were asked to participate via a formal letter of request to each Superintendent. The letter served as an introduction of the research and stated the research intent (see Appendix A). The total number of participants from each district,
three principals, that self identified themselves as having enrolled students from areas of Chicago that are undergoing gentrification or from areas of their districts that are experiencing gentrification.

District 1 is located in Cook County. It is a K-12 district serving predominately white population. District 1 has 1 early childhood center, 2 elementary schools, 1 middle school, and 1 high school. District 2 is a K-8 district serving a predominately Latino population. District 2 has 16 schools, 15 elementary schools and 1 junior high school. District 3 is a K-8 district serving a diverse student body. District 3 has 10 schools, 8 elementary and 2 middle schools. Table 10 through 12 compares the three districts’ student, teacher, and participant demographics.

Table 10

District One Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>2,855</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

District Two Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>13,713</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>93.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12

District Three Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>5,427</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: From http://webprod.isbe.net/ereportcard/publicsite

Data Collection Procedures

Interviews were recorded, transcribed, and reviewed several times by the researcher to check for inaccuracies. By reviewing these data, the researcher began to identify categories and patterns. All participants agreed to be audio taped. After each interview, typewritten transcripts were given to participants for comments, suggestions, and clarifications. All identifying markers will be removed from these transcripts before
being distributed to the participant for member checking. Six of the nine participants provided clarifying member checks.

There was minimal foreseeable risk as a result of this study. At any point, the participant was allowed to withdraw from the study. The participant names, school names, and interview responses will be kept strictly confidential. During the duration of this study, the records have been kept private and locked in a cabinet in the researcher’s home office. Afterward, the records will be destroyed via paper shredding. All identifying markers were deleted to further protect the privacy of the participants and their sites. Data analysis identified emergent themes across the sample population.

**Informed Consent**

The central principle of ethical adequacy is that of informed consent. The participants involved in this study were informed of the nature and purpose of the research, as well as any involved risks. Participants without coercion, agreed to participate (Anderson, 1999). Through a written consent letter, these participants were informed about the nature of this study. School principals were informed that they could withdraw at any point in the study and were provided with the opportunity to edit and clarify interview statements before analysis. Their anonymity has been protected throughout the description of the data analysis and findings. As well, schools to which these administrators belong have not been identified.
Coding Procedures

There were three rounds of coding of the participant’s transcripts. Neither Marzano (2003) nor Bolman and Deal’s (2004) categories were used to code the responses of the interview. However, both Jim Collins (2001) and Michael Fullan (2006) were found to have a greater focus on leadership and the impact of external forces. Hence, categories for the first round of coding were based on an analysis of the responses in relation to Collins’ characteristics and behaviors of a Level 5 leader. The second round of coding were based on the examination of Michael Fullan’s theory of Turnaround Leadership and its elements of successful change, and finally a third round was done using Di Primio (1988) turnaround strategies. Related codes were grouped together in code families. Tables 13, 14, and 15 present the code families that were applied in this analysis, and turnaround leadership philosophies, respectively. Results were then compared for commonalities.
Table 13

*Code Families Adapted from Jim Collins Good to Great Level 5 Leadership (2001)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE FAMILY</th>
<th>RELATED CODES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duality of Professional Will and</td>
<td>Acts as a buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Humility</td>
<td>Humble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A catalyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courageous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambition for Success of Company</td>
<td>Puts school first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotes leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Values building capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shows concern for successor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compelling Modesty</td>
<td>Gives credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takes blame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supports teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is under-stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwavering Resolve</td>
<td>Relentless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persuasive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present in classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Who . . . Then What</td>
<td>Authority to hire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latitude to hire and fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confront the Brutal Facts</td>
<td>Analyzes data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works through problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not submissive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hedgehog Concept</td>
<td>Has passion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knows what the school can be best at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knows what will make the difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of Discipline</td>
<td>Has vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not micromanage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focuses on student achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher freedom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

Turnaround Leadership Philosophies (Fullan vs Corporate Models)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FULLAN’S MODEL OF TURNAROUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Define closing the gap as the overarching goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend initially to the three basics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be driven by tapping into people’s dignity and sense of respect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that the best people are working on the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize that all successful strategies are socially based and action oriented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume that lack of capacity is the initial problem and then work on it continuously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay the course through continuity of good direction by leveraging leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build internal accountability linked to external accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish conditions for the evolution of positive pressure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build public confidence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15

Di Primio’s Turnaround Corporate Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUSINESS/CORPORATE TURNAROUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smart Turnaround</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just-in-Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival Model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limitations

The researcher is aware that this study was limited to three school districts near the geographic area of the city of Chicago. Secondly, the size of the total sample population for analysis is small (31 schools) with only nine principals from these three districts chosen. Third, these data are only available at the principal level. Teachers and
other staff members were not studied. Finally, this study is the sole work of one individual who is a school leader in the school whose population is undergoing gentrification. Therefore, a journal was kept detailing subjective analysis and other bias. Despite these limitations the researcher believes this was the best method to understand these principals’ perceptions on the impact of gentrification on school leadership.

**Bias Minimization**

Undoubtedly, qualitative methods (particularly interviews and questionnaires) suffer from several weaknesses.

1. Interviewers may have a percentage of interviewer bias (Kleinman & Copp, 1993).
2. Questionnaires run the risks of having responses that have been faked, or responses that are socially desirable or politically correct (McMillan & Schumaker, 2001).

In addition, both methods suffer from questions that may be ambiguous or leading. To enhance content validity and minimize the possible bias from both the participants and the researcher, the following strategies were used:

1. Multi-method strategies to allow for triangulation in data collection and data analysis.
2. Mechanically recorded data via tape recorders.
3. Member checking of participants’ statements. (McMillan & Schumaker, 2001) Participants reviewed the transcripts and were provided the opportunity to modify prior interpretations. Researcher bias (or subjectivity) was recorded in a field log shared
with the dissertation chair. In addition to a log, the dissertation chair served as peer
debriefer—utilized to facilitate data analysis and interpretation since this topic is
emotionally charged and participants may have conflicting values in data collection.

**Summary**

This study focuses on the thoughts and ideas derived from selected principals
practicing in areas of gentrification or urban renewal. Using this qualitative data (secured
from semi-structured interviews) these data were compared and organized for analysis.
The data set of principal comments were coded and arranged into larger categories
according to the research questions and conceptual frameworks. The qualitative data were
organized and analyzed for recurrent patterns and themes for analysis, review, and
deliberations.
CHAPTER IV

DATA

This study explored principal perceptions on the impact of leadership and school culture brought about by gentrification. Vital to the researcher was the framework the selected principals utilized to lead their school community while dealing with the phenomenon of gentrification. Webster’s Dictionary defines gentrification as “the process of renewal and rebuilding accompanying the influx of middle class or affluent people into deteriorating areas that often displaces earlier usually poorer residents” (retrieved May 17, 2007 from www.merriam-webster.com). Common in all three school districts was condo conversion and new construction that are not single family homes, such as town homes, subdivisions for over 55 demographics and new buildings for retirees that require medical assistance. Utilizing qualitative phenomenological approach, the researcher interviewed principals from three collar districts from the City of Chicago. The three districts that participated in the study all border the City of Chicago. Principal interviews were coded using Jim Collins’ (2005), Good to Great characteristics, Michael Fullan’s (2006), Turnaround Leadership Traits, and Di Primo’s (1988), Corporate Strategies, to answer the following research questions investigated for this study:

1. What are principals’ perceptions of neighborhood gentrification?
2. In what ways do principals perceive their school culture being affected by gentrification?
3. What strategies do principals implement in response to changes in student enrollment caused by gentrification?

4. In what ways do principals perceive their leadership styles being affected by gentrification?

5. What opportunities for improving instructional environment for students do principals believe that gentrification brings to their schools?

**Participating Districts’ Demographics and Socioeconomic Indicators**

For this research, study participants included nine principals from three collar districts directly adjacent to the City of Chicago. Districts are arbitrarily represented as District 1, District 2, and District 3. Each district had three principals participating in the study. Table 16 provides a statistical and demographical analysis of the three school districts.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>42,621</td>
<td>86,133</td>
<td>32,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age Female</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age Male</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: From: [http://factfinder.census.gov/saff/main.html?_lan=en](http://factfinder.census.gov/saff/main.html?_lan=en), retrieved October 15, 2010.*
The following tables summarize several other indices that affect educational services, teacher quality, and student performance. Tables 17, 18, and 19 describe the representative districts’ economic indicators, such as median income, unemployment and educational attainment of residents. Tables 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 focus on each of the three school districts profiles, in addition to enrollment trends and educational environment indicators (i.e., attendance rate, low income, and mobility rates). District 3 is the most affluent community of the three districts, with median incomes near $60,000. District 1 and District 2 trail in all economic indicators, hence lack the resources of District 3. Both District 1 and District 2, have sizeable differences in just about every social indicator, such as educational attainment and two parent households. Student poverty ranks highest in District 2, 83.9%, while District 1 has 37% and District 3 has only 19.3% of students receiving free or reduced lunch.

Table 17

Representative Districts’ Economic/Household Indicators Expressed in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>16,266</td>
<td>24,655</td>
<td>15,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>$47,365</td>
<td>$38,044</td>
<td>$57,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Households Income &lt;$100,000</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty Line</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18

*Representative Districts’ Employment Demographics Expressed in Percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mgt./Professional</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/Office</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing/Transportation</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 19

*Representative Districts’ Social Indicators Expressed in Percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Among 25 or older</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongraduate</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/Professional</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same home 5 plus yrs</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20

District General Illinois Report Card Profiles Expressed in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009 Composite ISAT</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYP (2009)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYP (2010)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Schools</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (%)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. Fund Per Pupil Expenditure</td>
<td>$6,143</td>
<td>$4,862</td>
<td>$7,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Teacher $</td>
<td>$66,681</td>
<td>$56,975</td>
<td>$69,675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 21

School Districts’ Enrollment Trends 2005-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>13,624</td>
<td>4,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2,766</td>
<td>13,528</td>
<td>4,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2,782</td>
<td>13,458</td>
<td>5,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2,763</td>
<td>13,552</td>
<td>5,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2,812</td>
<td>13,713</td>
<td>5,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2,855</td>
<td>13,680</td>
<td>5,421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22

*School Districts’ Low Income Trends 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 23

*Districts’ Student Mobility Trends 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24

*Districts’ Student Attendance Trends 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Participants’ Demographics**

Study participants included two males and seven female principals. The percentage minority of participants was 11% African American (n=1), 11% Asian (n=1), compared to 78% White (n=7). As part of the recruitment protocol, principals had to be in their current position for at least three years. Participants’ experience as a school principal ranged from 3 years to 15 years. The principals ranged in age from 40 to 58 years of age. Table 25 presents a summary profile of the nine school leaders interviewed for this study. Participants are labeled in order of interview and linked to their district number.
Table 25  

*Participants’ Profile*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Years as a Principal</th>
<th>Race and Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal A1</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>White Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal B2</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>White Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal C3</td>
<td>Doctoral Student</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Asian Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal D3</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>White Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal E3</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Black Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal F1</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>White Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal G1</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>White Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal H2</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>White Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal I2</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>White Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Data: The Interviews**

Participants in this study were asked questions in an effort to understand how principals perceive the impact of gentrification on their leadership and school culture. The questions were discussed in person, tape recorded and later transcribed by researcher. The interviews were held in the principal’s office or conference room in their school. Interviews were conducted during the last two weeks of April to late August 2010. The interviews first phase focused on three questions presented below:

1. Please describe the demographic trends of the neighborhood that your school in located in?
2. Do you believe that gentrification has had any effect on your student population? How?
3. What are the top five priorities for the school? Are these priorities related to gentrification?

In addition 14 questions were asked regarding their leadership and school culture. The second phase of the interview included the following questions:

1. Describe the staff of the school in 2009-2010.
2. Describe your leadership style.
3. What kind of leadership style would your teachers say you have?
4. Give a brief description of your school’s student demographics and community data.
5. What strategies are being implemented in response to these trends?
6. Describe the history of gentrification in your local school.
7. Describe your viewpoint on gentrification.
8. What opportunities does gentrification bring to your school?
9. What strategies are being implemented to maximize those opportunities?
10. What were the factors that facilitated the implementation of the strategies?
11. What are the barriers to implementing these strategies?
12. What type of assistance and support is provided to your building by central office concerning these issues of demographic change?
13. Describe how your teachers have responded to student decline in enrollment and neighborhood change?
14. In what ways is your school leadership being impacted by gentrification?
Each interview lasted between 45 minutes to over one hour and a half. The following are the summaries of each principal concerning the questions above.

**Interview Summary from Principal A1**

During the interview, Principal A1 stated, in regards to demographic changes “when I interviewed for my position here and I looked at the IIRC data of the school district, I noted that over the previous years, Hispanic population has tripled and along with that the low income population has also tripled, so I see that the Hispanic population has a growing population in the community…so the community is definitely shifted.” Mexican is the nationality that Principal A1 identifies that makes up the bulk of the Hispanics. Table 26 illustrates the demographic trend of School A1 from 2005 to 2010.

Principal A1 feels that gentrification is an “anti-social-justice term…Lower income people tend to be displaced in those scenarios in my mind.” Principal A1, also states that the number of residents who have applied for free lunch has “skyrocketed”. In regards to students coming from Chicago, Principal A1 identified struggles with transitioning into the current school culture and “the kids moving into the district…we see gaps, kids we see move from school to school, we see a lack of continuity.” Principal A1 also admits that the district may be suffering from a mild case of “xenophobia”. Principal A1 shared that “African American parents have reported to me” that the community is “racist”.

Racial tension and achievement gaps due to mobility, was a repeated theme throughout the interview and Principal A1 seems to believe that there is a “psychological divide” in the district that is being altered by the new diversity and racial tensions outside
of school is on the rise. The biggest issues identified during the interview were creating a culture of college bound readiness, dealing with diversity, and an increase in poverty in the district. Raising expectations for all, programs such as PBIS (Positive Behavior In School), and hiring teachers with urban experience were identified by Principal A1 as her framework to meet the needs of her school. Principal A1 states,

For many years (District) was a very solidly Italian-American Community…People tend to grow up here and then get married, buy a house here and raise their family here…Some of the administrators that I work with in the district actually grew up in this town, went to school in this town, got their first teaching job here, they never lived or worked anywhere else.

Table 26

School A1’s Demographic Trend 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Multi Racial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal A1’s Perceived Leadership Profile

Principal A1 was the only participant with a doctorate degree. She was the only participant that described her leadership style by utilizing the term “transformational”. It was quite clear to the researcher that her intent was to reengineer the school culture. Although she mentioned that the community was perhaps incompatible with the college bound culture that she envisioned, no anxiety was evident during the interview. On the contrary, Principal A1 describes her staff as “remarkably student centered”:

When I came here to become principal…my background before this has been high schools, so part of that might be that they are a middle school staff and they really take middle school seriously. They look at the whole kid, they know their students, they focus on their student’s needs, but I honestly never worked with a staff where there are so few issues, the grownups are worried about what’s good for students not grownups.

Principal A1 declares that this unselfishness makes decision making an easy process at her school. Teachers hired were described as “very innovative…they’re always coming up with new ideas of ways to help students”. Principal A1 perceives her staff as the type that go “above and beyond the contract”. She attributes the low turnover and innovations to the culture the staff have created over her tenure. “It’s a very warm dedicated staff.”

As a leader, Principal A1 describes herself as a transformational leader.

I am a firm believer in transformational leadership, I really believe along with the concept of servant leadership. I really believe that the role of the administrator is to help teachers be better teachers…you know what
happens in the classroom is the real business of what goes on in school
every day and my job is to facilitate that.

Principal A1 perceives that her staff would describe her as a principal who is
approachable. “I think that most of them believe I have an open door policy.” She
believes that her teachers think she is down to earth and approachable. Principal A1
reiterates that her staff would further describe her as a principal with high standards and
expectations:

So my faculty knows that is my ambition and my vision for us as a
community, that we can really expand the universe in a way we haven’t
thought about before.

Principal A1 discussed the importance of her district office in the support her staff
receives. The lack of bureaucracy was perceived to be a positive aspect. “There is no
wait there…they are stretch thin you know they do not have a lot of human resources and
they travel around the district but whenever I need anything they do it.” Regardless, she
still must be “diplomatic” since the assistant superintendent was the former principal of
the school. “I do not want to be implying what she did here was mediocre…I’m very
careful on how I suggest new directions because I don’t want to step on anybody’s toes or
imply that what they did wasn’t good.”

As for teacher recruitment, Principal A1 has hired two new teachers due to
retirements during her tenure. Principal A1 has a preference for experience and
preferably from outside the district. The percentage of teachers with Master degrees
during her tenure has increased drastically the last decade. In 2004, 55% of teacher had
their Masters degree compared to 74.2% in 2009. The average teacher experience in years has trended down in 2004 the average teacher had 11.0 and has stayed at the same level or 11.2 in 2009.

**Interview Summary from Principal B2**

Principal B2 believes that there has been “more African American students from Chicago since I came here four years ago.” Table 27 demonstrated the demographic trend of the last five years. Principal B2 does not believe that gentrification has had any impact on her school’s student population. Her framework to deal with the needs of her school is educational initiatives that are built around ELL issues. Principal B2 defined her viewpoint of gentrification as “change is ever constant.” Principal B2 did not offer her working definition of the phenomenon nor explained the cause of the ebb and flow of African American students. Principal B2 believes that “different cultures may have different levels of acceptance of different behaviors.” Principal B2 believes that “some students from Chicago have some educational deficits that we find to be a challenge but continue to work on this.” Principal B2 believes that her staff tends to lack the experience to deal with the added diversity and her school has “higher percentage of younger teachers,” which could delay the school from coming out of academic warming status.
Table 27

*School B2’s Demographic Trends 2005-2010*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Multi Racial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Principal B2’s Perceived Leadership Profile**

Principal B2 has been the principal at her current school for five years. Prior to she served as the assistant principal of the school for four years. School B2 is a Pre-K to 6th building with an enrollment of 839 students. For the first time in last five years, there are no teachers with Emergency or Provisional Certification. Principal B2 made no mention of recent hiring but the average teaching experience in the District 2 is 10.3 years. Although District 2 serves a very high percent of minority students, teacher racial profile were 71.1% White, 0.5% African-American, and 28% Latino.

According to Principal B2, the school has seen an ebb and flow in the African-American student population during her tenure. She acknowledged that African American culture has differences and mentioned the phrase “racial issues” during the interview.
The Hispanic and African American cultures differ in many aspects, but we as a school treat all with respect and expect the same from them and their families. Principal B2 did not specifically explain particular strategies or initiatives, other than vaguely state that the school’s “educational initiatives are built around ELL issues.” Yet according to Illinois School Report Card, the subgroup that did not meet yearly progress was not the English Language Learners but the Special Education students.

Interesting was her definition of change, “change is ever constant.” Whether Principal B2 operated from the book or was a pioneer or a trailblazer was inconclusive, but she did not give the researcher the impression that she avoided leadership. Yet absent from her interview was any mention of key phrases found in the vernacular of educational leaders, such as, high expectations, integration of technology, nor balanced literacy.

**Interview Summary from Principal C3**

Principal C3 is the only participant of Asian background and currently pursuing a doctoral degree. Principal C3, believes that out of 500 students possibly 2 to 3% have come from Chicago Public Schools. “African Americans are perhaps the most misunderstood…there is a huge Islamic population that has developed.” Principal C3 believes that minority parents who are single with more than one child District 3 tend to be overwhelmed.

I had a second grader, only African American boy in second grade, the mom was really adamant that he stays here…she had four kids at four
different schools…in the end her car broke down…they moved back…yes they came from the city.

Principal C3 believes that recruiting minority teachers and in particular males has made an impact. The district’s goal of having the “staff reflect the population of students” has been very welcoming by the community. “This year to really promote…the district went to all kind of job fairs, did all kinds of flyers, went even to churches all over.” Principal C3 believes that gentrification brings unique challenges to the school, such as contemplating canceling the Christmas celebrations due to an increase of non-Christian parents. Principal C3 believes that school leaders are not as mindful of religion and the learning opportunity that the increase of religious diversity could bring for all students regardless of their beliefs.

We have to mindful of holidays around here…we have to mindful of the homework you give on those days…we do not schedule curriculum night and PTO night on Jewish holidays…you can’t operate in isolation.

Principal C3 also believes that teachers in her school find it difficult to reach struggling students. Since her school is so high achieving, Principal C3 believes that District 3 tends to neglect the school when it comes to additional resources. Principal C3 believes that the biggest barrier is appeasing her community.

It’s hard, I can’t change what I have here you know, I have to keep it moving forward…expectations here are high because of the social high economic, most parents have at least one college degree if not two.
Principal C3’s biggest struggle is avoiding the trap of success or “the ease of becoming a manager.” Her framework to deal with the students would be to welcome the parents, hire a diverse staff, have a curriculum that is multi-cultural centered, and celebrate diversity. Principal C3 also thinks that family structure is an important metric to monitor and welcome. Table 28 illustrates student racial demographics and trend from the last five years.

Table 28

School C3’s Demographic Trends 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Multi Racial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Principal C3’s Perceived Leadership Profile

School C3 led all participants in every academic category. School C3 has an enrollment of 503 students. The racial breakdown was approximately 79% White, 9% African-American, 3% Hispanic, 2% Asian, and 7% Multiracial. Teacher racial breakdown of the school is as follows, 8% African-American, 2% Hispanic, and 89% White. Principal C3 was of Asian descent and had experience as a school leader in three states. In School C3, 74.5% of teachers have a Master’s degree or above. The overall
performance by students was the highest of all participants, or 94.2% compared to State Average of 80.9%.

Principal C3 discussed that one of her strategies was to recruit minority hires and “I have a male teacher at every grade level.” In her opinion minority hires have been a focus,

I think that’s made a huge difference. That’s been very welcoming by the community…That’s always been a goal of (District 3), you know the staff reflect the population of the students and definitely and a big goal for the current Superintendent.

Principal C3 discussed that once the staff is in place she relies on teacher leaders to implement new initiatives and guide change. Principal C3 continues,

Anyone who is a General Leader will be the first one to implement…incorporate effective tools in the classroom, our School Improvement Team has been focusing…effective use of technology.

Principal C3 has cautiously introduced LCD projectors, Elmos, and now Smart Boards (Technology Accelerators). According to Principal C3 “technology…it’s not a want anymore, it’s a need.”

Principal C3 describes her leadership style as collaborative. She elaborates, “I try to get a lot of different info from a lot of different staff members to make decisions…I came to make decisions too. I have elementary and middle school experience, as well as administrative. I have a good scope of curriculum and instruction…I’m very hands on, I
think I’m very approachable. My staff collaboration is huge…I collaborate huge with my staff.” In reference to what expectations she has for her staff,

I really, really have high expectations…Expectation of how they teach, what they teach, their professional in the school.

One of her expectations is about “challenging the students…whether it’s before school, after school…it’s not just about me…I’m trying to get them to be teacher leaders. That’s the huge piece I like to work on.”

According to Principal C3, money is not a barrier, “if you walk into my classrooms, my teachers have so much stuff, they have nothing to complain about, as far as what to teach and how to teach.” Principal C3 believes that the District 3’s allocation of resources is a perceived problem, “using it effectively, they have a long way to go.”

Expanding her perception of District 3, Principal C3 believes,

Our building, unfortunately, because we have such higher scores than the rest, they say we don’t need anything, we have everything. That’s the biggest thing. It’s hard I can’t change what I have here. I have to keep moving it forward. There are expectations here, because of the social high economic, most of our parents have at least one college degree, if not two.

Principal C3 perceives her building to be “ostracized or mocked” by several in the district, because the students have the highest level of achievement in District 3.

Principal C3 believes another issue is that the community has issues with full inclusion.

You know kids of all different backgrounds and not just race, but different family structures and it’s hard. Like I do have some children with two
moms and the other opposite…the other 99 percent of my children have a mom and a dad. So for those kids, to understand that you have two moms, it’s been an issue.

**Interview Summary from Principal D3**

Principal D3 is the only participant that has a music background and been in the same school for 23 years. Principal D3 admits that he does not have hard data, but most of his “low income folks” are coming from Chicago. Principal D3 elaborated,

So a lot of our renters are coming from Chicago…I do not have hard demographic data, hard numbers to back this up…I would just have to say is my gut.

Principal D3 is aware that gentrification across district boundaries has risen in the last 23 years of his tenure in the district, as both a teacher and principal. Principal D3 stated that the district centrally controls the enrollment process of students and does not relay the data to the schools.

I would say that there have been concerns about change at various points in time, if there was some news about some Section 8 housing people at one end, get concerned how things might change at other end, anytime rental properties go condo there is concern about gentrification, low income folks getting priced out.

According to Principal D3, the biggest focus for the school is PBIS and other anti-bullying programs. Principal D3 was the only participant to highlight the Olweus (1991) study on school violence that promotes the usage of cooperative learning and improving
family relationships to curtail bullying in schools. Principal D3 believes that kids coming from Chicago, “not to diss or put down CPS in general, again for whole variety reasons…especially kids moving in those rental units that we were talking about, are more likely to come behind and likewise need some of those interventions.”

Principal D3 relies heavily on extended programs and test prep to help kids make the connection between instruction and the ISAT. The Table 29 illustrates the trend of racial make up of School D3 for the past five years

Table 29

*School D3’s Demographic Trends 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Multi Racial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Principal D3’s Perceived Leadership Profile**

Principal D3 presides over a school that is known for its inclusiveness. Principal D3’s top priorities all focused on creating the latter. According to Principal D3 his five priorities are:

1. Continue anti-bullying efforts via the Olweus system (anti-bullying program).
3. Close the achievement gap amongst students of color and low income.

4. “Stretch kids at the top end” to increase the number of high achievers.

5. Beginning and building RTI (Response to Intervention).

Principal D3 describes his leadership as one that has “a clear commitment to kids”; similar to the other participants the term “collaborative” in a unique manner. Principal D3 states,

That is not collaborative to a fault. I guess in other words, I guess that people would see that I do have a vision for some things. We (Principals) ought to be and a part of leadership. It’s not just about calling the team together, but providing some guidance and some strategic vision…I hope that my staff and my parents and my students would say that I’m an effective communicator and that I’m committed to improvement.

Principal D3’s vision for School D3 is for the school to have a Fine Arts commitment or focus. According to Principal D3:

Trying to build a common school culture so that no matter what someone’s starting point would be that you honor that and respect that, but you get to build something which is the way we do it at (School D3).

Giving a student a musical instrument according to Principal D3 puts them at an equal footing, regardless of their racial or economic background. Principal D3 hopes that programs like the latter can start to “break down that kind of barrier” and unite students regardless their background or socioeconomic status. This empathy is what School D3 is “trying to build.”
**Interview Summary from Principal E3**

“I can remember very clearly one summer losing thirty African-American children, because a building became a condo and they had to move” declared this principal. Table 30 illustrates the racial trends of School E3. Principal E3 defines her most important part of her job is to show the “beautiful diversity” of the school by being inclusive. Principal E3’s other priority is to hire the “right people” and affirms that “making sure every child experiences success…what that means is we take them where ever they are, no matter how low or how high and move them to the next level”. Principal E3 affirms that can only happen if during the interview process you get to “look at their hearts.” Principal E3 feels that teacher personality is important, “they can be an outstanding teacher, but if they have an edge, I don’t want them, I don’t like people with an edge…Because if you want to hold a child’s attention you have to perky, love life…children need to see it.” Principal E3 was the only participant that believed strongly on literacy and elaborated on a Read-a-thon. “I’ve been doing it for twelve years…the goal of the program is to get children to read at home…it starts the first day of school…and it ends in May.” Principal E3 affirms “never hire someone who is just good enough.” Principal E3 has a preference for experienced teacher, “I don’t have a lot of support here, so I don’t have time to teach you to teach…I love experience, it doesn’t have to be a lot, but I want someone to have a clue beyond student teaching generally.” Principal E3 considers that she must be “there” for every child. “I probably promote more kids than anybody in the district…I believe in putting them where they belong academically…right now there are a number of children in 5th grade that were promoted
to Junior High.” Principal E3 was the only participant that spoke about expectations and results.

Principal E3 has a formula for results. The Read-a-thon is one variable, high quality teachers, full inclusion, high expectations, parent empowerment, and rewards make the rest of the formula. Principal E3 has a secret weapon, “attitude is everything.” It is this philosophy that is nurtured at the school. “The secret weapon has nothing to do with education…you treat people the way you want to be treated.”

Table 30

School E3’s Demographic Trends 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Multi Racial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Principal E3’s Perceived Leadership Profile

Principal E3 believes that a principal must, first spend “time knowing your community”. Secondly the principal must know the “strength and weakness of your staff.” Third, “connect with the children, that’s the key, build a relationship with the children, connect with them.” Then “try not to get comfortable…it is so easy to get comfortable…always strive to do better…yes grow and learn in the position…never feel
like I got it all together.” Finally “attitude is everything…you keep a good attitude it will take you far in life.”

Principal E3 expands that teachers with “an edge” are not the prototype she is looking to hire. She wants teachers with the following list of traits:

1. Teachers that maintain professional portfolios (“evidence to help me understand how good you are”).
2. Teachers that pursue additional degrees and credentials (“professional growth” and “constantly taking classes”).
3. Curriculum expertise (“we talk about how you plan a lesson” and “learning environment”).
4. Life Long Learners (“you don’t want somebody that feels they are good already”).
5. Experience in teaching a diverse population (“every child is different”).
6. “Professional Conduct”
7. Community Outreach (“how do you handle discipline” and “how well they get along with parents”).

Interview Summary from Principal F1

In Principal F1 tenure of 15 years, this was first time, his school did not meet annual yearly progress. Principal F1 struggled to state, “we did not make AYP this year.” This participant believes that gentrification could have had an effect on his school AYP status. “What we are seeing is a lot of people coming from Chicago…a third of our students are from Chicago.” “We do not have a strong ESL program for Spanish and for
Polish.” Principal F1 struggles with the lack of clarity (provided to him by District 1) he has to give his teachers. “Because when I tell them something, I don’t have the whole story, and so I come with piece meal information, and sometimes that’s not what the teachers need.” Principal F1 perceives gentrification as,

“great, I think it helps beautify and clean up the area, but it’s displacing families. They are trying to find affordable housing and where they go sometimes, it’s unfortunate. They have lived there 20 to 30 years and then someone else comes in and they are kicked out. Which is sad, but I think gentrification is great…something has to give.”

In reference to the students enrolling from Chicago, Principal F1 declares, that his “leadership has changed making sure that students can learn, because the pressure of the ISATs, that’s the big elephant in the room, that we make AYP.” Principal F1 reveals that his hiring has been altered to hire teachers with certain certification.

“Well when they sometimes have IEPs or ESL or ELL bilingual program…but we do not have a strong ESL or bilingual program…I have had to hire two bilingual teachers one who will be teaching Spanish to the kids and then one will teach Polish.”

Table 31 depicts the school’s demographic trends of the last five years.
Table 31

School F1’s Demographic Trends 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Multi Racial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Principal F1’s Perceived Leadership Profile

School F1 for the first time under the NCLB era was labeled a failing school. Principal F1 believes that the diversity at the school has created a tide that has not raised all boats. Principal F1 has struggled to hire the staff to meet the needs of the new students and the school is playing catch up.

Everything is about relationships now…when you have a classroom and trying to build relationships with these kids…relationships with parents are very very important.

According to Principal F1 the school culture is set around the belief that family comes first. Principal F1 acknowledges his staff is made up of young mothers that have unique personal needs that he tries to support. He perceives the following:

I think the best part of working here…if you got a situation and have to leave, bye.
School F1’s demographics have changed according to Principal F1 during his tenure and he paints it as a challenge. In regards to the increase of diversity, Principal F1 recognizes that the school needs help.

We just know the parents coming in tell their kids how to behave but they need to be shown how to behave in a school setting. We didn’t usually have to tell them how to use the washroom or tell them how to be quiet during an assembly or tell them that when you come in, you have to make sure you take a hat off in the building, you know hands and feet to yourself.

**Interview Summary of Principal G1**

Principal G1 states that “we are seeing more new immigrants from Latin America and Eastern Europe; I have not yet seen too many middle class Caucasians leaving the city to come to (District 1).” According to Principal G1 the school now utilizes a firm to check the address of parents applying to the school. Even with such increase in diversity, Principal G1 believes that gentrification is not playing a role in the increase in diversity of her school and district. Principal G1 describes the demographics of the school as “lower middle class at its socioeconomic level and primarily Caucasian and we have a significant Hispanic population that is increasing.” Principal G1’s view on gentrification is “conflicted” as a resident of Chicago she is “happy to see gentrification in my neighborhood because it increased the quality of my school.” “It’s difficult for low income parents to be pushed out somewhere they love and have lived for many years.”
Principal G1 has the viewpoint that the White middle class parents have the potential of improving the schools.

“The good thing about gentrification is that...parents decide they do not want to pay for private school...they get involved...and suddenly their school is a model school...they have these really great programs...because parents got involved and made a difference.”

Principal G1’s biggest obstacle is the design of the Bilingual program. “I would say this about education in general, very few schools, do an exemplary job with Bilingual Education...the studies show that Bilingual Education is a process that could take up to seven years, so any program that was exiting at three years, no matter how good they were, they weren’t doing the best for the students.” Table 32 depicts the demographic trends of School G1 from 2005 to 2010.

Table 32

School G1’s Demographic Trends 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Multi Racial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Principal G1’s Perceived Leadership Profile**

Principal G1 perceives her staff views her as “hands off” and empowering. Principal G1 perceives her staff as “very confident, committed and energetic.” She used terms throughout the interview as “hard working”, “confident”, and “energetic”. Her enthusiasm and passion for what she did was evident and clear:

I’m really happy to be in this building. I don’t know if you know, but I’m the principal of this building, but I’m also the bilingual coordinator for the district. So I’m really glad to be here because we get a lot of new Hispanic and Polish families who come here first.

Human resources has been impacted by the diversity according to Principal G1, Since I have been here (three years) I have hired two Spanish speaking people, so now out of 15 people, four are Spanish speakers. I think that’s really important to make our parents feel comfortable…I hired a Polish speaking bilingual teacher…so I feel that we have the important two languages covered.

To Principal G1 it is important for her parents to be happy, if the parents are happy, she equates the latter with her also being happy. She relates her own parent’s experience, “my parents immigrated to this country and I know it was hard for my mom and I remember sometimes people weren’t that nice to her, because she spoke with an accent.” Principal G1 has taken those personal experiences and has made making parents feel welcomed a priority.
I’m really happy about making parents feel good about coming to our school district and I feel that I think my staff tries their hardest to make the parents feel comfortable and welcomed at our school district. Our parents are very comfortable coming to our building because we have enough staff. But I don’t think that’s the case in all the building.

**Interview Summary of Principal H2**

Principal H2 describes her school demographic as “mostly a Mexican population with gang activity and low income single parent households.” Principal H2 does not believe that gentrification had any effect on her increase of student enrollment. Yet she does state that “I never gave it much thought but as it increases in our neighboring Chicagoland area, I could see our numbers continue to rise.” Table 33 depicts schools demographic trend for the last five year cycle.

Principal H2 identifies the biggest barriers to the increasing student population are “finding teachers with endorsements…and our budget was dramatically reduced for the 2009-2010 school year.” Principal H2 spoke extensively on student behavior and the school’s PBIS system. Street gangs, was self identified to have a negative impact and influence in School H2. According to Principal H2, “thirteen percent of all disciplinary incidents this year related to gang activity…data is monitored regularly.” School H2, has not met AYP for the last three years. The total enrollment of School H2 has more than doubled in a year, in 2008-2009 enrollment was 1,296, while in 2009-2010 it rose to 2,717.
Table 33

School H2’s Demographic Trends 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Multi Racial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: From Interactive Illinois Report Card, [www.iirc.niu.edu](http://www.iirc.niu.edu), retrieved November 1, 2010.*

**Principal H2’s Perceived Leadership Profile**

Principal H2 clearly understands the despairing facts concerning lack of funding and socioeconomic factors that her staff has to face.

The neighborhood has changed for a long time now and the population has been like this for awhile. We have always had large numbers and our numbers continue to increase not decrease.

Principal H2 was not as forthcoming as the other respondents and her answers tended to be brief without deep elaboration. According to Principal H2 the school is facing multiple issues. First and foremost, budget reductions and cutbacks from District 2, have impacted the loss of enrichment opportunities such as field trips, and extended day, reading supplemental services. Secondly, Principal H2 believes there is a lack of parental involvement and blames the lack of resources and language barriers as the source. Finally, street gangs are impacting the learning climate and teaching and learning.
Interview Summary of Principal I2

Principal I2 has been at the current school for 15 years. Principal I2 has seen school enrollment drop significantly.

A report published four years ago, indicated that property values. The median home sale price, were increasing at a rate of 40%…Consequently many of the apartment buildings were converted to condominiums …apartment rental increased as well…students left our school, decreasing our overall student population and more low incidence special education programs were brought in to help offset this effect.

Principal I believes that “the immigrant population find it hard to live in (District 2), especially with many of them being unemployed.” Mobility for School I2 has peaked to 30.8% in 2005 and then has decreased slightly, 24.5 in 2006, 25.3 in 2007, 25.7 in 2008, and finally to 18.4% in 2009. Principal I2’s focus is to continue to “attract families who are currently paying tuition for their children to attend private schools.” Even though Principal I2 realizes the impact on enrollment gentrification has had, she perceived benefits. “There are more opportunities for business partnerships…the community is safer…There are no longer dilapidated homes…now neighbors are very proactive in regards to the slightest infractions of the law.” Regardless, the biggest obstacles for the school’s agenda, according to Principal I2 are:

The economy and fewer teachers. It all boils down to time and resources.

There simply isn’t enough of either. This impedes progress in this area. Table 34 illustrates School I2’s demographic trend from 2005 to 2010.
Table 34

School I2’s Demographic Trends 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Multi Racial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Principal I2’s Perceived Leadership Profile**

Principal I2 noted that she believed in “shared decision making, collaboration, and setting a good example” but did not offer clear examples of how the latter were cultivated. Principal I2 stated, “we must evolve to survive” and the “evolutionary process is embraced by most and effective.” According to Principal I2,

I am assertive and also persistent. I have good interpersonal skills. Yet she follows with the following statements: I’m not here to make friends.

My staff understands that I will not hesitate to utilize appropriate employee discipline when necessary.

**Gentrification Analysis**

In regard to gentrification five out the nine respondents viewed gentrification as a positive phenomenon. Respondents in District 1 and 3 were more likely to acknowledge gentrification in their districts. District 2 respondents were more likely to renounce the
phenomenon, but could not explain the increase of student enrollment at their school. Table 35 summarizes and synthesizes the participants’ acknowledgement of gentrification and possible impact on their leadership. Participants with longer tenures seemed to be more at ease discussing the topic and participants with either experience working in Chicago Public Schools or attending the latter seemed to be more elaborative with their responses. District 3, the most affluent, had a consistent trend of African American students, District 2 had only one participant acknowledge gentrification, and District 1 had two participants definitely acknowledge a great influx of students, in particularly Hispanics, Polish and Eastern Europeans.

Table 35

*Jim Collins (2001) Good to Great Comparison*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Tenure (Yrs.)</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Gentrification</th>
<th>Largest Minority Group Entering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal A1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Maybe”</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal B2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal C3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal D3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal E3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal F1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hispanic, Polish, and Eastern European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal G1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hispanic and Eastern European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal H2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Not Really”</td>
<td>Hispanic Immigrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal I2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coding Procedures

The first round of coding of this study, utilized Jim Collins (2001) characteristics and behaviors of a Level 5 leader and strategy patterns of the Good to Great companies, in his study of Good to Great companies. According Collins, framework has three stages:

Stage 1: Discipline People (Level 5 leadership and First Who, Then What)

Stage 2: Discipline Thought (Confront the Brutal Facts and The Hedgehog Concept)

Stage 3: Building Greatness to Last (Clock Building and Stimulate Progress)

The results of these three stages, according to Collins (2001) study, garnished superior performance, make a unique impact in the community, and achieved lasting endurance.

Good to Great Coding of Principal A1

Using the Collins’ attributes Principal A1 was coded to have several of the conceptual links. Level 5 Leadership and First Who then What were evident via bringing to the school talented teachers that were teacher leaders. Confronting the Brutal Facts, Principal A1 acknowledges that the community is “kinda still in the 50’s” and that “only 19% of its residents have a college degree” makes her job more challenging.

You know our parents are trades people; they got high school diplomas, for the vast majority of them a college degree is a vast attainment. They really don’t have the expectations that their kids are going to go to great universities.
Principal A1 has adopted a mission to create a college bound culture and that has developed on what Jim Collins calls the *Hedgehog Concept*. The *Culture of Discipline* has been communicated to her staff and her goal of “expanding the universe” of her students. Regardless of the resistance from parents such as “you know they don’t have to read 30 minutes a day,” “you are pressuring these kids,” and “C’s are fine,” Principal A1 is determined to move her students past the expected norm. In reference to *Technology Accelerator*, Principal A1 reviewed the importance of the Danielson’s Framework (2009) and how valuable her laptop was to give teachers immediate feedback. Principal A1 is trying to pioneer her application of technology to increase the effectiveness of teaching and learning. “I think we need to push our kids and push our community…and they need to be a little more global in their thinking.” Principal A1 has underestimated how much energy it will take in motivating the “old established community” and rallying them around the School A’s new vision, yet both leader and school are solidly in Stage 3 of Collins’ *Building Greatness Model*. Principal A1 has made her priority to establish a culture of discipline and credits her staff for many of the schools breakthroughs.

**Good to Great Coding of Principal B2**

School B2 is a classic participant in Stage 1 of the Collins’ Process. Principal B2 seems to be in the beginning phases of Stage 1 of Jim Collins *Good to Great Framework*. Principal B2 seemed to just manage the situation and although she described her leadership using only one word “collaborative,” risk taking, innovation, or transformational type phrases were completely absent from the interview. Principal B2’s description of her community as, “entry level,” ironically contradicts her definition of
change. This leader for one reason or another is still *Confronting the Brutal Facts* and has not moved into the other conceptual frameworks proposed by Collins *Good to Great* model. In addition, both Principal B2 and the school may also be struggling with the *Doom Loop*. Principal B2 describes the school and district as “a suburban school that is really more like an urban school…District 2 is an old entry level immigrant community.”

Collins (2001) gives the following signs that the organization is in *Doom Loop*. First the organization reacts without understanding, new direction, program, leader, event, fad intervened the momentum of the organization and results disappoint (pp. 183-184).

**Good to Great Coding of Principal C3**

*Confronting the Brutal Facts*, Principal C3 states that, “we really need to mindful …of holidays around here, we have a huge Jewish population…we have to be mindful of homework you give on those days…it’s still a learning experience for their child and you have to think of it as in a positive way.” Principal C3 continues “that you cannot operate in isolation.” As far as her *Hedgehog Concept*, Principal C3 credits her multi-cultural curriculum. She does admit that it takes a great deal of time to motivate her staff and even for her students to accept different “family structures.” Nevertheless, School C3 continues to be awarded the Academic Excellence Award, which recognizes schools with three years of sustaining 90% of students passing the state test. Principal C3 ironically would prefer being in a school where “I could really make a difference, you know here things can move along very easily without doing too much…it’s easy to become a manager here.” The latter clearly gives us a *Level 5* leader that is “looking at the mirror, not out the window, to apportion responsibility” (p. 33), but in this case the leader is in
Stage 2 of Collins’ *Good to Great Framework*. The latter is an interesting dichotomy, because the test scores seem to indicate that School C3 is in Stage 3, meaning that great results or high tests scores are just one component to meeting Collins’ *Good to Great Framework*.

**Good to Great Coding of Principal D3**

Principal D3 has an overarching goal, “our number one goal is make sure that every teacher has the skills and tools to be differentiating in their classroom, so when you got some of those kids who are not highfliers yet, no matter what other supports you have in place…every homeroom teacher can meet those needs.” Principal D3 strategically utilized Title 1 funds to create his “Boost” program. Along with the programs to transition students and increase self-efficacy, this is School D3’s *Hedgehog Concept*. Principal D3 further describes the program:

> Depending on the year that group is usually between 2 to 25 students…we do not necessarily divide them up by grade…we try to find…the skill in terms to divide kids up and have them work…We use a program called PS Reading which is big on pre-assessing kids…all paper assessment…and then it channels them through a curriculum that is really responsive.

Principal D3 also highlight the need for hiring minority teachers and his struggles to find and hire them (*First Who...Then What*). “We had had job fairs as far away as New York and New Jersey, to make sure we are leaving no stone unturned. There are just a few associations of minority teachers…we have tried to put the word out through those networks, but I’ll just tell you it’s hard. There’s no magic bullet…to more highly
qualified minority candidates.” Once hired Principal D3 acknowledges the District 3’s University has assisted the new teachers and given them “diversity trainings” and training in differentiation. Principal D3 credits the district’s new introduction to Charlotte Danielson’s (2009) teacher evaluation for assisting him in evaluating his staff (*Putting the Right People On the Bus*). Therefore, Principal D3 has the school solidly in Stage 2, where people have jobs and responsibilities. However, the school is built primarily around him as a leader; therefore, Stage 3 (*Built to Last*) will be a struggle to attain.

**Good to Great Coding of Principal E3**

School E3 was the only coded Good to Great school rated a Stage 3 with many of the positive levers that are identified in the Collins (2001) study. The school’s *Hedgehog concept* is the Read-a-Thon. Principal E3’s Read-a-Thon is the compelling common goal that challenges students to read. It is not just the compelling common goal for the school but the one common ground that unites all the students to read. As Collins study has identified without self-motivated people greatness cannot be achieved. Principal E3 has discovered:

> My gosh, it’s the truth and I have the evidence that it works…when a child can connect with that teacher, oh my gosh it’s amazing what can happen. It’s when there is no connection and that’s where it’s vital for me to be a role model for my staff…to connect with the child, their parents, their grandparents whoever.

Having disciplined people, or as Collins discussed the “Who” before the “What” was highlighted by Principal E3. One of her initiatives was to hire male teachers.
For the last two years I had all female staff…I needed male teachers…its so good for children to see that…what I found out that now I hire people that could take my staff to the next level…I’m just totally thankful that they are beautiful on the inside and out.

Principal E3 strives to be an instructional leader like one of Collins (2001) *Good to Great Company* (Wells Fargo) “the driver is not profit per loan but profit by employee” (pp. 53-54). In other words, the contributions of each teacher are what Principal E3 attributes to the success of the school. In addition, her fanatical pursuit of hiring superb teachers is matched with the expectation that they pursue a path of self improvement. The extraneous distractions of diversity and gentrification are not what are vital in School E3. Principal E3’s diligence and the simplicity that the Read-a-thon brings is what create the path to greatness.

First of all I believe that I’m the role model for my students and my staff…as a result of that, it is very important that I remain positive no matter what. You will never hear me yell at a staff member…giving them the support they need when it is a bad situation…I’m really good at that, how to make it work.

Principal E3 perceives “taking lemons and making lemonade, I consider any barrier a challenge,” This mindset is what transformed the school from one that parents sought transfers out of to one that “people want to come to…we are on the map…I love that.”

Principal E3 has become a *Level 5* principal by making her job meaningful. According to Jim Collins (2001), “you might gain that rare tranquility that comes from knowing that
you’ve had a hand in creating something of intrinsic excellence that makes a contribution” (p. 210). Principal E3 understands that what matters is balancing human resources, instructional leadership, and a passion for learning are the key to success. School E3 is in Stage 3 of the Collins process that will transcend leaders and build greatness for her school that will last.

**Good to Great Coding of Principal F1**

This school has instituted PBIS to set the appropriate tone and behavioral expectations. Other initiatives that have evolved have been the need for the teachers to pursue additional accreditation. According to Principal F1,

We have two teachers that went back and got their ESL endorsements. We had one teacher who said I can’t speak the language, but I need some clues to better reach my children. I think that is a positive trend.

On the other hand, Principal F1 also perceives impediments coming primarily from the School Board.

The budgets are so tight now…we will see that from time to time, I had to prove we needed an extra teacher. It took about a week and then I hired a teacher which took another week and then it took another week to get her in here. To get a room set up, transfer all the kids, tell all the parents and so on, it was about three weeks.

In School F1 provided no evidence of that the Hedgehog concept existed.

Principal F1 spoke of several curricula (i.e., Harcourt Journey Reading Series, Math Trailblazers, Study Island, etc.) but there was no mention of the one thing the school is
best at nor what drives the school to excel. Principal F1 recognizes that together, he and his staff are along for the ride; hence the strategy he seems to implement is to try to permeate the mindset that all staff must keep balance with work and their personal life to prevent either burnout or attrition. Principal F1 highlights it very clearly,

I would have to say that some of the decisions I make don’t come down to a pinpoint accuracy, because when I tell them (teachers) something I don’t have the whole story, because the Board doesn’t give me the whole story. So I come with piecemeal information and sometimes that’s not what the teachers need.

In summary, Principal F1 has engaged his practice in the Collins Stage 1 (Human Resources).

School F1 seems to be entering the second stage, digesting the brutal facts, and still in the process of developing their Hedgehog Concept.

**Good to Great Coding of Principal G1**

Principal G1 was unique to the study because School G1 is an early childhood center. The school houses the district’s Pre-K and Kindergarten programs. Principal G1 admits that her staff are vital to the success of school and even have shaped her leadership style:

This is a pretty friendly place…this is my third year here, there was no use in me coming in the first year in like gangbuster…making all these changes. I think the first year I began to build relationships and massage people along…I see people (staff) pretty flexible…I don’t think I have to
make great changes. But I think there is some little tweaking that could go on…My style would have been a lot different, had I had a different staff…so I think consensus building is what we need.

Parent connection is a vital component at School G1, “it is important that District 1 presents itself as a friendly place to our non-English speaking parents.” The instructional needs of the students are also perceived as an important aspect.

Program design…it’s really my priority to take a look at our program design and see where it can be improved.

In summary Principal G1 highlighted the importance of the school climate and the need for having a staff that could meet the needs of the changing community. Absent was the culture of execution and innovation evident in Collins’ *Good to Great* organizations. The creation of a positive environment was made clear but whether this is being impacted by the influx of “new immigrant families” was not stated. Principal G1 is primarily functioning in Stage 1 *Discipline People*. “I think there is some little tweaking that could go on…consensus building is what we need to be doing here.” Principal G1 is focusing on assuring that key personnel are in place (i.e., Bilingual Staff) and in the right seat on the bus.

**Good to Great Coding of Principal H2**

Principal H2 is another example of a leader that is in Stage 1 of the Collins framework.

We have a very large staff…finding teachers with endorsements. While we have many great teachers who voluntarily supervise and sponsor
activities, clubs, groups, etc. we cannot offer them (enrichment and supplemental programs) on a consistent basis.

Principal H2 clearly understands the despairing facts concerning lack of funding and socioeconomic factors that her staff has to face. Principal H2 pessimistically noted:

The neighborhood has changed for a long time now and the population has been like this for awhile. We have always had large numbers and our numbers continue to increase not decrease.

Her answer to the protocol questions did not portray a sense of confidence or unwavering resolve. School H2 has the tools (i.e., Map Testing and PBIS) yet Principal H2 did not articulate how she plans to confront a long list of issues surrounding her school. Principal H2 gave the researcher the impression that it was a monumental task to turn things around, and that programs and additional resources seemed to be the solution. No evidence of a *Hedgehog Concept* was discussed nor mentioned.

**Good to Great Coding of Principal I2**

School I2 has been altered by the shift in population. As gentrification has increased and property values have risen, the stable immigrant population has been forced to relocate and depart. District 2 has increased the school enrollment assigning and housing one of the district’s special education program. Principal I2 seems to be in Stage 1 of the Greatness Process and has not graduated into Stage 2 or *Hedgehog Concept*. She seems to be paralyzed by the brutal facts and the school and staff have yet to discover their *Hedgehog Concept* or deep passion of what best drives the school community.
School I2 has a big goal to “attract families who are currently paying tuition for their children to attend private schools” but their action plan lacked deep detail past some cosmetic changes to the school.

We are in the process of improving our first impressions of visual appeal, which is what seems to be significant in that there is some trepidation for families coming to public schools. We want our families to see more vibrant and colorful environment getting away from the industrial age design of the building.

Principal I2 lacked the required skills of a Level 5 leader. Skills such as cultivating leadership focus on long term greatness, inspiring others via excellence, hard word, sacrifice, integrity, results over intentions. Principal I2 noted that she believed in “shared decision making, collaboration, and setting a good example” but did not offer clear examples of how the latter were cultivated. In terms of hiring, Principal I2 does not have a rigorous selection process and the investment necessary to evaluate each candidate. Principal I2 seems to be looking for quick wins or silver bullets to tough problems. Principal I2 did not mention a time horizon. What was the school going to mutate into was not articulated, hence Principal I2, seems to be fixed in Stage 1 of the Good to Great process.

Summary of Good to Great Coding Analysis

While most of the principals met many of Collins (2001) matrix only one out of the nine, met all eight indicators and reached the fourth stage. Principal A1 met seven of the indicators while Principal E3 provided the language and also the examples. The
indicator that set them both apart from the rest of the pool of participants, was simply they both had *Unwavering Resolve*. Examples of unwavering resolve:

Principal A1: “We can feel great that we are meeting AYP every year and 85% plus kids are meeting and exceeding, but that does not translate…beyond high school…the faculty knows that is my ambition and my vision for us as a community. That we can really expand the universe in a way we haven’t thought before.” “I think we need to push our kids and push our community and be a little more global in their thinking.”

Principal E3: “At that time the school was suffering…in particular the leadership when I first got here…it had to go through a lot of changes to get (School E3) on the right track and getting the right people hired.” “Connection is vital…when children and families are involved the children do better.”

According to Jim Collins (2001), the *Hedgehog Concept*, is what sets the organization apart, for Principal E3 and her school it was clear:

I’ll tell you I have been here since 77, we have not experienced the white flight. People want to come (District 3). I have this program, it starts from the very first day of school…the goal is reading at home. What the children do is read and parents write down the name of the book. The author, how many pages…I tally for the entire school. People thought I was nuts because it is a lot of work. The goal is to get 176 points…picture books are worth 1 point, novels every ten pages are worth 1 point…so I tally this. It’s a lot of work but it’s worth it. I had some children by the
end of year with 3,000 points. Now the carrot, I took 280 children who met the goal…to a gymnastic club…and we party…it’s a 30,000 square foot unit, there are pits, there’s climbing walls, there are inflatables, the team performs for them and there is a pizza party.”

What was further unique was that this task was not delegated to any other staff member. Principal E3 tracks the students and uses the Read-A-Thon for progress monitoring of her students. This quality control process is used by Principal E3 to drive her conversations with teachers and parents. According to this Principal E3 reports:

“I’m really trying to get the kids who don’t read to read and I have so many parents who say thank you so much for having this program…once they see how much fun reading is they just soak it up.

Tables 36 and 37 underscore the final analysis of the first round of coding using the Collins Good to Great framework. Even though each participant was at different stages of the spectrum, the table synthesizes the participants, their tenure in years, their assigned stage or phase, and schools 2010 ISAT Composite. Participants stating that their schools were impacted by gentrification, Principal D3 and F1 both had a drop in their ISAT composite and one did not meet Federal Requirements or AYP (Annual Yearly Progress). School G1 had no AYP data because it’s an Early Childhood Center. However Principal G1 admitted that the district has hired a private firm to check the residency of all applicants. School D3, G1, and F1 had the closest proximity to the City of Chicago and therefore had the largest report of influx of students as well as a drop in academic achievement.
### Table 36

**Jim Collins (2001) Good to Great Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Tenure (Yrs.)</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Assigned Stage</th>
<th>2010 ISAT Composite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal A1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal B2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal C3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal D3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal E3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal F1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal G1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal H2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal I2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 37

**Code Families adapted from Jim Collins Good to Great Level 5 Leadership (2001)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE FAMILY</th>
<th>RELATED CODES</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Duality of Professional Will and Personal Humility | Acts as a buffer  
Humble  
A catalyst  
Courageous | A1,C3,D3,E3,F1,G1,H2,I2 |
| Ambition for Success of Company       | Puts school first  
Encourages professionalism  
Promotes leadership  
Values building capacity  
Shows concern for successor | A1,D3,E3,I2 |
| Compelling Modesty                   | Gives credit  
Takes blame  
Supports teachers  
Is under-stated | A1,C3,D3,E3,F1,G1,H2,I2 |
### Coding Using Fullan’s (2006) Turnaround Leadership Framework

The second round of coding utilized the framework of *Turnaround Leadership*. For this analysis data from the largest minority group of the school will be compared against the majority or Caucasian student subgroup to see if the participants have managed to reduce the academic or achievement gap. According to Michael Fullan (2006),

> Culture does not change by mandate; they change by specific displacement of existing norms, structures, and processes by others; the process of cultural depends fundamentally on modeling the new values and behavior that you expect to displace the existing one. (p. 57)
Fullan further elaborates the “real reform agenda is to reduce the income gap between the highest and lowest earners in society…When public education seriously underfunds the poor, it puts the schools in question in a position of perpetuating the problem through their inability to get the education to do its share of gap reduction by improving the educational achievement of the disadvantage” (p. 71). Fullan maintains that students in poverty require additional funding, “commonly accepted as a 40% increase.”

Table 38 illustrates the percentage of students meeting and exceeding the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) for a three year trend. District 2, the most underfunded had the lowest performance of all three districts. District 3 the wealthiest of the three districts had not only the highest percentage of students in the meets/exceed category but also a consistent upward three year trend.

Table 38

| Participating Districts’ ISAT Meet/Exceed Comparison Expressed in Percentages |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------------------|
| District        | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | Participants     |
| District 1      | 76   | 80   | 78   | A1, F1, G1       |
| District 2      | 60   | 60   | 63   | B2, H2, I2       |
| District 3      | 88   | 89   | 89   | C3, D3, E3       |

Table 39 showcases the Reading categories utilized by the State of Illinois’s ISAT to further illustrate that District 3 had the highest number of students in the exceed category in Reading, while District 2 had the lowest of students in the Exceed category and the largest number of students in the “Warning” category.
Table 39

Participating Districts’ 2010 ISAT Percentage of 8th Grade at Each Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Reading Exceed</th>
<th>Reading Meets</th>
<th>Reading Below</th>
<th>Reading Warning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: From http://iirc.niu.edu: Retrieved on December 6, 2010.*

Principals were asked to elaborate on their five top priorities for their schools to assess whether the achievement gap was targeted. Principals’ priorities are listed below followed with detailed tables of the achievement of their largest minority groups. Tables differ due to differences in minority groups or low number of certain subgroups, including White population, particularly participants from District 2. Data was again derived from the Illinois Interactive Report Card retrieved on December 6, 2010.

**Principal A1**

Question: What are the top five priorities for the school?

Answer: Our biggest areas of educational concern for the school are reading for our Special Education population…that’s really our big issue educationally. Our kids do extremely well, when you look at our data our Low Income students in all our subgroups do as well as our Caucasian kids across the board…The other issues, we are introducing PBIS this year…our big huge issue are tardy to class, disrespectful behavior in the classroom…those are our huge issues…My part of what we are trying to accomplish with PBIS is peaceful conflict resolution.
Table 40

*School A1’s ISAT Achievement Gap Between Hispanics versus Whites Expressed in Percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7th Reading</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Math</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Science</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Reading</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Math</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 41

*School A1’s ISAT Achievement Gap Between Low Income versus Non Low Income Expressed in Percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7th Reading</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Math</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Science</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Reading</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Math</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 42

*School A1’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Reading Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>% Exceed</th>
<th>% Meets</th>
<th>% Below</th>
<th>% Warning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 43

School A1’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Math Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>% Exceed</th>
<th>% Meets</th>
<th>% Below</th>
<th>% Warning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: From http://iirc.niu.edu: Retrieved on December 6, 2010.*

Principal B2

Question: What are the top five priorities for the school?

Answer: Our educational initiatives are built around ELL issues.

Table 44

School B2’s Percentage of Meets and Exceed of Hispanics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd Reading</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Math</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Reading</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Math</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Science</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Reading</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Math</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Reading</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Math</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: From http://iirc.niu.edu: Retrieved on December 6, 2010.*
Table 45

School B2’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Reading Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>% Exceed</th>
<th>% Meets</th>
<th>% Below</th>
<th>% Warning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: From http://iirc.niu.edu: Retrieved on December 6, 2010.*

Table 46

School B2’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Math Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>% Exceed</th>
<th>% Meets</th>
<th>% Below</th>
<th>% Warning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: From http://iirc.niu.edu: Retrieved on December 6, 2010.*

Principal C3

Question: What are the top five priorities for the school?

Answer: We implemented the PBIS program here…this building doesn’t have any (self contained classrooms)…kids haven’t been that inclusive so we’re looking at being more inclusive…Everyone having the same amount of empathy towards all children isn’t there so those are the current priorities I would say.
Table 47

School C3’s ISAT Achievement Gap Between Black versus White Expressed in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd Reading</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Math</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Reading</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Math</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Science</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Reading</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Math</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 48

School C3’s ISAT Achievement Gap Between IEP versus Non IEP Expressed in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd Reading</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Math</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Reading</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Math</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Science</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Reading</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Math</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 49

School C3’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Reading Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>% Exceed</th>
<th>% Meets</th>
<th>% Below</th>
<th>% Warning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 50

School C3’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Math Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>% Exceed</th>
<th>% Meets</th>
<th>% Below</th>
<th>% Warning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Principal D3

Question: What are the five top priorities for the school?

Answer: We’re doing PBIS and that was a big focus for part of this year…Of course trying to close the achievement gap in a district like ours where you have kids who either because they are low income or because color of their skin are more likely to struggle…Let me see…we had a real focus trend to stretch kids at the top end… we have a full time Gifted teacher working with them…RTI we really are at the beginning.
Table 51

School D3’s ISAT Achievement Gap Between Black versus White Expressed in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd Reading</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Math</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Reading</td>
<td>-59</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Math</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Science</td>
<td>-52</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Reading</td>
<td>-43</td>
<td>-59</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Math</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 52

School D3’s ISAT Achievement Gap Between Low Income versus Non Low Income Expressed in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd Reading</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Math</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Math</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Reading</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Math</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 53

School D3’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Reading Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>% Exceed</th>
<th>% Meets</th>
<th>% Below</th>
<th>% Warning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 54

School D3’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Math Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>% Exceed</th>
<th>% Meets</th>
<th>% Below</th>
<th>% Warning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Principal E3

Question: What are the top five priorities for the school?

Answer: My priorities, it’s very important the children feel connected with the school. That the families feel connected with the school. When people feel connected they want to be involved, the children do better, because their parents and family are supporting the school making that vital connection vital. Another priority is making sure that every child is successful, what that means is we take them wherever they are no matter how low or how high and move them to the next level…through differentiation…whatever is
needed to move that child from point A to point B. Another priority for me is that I hire the right people.

Table 55

*School E3’s ISAT Achievement Gap Between Black versus White Expressed in Percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd Reading</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Math</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Reading</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Math</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Science</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Reading</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-56</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Math</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 56

*School E3’s ISAT Achievement Gap between Low Income versus Non Low Income Expressed in Percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd Reading</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Math</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Reading</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-48</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Math</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Science</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-43</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Reading</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Math</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 57

School E3’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Reading Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>% Exceed</th>
<th>% Meets</th>
<th>% Below</th>
<th>% Warning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 58

School E3’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Math Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>% Exceed</th>
<th>% Meets</th>
<th>% Below</th>
<th>% Warning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Principal F1**

Question: What are the top five priorities for the school?

Answer: We don’t have a strong program for ESL or bilingual population for Spanish or Polish…I have had to hire two bilingual teachers.
Table 59

*School F1’s ISAT Achievement Gap of Hispanic versus White Expressed in Percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd Reading</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Math</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Reading</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Math</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Science</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Reading</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Math</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Reading</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Math</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: From http://iirc.niu.edu: Retrieved on December 6, 2010.*

Table 60

*School F1’s ISAT Achievement Gap Between Low Income versus Non Low Income Expressed in Percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd Reading</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Math</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Reading</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Math</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Science</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Reading</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Math</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Reading</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Math</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: From http://iirc.niu.edu: Retrieved on December 6, 2010.*
Table 61

School F1’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Reading Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>% Exceed</th>
<th>% Meets</th>
<th>% Below</th>
<th>% Warning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 62

School F1’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Math Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>% Exceed</th>
<th>% Meets</th>
<th>% Below</th>
<th>% Warning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Principal G1

Question: What are the top five priorities for the school?

Answer: It would be literacy, social emotional growth for our students. English language acquisition for our students who are not English speakers for kindergarten, plenty on their plate…I would say getting our parents involved…get the parents aware of what our expectations are here.
Table 63

School G1’s Achievement Gap Hispanic versus White

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-K</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 64

School G1’s Low Income versus Non Low Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-K</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Principal H2

Question: What are the top five priorities for the school?

Answer: Well to provide a safe learning environment, promoting respect toward one another, promote responsibility and safety, maintain a positive climate, to reteach expectations and lastly I think to support our staff.

Table 65

School H2’s ISAT’s Achievement Gap Between Hispanic versus White Expressed in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7th Reading</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Math</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Science</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Reading</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Math</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 66

School H2’s ISAT’s Achievement Gap Between Black versus Hispanic Expressed in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7th Reading</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Math</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Science</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Reading</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Math</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 67

School H2’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Reading Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>% Exceed</th>
<th>% Meets</th>
<th>% Below</th>
<th>% Warning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 68

School H2’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Math Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>% Exceed</th>
<th>% Meets</th>
<th>% Below</th>
<th>% Warning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Principal I2**

**Question:** What are the top five priorities for the school?

**Answer:** With improvement in these five areas, we believe that we can attract families who are currently paying tuition for their children to attend private schools. The first one is literacy reading. Literacy writing, mathematics, I would say science and improving school climate and culture.

Table 69

*School I2’s ISAT Achievement Gap Between Low Income versus Non Low Income Expressed in Percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd Reading</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Math</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Reading</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Math</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Science</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Reading</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Math</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Reading</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Math</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Writing</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 70

*School I2’s 2010 Subgroup ISAT Reading Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>% Exceed</th>
<th>% Meets</th>
<th>% Below</th>
<th>% Warning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 71

School’s I2 2010 Subgroup ISAT Math Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>% Exceed</th>
<th>% Meets</th>
<th>% Below</th>
<th>% Warning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: From http://iirc.niu.edu: Retrieved on December 6, 2010

Summary of Fullan’s (2006) Turnaround Leadership Coding

Using the answers provided by the principals, Table 72 charts the frequency distribution of the participants using the second phase of coding. Again this leadership calls for the creation of schools that will alter the current model to improve the quality of life for all students. According to Fullan (2006) the leader’s role is to create change agents for the sole purpose of increasing collaboration, initiative, and accountability of the school. Principal A1, C3, D3, E3, and G1 gave answers and provided the evidence that places them in many of Fullan’s blueprint for Turnaround Leadership. Principal E3 was the only participant that provided the language and data that met all of Fullan’s requirements to be a successful turnaround leader. Tables 73 and 74 reveals that even the most experienced and able principal still cannot eliminate the achievement gap at the highest level of achievement, the ISAT exceed category.
Table 72

**Turnaround Leadership Philosophies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FULLAN’S MODEL OF TURNAROUND</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Define closing the gap as the overarching goal.</td>
<td>A1, C3, D3, E3, F1, G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend initially to the three basics (Literacy, Numeracy, and Emotional Health).</td>
<td>A1, B2, C3, D3, E3, F1, G1, H2, I2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be driven by tapping into people’s dignity and sense of respect.</td>
<td>A1, E3, G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that the best people are working on the problem.</td>
<td>A1, C3, D3, E3, F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize that all successful strategies are socially based and action oriented.</td>
<td>E3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume that lack of capacity is the initial problem and then work on it continuously.</td>
<td>A1, E3, F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay the course through continuity of good direction by leveraging leadership.</td>
<td>E3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build internal accountability linked to external accountability.</td>
<td>A1, C3, E3, F3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish conditions for the evolution of positive pressure.</td>
<td>A1, C3, E3, F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build public confidence.</td>
<td>A1, C3, E3, F1, G1, I2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 73

**Participants’ Black Students Exceeding in 2010 ISAT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Reading % Exceed</th>
<th>Math % Exceed</th>
<th>Science % Exceed</th>
<th>Writing % Exceed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal A1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal B2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal C3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal D3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal E3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal F1</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal G1</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal H2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal I2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Illinois</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 74

Participants’ Hispanic Students Exceeding in 2010 ISAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Reading % Exceed</th>
<th>Math % Exceed</th>
<th>Science % Exceed</th>
<th>Writing % Exceed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal A1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal B2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal C3</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal D3</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal E3</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal F1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal G1</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal H2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal I2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Illinois</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Di Primio (1988) Coding Analysis

The third phase of coding uses the Di Primio (1988) Turnaround Corporate Management model illustrated by Table 75. Di Primio’s model creates an archetype that corporations utilize to bring the organization back to profit. Di Primio defines corporate turnaround management as a process that involves establishing accountability, conducting diagnostic analyses, setting up an information system, preparing action plans, taking action, and evaluating results. Turnaround can be introduced at several stages of the corporate cycle. For instance, smart turnaround, primarily the first type of turnaround, is introduced when the firm starts to decline. The second type, just-in-time (JIT) turnaround, is used when the firm is facing continually declining performance and profitability. The third and most drastic type, survival turnaround, is when the organization is already losing profitability and performance for a longer period of time.
Using the principals’ responses the type of turnaround strategy will be made evident and assessed for each participant. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) will be evaluated in detail for each participant. It should be noted that AYP is only provided for grades 3rd through 8th and when a school has a subgroup with less than 25 students, the Illinois State Report Card does not provide data. Under those scenarios (No Data) will be indicated. Since the Illinois State Report Card of each school includes the 2008-09 Instructional Expenditure Per Pupil, a return on investment will also be utilized to gauge whether the school leaders are turning their organization around or being impacted in some negative way from the increase diversity and gentrification.

Table 75

*Di Primio’s (1988) Turnaround Corporate Management*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUSINESS/CORPORATE TURNAROUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SMART TURNAROUND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. JUST-IN-TIME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SURVIVAL MODEL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Principal A1**

Question: Is your school on academic watch list?

Answer: No we are not.

Question: Is your school on academic warning list?

Answer: No we are not.
Table 76

School A1’s Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) Report 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>Percent Tested Reading</th>
<th>Percent Tested Math</th>
<th>Exceed/Met AYP in Reading</th>
<th>Exceed/Met AYP in Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Status: According to Illinois School Report Card School A1 did not make AYP in the year 2010 due to the Reading scores of IEP Subgroup or Students with Disability (52.2 percent met).

Table 77

School A1’s Turnaround Phase

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smart Turnaround</td>
<td>“Our biggest areas of educational concern for the school are reading for our special education population”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just-in-Time</td>
<td>“We’re introducing PBIS this year…are big issues is tardy to class, disrespectful behavior in the classroom”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival Model</td>
<td>“You live in a block away from the city, but there is definitely a psychological divide…there’s a certain amount of alarm amongst the old time families that elements from Chicago are moving into the community”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The whole xenophobic thing is definitely a factor”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 78

*School A1’s Return on Investment in Reading and Math (Student Per Pupil Expenditure divided by the Average/Composite of Reading and Math ISAT Percent of Students that Met/Exceeded 2010 ISAT) by AYP Subgroups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>Return on Investment in ($)</th>
<th>Per Pupil Expenditure</th>
<th>Percent Exceed Met AYP in Reading</th>
<th>Percent Exceed Met AYP in Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>$72.33</td>
<td>$6,756</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>$6,756</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>$77.21</td>
<td>$6,756</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>$6,756</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>$109.14</td>
<td>$6,756</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>$77.75</td>
<td>$6,756</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: From http://iirc.niu.edu: Retrieved on December 6, 2010.*

**Principal B2**

Question: Is your school on the academic watch list?

Answer: No

Question: Is your school on the academic warning list?

Answer No
Table 79

School B2’s Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) Report 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>Percent Tested Reading</th>
<th>Percent Tested Math</th>
<th>Exceed Met AYP in Reading</th>
<th>Exceed Met AYP in Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: From http://iirc.niu.edu; Retrieved on December 6, 2010.

Status: According to Illinois School Report Card School B2 did not make AYP in the year 2010 due to the Reading scores of Students with Disability (25.5% met) and Math scores of Hispanics (71.7% met), Students with Disability (30.4% met), and Economically Disadvantage (71.3% met).

Table 80

School B2’s Turnaround Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Smart Turnaround</th>
<th>Hiring a “higher percentage of younger teachers”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Just-in-Time</td>
<td>“Our educational initiatives are built around ELL strategies”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Some of our students from Chicago have some educational deficits that we find a challenge but continue to work on this.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival Model</td>
<td>“There has probably not been a significant rise but we have seen more African American students from Chicago since I came here four years ago. They have learned to adjust to our school culture…we had open conversation with staff reminding everyone that different cultures may have different levels of acceptance of different behaviors”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 81

_School B2’s Return on Investment in Reading and Math (Student Per Pupil Expenditure divided by the Average/Composite of Reading and Math ISAT Percent of Students that Met/Exceeded 2010 ISAT) by AYP Subgroups_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>Return on Investment in ($)</th>
<th>Per Pupil Expenditure</th>
<th>Percent Exceed Met AYP in Reading</th>
<th>Percent Exceed Met AYP in Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>$5,154</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>$5,154</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>$80.22</td>
<td>$5,154</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>$93.03</td>
<td>$5,154</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>$184.40</td>
<td>$5,154</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>$80.34</td>
<td>$5,154</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Principal C3**

Question: Is your school on the academic watch list?

Answer: No

Question: Is your school on the academic warning list?

Answer: No
Table 82

*School C3’s Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) Report 2010*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>Percent Tested Reading</th>
<th>Percent Tested Math</th>
<th>Exceed Met AYP in Reading</th>
<th>Exceed Met AYP in Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 83

*School C3’s Turnaround Phase*

| Smart Turnaround                                                                 | “So the district has had a huge drive to recruit minority hire.”
|                                                                               | “We’re looking at being more inclusive”
|                                                                               | “I think I have a male teacher at every grade level”
|                                                                               | “I’m trying to get them to be teacher leaders”
|                                                                               | “Staff collaboration is huge. I collaborate huge with my staff.”
| Just-in-Time                                                                 | “we implemented the PBIS program”
|                                                                               | “We are working on also looking at a variety of ways technology can assist with RTI”
|                                                                               | “All day kindergarten”
| Survival Model                                                               | “Everybody having the same amount of empathy towards all children isn’t there”
|                                                                               | “We struggle with because the district has always self contain classrooms”
|                                                                               | “There are a lot of people who are afraid to speak up”
|                                                                               | “They (African Americans) are very different…chances are they are from a single parent home”
Table 84

*School C3’s Return on Investment in Reading and Math (Student Per Pupil Expenditure divided by the Average/Composite of Reading and Math ISAT Percent of Students that Met/Exceeded 2010 ISAT) by AYP Subgroups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>Return on Investment in ($)</th>
<th>Per Pupil Expenditure</th>
<th>Percent Exceed Met AYP in Reading</th>
<th>Percent Exceed Met AYP in Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>$81.55</td>
<td>$7,911</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>$103.41</td>
<td>$7,911</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>$7,911</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>$7,911</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>$98.88</td>
<td>$7,911</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>$137.58</td>
<td>$7,911</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Principal D3**

Question: Is your school on the academic watch list?

Answer: No

Question: Is your school on the academic warning list?

Answer: No
Table 85

School D3’s Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) Report 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>Percent Tested Reading</th>
<th>Percent Tested Math</th>
<th>Exceed Met AYP in Reading</th>
<th>Exceed Met AYP in Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 86

School D3’s Turnaround Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Smart Turnaround</th>
<th>“Even though we’re not in warning and not required to do a School Improvement Plan…schools do a School Improvement Plan, that’s something that teachers and parents work on together.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Of course trying to close the achievement gap in a district like ours, where you have kids who either have kids who either because they are low income or because of color of their skin are more likely to struggle to meet standards, that is a huge priority”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just-in-Time</td>
<td>“We are doing PBIS…the year before we started an anti-bullying effort…Olweus Anti-Bullying System that we folded into PBIS.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“RTI we really are the beginning and building it at a district”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Stretch kids at the top end, again in a community like this you have plenty of high achievers and you can’t pay attention to the kids that are struggling to get a 3 on ISAT.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We have a full time gifted teacher…trying to squeeze the most we can out of that program.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Our number one goal is to make sure that every teacher has the skills and tools to be differentiating in their classroom”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Survival Model              | “I will tell you not to stereotype or generalize but more kids that come from Chicago who probably going to struggle immediately trying to meet our expectation” |
|                             | “Kids coming from Chicago…moving into the rental units…are more likely to come behind and likewise need some of those interventions we have in place trying to close the gap.” |
|                             | “What we have found using the test prep stuff as the basis in math, is that it just helps kids kind of make connection” |
|                             | “Renters coming in right before schools starts…we have some won’t even have a lease till September…they register late.” |
Table 87

School D3’s Return on Investment in Reading and Math (Student Per Pupil Expenditure divided by the Average/Composite of Reading and Math ISAT Percent of Students that Met/Exceeded 2010 ISAT) by AYP Subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>Return on Investment in ($)</th>
<th>Per Pupil Expenditure</th>
<th>Percent Exceed Met AYP in Reading</th>
<th>Percent Exceed Met AYP in Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>$99.51</td>
<td>$7,911</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>$113.01</td>
<td>$7,911</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>$7,911</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>$7,911</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>$109.87</td>
<td>$7,911</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>$110.64</td>
<td>$7,911</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Principal E3

Question: Is your school on the academic watch list?

Answer: No

Question: Is your school on the academic warning list?

Answer: No
### Table 88

**School E3’s Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) Report 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>Percent Tested Reading</th>
<th>Percent Tested Math</th>
<th>Exceed Met AYP in Reading</th>
<th>Exceed Met AYP in Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: From http://iirc.niu.edu: Retrieved on December 6, 2010.*

**Status:** According to Illinois School Report Card School E3 made AYP in the year 2010.

### Table 89

**School E3’s Turnaround Phase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Smart Turnaround</th>
<th>“I’m the role model for my students and my staff, as a result of that is very important that I remain positive no matter what.” “It’s just that’s my job to guide.” “As you look at the criminal system jails you look at the Special Ed. And how many minorities are in Special Ed, you know there’s a reason why I’m here, see at my black face and I told them…there is a reason why I’m here.” “After school, well we adjust to the child, before school, lunchtime, after school and time is usually only a half an hour…my staff is like a luscious cake you know it’s amazing, and then the tutoring is like icing on the cake” “When you connect with a child you learn their name because they are uniquely different than any other child you are going to meet.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---
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Table 89 (continued)

| Just-in-Time | “I had to go through a lot of changes to get (School E3) on the right track and getting the right people hired.”
|             | “it’s very important that children feel connected with the school”
|             | “That’s why is so important in the interview process to get at the core of what the candidates want and what they can help us with.”
|             | “Another goal I have is a Read-a-thon... because the more you read at home, the better you read and oh my goodness it helps everything.”

| Survival Model | “Don’t know, I’m sure they found other places to live.”

Table 90

*School E3’s Return on Investment in Reading and Math (Student Per Pupil Expenditure divided by the Average/Composite of Reading and Math ISAT Percent of Students that Met/Exceeded 2010 ISAT) by AYP Subgroups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>Return on Investment in ($)</th>
<th>Per Pupil Expenditure</th>
<th>Percent Exceed Met AYP in Reading</th>
<th>Percent Exceed Met AYP in Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>$82.83</td>
<td>$7,911</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>$96.47</td>
<td>$7,911</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>$7,911</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>$7,911</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>$114.65</td>
<td>$7,911</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>$102.74</td>
<td>$7,911</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Principal F1**

Question: Is your school on the academic watch list?

Answer: No

Question: Is your school on the academic warning list?

Answer: We didn’t make AYP this year.

Table 91

*School F1’s Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) Report 2010*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>Percent Tested Reading</th>
<th>Percent Tested Math</th>
<th>Exceed Met AYP in Reading</th>
<th>Exceed Met AYP in Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Status: According to Illinois School Report Card School F1 did not make AYP in the year 2010. Hispanics (67.9 met) and Economically Disadvantaged students (64.8 met) did not meet AYP in Reading.
### School F1’s Turnaround Phase

| Smart Turnaround | “The big elephant in the room is that we make AYP”  
|                  | “We have two teachers that went back and got their ESL endorsements”  
| Just-in-Time     | “behavioral system…it’s teaching teachers how to work with children…build relationships”  
|                  | “I just attended a conference in Chicago on differentiation”  
|                  | “We are starting PBIS in our school this is our 1st implementation”  
|                  | “Working as a team, our former ESL teacher would go in and work with our 1st graders and he did Countries Around the World”  
|                  | “We started a new curriculum this year we bought Harcourt K-6 Journeys.”  
|                  | “We have started studying Study Island, it’s online but we only used it with our afterschool program.”  
|                  | “I have a Doctoral student coming in to work with our 4th grader classroom on Spanish cognates in science…her premise is that these words we use in science are very close to Spanish”  
| Survival Model   | “Sometimes they have IEPs or ESL or ELL bilingual education so what we have are special programs for that but right now we do not have a strong ESL or Bilingual population for Spanish and for Polish”  
|                  | “The last couple of years it’s been doubling up or tripling up to live with parents and or relatives”  
|                  | “we are seeing a lot of people coming from Chicago”  
|                  | “since two years we had a lot of people retire. We had seven retire so that brought down the staff age average lower”  
|                  | “We usually did not have to tell them how to use the washroom or tell them how to be quiet in an assembly”  

Table 93

*School F1’s Return on Investment in Reading and Math (Student Per Pupil Expenditure divided by the Average/Composite of Reading and Math ISAT Percent of Students that Met/Exceeded 2010 ISAT) by AYP Subgroups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>Return on Investment in ($)</th>
<th>Per Pupil Expenditure</th>
<th>Percent Exceed Met AYP in Reading</th>
<th>Percent Exceed Met AYP in Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>$79.95</td>
<td>$6,756</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>$6,756</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>$94.55</td>
<td>$6,756</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>$150.13</td>
<td>$6,756</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>$108.97</td>
<td>$6,756</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>$94.62</td>
<td>$6,756</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: From http://iirc.niu.edu: Retrieved on December 6, 2010.*

**Principal G1**

Question: Is your school on the academic watch list?

Answer: Does not apply because we are an Early Childhood Building.

Question: Is your school on the academic warning list?

Answer: Does not apply.
Table 94

School G1’s Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) Report 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>Percent Tested Reading</th>
<th>Percent Tested Math</th>
<th>Exceed Met AYP in Reading</th>
<th>Exceed Met AYP in Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: From http://iirc.niu.edu: Retrieved on December 6, 2010.*

Table 95

School G’s Turnaround Phase

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smart Turnaround</td>
<td>“I have hired two other Spanish speaking people, so now our building out of 15 people we have four are Spanish speaking people and I think that’s really important to make our parents feel comfortable”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“My first year that I was here I hired a Polish speaking bilingual teacher…so I feel that we have the important two languages covered in this building and can communicate with parents.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Just-in-Time</td>
<td>“A lot of teachers taking Spanish classes or taking CDs out of the Library so they can learn a little…they understand how limited they are in communicating with parents”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“this is the first year our school is offering Bilingual Kindergarten”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“found enough money from Title I to purchase every single aspect of this Journey curriculum”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“We are definitely seeing more new immigrants from Latin American and Eastern Europe. I have yet not see too many middle class Caucasians”
“District has hired a firm to verify residences”
“We have a significant Hispanic population that is increasing and nonnative population that is increasing”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>Return on Investment in ($)</th>
<th>Per Pupil Expenditure</th>
<th>Percent Exceed Met AYP in Reading</th>
<th>Percent Exceed Met AYP in Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>$6,756</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>$6,756</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>$6,756</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>$6,756</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>$6,756</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>$6,756</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Principal H2**

Question: Is your school on the academic watch list?

Answer: Yes it is.

Question: Is your school on the academic warning list?

Answer: Yes
### Table 97

**School H2’s Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) Report 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>Percent Tested Reading</th>
<th>Percent Tested Math</th>
<th>Exceed Met AYP in Reading</th>
<th>Exceed Met AYP in Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Status:** According to Illinois School Report Card School H2 did not make AYP in the year 2010. Whites (60.6 met), Hispanics (63.4), LEP (33.8 met), IEP (33.2 met) and Economically Disadvantaged (62.6 met) did not meet AYP in Reading. LEP students (53.5 met) did not meet AYP in Math.

### Table 98

**School H2’s Turnaround Phase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Smart Turnaround</th>
<th>“I believe in being a team player, shared leadership amongst the team of 11. I listen to suggestions before making final decisions.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Just-in-Time     | “increasing student population would hopefully result in more teaching positions to prevent overcrowding.”  
“ESL teacher is now teaching on block of Language Arts.”  
“School H implements the PBIS System to teach, reward, and celebrate positive student behavior.”  |
“Our budget was dramatically reduced for 2009-10 school year”
“We have always have large class sizes and our numbers continue to increase not decrease.”
“Lastly gangs in District 2 obviously have an influence on School H2’s students. Instead of focusing on their academic responsibilities, many of these students are channeling their energy elsewhere.”
“About thirteen percent of all disciplinary incidents this year were related to gang activity.”

Table 99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>Return on Investment in ($)</th>
<th>Per Pupil Expenditure</th>
<th>Percent Met AYP in Reading</th>
<th>Percent Met AYP in Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>$83.40</td>
<td>$5,154</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>$109.66</td>
<td>$5,154</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>$78.69</td>
<td>$5,154</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>$118.08</td>
<td>$5,154</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>$144.78</td>
<td>$5,154</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>$78.92</td>
<td>$5,154</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Principal I2

Question: Is your school on the academic watch list?

Answer: No

Question: Is your school on the academic warning list?
Answer: We didn’t make AYP this year.

Table 100

School I2’s Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP) Report 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>Percent Tested Reading</th>
<th>Percent Tested Math</th>
<th>Exceed Met AYP in Reading</th>
<th>Exceed Met AYP in Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Status: According to Illinois School Report Card School I2 did not make AYP in the year 2010. Hispanics did not meet AYP in Reading (57.4 met).

Table 101

School I2’s Turnaround Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Smart Turnaround</th>
<th>“We believe we can attract families who are currently paying tuition for their children to attend private schools.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I believe in shared decision making, collaboration, setting an example for a good work ethic”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“more proactive in establishing community relations and partnership building with more organizations.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 101 (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Just-in-Time</th>
<th>“We are in the process of improving our first impressions of visual appeal…there is some trepidation for families and public schools.” “Consequently there is more residents working with the police and community outreach programs.” “Many realize the need for promoting our school. We have the mindset that we are essentially a business. All the fundamentals of business come into play: customer service, marketing, supply and demand, relationship building, and finished product; test scores.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survival Model</td>
<td>“Families have moved further west or in other suburbs away from what is now a very expensive District neighborhood. Our immigrant population are finding it very hard to live in District” “We must evolve to survive.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 102**

*School 12’s Return on Investment in Reading and Math (Student Per Pupil Expenditure divided by the Average of Reading and Math ISAT Percent of Students that Met/Exceeded 2010 ISAT) by AYP Subgroups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>Return on Investment in ($)</th>
<th>Per Pupil Expenditure</th>
<th>Percent Exceed Met AYP in Reading</th>
<th>Percent Exceed Met AYP in Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>$5,154</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>$103.08</td>
<td>$5,154</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>$75.57</td>
<td>$5,154</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>$94.57</td>
<td>$5,154</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>$90.42</td>
<td>$5,154</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>$76.93</td>
<td>$5,154</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: From http://iirc.niu.edu: Retrieved on December 6, 2010.*
Summary

Nine principals from three school districts that border the City of Chicago were interviewed for this study. The answers to the questions they were asked have been presented in this chapter and coded using Jim Collins’ *Good to Great Model* (2001), Michael Fullan’s *Turnaround Leadership* (2006), and Anthony Di Primio *Corporate Turnaround Model* (1988). In addition ISAT and U.S. Census data have been used to supplement and illuminate participants’ responses and perceptions. In the final Chapter V, a summary, discussion, recommendations, and implications for future studies on the topic of gentrification and its impact on school leadership and school culture are presented. Therefore, the interview responses were analyzed and synthesized with the ISAT trends and common themes to formally answer the questions put forward by this study. The questions were:

1. What are principals’ perceptions of neighborhood gentrification?
2. In what ways do principals perceive their school culture being affected by gentrification?
3. What strategies do principals implement in response to changes in student enrollment caused by gentrification?
4. In what ways do principals perceive their leadership styles being affected by gentrification?
5. What opportunities for improving instructional environment for students do principals believe that gentrification brings to their schools?
CHAPTER V
DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This study examined the perceptions of nine school principals regarding gentrification and its impact on school leadership and school culture. Despite the growth of gentrification in many residential settings, little was known and reported about the perceptions and experiences of school principals concerning this phenomenon. This qualitative study was launched to close this research gap and to gain a sense of perspective from the school principal’s point of view. The primary research question was *how do principals perceive their leadership and school cultures being impacted by gentrification?*

Using qualitative research approach, the researcher interviewed nine active principals in Cook County, Illinois to answer the following research questions:

1. What are principals’ perceptions of neighborhood gentrification?
2. In what ways do principals perceive their school culture being affected by gentrification?
3. What strategies do principals implement in response to student changes in enrollment caused by gentrification?
4. In what ways do principals perceive their leadership styles being affected by gentrification?
5. What opportunities for improving instructional environment for students do principals believe that gentrification brings to their schools?

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze and interpret the data obtained during the interviews in the research study. These data will be triangulated with the literature review from chapter two and data from the Illinois Interactive Report Card website. Then data will be analyzed to see which themes emerged. Finally, in this chapter, limitations of this study and the opportunities for further research will be identified.

**Triangulation**

The data for this study has been analyzed using the three leadership frameworks of Collins (2001), Fullan (2006), and Di Primi (1988), discussed in the literature review in chapter two. In addition, data obtained from the websites of the Illinois Interactive Report Card, State of Illinois School Report Card, and United States Census provided data points for triangulation for analysis and theme construction.

**Data Analysis**

The researcher has identified eight main themes from the data obtained during this qualitative research study. The eight themes are the following:

1. The principals in this study were moderately aware of the impact of gentrification yet lacked a common definition of the phenomenon.
2. The principals in this study cited race as a factor that is a challenge for them.
3. When dealing with the changing demographics, the principals in this study’s primary strategy was strategic hiring or talent acquisition.
4. The principals in this study also relied on afterschool or remedial programs as a method to close the achievement gap.

5. A number of principals in this study had negative perceptions of students enrolling from Chicago Public Schools.

6. The principals in this study perceived a shortage of qualified teachers for their new population as an impediment to effective teaching and learning.

7. The principals in this study perceived the ISAT and NCLB as negatively impacting their school’s culture by labeling them as failures.

8. The principals in this study tended to have a short term focus, such as meeting AYP, versus the development of the whole child over the long term.

Themes

**Theme 1: Principals were moderately aware of the impact of gentrification yet lacked a common definition of the phenomenon.**

Five principals out of a total of nine, acknowledged the impact of gentrification from Chicago or internally within their district. Yet not all shared the same definition. The most common element articulated by the principals was that individuals were displaced.

Principal E3 declared:

I found a lot of the apartment buildings became condos and when that happened a mass exodus of children who were free and reduced and some cases African American children…they had to move…I’m sure they found other places to live, but not in (District 3).
Principal A1 revealed that “there is more mobility than there used to be…when I think of gentrification I think of working families and poverty families being displaced by higher incomes and I don’t see that happening here.” While other principals differed on how they labeled the displaced, such Principal D3’s label of “Section 8 folks” the increase was attributed to coming from Chicago.

Principal D3 further adds:

I do not have any real demographics data, hard numbers to back this up, it is my gut…if you look right across the border into Austin…there are pockets of gentrifications right across the hospital where white families are moving into substantial number of homes and reclaiming blocks.

According to Di Primio (1988) “when a loss of accounts (students in this case) is visible and triggers a loss of confidence,” it is vital to “diagnose, determine and document the root cause of the problems” (p. 61). What seems to be clear is that gentrification experienced by these principals, unlike Kennedy’s (2001) research, is perhaps no longer a neutral phenomenon toward schools.

**Theme 2: Principals cited race as a factor that is a challenge for them.**

Principals in this study were perplexed with the issue of race, in particularly in finding strategies to bring about social cohesion. Principal C3 shared this lack of understanding by sharing the following:

African Americans are probably the one’s most misunderstood…they culturally have different ways of doing things.

Principal B2 further illustrated the racial matrix in her school by sharing the following:
There has probably not been a significant rise but we have seen more African American students from Chicago since I came here four years ago. They have learned to adjust to our school culture, which I am proud to say is based on dignity and respect. I did not change my leadership, but we have an open conversation with the staff reminding everyone that different cultures may have different levels of acceptance of different behaviors. The Hispanic and African American differ in many aspects…any racial issues were dealt with openly and immediately and their parents were informed of any issues.

Principal C3 also offered this perception:

the kids that are coming, lets say from single family homes, African Americans…culturally have different ways of doing things.

In addition to cultural disconnects, Principal F1 further added this perspective:

We had one family that moved out that said, ‘I’m tired of it, I can’t stand the people my landlord is renting to…they’re gang like’, they do not want their children around that so they move out.

Wilkinson (2005) believes that what accounts for the latter is the following: “social cohesion in the more unequal societies has multifaceted negative consequences, in which people who feel humiliated try to repair their sense of selfhood by demonstrating their superiority over more vulnerable groups” (p. 219). Fullan (2006) quoting Gilligan (1996), states that the correlation between violence and social cohesion: “I have yet to see
a serious act of violence that was not provoked by the experience of feeling shame and humiliated, disrespected and ridiculed” (p. 110).

There is also the potential illustrated by Ruby Payne (1997) that: “Hidden rules are the unspoken cues and habits of a group. Distinct cueing systems exist between and among groups and economic classes” (p. 38). Regardless, Fullan (2006) believes that leadership is the key in all this complexity, quoting Kanter (2004), “The fundamental task of the leaders is to develop confidence in advance of victory, in order to attract the investments that make victory possible-money, talent, support, empathy, attention, effort, or people’s best thinking” (p. 19).

Therefore in regards to race, principals should make all stakeholders aware that all students will be treated with dignity and respect. Again all parties should be treated as worthy and all unethical behavior handled accordingly. Finally, principals should pursue what Fullan (2005) calls the three components of moral dimensions or purpose of school leadership, that is “demanding respect, mutual caring, and mutual expectations to contribute to the betterment of the school” (p. 53).

**Theme 3: When dealing with changing demographics principals’ primary strategy was strategic hiring or talent acquisition.**

Both Collins (2001) and Fullan (2006) want leaders to “ensure that the best people are working on the problem” or “get the right people are on the bus.” Many principals in this study were seeking to increase the talent in their perspective schools. Principal F1 highlighted the need in response to the new entrants to the school:
Well when they sometimes have an IEP or ESL…we do not have a
strong program…I have to hire two bilingual teachers. When I hire them,
the first thing I look for is can they do it, are they certified…I’ve only
hired males this year.

Principal C3 added the following:

One goal of our district is for our staff to reflect the population of
students…this year to really promote (the strategy) the district went to all
kind of job fairs, did all kind of fliers, and went to churches all over.

Principal D3 further elaborated:

We are looking for highly qualified minority candidate. I’ve tried to go to
lacies like community civic organizations to get the word out. We have
over five hundred teacher in the district and they know what we are
looking for and they have been a great source of bringing folks to us.
Some through our relationships with institutions that send us student
teachers…but you know that is hit or miss for us, they don’t really have
substantial minority population in their programs.

Principal A1 added the following perspective:

So the community is definitely shifting…I had two teachers who retired
last year we hired replacements that are…very innovative…go above and
beyond the contract.

Larry Bossidy and Ram Charan (2002) agree that there are three realms for the
process of execution of a successful oranization. The first is strategy, the second is
people, and the third is operations. According to Bossidy and Charan, a “robust people process provides a powerful framework based on linkage to strategic plan and its near-, medium-, and long term milestones and the operating plan target” (p. 148). The authors promote the following plan:

1. Developing the leadership pipeline through continuous improvement, succession depth, and reducing retention risk.
2. Deciding what to do about nonperformers.
3. Transforming the mission and operations of HR.

Theme 4: Principals’ also relied on afterschool or remedial programs as a method to close the achievement gap.

Principal D3 shared the following:

Where we put our lion’s share of extra support is trying to make sure we send as many students 3rd grade that are fluent readers, because that research says if we don’t have them reading by then we are really just pushing Jello uphill and that just gets harder and harder. We have a program that goes after school that we call ‘Boost’ that extends the school day…it focuses on reading and math support…ISAT test prep.

Principal F1 contributed the following:

I have brought several after school programs that help kids get ready for the test the ISAT. So it is terrible to say we are teaching to the tests but we have a goal that we want to make sure everybody can learn.
Principal E3 added this perspective:

We have to adjust to the child, before school, lunchtime, and after school.

I explained to my superintendent, that getting the right people is like luscious cake and then the tutoring is like the icing on the cake, because what it does for those children that are not at grade level in reading and math...somebody is there for them and I had it real flexible, one time a week or 4 times a week. I had a little boy who came every day for half an hour from September till March and it really makes a difference.

Collins (2001) quest or pursuit of greatness is at work in several of the schools in this study. Participants focused a great deal of energy not only in talent acquisition but in creating a portfolio of services and programs that increases student achievement. Di Primio (1988) calls this stage “implementing turnaround strategies and evaluating the results” (p.61). Fullan (2006) sees the sense of urgency to get the “basics right by age twelve” (p.46). According to Fullan, the “three legs of the improvement stool” are literacy, numeracy, and emotional intelligence of students. Programs addressing these needs were prevalent in all schools in the study. The researcher and these participants demonstrate behavior that supports Heckman’s (2006) analysis which presents the argument that early interventions targeted toward disadvantage children have much higher returns than later interventions such as reduced pupil-teacher ratios, public job training, convict rehabilitation programs, tuition subsidies, or expenditure on police.
Theme 5: A number of principals had a negative perception of students enrolling from Chicago Public Schools.

Several principals revealed that students from Chicago manifested severe academic and behavior deficits outside the perceived norm.

Principal A1 elaborated:

Unfortunately, I hate the way this sounds…our students that come from Chicago Public Schools tend to have educational gap. Their attendance is spotty; it is not uncommon for us to get a transfer student who has not been in school for three, four, or even six weeks. Getting them up speed socially and culturally who transfer from the city are used to tell us the culture of this school is very different. The way they talk to each other tends not to as advance…there is a cultural shift for some of them too.

Principal B2 also shared:

Some of the students from Chicago have some deficits we find to be a challenge.

Principal D3 further elaborated:

Not to stereotype or generalize, but most kids that come to us from Chicago are going to struggle immediately to meet our expectations…it’s not fault of their own. Not to diss this school’s good name or to put down Chicago Public Schools in general, but again for a whole variety of reasons, kids who come to us are more likely to fall into that gap,
especially kids coming from Chicago need some of those interventions we have in place to try to close the gap.

Fullan (2006) believes that “closing the gap is a system problem that needs a system solution, which you cannot reach if people are constantly sniping at each other” (p. 81). Regardless where children of the poor reside, if we continue to fail at educating them, inequity will persist. According to Gilligan (1996) study of violence, there seems to be a “downward discrimination” or a “kind of kick-the-cat-syndrome” in which educators that feel disrespected “mistreat those who are next in line in the status hierarchy and become unconsciously less caring of the students” (p. 110). Campbell’s (2007) study on entrenched norms of collegiality which “equates ethical treatment of colleagues with a kind of unquestioned loyalty even at the expense of student’s well-being,” further complicates whether the perception Chicago Public School students will ever improve.

**Theme 6: Principals perceived a shortage of qualified teachers for their new population as an impediment to effective teaching and learning.**

Principal C3 added:

The goal has always been to have the staff reflect the population of the students, definitely a goal of our superintendent. Somehow last year, I think there was only one minority hired. This year to really promote, the district went to all kind of job fairs, did all kind of fliers and even recruited in churches all over.
Principal F1 further explained:

We don’t have a strong ESL or Special Education program. I have had to hired two bilingual teachers who will be teaching Spanish to the kids and then one who will be teaching Polish…My former ESL teacher, I placed him into Second grade, a grade he never taught, I think he will be uncomfortable with that.

Principal A1 elaborated further:

Some of the administrator that I work with in the district actually grew up in this town, went to school in this town, got their first teaching job here, they never lived or worked anywhere else …the teachers is the same thing. They never left this area…the community is shifting for example the Hispanic population has tripled the last eight years…you have an old established community who have been here for generations and they like the way things were and whenever things change there is going to be issues around that.

Principal H2 added:

I think the increasing student population would hopefully result in more teaching positions to prevent overcrowding. Large class size was adjusted by altering teachers’ schedules for example an ESL teacher is now teaching one block of Language Arts, the difficulty is find the teachers with both endorsements.

Principal I2 added this perspective:
It all comes down to the economy and fewer teachers. It all boils down to time and resources, there simply isn’t enough of either and this impedes progress in this area.

Collins (2001) argues the getting the “right people on the bus and on the right seat” is extremely crucial. Collins developed three practical disciplines of hiring:

1. When in doubt, don’t hire, keep looking.
2. When you know you need to make a people change, act.
3. Put your best people on your biggest opportunities, not your biggest problems.

(p. 58)

Hence *Good to Great* leaders “began the transformation by first getting the right people on the bus (and the wrong people off the bus) and then figured out where to drive it” (p. 63). Collins (2001) agrees with the old adage that the “right people” are your biggest asset.

**Theme 7: Principals perceived the ISAT and NCLB as negatively impacting their school’s culture and leadership by labeling them as failures.**

Principal F1 stated:

The demographic changes of the school has impacted the school due to all the different regulations the state has especially with the ISAT testing.

We have brought several programs that help kids get ready for the test, it’s terrible to say we are teaching to the test, but we have one goal that we make sure everyone can learn…I think my leadership style has changed, making sure that all students learn, because of the pressure of the ISAT’s,
that's the big elephant in the room, that we make AYP. We didn’t make AYP this time, because our Hispanic population and our low socioeconomic population, that’s never happened to me before.

Principal D3 added:

A district like ours, where you have kids because they are low income or because their color of their skin, are more likely to struggle to meet standards, that is a huge priority. We had a real focus trend to stretch the kids at the top end, again in a community like this you have plenty of high achievers and you can’t just pay attention to the kids who are struggling to a 3 on the ISAT…you need to work with kids who have a 4…we are trying to squeeze the most we can out of programs and resources

Principal A1 added this example:

Our biggest area of educational concern for the school is Reading for our Special Education population, that is really our big issue educationally. Our kids do extremely well, when you look at our test data. Our low income students in all of our subgroups so as well as our Caucasian kids across the board, our special education is still our concern.

Fullan (2006) argues that “the turnaround schools”…represent at best, moving from awful to adequate, with no staying power to continue to improve (p. xii). Fullan further states that “every developed country has specific provisions for intervening…I argue that the turnaround phenomenon is a dangerously narrow and underconceptualized strategy…we need to cast the problem of failing schools in much larger perspective, not
only in the context of the entire educational system but in reference to societal
development as a whole” (p. xii). Jim Collins (2001) stated that “good is the enemy of
great”, and there is no doubt that we need great schools, but policies that label schools
failures may create more injustice and inequities that they can possibly solve. In the final
analysis, what Fullan (2006) labels as the “psychology of failure” hinders schools rather
than transforms them (p. 20).

**Theme 8: Most principals tended to have a short term focus, such as meeting AYP, versus the development of the whole child over the long term.**

Principal I2 elaborated:

> We are more proactive in establishing community relations and partnership building with more organizations. We are in the process of improving our first impressions of visual appeal, which is what seems to be significant in that there is more trepidation for families and public schools. We want our families to see a more vibrant and colorful environment getting away from our industrial age design of the building.

Principal B2 added:

> Our educational initiatives are built around ELL issues.

Principal G1 adds this example:

> I would say getting the parents aware of what the expectations are here of the Early Childhood Center. Some children come here prepared and some parents have no idea their children should have known their letters.

Principal C3 adds this perception:
Kids haven’t been that inclusive…its hard I have parents who have children who are very high achieving and then I have Special Education where the needs are very different…everyone having the same empathy towards all children isn’t there…I have a lot of parents that travel a lot with their jobs and they pull their kids out for a week staff get irate…I tell them it’s a learning experience for their child and you have to think of it as a positive. We have athletics here and its really competitive, right now its softball and baseball season and I tell my staff to please not give too much homework now because its huge part of the community

According to Fullan (2006) there are five main reasons why schools fail:

1. Ineffective Leadership
2. Weak governance
3. Poor Standards of teaching
4. Lack of external support
5. Challenging Circumstances (p.18)

Fullan “through strong, relentless control and discipline (for staff as well as for students) and a deep respect for the welfare of the students” are the “special measures” required to turnaround a school (p. 20). Effective turnaround practice entails the phases proposed by Di Primio (1988). Table 103 illustrates the commonality of the three frameworks, although the language or sequence may differ, to achieve a mid to long term focus on improvement.
Table 103


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish accountability for functional responsibilities.</td>
<td>Good is the enemy of great.</td>
<td>Engage people with expertise and experience in improving underperforming schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct diagnostic analyses to determine and document the root causes of problems.</td>
<td>Level 5 leadership.</td>
<td>Appoint a new head teacher if possible to bring about rapid cultural change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting up a management information system.</td>
<td>First who…then what.</td>
<td>Select a head teacher with strong intrapersonal and interpersonal skill who will accept external support and team solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing action plans.</td>
<td>Confront the brutal facts.</td>
<td>Conduct a thorough review to identify the school’s key weakness and to devise strategies to correct them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing the chosen turnaround strategies.</td>
<td>The Hedgehog Concept</td>
<td>Monitor the implementation of the plan carefully and hold regular reviews of progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating results.</td>
<td>A culture of discipline</td>
<td>Have clear behaviors, tasks, and target for all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology Accelerators. The Flywheel and the Doom Loop. Form Good to Great to Built to Last.</td>
<td>Consider contracting external service providers to undertake specific tasks and function.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the frameworks provided in this study school districts should also focus on the whole child by assuring each school has a culture that ensures the health and well-being of each child. In particular, policies and strategies that not only academically challenge students but also the emotional and social development of each child. The eight
themes that emerged from this study and conceptual ideas discussed in Table 103 were predominately identified and led by the research questions of this study.

**Question 1: What are the principals’ perceptions of neighborhood gentrification?**

To answer the question, one must return to the review of literature. The term gentrification was coined by Ruth Glass (1964) in the early 1960s to define the movement of middle class citizens into lower income enclaves of a city. Maureen Kennedy and Paul Leonard (2001) have further defined gentrification as, “the process by which higher income households displace lower income residents of a neighborhood, changing the essential character and flavor of that neighborhood” (p. 6). Kennedy and Leonard claim that gentrification is neutral when it comes to schools. They contend that many newcomers have no children or look to private schools, thus the latter tend not to bring additional pressure to improve public schools.

Bostic and Martin (2003) add the element of race, as well acknowledging that, “gentrification is often treated as a process that, in addition to more affluent households replacing less affluent households, also involves the displacement of minority households by White households” (p. 24). Logically then the change in population demographics upon one area tends to change the demographics of others as the displaced migrate to new areas. In Chicago, the change in demographics has been acerbated by not only gentrification, which has reversed the pattern of white flight of the 1950s and 1960s, but by policies such as the Chicago Housing Authority Plan of Transformation. According to Vale and Graves (2010), 62% of the residents that were relocated were “hard to house” meaning these families needed a three or four bedroom household. Vale and Graves
study set the stage further with additional statistics of those that were relocated during 1999 to 2007:

- Forty-eight percent of the working age are unemployed.
- Forty-four percent did not complete a high school degree.
- Only 71% of the planned 25,000 units needed to relocate the former residents has been completed.
- Areas that demolished housing projects have seen property values increase from 25 to 40%, pricing out the original tenants. (pp. 8-12)

These studies set the stage for our participants and how they define and view the process of gentrification.

Fifty-five percent (n=5) of the participants self-identified themselves as being impacted by gentrification. These five participants tended to have tenures greater than four years. Twenty-two percent (n=2) stated that gentrification was within their district and 33% (n=3) claimed being impacted from the gentrification occurring within Chicago. Table 104 profiles the participants sorted by their tenure and response to gentrification in their district.

In District 1, principals tended to define gentrification in traditional terms. For example, Principal F1 defines gentrification the following way:

I think it’s (gentrification) great…it helps beautify and clean up the area, but it’s displacing families. They are trying to find affordable housing and where they sometimes go it’s unfortunate. They have lived there twenty
or thirty years and then someone else comes in and they are kicked out, which is sad. But I think gentrification is great…something has to give.

Table 104

*Participant Demographics and Consensus on Gentrification by Tenure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Tenure (Yrs.)</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Gentrification</th>
<th>Largest Minority Group Entering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal A1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Maybe”</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal G1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hispanic and Eastern European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal F1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hispanic, Polish, and Eastern European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal B2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal H2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Not Really”</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal I2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal C3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal D3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal E3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal A1, a colleague of the latter participant defines her working definition of gentrification, as a process of “where working class and poverty families are being displaced by higher incomes.” In contrast for Principal G1 gentrification was personal:

Personally I’m conflicted because where I live the local school was a dump and now is wonderful. On a personal basis, you know I was happy to see gentrification in my neighborhood, because it increased the quality of my school…it’s difficult for low income parents to be pushed out of somewhere they love and have lived. When I worked at (CPS School) that was experiencing gentrification you would walk and see middle class or white parents, but they were not sending their kids to our school, they
were homeschooling or private schooling. Our school had Hispanic students coming to us, I feel that if those white middle class parents had gotten involved they could have improved our school…that would have been better for everybody. To have a class structure that the owners of the buildings not sending their kids to our school and people renting in the buildings send their kids to the school was unfortunate.

Principals in District 2 defined gentrification as a process that was mainly occurring in Chicago rather than within their district. Principal H2 had no opinion of gentrification and according to this participant, “I never gave it much thought but as it increases in our neighboring Chicago area, I could see our numbers continue to rise.” Principal I2 in contrast sees gentrification as a possible culprit of white flight. “Families have moved further west or in other suburbs away from what is now a very expensive (District) neighborhood…Our immigrant families are finding it very hard to live in (District).” Principal B2 who described the school as “a suburban school that is really more like an urban school,” defined gentrification as “change is ever constant.”

In District 3, the three participants shared their working definitions in the following ways:

Principal E3 I found that a lot of the apartment buildings became condos and when that happened there were mass exits of children who were free and reduced and in some cases African American…Unlike Chicago which is very segregated… (District) has always made an effort to keep the district diverse. Show beautiful diversity, keep
beautiful diversity…They really work hard to keep diversity spread out…so you don’t have white flight

Principal D3 For the twenty three years I have been here, not a whole lot of substantial change…there have been concerns at various points in time, if there is some news about some Section 8 housing people at one end get concerned how things might change at the other end, anytime rental properties go condo. There is concern about gentrification, low income folks being priced out…the community has been watchful.

Principal C3 I think communities change all the time. Economics change quite a bit so communities are constantly changing and evolving.

Unlike the traditional definition provided by Kennedy and Leonard (2001), in particular that gentrification is neutral to schools participants reported gaining students, diversity, and an increase of student achievement gaps. Landlords were also blamed for renting to “anybody”, condo conversions were also prevalent in all three districts, especially near the METRA lines that ran through the districts. All three districts had several new residential developments but according to one principal in District 1, families are not being displaced rather they are “doubling and even tripling up.” Another principal in District 1 also detailed that “the second floor is being added to some homes” and then rented. Hence, it seems that those being impacted are adapting and avoiding the displacement caused by gentrification by doubling or tripling up. Participants in this
study tended to view the impact of gentrification into four themes: 1) the fear of white flight; 2) race; 3) academic achievement gaps; and, 4) culture shock.

The concept of white flight resonated in all the districts. Proximity to the city played a role. The schools in this study that bordered the city or 33% (n=3) of the participants tended to experience “white flight” the most. Table 105 indicates the increase in diversity and/or “white flight” in schools closest to the City of Chicago from each three districts.

Table 105

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The theme of white flight was further elaborated by Principal A1:

When a family moves here from Chicago it always cracks me up, because people who have grown up here and lived in this community talk about Chicago like it’s a million miles away…they live a block away from the city but there is definitely a psychological divide…I think that there’s a certain amount of alarm amongst the old time families that elements from Chicago are moving into the community.

Principal D3 illustrates the mood of the community he serves:
If there is news about some Section 8 housing people at one end, people get concerned how things might change at the other end. Any time rental properties go condo there is concern about gentrification and low income folks being priced out. So I would say the community is watchful.

The second theme that arose was race. Eighty-eight percent (n=8) of principals shared their perceptions about the topic of race, with the following statements:

Principal B2  “Hispanic and African American cultures differ in many aspects”

Principal C3  “African Americans are probably the one’s most misunderstood…because they culturally have different ways of doing things”

Principal D3  “a little gentrified pocket across from the hospital…some white families…reclaiming the block…it seems to be isolated rather than spreading like wildfire”

Principal F1  “We had a family that said, I’m tired of the people my landlord is renting to, he doesn’t check references and the people who rent are Hispanic…gang like”

The third theme developed from the interviews dealt with concerns surrounding academic achievement gaps of the newcomers. Seventy eight percent (n=7) of the principals mentioned their concerns around this topic. The following quotes speak directly to this theme:

A1 students that come from Chicago Public Schools tend to be families that have been more mobile and have educational gaps…it is not uncommon
for us to get a transfer student that has been out of school for 3, 4 or even 6 weeks.

C3 they need a lot of support…that is why the male instructor does make a difference for those kids…they need that one on one time.

F1 The big elephant in the room is that we usually make AYP…we didn’t make AYP this year because of our Hispanic population.

The fourth theme mentioned by the participants was culture shock.

Principal A1 So they come in and a lot of them look around and say this place is nice and some say this place is weird…there is a cultural shift for some of them too.

Principal F1 We didn’t usually have to tell them how to use the washroom or tell them how to be quiet in an assembly.

Principal C3 They definitely stand out.

In these three school districts one can argue that gentrification is being redefined. As Principal A1 states, gentrification is an “anti-social term…people tend to be displaced…students on free lunch have skyrocketed.” Kennedy and Leonard (2001) caution against generalizations and the ability to project the phenomenon:

It is a significant challenge to determine which data are truly useful in predicting and acting on gentrification trends…Even if good data at the census tract level were available, these data do not always unambiguously reflect the impact of gentrification. (p. 7)
Finally, there seem to be a tendency for all principals to only look at their backyard. Quite clearly they felt in uncharted waters when dealing with the dilemmas of the newcomers. When it came to the externalities, Principal F1 was quoted that “we really have no control.” Eighty-eight percent of principals (n=8) in this study are still trying to get their arms around gentrification and the changing tide of demographics that it has brought to their school and district. One principal revealed the roadblocks that his district was attempting, “when minorities began to move in they were very active and trying to make sure that it was not a process that got away from them…so they took steps of making sure that “For Sale” signs were not posted in yards so you didn’t have whole blocks of white flight and people getting paranoid…I think that’s the kind of engagement you need…a community should not be a victim of gentrification…gentrification itself does not strike me as a problem except when it runs amuck.”

Participants in this study described gentrification as a process that seems to be morphing into a new phenomenon that challenges the old equilibrium and creates a new social order for their schools and districts. A social order that principals say includes increases of anxiety or fear by many in their communities, increased diversity and issues with race, challenges to meet the academic needs of the newcomers, and the culture shock that the many have as they transition into the schools.

**Question 2: In what ways do principals perceive their school culture being affected by gentrification?**

As discussed earlier, principals shared that their school culture were experiencing issues surrounding racial tensions and student inappropriate behaviors. Peterson and
Deal (2002) define school culture, as the underlining set of norms, values, beliefs, rituals, and traditions that make up the unwritten rules of how to think, feel and act in an organization. According to Peterson and Deal, every organization has a conscious, predictable part of the rules and procedures and so forth, but the school’s culture is often below the stream of consciousness and is really what affects how people interact in an organization. Culture is the unwritten rules about interaction and problem solving and decision-making. Peterson and Deal further point out that a school with a positive school culture is a place with a “shared sense of what is important, a shared ethos of caring and concern, and a shared commitment to helping students learn” (p. 29).

For 55% (n=5) of principals, the fact that the gentry was exiting and “low income folks” were moving in, many from Chicago, rather than being displaced, posed the greatest concerns and demanded additional resources. The latter trend was also accelerated by the fact that principals revealed their teachers lacked the capacity to meet the needs of the newcomers. Table 106 illustrates the rise of poverty in each district for the last five years. Many of the participants also struggled to meet the achievement gaps brought by many of the students enrolling primarily from Chicago Public Schools. Table 107 provides evidence that the achievement gap in Reading as measured by 2010 ISAT.
Table 106

*School Districts’ Low Income Trends 2005-2010 Expressed in Percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 107

*School Districts’ 2010 ISAT Reading (Percent Met/Exceed) Summary of Achievement Gap Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


These data suggest that the school culture is being impacted by the increase of both poverty and achievement gaps, particularly amongst African-Americans. Principals in the study shared their concerns with the achievement gap and rising poverty rate of their school. Several mentioned the teachers lacked of capacity in coping with the changing demographics:

C3 The kids that are coming are from single family homes…my teachers were probably good students when they were a student…they never had to
struggle themselves when they were a student. They cannot relate to children who struggle…I think that’s why change in education is so much harder, their frame of mind makes it really hard for teachers to be more inclusive.

The problem is that we do not have a strong ESL or Bilingual program for our Spanish and Polish students…my former ESL teacher never taught in the program and I had to put him in second grade.

Quite clearly principals are concerned about student performance and students’ future. Chetty (2010) study concurs with the participants that teacher quality matters deeply. Chetty found that the value of an above average teacher in terms of effectiveness, can “impact future individual earnings of 13 percent per standard deviation of achievement yields a present value of $10,600 over a lifetime of work for the average worker” (p. 18). According to the research a “teacher who is one standard deviation from the mean (84th percentile) produces over $400,000 in added earnings for her class of twenty” (p. 18). Chetty extrapolates that if students have an effective teacher the United States would regain dominancy in international math and science tests and calculates that Gross Domestic Product (GDP) would create future increments of GDP in the U.S. of $44 to 112 trillion (p. 21). Further Fullan (2006) warns that the achievement gaps could also impact “social cohesion” (p. 5). Per Fullan, “when inequality is high, anxiety and insecurity take their toll even if one is not aware of them…biological pathways in which recurrent stress affects health are hidden from one’s conscious self…improving the
education for all from day one, and raising the bar and closing the gap, has double payoff for society, namely economic prosperity and social cohesion” (p. 8).

This “social cohesion” element was evident and several principals shared that student behavior was also altering the cultural landscape of the school. One hundred percent (n=9) of the schools recently adopted PBIS as a manifestation of the changing school culture in the schools. “PBIS” is short for Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports. This language comes directly from the 1997 reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). PBIS is a framework or approach for assisting school personnel in adopting and organizing evidence-based behavioral interventions into an integrated continuum that enhances academic and social behavior outcomes for all students.

For the principals in this study, getting a handle on student behavior was critical to teaching and learning. Principal A1 elaborated the need, “we’re introducing PBIS this year our big issues are tardy to class, disrespectful behavior in the classroom, we are trying to use PBIS as a tool for peaceful conflict resolution, although we do not have fighting in school a good number of students tend to think it’s ok to fight outside of school, we are trying to instill in them a culture that says it is not ok to fight to resolve their disputes.” Principal F1 also stated, “we recognize we need help, we didn’t usually have to tell them how to use the bathroom or be quiet in assembly.” Principal F1 and H2 also mentioned difficulties with street gangs. According to Principal H2, gangs have an influence and 13% of all disciplinary incidents are related to gang activity. PBIS system is used by the participants to “teach, reward, and celebrate positive student behavior” to
curtail student violence and bullying. Principals of middle schools (n=2) reported the most concerns with student violence and gang, while elementary principals reported primarily issues of bullying. Principal D3 reported that the school has “folded the Olweus system from Denmark into PBIS to educate students on bullying and prevent it by surveying students and urging them to get their hands around bullying.”

All of the participants shared that students were struggling to behave in the schools and that school violence was increasing. One hundred percent of the principals (n=9) implemented the PBIS program as a whole school initiative to maintain a positive school culture and reduce school violence.

**Question 3: What strategies do principals implement in response to changes in student enrollment?**

As Fullan (2006) states the crux of Turnaround Leadership is the following: The solutions are not simple, but my argument is straightforward. First, focus on the societal problem of income differential and employ direct community-based short-term and long-term strategies. Second, conceive of education as playing a role in gap closing, especially as we shall see by working intensely on the three basics of literacy, numeracy, and what I will call the well-beings of students (a term that encompasses emotional intelligence, character education, and safe schools). (p.10)

Collins (2001) simplifies this task by quoting the ancient Greek poet Archilochus who denotes that there are two archetypes of leaders. “The fox knows many things, but
the hedgehog knows one big thing” (p. 91). Collins quoting Princeton professor Marvin Bressler:

‘You want to know what separates those who make the biggest impact from all other who are just smart? They are hedgehogs. Freud and the unconscious, Darwin and natural selection, Marx and class struggle, Einstein and relativity, Adam Smith and division of labor, they were all hedgehogs. They took a complex world and simplified it.’ (p. 91)

Only one or eleven percent of the participants would be considered a hedgehog, while the vast majority would be developing Hedgehogs, according to Collins (2001) leadership model. Collins defines a hedgehog as an individual with a “severe standard of excellence…it’s not just about building on strength and competence, but about understanding what your organization truly has potential to be the very best at and sticking to it” (p. 100). Table 108 summarizes the participants into their leadership subgroup.

Table 108

**Participants Foxes or Hedgehogs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foxes</th>
<th>Developing Hedgehogs</th>
<th>Hedgehog(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2, H2,</td>
<td>A1, C3, D3, F1, G1, I2</td>
<td>E3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again hedgehogs see what is essential, and ignore the rest. The most prevalent strategy that principals (n=9) reported revolved around meeting AYP (Annual Yearly
Progress) for the school. Note the following quotes made by the developing hedgehogs (n=6):

F1  We have two teachers that went back and got their ESL endorsements…I think that’s a positive trend…We started a new reading curriculum…we have zero math endorsed teachers teaching our ELL population…it’s going to be rough.

D3  We folded PBIS under the anti-bullying umbrella…of course we are trying to close the achievement gap…we had a real focus on stretching the kids at the top end…in a community like this you have to have plenty of high achievers…RTI is really in the beginning and we are trying to build it at a district level.

C3  We implemented PBIS program…kids haven’t been that inclusive so we are working at looking at being more inclusive…huge drive to you know recruit minority hires.

I2  Improvements in five areas…literacy or reading, writing, mathematics, science, and improving school climate and culture.

To summarize developing hedgehog principals’ responses were categorized in the following five areas:

1. After school tutoring
2. Remedial, pullout programs or interventions.
3. Effective teaching strategies via a new teacher evaluation protocol.
4. Focus on student behaviors and modification.
5. Teacher recruitment or pursuit of additional credentials.

What was surprising 80% (n=4) of participants that self-reported being impacted (n=5) either by internal or external (Chicago) gentrification, relied on solutions and programs (i.e., PBIS, bullying programs, curricula, after school programs, etc.) that were imported just like the students. The impact of displaced students has been such a concern that one participant reported that their district has hired a firm to check the newcomers’ residency.

All nine participants indicated that they used afterschool tutoring to narrow the achievement gaps in their school. One principal, for example, said, F1 “we have started to use Study Island for our afterschool program for ISAT prep…for students who did not make AYP or are receiving a failing grade in their report cards.” Principal D3 stated,

Students on the ISAT clock our 3rd, 4th, and 5th graders…we extend the school day and attend a program we call BOOST, which stands for Building On Our Strengths Together. We look at the strength and weaknesses of each student and tutor students in their areas of weakness.

Another prevalent strategy reported by principals (n=3) was the use of effective teaching strategies by increasing teacher accountability by using the Charlotte Danielson (2009) teacher evaluation tool. These included strategies like differentiated instruction, assessing students, and student question design. In addition to tutoring and increase in teacher accountability, all participants tended to focus on modification of student behaviors such as the introduction of PBIS programs, on programs to tackle the achievement gaps of students, and on building teacher capacity.
In contrast the sole hedgehog in the study, Principal E3 had one strategy that was utilized to meet AYP and increase social cohesion. The school’s Hedgehog concept is the Read-a-Thon. Principal E3’s Read-a-Thon is the compelling common goal that challenges students to read. It is not just the compelling common goal for the school but the one common grounding movement that unites all the students to read. In addition, Principal E3 also acknowledged that without self-motivated people, greatness cannot be achieved. Principal E3 has discovered:

My gosh, it’s the truth and I have the evidence that it works…when a child can connect with that teacher, oh my gosh it’s amazing what can happen. It’s when there is no connection and that’s where it’s vital for me to be a role model for my staff …to connect with the child, their parents, their grandparents whoever.

The issues of diversity and gentrification did not define Principal E3. Principal E3’s diligence and the simplicity that the Read-a-thon brings is what created the path to greatness. Table 109 suggests that simplicity works. In School E3 the achievement gap between Black and White is only 18 points in reading and 9 points in Math. In contrast, compared to the State of Illinois the reduction in the achievement gap in the School E3 was extraordinary. Table 110 illustrates the State of Illinois ISAT Reading trends and achievement gap since 2007 to 2010, indicating that Collins (2001) Hedgehog Concept has validity in School E3 for all students, regardless of race.
Table 109

*School E3’s Composite of Reading and Math ISAT Percent of Students that Met/Exceeded 2010 ISAT by AYP Subgroups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>Percent Exceed Met AYP in Reading</th>
<th>Percent Exceed Met AYP in Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: From http://iirc.niu.edu: Retrieved on December 6, 2010.*

Table 110

*State of Illinois ISAT Reading by Race 2008-2010*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Di Primio (1988) answers the question of how a turnaround manager can increase productivity and efficiency by reminding leaders the following:

One of the surest signs of efficient management is a reputation for superior quality…In the present no-growth economy a company can increase
market share in two ways: attract more new customers or get more business from current customers. (p. 61)

The hedgehog in the study has accomplished both tasks: 1) her students continue to exceed expectations per standardized examinations; and 2) creating a reputation of greatness that avoids the exodus of clients (white flight). Table 111 clearly depicts a complete turnaround in terms of a rebound of whites returning to the school. Principal E3, “when I got here it was like clockwork, kindergarten projections were always 32 to 36 students and the last three to four years, kindergarten will be in the fifties…the reputation of the school changed…people want a permission transfer to go to (E3 school).”

Table 111

*E3 White Flight Reversal and 2005-2010 ISAT Exceed/Meet in Percentage*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Multi Racial</th>
<th>Meet/Exceed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In conclusion, as Principal E3 demonstrated what Fullan (2006) has imparted:

“You cannot do everything at once, which is why we have prioritized literacy and numeracy as the first order of business” (p. 92). Participants labeled to be foxes and developing hedgehogs have not yet done this.
Question 4: In what ways do principals perceive their leadership styles being affected by gentrification?

According to Fullan (2006) “something direct must be done about the principalship in which new expectations have been added for the principal as a leader of leaders in improving learning and closing the gap, without taking away or extending support for the managerial and community relations side of the role” (p. 94). The vast majority of participants (n=8) never mentioned receiving any support from district office to relieve the burden of managing their school. Putting their leadership under the Collins (2001) Good to Great microscope, only one participant (Principal E3) would be rated as a Level 5 leader. Worth repeating, a Level 5 leader is someone who has “ferocious resolve, an almost stoic determination to do whatever needs to be done to make the company great” (p. 30). Only 11% (n=1) of the sample of principals in the study accomplished sufficient reduction in the area of achievement gap and contained “white flight”. As described in Chapter IV’s census track data, white flight was the biggest hurdle to climb by the principals of this study.

Principal E3 was the benchmark of the study dealing with the white flight issue. Her leadership style focused both on people and systems. Worth repeating from Chapter IV, Principal E3’s framework has been heavily focused on teacher recruitment and selection. Principal E3 believes that teachers with “an edge” are not the prototype she is looking to hire. She wants teachers with the following seven traits:

1. Teachers that maintain professional portfolios (“evidence to help me understand how good you are”).
2. Teachers that pursue additional degrees and credentials (“professional growth” and “constantly taking classes”).

3. Curriculum expertise (“we talk about how you plan a lesson” and “learning environment”).

4. Life Long Learners (“you don’t want somebody that feels they are good already”).

5. Experience in teaching a diverse population (“every child is different”).

6. “Professional Conduct”

7. Community Outreach (“how do you handle discipline” and “how well they get along with parents”).

In contrast to Principal E3, participants in District 2 revealed that they often lacked the adequate financial resources to implement all of their initiatives and this in turn attributed to their leadership styles. For example Principal H2 perceived rising class size as an impediment on teaching and learning:

Well it (gentrification) really hasn’t had an effect on and I never gave it much thought, but as it increases in our neighboring Chicagoland area, I could see our numbers continue to rise…increasing student population would hopefully result in more teaching positions to prevent overcrowding …finding teachers with endorsements is a barrier…While we have a great many teachers who voluntarily supervise and sponsor activities, clubs, groups, etc. We cannot always offer them on a consistent basis due to a lack of funding. Our budget was dramatically reduced for the 2009-2010
school year. The neighborhood has changed for a long time now and the population has been like this for a while. We have always had large class sizes and our numbers continue to rise not decrease.

Another aspect that the newcomers bring to the schools that was mentioned by 22% of the participants (n=2) impacting their leadership styles was the increase of street gangs. One principal was quoted, “people moving in are gang like” another stated that “gangs have influence on the students…instead of focusing on their academic success, many of these students are channeling their energy elsewhere…about thirteen percent of all disciplinary incidents this year were related to gang activity.” The gang influence tended again to be prevalent in the schools closest in proximity to the city of Chicago and in schools with Hispanic population. These principals felt their instructional leadership had to be halted to cater to policies that curtailed the gang influence.

Principals also mentioned complacency and the lack of collaboration within the district limiting their development as leaders and subsequently their leadership styles. Principal C3 stated that “it’s easy to become a manager here and sometimes that is what many of the teachers want…Money is not a problem using it effectively is where we have a long way to go.” Participants in affluent schools in the study complained about working in silos. One principal was quoted “A lot of our schools, there’s ten of them, we operate very independently of the district office.” District 3 had all their schools that met AYP, but participants claimed that sharing their success needed to be expanded. Yet several of the participants from District 3 claimed that hiring qualified minority candidates was a struggle.
In contrast, gentrification tended to frustrate the leaders and their leadership in districts with limited resources. As gentrification increases the diversity of students and their instructional needs, resources remained constant. For example, District 1 participants claimed that teacher shortages and capacity was impacting their school. Several of the participants in District 1 highlighted a need for ESL certification and teachers with math endorsements. Principals from District 2 struggled the most from unacceptable and violent behaviors. Participants from District 2 also mentioned that budget constraints impeded teaching and learning due to high class sizes. The increase of diversity created a new set of challenges for these leaders. District 2 had the highest number of schools (n=3) not meeting AYP, while all schools in District 3 met NCLB’s targets and only one participant failed to meet AYP in District 2. As Fullan (2006) concludes, “education reflects society’s priorities and then returns on that investment…low investment perpetuates the status quo” (p. 71). Table 112 reflects the return of investment from the districts in this study. Districts such as District 3, tended to over invest and targeted resources effectively and are therefore riding the wave of gentrification and reducing achievement gaps.

Participants (n=3) with the resources could cope with the raising of the bar of NCLB and increase in diversity from gentrification. Principal E3, in particular, created the social environment to bring about the best in people, by combining teacher accountability and a laser focus on literacy. Even though the vast majority of the principals (n=5) were unable to influence the change required to meet AYP, school
leaders in this study struggled to make great strides in the reduction of achievement gaps, in particular between White and African-Americans.

Table 112

*District Rate of Return in Dollars and 2010 ISAT in Percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Investment (Per Pupil Expenditure in Dollars)</th>
<th>Return (2010 ISAT District Composite Met/Exceed in %)</th>
<th>Met AYP In 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A1, F1, G1</td>
<td>$6,756</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B2, I2, H2</td>
<td>$5,154</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C3, D3, E3</td>
<td>$7,911</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In summary, the leadership styles of the participants were perceived to be impacted by external forces, such as the lack of funds, large class size, street gangs, or lack of collaboration. Fullan (2006) states that “all successful turnarounds develop collaboration where there was none before” (p. 54). Hence building public confidence, via better performance was limited to only one participant (Principal E3). Yet it must be stated that external confidence may lead to the heart of what truly impacts leadership styles. Leaders need to be aware that what goes on outside the school walls is just as important as what takes place within them.

**Question 5: What opportunities for improving instructional environment for students do principals believe that gentrification brings to their schools?**

In *The Fourth Turning*, demographers William Strauss and Neil Howe (1997), state that history is broken into a pattern of four cycles. The patterns can be traced to
how mankind perceives the seasons, the calendar, time and the life cycle. According to Strauss and Howe, first “turning” or cycle is an upbeat era of strengthening institutions and weakening individualism (growth). The second cycle is the “Awakening”, a passionate era of spiritual upheaval (Maturation). The third turning (entropy) is labeled the Unraveling or an era where civic order decays and individualism strengthens. The fourth turning is crisis or destruction. Strauss and Howe (1997) believe that we are currently in this cycle of time:

Real hardship will beset the land, with severe distress that could involve questions of class, race, nation, and empire. Yet this time will bring seeds of social rebirth. (p. 6)

One is left to extrapolate that gentrification has brought the sense of urgency by participants for a change in school culture. For example, Principal C3 seeks to have a male teacher in every classroom, Principal F1 seeks news hires that have ESL endorsements, and Principal A1 wants new teachers with urban teaching experience. The most common method utilized by the principals was to increase their hiring and staffing to meet the needs of their students. Collins (2001) states that “if you begin with who rather than what, you can more easily adapt to a changing world” (p. 42). Collins’ principle of “getting the right people on the bus” was prevalent with 88% of the participants (n=8). Hence, talent acquisition was a new opportunity to many of the participants in this study.

A moderate number of participants or 33% (n=3) of principals dealing with increasing student enrollment mentioned the need to reassess their organizations. Yet the
need to hire was a double edge sword, because many applicants either lacked the endorsements to teach the newcomers or lacked the classroom management to keep their assignments. Again the principals targeted different personnel needs. Participants in District 2 tended to seek candidates with ELL endorsements; those in District 1 pursued teachers with ELL endorsement and teaching experience outside the district or urban experience in particular; and finally two participants within District 3 stated, Principal C3, this year we have had a huge drive to recruit minority hires and it has been very successful…I too have tried. I think I have a male teacher at every grade level.

Principal D3, for all my new hires, which is almost half the classroom teachers…they are very involved…they have great communication with parents…our ISAT scores are phenomenal, 90% of our students meet or exceed state standards and 80 percent are above grade level it’s not a hard place to teach…challenging the students…always looking to enrich student experience in the school whether before or after school…I’m trying to get them to be teacher leaders. That’s a huge piece I like to work on.

Principal C3 further explains that “so they really seek good quality applicants…this year to really promote the district, they went to all kind of job fairs, did all kind of fliers and even went to churches all over.” Again the common theme was principals made an
attempt to recruit teachers that met the needs of the students or reflected the demographics in the classrooms.

Strauss and Howe (1997) state that institutions entering the *Fourth Turning* must “clear the debris and find out what works, but don’t try building anything big” (p. 313). Collins (2001) participants that would be labeled *foxes* in this study did not see many opportunities. Those principals with the developing hedgehog philosophy did welcome the opportunity to change the culture of their schools. The change in culture took place via teacher selection, teacher evaluation and relying on metrics for decision making. The sole hedgehog in the study, Principal E3 focused on establishing a culture of teaching and learning. Principal E3 stated that her biggest priority was to “make students connect with the school…when they are connected they tend to do better…making sure every child is successful…through differentiation, mentoring, tutoring whatever is needed to move that child from A to B…my second priority is that I hire that right people that can make that happen.”

Developing hedgehogs also took advantage of the increase of diversity of their school by creating the sense of urgency to develop a college bound mindset for all her students. For example, Principal A1 focused on college readiness and career awareness curriculum:

You know middle school should be the beginning of your post high school awareness and so my teachers need to start being familiar with the College Readiness Standards and with the ACT and what those expectations are. We can feel great that we are making AYP every year and 85 percent plus
of kids are meeting and exceeding…the faculty knows that is my ambition and my vision for us as a community that we really expand their universe.

Creating a culture of academic achievement was the major theme of the principals in this study. The vast majority or 88% (n=8) had tendencies to acquire new talent, accountability systems, and new curriculum in the main content areas.

All principals in District 1 and District 3 have implemented out the Charlotte Danielson (2007) teacher evaluation system. All participants also stated that PBIS was also instituted in their school due to challenges with student behavior entering the school. Only Principal D3 mentioned a specific approach to reduce the bullying in his school while principals in District 2 mentioned methods to curtail an increase in gangs and their influence over the students. While all leaders interviewed for the study tended to mention the same programs, PBIS for discipline and Charlotte Danielson for teacher accountability, one element seemed evident, only Principal E3 had a core strategy, instilling in children the love of reading. According to Principal E3 “the key is to see challenges as opportunities and know your community…connect with the children…build a relationship with the children, connect with them.”

Limitations of the Study

This research study is subject to a number of limitations imposed by the research design and time constraints. These limitations include:

1. The sample of respondents (n=9) does not truly represent all principals in the state of Illinois. By limiting the participant sample, due to time and means
constraints, only the principals in the three suburban elementary school
districts are represented in this study.

2. The sample participants (n=9) all serve as principals in one geographical
location; data may not be representative of other geographical areas of the
states or outside the state of Illinois.

3. Identifying themes and patterns is a subjective process, thus the researcher’s
bias and worldview may limit the generalization of the results.

4. Tape recordings of all interviews were transcribed and member checked for
accuracy; however only six out of nine principals responded to member check
emails. In addition, the nuances of body language, facial expression and tone
was absent from the transcription of the dialogue and some content may have
been lost due to indiscernible portions of the audio recording.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

The following recommendations are offered from these data gathered in this study
for further research regarding the impact of gentrification on leadership and school
culture:

1. A follow-up study could be conducted in Chicago and Chicago Public Schools
to provide more in-depth information to the strategic programs principals
utilize in their schools dealing with the phenomenon of gentrification. Key
questions should focus on where families are going that have been displaced.
2. This study could be duplicated and conducted with suburban superintendents and teachers to gather their point of views concerning the phenomenon of gentrification.

3. Further research is needed in the area of demographic shifts or changes in Illinois and how the change is either integrating or segregating student populations.

4. Finally, case study method analysis should be expanded in schools in areas that are gentrifying, that are dramatically closing the achievement gap with particular focus on leadership, teacher working conditions, and instructional strategies utilized so frameworks could be established and replicated at sites impacted by gentrification.

**Implications for Leadership Preparation**

Administrators and teachers alike are facing a changing world that will require a new set of knowledge. Fifty-five percent of the principals (n=5) in this study perceived gentrification impacting their school culture and leadership. Therefore, principal preparation programs should provide future administrators a multidisciplinary learning approach based on the co-teaching of integrated classes taught by professors from the School of Education, Sociology Department and School of Business. This might allow future principals practice in developing a collaborative model that deals with demographic shifts in student population. Today’s problems are complex and school leaders need to be trained in a collaborative setting that models collaboration and offers
multiple perspectives of different academic branches that study the phenomenon of gentrification.

Eighty-eight percent of the principals (n=8) recognized that an increase in poverty and diversity impacted school’s student achievement gaps. Principal preparation programs should be incubators for developing moral agents and instructional leadership. Preparation programs need to provide future principals with the means to adequately evaluate and develop teachers, curriculum, and community outreach programs.

One hundred percent of principals (n=9) perceive human resources (i.e., teacher selection and teacher evaluation) as a positive strategy to deal with the increase in diversity and in reducing achievement gaps. The final recommendation based on the findings of this study is that principal preparation programs should consider training future leaders in methods to hire a driven and diverse workforce that is representative of the students and families they serve.

**Conclusion**

As the barrios (Humbolt Park and Pilsen) and housing ghettos (Cabrini Green and Robert Taylor) disappear from the city of Chicago, a wave of former residents is migrating to collar suburbs. The principals in this study recognized that student demographics are shifting in their schools and districts. Data from the Interactive Report Card also illustrate this trend. In fact, several principals acknowledged that there has been an increase in the number of students from Chicago Public Schools during their tenure. This new wave of newcomers, posed a real challenge to individual school leaders and their school culture in this study. The participants in school districts with limited
resources struggled the most in providing certified personnel and curriculum to meet the needs of these students. While many principals in the study are aware of the challenges that these new students face, several were also concerned with the racial tension and the potential of white flight phenomenon.

Regardless of the struggle, the study identified several principals attempting to move their schools from “Good to Great.” However, this study identified only one principal that had turnarounded her school by using a concentrated focus on reading for all. In this study, participants are struggling to confront the brutal facts of student diversity brought by gentrification and simultaneously meeting the performance requirements of the NCLB Act.

This research posits a systematic model that combines Fullan’s (2006) overarching goal of eliminating the achievement gap and Di Primio’s (1988) basic tenets of turnaround strategies to be considered by schools and principals in order to move towards excellence, regardless of the student population served by the school. While there is no guarantee that excellence will be the result, there is the promise that schools will be submerged and sink into low levels of performance if the status quo or worst is maintained. This study has highlighted the possibility of turning around a school that is going through gentrification, and even succeed through the adoption of principles and rules of sound leadership. In closing, demography matters and all school leaders should be cognizant of when these shifts occur. Even though the stakes are higher, to quote Fullan (2006),
Why not use our human and social ingenuity to mobilize the million change agents that will take to accomplish two giant things at once: greater equality and multifaceted prosperity? This is education’s true calling in the twenty-first century. (p. 97)

Future principals need to live the Principal E3 axiom, “I do not see change as a problem but as an opportunity.” By following this philosophy, principals might gain the deepest satisfaction of knowing that their tenure mattered.
APPENDIX A

DISTRICT LETTER OF COOPERATION TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH
To: Superintendent

Date: TBD

Re: Letter of Cooperation to Participate in Research

Project Title: Riding the Wave of Gentrification: Selected Principals’ Perceptions of Gentrification’s Impact on Leadership and School Culture

Researcher: J. Antonio Jimenez
Loyola University Chicago

Faculty Sponsor: Dr. Marla Israel
Educational Administration and Leadership Department

Purpose
The purpose of this study is to investigate principals’ perceptions concerning the phenomenon of gentrification and how they are responding to it. In addition, this research will focus on strategies that principals are implementing in response to any possible impact of gentrification and what perceived opportunities the phenomenon brings to their school.

Introduction
You are being asked to provide cooperating consent allowing your building principals to take part in a research study being conducted by J. Antonio Jimenez for his dissertation conducted under the supervision of Dr. Marla Israel in the School of Education at Loyola University Chicago.

Your principals are being asked to participate because certain areas within your district are experiencing gentrification. Principals will receive a recruitment email and will be asked to be interviewed. The researcher hopes to understand principals’ perceptions of gentrification on school culture and leadership.

Please read this form carefully and ask any questions you may have before deciding whether to participate in this study. You may contact the researcher at (773) 534-5051.

Procedures
As the Superintendent of District, if you agree to allow your principals participate in this study, you will be asked to give permission for the researcher to interview your principals. In addition researcher will:

1. Email principals in your district to participate.
2. From this initial pool of principals, of those that agree to be part of the study, the researcher will select a total of 3-5 principals that meet the criteria of three years of tenure.

3. The researcher will ask these principals to meet during non-contractual hours at a convenient location for a 45 minute interview.

4. These principals will be asked a set of standardized open ended questions relating to gentrification and how their leadership has evolved during the phenomenon.

**Risks & Benefits**

There are no risks involved in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life. The researcher’s intent is to have an open conversation about gentrification and the impact of school leadership and school culture. Precautions will be taken to ensure anonymity of all study participants. There are no direct benefits for participants, however, it is hoped this study will add to the body of research in leadership, education, and school culture. Additionally, it is hoped the information cited in this study will benefit current and future educational leaders practicing in areas experiencing gentrification.

**Confidentiality**

All responses will remain confidential. Each respondent will receive a unique identification number and all data will be analyzed and coded using this number. Individual names (or names of schools) will not be mentioned in the final writing. The audio tape recordings of the interviews will be kept in a locked file in the researcher’s home. Once final writing of the research is completed, the recordings will be destroyed via shredding. District will be identified, but no school or principal will be mentioned in the study.

**Voluntary Participation**

Participation in this study is voluntary. If a principal decides to participate, he/she may elect not to answer a specific question or to withdraw from participation entirely, without penalty. The principal can do this at any time during this process.

**Contacts and Questions**

Thank you in advance for your participation in this very important study. If you have questions about this research study, please contact:

Dr. Marla Israel, Dissertation Chair at misarael@luc.edu

J. Antonio Jimenez, Researcher at jajimenez@cps.k12.il.us

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Compliance Manager in Loyola’s Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689.
Statement of Consent:

Please copy the following on letterhead. Your signature below indicates that you have read and understood the information provided above, have had an opportunity to ask questions, and agree to allow your principals to participate in this research study. Riding the Wave of Gentrification: Selected Principals’ Perceptions of Gentrification’s Impact on Leadership and School Culture will focus and investigate principals’ perceptions concerning the phenomenon of gentrification and how they are responding to it. In addition, this research will focus on strategies that principals are implementing in response to any possible impact of gentrification and what perceived opportunities the phenomenon brings to their school. You will be given a copy of this form to keep for your records.

________________________________________  __________________________
Superintendent Signature                     Date

________________________________________  __________________________
Researcher’s Signature                        Date
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PRINCIPAL CONSENT LETTER I EMAILED
Date TBD

Dear Mr/Mrs/Dr. Participant’s Name

You are being asked to take part in a research study being conducted by J. Antonio Jimenez for his dissertation conducted under the supervision of Dr. Marla Israel in the School of Education at Loyola University Chicago. You are being asked to participate because your school is experiencing gentrification. The Superintendent of Schools has approved this study (on TBD). The researcher hopes to understand principal’s perceptions of gentrification on school culture and leadership. Please read this form carefully and ask any questions you may have before deciding whether to participate in this study. You may contact the researcher at (773) 534-5051.

If you agree to this study, you will be asked to:

1. Agree to participate by responding to this email invitation (see directions below).
2. Agree to participate in a 45 minute open ended interview and answer a set of standardized questions about leadership and how your leadership has evolved during the gentrification process by sending.
3. Prior to the interview sign a consent form allowing researcher to interview you for this study.

Contacts and Questions
Thank you in advance for your participation in this very important study. If you have questions about this research study, please contact:

Dr. Marla Israel, Dissertation Chair at misarael@luc.edu
J. Antonio Jimenez, Researcher at jajimenez@cps.k12.il.us

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Compliance Manager in Loyola’s Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689.

Directions: If you are interested in participating and have been a principal in your school district for at least three years, please reply via email to Tony Jimenez at jajimenez@cps.k12.il.us, indicating your name, school name and the number of years you have been principal at the present school. A copy of the interview questions has been attached to this email.
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
Topic Domains: *A Principal’s Perception of Possible Influence of Gentrification on School Leadership and Culture.*

**Phase I**

**DEMOGRAPHIC & OTHER INFORMATION**

1. Length of employment before becoming principal of your current school:

2. Job held immediately before becoming principal of your current school:

3. Length of time in your current school as the principal?

4. Is your school on the academic watch list?

5. Is your school on the academic warning list?

**Phase II**

**NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTERISTICS/POPULATION TRENDS**

6. Please describe the demographic trends of the neighborhood that your school is located in.

7. Do you believe that gentrification has had any effect on your student population? How?

8. What are the top five priorities for the school? Are these priorities related to gentrification?

**Phase III**

**QUESTIONS**

A. Describe the staff of the school in 2009-2010.

B. Describe your leadership style.

C. What kind of leadership style would your teachers say you have?
D. Give a brief description of your school’s student demographics and community data.

E. What strategies are being implemented in response to these trends?

F. Describe the history of gentrification in your local school.

G. Describe your viewpoint on gentrification.

H. What opportunities does gentrification bring to your school?

I. What strategies are being implemented to maximize those opportunities?

J. What were the factors that facilitated the implementation of the strategies?

K. What are the barriers to implementing these strategies?

L. What type of assistance and support is provided to your building by central office concerning these issues of demographic change?

M. Describe how your teachers have responded to student decline in enrollment and neighborhood change?

N. In what ways is your school leadership being impacted by gentrification?
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PRINCIPAL CONSENT LETTER II
To: Name

Date: TBD

Re: Letter of Consent to Participate in Research

Project Title: Riding the Wave of Gentrification: Selected Principals’ Perceptions of Gentrification’s Impact on Leadership and School Culture

Researcher: J. Antonio Jimenez
Loyola University Chicago

Faculty Sponsor: Dr. Marla Israel
Educational Administration and Leadership Department

Introduction
You have been invited to participate in a research study being conducted by J. Antonio Jimenez for his dissertation conducted under the supervision of Dr. Marla Israel in the School of Education at Loyola University Chicago.

You are being asked to participate because your district is experiencing urban renewal or gentrification. This study has the institutional approval of your district and Superintendent of Schools.

Please read this form carefully and ask any questions you may have before deciding whether to participate in this study.

Purpose
The purpose of this study is to investigate principals’ perceptions concerning the phenomenon of gentrification and how principals are responding to it. In addition, this research will focus on strategies that principals are implementing in response to any possible impact of gentrification and what perceived opportunities the phenomenon brings to their school.

Procedures
If you agree to this study, you will be asked to:

1. At the interview sign a consent form.
2. Answer questions from the interview protocol attached.

Risks & Benefits
There are minimal risks involved in participating in the research beyond those experienced in everyday life. The researcher’s intent is to have an open conversation
about gentrification and the impact of school leadership and school culture. Precautions will be taken to ensure confidentiality of all study participants. There are no direct benefits for participants however, it is hoped this study will add to the body of research in leadership, education, and school culture. Additionally, it is hoped the information cited in this study will benefit current and future educational leaders practicing in areas experiencing gentrification. Confidentiality of schools and principals will be maintained only district will be identified.

Confidentiality
All responses will remain confidential. Each respondent will receive a unique identification number and all data will be analyzed and coded using this number. Individual names (or names of schools) will not be mentioned in the final writing.

The audio tape recordings of the interviews will be kept in a locked file in the researcher’s home. Once final writing of the research is completed, the recordings will be destroyed via shredding.

Voluntary Participation
Participation in this study is voluntary. If you decide to participate, you may elect not to answer a specific question or to withdraw from participation entirely, without penalty. You can do this at any time during this process.

Contacts and Questions
Thank you in advance for your participation in this very important study. If you have questions about this research study, please contact:

Dr. Marla Israel at misarael@luc.edu
J. Antonio Jimenez at jajimenez@cps.k12.il.us

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Compliance Manager in Loyola’s Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689.

Statement of Consent:
Your signature below indicates that you have read and understand the information provided above, have had an opportunity to ask questions, and agree to participate in this research study. You will be given a copy of this form for your records.

______________________________  __________________
School Principal’s Signature        Date

______________________________  __________________
Researcher’s Signature            Date
APPENDIX E

PARTICIPANT REJECTION LETTER
Dear Mr/Mrs./Dr. Principal’s Name

Thank you so much for taking the time to respond to my study’s recruitment email entitled “Principal Consent Email.” This letter is to inform you that you have not been selected for the study. I am sorry that I cannot accommodate your interest in my study. I wish you every personal and professional success this school year and in the future. Thank you again for your interest in my study.

Respectfully,
J. Antonio Jimenez
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