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BACKGROUND COMMENTS

At the outset it must be stated that no one knows for certain how to prepare leaders. The formal preparation of educational leaders is affected by those who teach the candidates, by the content, by the candidates themselves, and by the intangible but significant interactions which result. There are no magical formulas, no tried and true recipes, no perfect models, and no guarantees.

Educational leadership is an art and a science, an art because it must be felt and interpreted before it is applied, a science because there is a somewhat systematized body of knowledge to be mastered. In far too many universities the science of leadership is emphasized, the art given some consideration, and the practical realities of leadership are minimized, especially for future principals and superintendents.

Although everyone knows that the most difficult task of a leader is keeping his position, the truism is obscured by and/or substituted by pseudo-sagacity. If the last phrase sounds stilted, how does the following simple fact couched in typical professorial language influence leaders?

An incremental analysis of the viable alternatives proscribed by the nonparametric variables inherent in the situation will provide sufficient salience and the requisite linkage between the nomothetic and the idiographic dimensions of the delivery system.

Even if this statement were understood by the prospective leader, applying it would be the test of success, not presenting it as a truism of leadership in some formal paper.
In treating the topic of preparing educational leaders, primarily principals and superintendents, it is necessary to discuss the present scene and to suggest improvements. Those portions of this booklet which focus on the present are not intended to be merely a critical review. Suggestions for change and improvement are implicit throughout, and the explicit suggestions are given as possible practical directives, not as soothsaying utterances.
WHAT IS LEADERSHIP?

There are so many versions of the concept of leadership that a serious student of the topic can soon find himself in a mind-boggling situation. Students of school administration in particular have had a problem analyzing leadership, because the science of school administration is in itself a rather new science. Its truths seem to have been borrowed from industry, government, and perhaps political science. While the science is complex, the art of school administration, which is based upon philosophy, psychology, and sociology, presents further complications. If one wishes to go back to Plato’s Republic or Machiavelli’s The Prince, one can find many suggestions and directions for leading a group to success regardless of the nature of the enterprise.

These and similar classics, however, are not absolutes, and they were not written with school administrators in mind. Because there are so many viewpoints about how a leader should lead, why he should lead, whom he should lead, and other vital concerns, any potential teacher must develop his own framework, based on a foundation of knowledge and much soul searching, from which he can lead effectively. The very existence of diverse and often contradictory concepts is evidence that the topic deserves serious analysis.

The concept of leadership has become an increasingly popular subject for analysis. Despite the innumerable research studies conducted over the years, investigations continue to shed new light upon this old and well lit topic. Theorists have constructed complex models to explain the whys and hows of leadership. Psychologists have delved into the personality factors which al-
legedly contribute to and detract from leadership. Social scientists have expounded upon the phenomena in given societies which can explain the motives and the factors that induce leaders to perform in one way or another. There are models to follow, matrices for analytical purposes, socio-grams of all types, personality tests, and concepts of transactional analysis which have been posited as facets in leadership. Although the very complicated task called leadership cannot be taken lightly, it should not be discussed in such fashion that the words becloud the issue. When all the verbiage is swept aside, the overriding conclusion is that leadership depends upon execution and not upon verbalization, doing and not writing about doing.

Reduced to its essence, the true test of leadership is followership. No matter how democratically or autocratically leadership is defined, there are no leaders unless there are followers. The roles may switch in times of crisis, but the roles cannot be denied. Thus, the person who considers himself a leader must be able to do more than merely hold the position. The power of position cannot be ignored, but by itself that power is inadequate until the dictator is ousted. If the leader is not able to develop insights and talents for delegating authority, looking at alternatives in any situation, communicating effectively, organizing his tasks effectively, working effectively with community groups, and coordinating the total effort, then the position, however enticing, will soon slip away. In today's society—particularly in an educational institution, where everyone seemingly wants a piece of the action—the leader must be able to achieve appropriate goals or he will not be around to serve the second term of his contract. The rampant dissatisfaction of the American public with American schools seems to be reaching a higher pitch, and whether or not the dissatisfaction is well grounded is ultimately of no consequence. The fact is that the leader or superintendent must be able to achieve goals which he, his administrative staff, his teaching staff, and his community advisors deem proper in harmony with school board policy.
WHO ARE THE EDUCATIONAL LEADERS?

Professional education literature is rife with statements about the low-caliber of students who major in educational administration. Most of these comments come from the teachers of those students, that is, from professors of educational administration. Two questions come to mind. If the reports are correct, how did the professors who wrote them get so intelligent? If the reports are incorrect, of what value are they? There are exceptional students, of course, as any possessor of a doctorate in administration will be happy to attest, but the allegations cannot be swept aside facetiously.

If the typical student of educational administration does not compare favorably with other graduate students in mental ability and academic performance, the university must accept the major blame. The positions of principal and superintendent are high level leadership positions, which offer personal and professional prestige in a community and relatively attractive salaries. Those administrators who prefer the incomes of medical doctors or attorneys will have to become a medical doctor or an attorney, either that or marry into wealth, invest money wisely, gamble successfully, adjust, or suffer. If the alleged low-caliber problem truly exists, the university can work to develop an effective public relations program and an aura of excellence around its course sequence as a means of attracting high-caliber people to replace the inferior types who will not be allowed to continue in programs for leaders. When Horace Mann accepted a state superintendency, he was quoted as saying that if the position was not held in high regard at the time of his acceptance, it was clearly
his responsibility to change the image. His success was phenomenal.

Communities have a stake in this issue, also. If low-caliber people learn low-caliber content taught by low-caliber people, then how excellent can a community’s school leadership be? Moreover, the strife in local school communities is a factor in attracting or repelling would-be leaders. Many able students wish to be future educational leaders as university professors, authors, agency officials, or consultants, and they would prefer to avoid daily hand-to-hand combat with community constituents. Fortunately, there are many competent, dedicated educators who are not battle shy, but they bleed just as profusely as cowards. As a community’s real or imagined influence and/or control over schools increases, so does its responsibility to demand and attract high-caliber leaders. If the demands and the rewards are sufficient, the universities will have to improve its recruitment, selection, teaching, and graduation of high-caliber educators. The process takes time, of course, but to do nothing except bemoan the alleged low level of prospective leaders for schools is to waste time.

Any community can accelerate the process by giving education and educational leadership high priorities. The community leaders can cooperate with universities to provide funded on-the-job experiences as part of the school leadership program. Funds can be solicited from governmental and private sources, including local businesses, while the nature of the on-the-job experiences can be designed to satisfy the community, the school, and the university. There are many universities which are flexible enough, interested enough, and capable enough to meet community needs. Universities and communities can work hand in hand to raise the caliber of educational leaders.
WHO PREPARES EDUCATIONAL LEADERS?

Unfortunately, many people who are charged with the job of training leaders are not leaders themselves no matter how the word is defined. A common practice in colleges and universities is to employ professors of educational administration who have no firsthand knowledge of administration, leadership, or schools. Experience in schools cannot be a sine qua non, but a professor with no experience in schools often can produce theoretical analyses which are unrelated to the practical job faced by administrators today. It is necessary, therefore, to take a good hard look at what is happening in many schools of education where educational leaders are trained. The situation is not especially bright.

The typical college teacher, regardless of rank, is a king in his own right, the epitome of the self-contained classroom teacher. Unlike his counterpart in elementary and in secondary schools, he has no principal or supervisor who might visit his classroom, however infrequently. The college faculty member does not even have to motivate his students. He is free to bore them without fear of discipline problems erupting. Moreover, he can lecture to his heart’s content from notes yellowing with age, a process which testifies to their historical and scholarly value. Since institutions of higher learning are havens for specialization, the college teacher can belabor any point as an example of treatment in depth. If the professor conceptualizes, uses heavy jargon to explain the obvious, draws models, paradigms, and diagrams regularly, and refers to technological inputs for delivery systems, his apparent erudition can be an excuse for impractical emphases in his courses. If the professor sports a beard, wears glasses, uses
swear words in class, and is properly unkempt in his attire, he can coast for years on his image alone.

College professors who keep up with the times in their methods and ideas are to be congratulated, but alas, they are the exceptions. The typical college faculty member is guilty of perpetuating dull teaching by teaching dully. Students emulate their professors. When the model is archaic, the reflections are of similar vintage. When a monkey looks into a mirror, he sees a monkey.

Perhaps some readers will consider these comments extreme and unwarranted. The only offense intended is for those who have been accurately described. Talk to enough practitioners, and you will hear repeated complaints about windy, empty professors who speak on a lofty plane without regard for relevance. There is probably nothing more practical than good theory, but when it is the sole commodity, the complaints must be given some credence. Unfortunately, too many professors of school administration talk to their colleagues so much that they begin to believe that everyone speaks as they do. Leaders who do not wish to be practitioners may find fancy phrases to their liking, but school administrators who face their many publics need concrete and practical information, skills, and strategies.

The problem of impractical windbags is bad enough, but the real issue centering on the influence wielded by a teacher of leaders should not be minimized. Even at their advanced age and stage of educational and professional development, the students of school administration can be influenced significantly by their professors. Professors who teach leadership courses are probably in the most influential position to shape the attitudes and leadership styles of their students, and the influence can affect destiny. The potential impact of the leader of leaders is so vast and so significant that professors who teach educational leaders should be ever mindful of the importance of their role. Fortunately, some students are intelligent enough to learn what not to do in spite of the model.
WHAT IS THE NATURE OF PREPARATION PROGRAMS?

College preparation courses for administrators are often too dull, too trite, and too traditional for the schools of today. Some forward looking colleges are experimenting with variations in their professional sequence and with competency-based programs, but most are still preparing prospective administrators as though the educational scene had not changed over the decades. The grass-roots approach to inservice of some innovative elementary and secondary schools does not get the colleges off the hook. A partnership between schools which are utilizing new approaches and universities which prepare teachers and administrators is essential.

Although some universities have tried to incorporate new ideas and trends into their programs for future administrators, most institutions of higher learning are doing very little about innovative practices. The notable exceptions are those universities which have discovered that federal and private funds are available for training prospective administrators for inner-city schools. These institutions have learned how to be innovative in spending the vast sums which have been dumped into their coffers, and even more innovative in trying to get more money when the federal golden goose shows signs of constipation. The trick is to convince the faculty that innovations in curriculum and methods have professional value of greater import than sudden wealth.

In far too many universities the professional administration courses have not been changed significantly in years. Occasionally a university will allow students to enroll in a course in school law prior to taking a course in school finance. Such daring experi-
mentation might have been applauded seventy-five years ago, but something more drastic is necessary today. Juggling the order of the courses, attempting to team teach, providing internships, allowing some independent study opportunities, and providing study carrels simply are not adequate solutions. These efforts have promise, but they cannot exist in a vacuum. Unless college faculties keep close contact with elementary and secondary schools and learn what is actually happening in these schools, innovations at the university will be almost meaningless.

The preparation programs for a leader must include a variety of courses and experiences. The philosophical and psychological purposes behind these programs will differ, but the effective programs cannot be narrow in scope. In many universities so many courses are offered that one begins to wonder how so much can be mastered or how so little can be spread out so far. There is a vast amount of empirical evidence to support the contention that an administrator’s success or failure is due primarily to intangible factors, not inadequate knowledge of school law or building design. The typical sequence of courses in administration can be valuable, but courses alone cannot produce administrators who can lead. Even courses in leadership cannot guarantee results, especially when they are taught by former administrators who were unsuccessful practitioners or by theoreticians who never led anyone anywhere. Pity the poor theoretician who becomes trapped in his own matrix!

It is very difficult to speak of administrator preparation programs in generalities because of the specific and unique aspects of the programs, courses, and individuals involved. Every university which prepares educational leaders on the doctoral level prides itself on its worth, sometimes with reason. Yet the ingredients which make one program more outstanding than another usually defy evaluation on any objective level. Financial and geographic factors often influence a student’s decision to attend the university more than the research recognition or the practical focus of the university. Thus, one program might be of outstanding value for one future leader and of marginal value for another. The program, the professors, the colleagues, and the person himself all form a part of the preparation experiences, and these are usually interpreted personally and subjectively. While the unique
aspects of preparation programs must be acknowledged, it is necessary to discuss elements which typify programs.

A study of university course offerings can teach as much as a study of professional literature. Most of the references to programs contain course listings, which is a logical and not surprising state of affairs. Universities publish catalogues and bulletins with their array of offerings, sometimes with the names of those who teach the courses. Among the most frequently mentioned courses are those dealing with basic administration (principles, law, finance, buildings). Although the frequency of courses in leadership, group dynamics, and human relations are less frequently mentioned they appear often in university catalogues. In those departments which include supervision and administration, the basic techniques courses in supervision are part of the program. In some universities, cognate courses which relate to administration and/or supervision are offered. These courses are typically in the areas of bargaining, social structure, and business management. In addition, if there is a sequence to be followed by the student, the pattern is indicated and sometimes the rationale is explained. Graduation requirements are listed, and if a residency period is necessary, comments concerning the nature, scope, and regulations of the residency are stated. In all instances the specifics vary, but basic similarities among university programs do exist, these similarities characterize most programs which prepare educational leaders.

Some will argue that a structured program for leaders lacks the flexibility and the dynamism necessary in our society. If societal demands change rapidly, how can a structured program be effective? Those who raise this question have an excellent point if structure and tradition are viewed as synonymous. If structure means broad direction and the means within the structure can be described as varied, fluid, flexible, changing, or relevant, the degree of structure can be modified to suit general or individualized needs. A program without structure is aimless. Imagine the plight of a potential leader in education who has been so unstructured in his preparation that he will not know for what he is prepared, how he can manage whatever his preparation has produced, or how he can get to work on time.
WHY DO LEADERS GET HIRED AND FIRED?

Except in most unusual circumstances, administrators do not get fired because of incompetence. They lose their position because of difficulties in getting along with others. It seldom matters why the difficulties exist; the problem is that they do exist. Therefore, the leadership role in schools must be considered as primarily a people-people relationship. No amount of course work can guarantee that a candidate for an administrative position will have the qualifications a given school district wants. Those who prepare educational leaders are totally remiss if they do not attempt to teach prospective administrators that paper credentials, however valuable, cannot always win the day. School boards, after all, are not noted for their great wisdom, erudition, and insight. Their acceptance of a candidate for an administrative post is generally based upon intangible factors—vibrations or an intuitive feeling and candidates are rejected for the same reasons. Having served as a consultant with many school boards, I can document the preceding generalization. When a candidate is selected who is no better qualified than any other candidate, the selection cannot be based solely on credentials. It would behoove prospective leaders to analyze this harsh yet simple fact, a fact which must be emphasized in courses in leadership.

It comes as a shock to many eager but untried would-be leaders that intangibles play so big a part in getting and in retaining a leadership position. Some people seem too arrogant or too timid, too strong or too weak, too modern or too conservative. Some boards of education do not like a man with a mustache, or worse yet, a beard, and others do not like a man who is too
polished and dignified or too rough and gruff. Sometimes a candidate is rejected for tangible but unfair (and illegal) reasons, such as belonging to the “wrong” church, ethnic group, political party, or race. Certain obvious inequities in employment practices have been noted by the courts, and now that the legal decisions are made, there will be no unfairness in the selection of candidates, reality notwithstanding. Other influences may include marital status, membership in service organizations, or even wearing a Masonic ring, and the university from which one graduates is sometimes a consideration, also.

Most of the preceding intangibles cannot be easily controlled by the candidate, but the selection of the “right” university may be an excellent exercise in decision making. Some universities are well known for their research, others for their placement contacts, and others for their prestige. Some universities are members of the ingroup of speech makers, book writers, paper presenters, grant receivers, theory developers and/or copiers, and jargon weavers. The quality of instruction at these universities is a given, especially since those who rate them belong to the same ingroup. The few leaders who lead by virtue of ability do not have to rely upon university ties, but, by definition, such leaders are not in abundance. A student with a graduate degree from the right university is usually guaranteed a chance to be selected as a leader. Whether the chance itself is sufficient relates back to the intangibles cited, but the advantages of the proper connections and affiliations are definitely factors to consider in the preparation of administrative leaders.

It is no secret that administrators, particularly superintendents, often get fired. The various reasons why they lose their positions have great import for those who are charged with the formal preparation of leaders. Among the most commonly cited reasons for dismissal are the following:

1. Superintendent did not accept alternative means to attempt to solve problems.
2. Superintendent did not give enough priority to orientation of board members.
3. Superintendent avoided making decisions until he was forced into a decision.
4. Superintendent did not change with the community.
5. Superintendent became too possessive about the school system.
6. Superintendent did not delegate authority.
7. Superintendent was not public relations conscious.
8. Superintendent did not conduct his life with proper decorum.
9. Superintendent did not know bargaining problems.
10. Superintendent and board did not develop written school board policies.

Although this list has not been validated statistically, it is a compilation of factors which have appeared in the literature and which I have witnessed in my contacts with school boards and superintendents. Anyone who rejects the list because of its origin alone can develop his own statistically valid lists.

Assuming there is some value for the practitioner in what has been presented, professors of educational administration should be keenly aware of the foregoing list. Any item not included should be added. Inappropriate items should be deleted. Students in administration programs who aspire to become superintendents should learn from the list. They can analyze the items in terms of specific and personal application. They can rank the items. They can do the homework necessary to avoid the difficulties and develop strategies to become more effective leaders. They can do research to verify or reject the reasons stated. They can separate the tangibles from the intangibles, the science from the art. Most important, they can gain a realistic view of what expectancies are held for a superintendent.

Exploring and analyzing this list and similar ones can be a challenge to professors as well as students. Professors of administration who have had little or no practical experience as administrators may see in such lists a possible direction for seminar sessions and perhaps for course modification. Professors may be able to use such lists to help future leaders realize the importance of their followers' expectations, particularly those which are primarily subjective.
FRAMEWORK: BRIDGING THE GAP

Obviously the concept of leadership and the nature of leadership preparation need further study, because leading an educational institution is too important to be left in the hands of persons whose professional and personal qualifications are mediocre at best. Everyone involved in and affected by the preparation and selection of educational leaders should take the time to consider basic questions about purpose, motivation, ability, and energy relative to leadership. Those who lead the schools must be able to handle responsibility. To be selected, candidates for administrative positions need better credentials than undistinguished seniority, a political friend, a neighborhood service award, and a university degree earned by perseverance rather than accomplishments.

If some of the problems of leadership can be isolated and analyzed, what are some possible solutions which can be suggested to improve upon the present situation? Many communities throughout the United States are becoming very much involved and sometimes knowledgeable in the determination of who shall lead their schools. Professional associations for school leaders publish a variety of articles, pamphlets, newsletters, and monographs that explore leadership in a changing society. School board members who take the time to read the publications from their official associations can learn a great deal about their roles and responsibilities as leaders. In addition to a wealth of written materials, workshops, conferences, and conventions are held by the professional associations to inform and to stimulate administrators' and board members' leadership concerns. Unfortunately,
one can raise the question of who is leading whom when the professional association succeeds in stimulating leaders because of the attractions of the meeting locale rather than the contents of the meetings.

Universities which prepare educational leaders are also reacting to the changing scene. In many universities the reaction is to pretend that change, like federal grants and vocal critics, will simply fade away. In other universities innovative practices (such as allowing independent study for trustworthy students or designing a preparation program to suit the student's needs and competence) have finally become brand new ideas for implementation. In a few universities sweeping changes have been made in program requirements, so that many options, including nonattendance at the university (with credit, of course) are open to those interested in becoming leaders.

A study of the literature reveals certain important aspects, methods, and needs related to preparation programs. For the remainder of this section of the booklet, some of these important aspects are singled out for commentary. It must be kept in mind that the basic issue in every instance is the person and personality necessary for leadership.
DEFINITION OF PURPOSE

Other than the criteria for selecting students and faculty, the most important ingredient in a program to prepare educational leaders is its objective or purpose. For some unknown reason this purpose is seldom well stated, even though everyone knows that the graduates of these programs are job oriented. To this obvious purpose each university can make its own, unique contribution, which can be stated as a goal, objective, or purpose. Rather than commit nothing to writing for fear of semantic problems, a department of administration should begin somewhere. The following is an example of what might be stated by a university department:

Study in administration should emphasize primarily broad and general experiences rather than the establishment of position-type or highly specialized programs. Actually, preparation for leaders in administration and supervision is provided at two levels:

1. In higher echelons—superintendents of medium-sized and larger districts, and supervisors in larger schools
2. In lower echelons—superintendents, principals, and supervisors in smaller schools.

The major objective of the program in education administration and supervision is to develop competent, practical, and scholarly school leaders through appropriate studies and planned field experiences. Related to this one overriding objective are the following specific objectives:

1. To develop knowledge of the field of school administration and supervision and related fields;
2. To develop effective communication skills in presenting ideas;
3. To develop problem-solving skills in the analysis of practical school problems;
4. To develop positive attitudes toward the theory and practice of school administration and supervision.
The attainment of these objectives by graduate students in administration and supervision is provided for in class work and in the following field experiences:
Semester projects as part of classwork,
Extensive use of resource persons as class visitors,
Use of case studies and documents,
Seminars in educational problems including the use of simulated materials,
Selected participation of students in school surveys, group research projects, field experiences, theses, and dissertations.

Suitable differentiation in the types of learning experiences related to the preceding objectives is made for the various kinds of administrative positions to which the students aspire. Further differentiation is made for the master's-level and doctorate-level graduate students. In close association with colleagues and advisors, students develop the direction of the studies with specific reference to their career expectations.

A statement of purpose, whether good in itself or good only after revision, provides a type of framework. It presents basic questions, such as:

1. Is the basic purpose valid?
2. Are the objectives clear?
3. How can they be improved?
4. Should the emphasis be on course work or a field experience?
5. Are the objectives adequate for theorists and for practitioners?
6. Do the objectives allow sufficient flexibility?

There is nothing in the statement of general purposes which prevents modification of the purpose itself, the objectives, or the course offerings based upon these guides. Updating should be no problem. The listing of experiences can be broadened and made more varied. If the faculty wants to include a practicum in educational administration or an administrative internship, they may be easily added within the framework provided.

Students who read the purpose should be able to get a reasonable idea of the type of program offered in order to make some decisions concerning the relationship between their objectives and those of the program. If the statements are clear, future dissatisfaction and confusion should be held to a minimum, and the reaction to them by students can be an assessment for the university officials. A good program will attract students. Enough said.
SELECTION FACTORS

In spite of some of the tongue-in-cheek comments made in reference to the question WHO ARE THE EDUCATIONAL LEADERS?, there is documented research concerning the relatively low achievement scores of majors in school administration. If the research is correct the university which deplores the findings has to decide upon its criteria for acceptance. Given the economic, political, and social realities of today, some universities cannot afford to be as selective as they would prefer, so standards for acceptance into graduate programs in school administration may have to remain at present levels. Universities which do not have to worry about such concerns, of course, can be as selective as they desire.

The usual listing of criteria for selection of students into a program for the preparation of school leaders includes most of the following:

1. Intelligence
2. Personal standards
3. Broadness of undergraduate liberal education
4. Scholastic achievement
5. Knowledge in professional education fields
6. Excellence in master’s studies and in theses work
7. Professional experience
8. References
9. Standardized test results
10. Administrative potential

The relative importance of these criteria are in themselves a challenge to those who prepare educational leaders. It might be a good lesson in humility for professors of educational adminis-
tration to assess themselves according to these criteria. The super egoists can rate everyone else as a gratifying exercise in superiority.

Some universities publish the cutoff scores on standardized tests which preclude entrance into a doctoral program. It might be wiser to indicate that “satisfactory scores” are necessary as part of the screening procedure so that the screening committee will have sufficient leeway. Anyone with experience in screening applicants knows that some people with excellent test scores are miserable by most other measures and vice versa. If a major decision concerning acceptance into a program is based primarily on test results, the trust in the test must be extremely high and the regard for the human touch must be low. As stated several times in this booklet, the art of leadership is a crucial intangible which no test can measure. Test results, particularly of verbal skills, are very important considerations, but the person who applies for a degree in school administration may have significant abilities undetected by standardized measures.

Perhaps the well publicized fact that there are more holders of doctorates looking for positions than there are positions for them will allow some universities to stiffen selection criteria. Many large universities have cut back on numbers of graduate students and many are considering a total moratorium on entrance into graduate programs in several fields. If there is an overabundance of job seekers as well as doctoral students, some highly capable people may be turned away from the field and/or flee from the competition. Other highly capable people may regard the oversupply as an opportunity to excel due to competition. Regardless of which alternative is more realistic, the implications for selection criteria are varied and challenging. How else would leaders want the situation to be?
PREPARATION PROGRAM

It is clearly recognized that a school is not only a social institution, but also a social entity in its own right, with its own strata, pressures, conflicts, needs, and purposes. If the foregoing can be granted, significant courses in the social and behavioral sciences can be included in the preparation program to strengthen the perceptions and insights of prospective administrators. Merely mentioning that the leader must be aware of new trends and ideas is insufficient; the new trends must be integral parts of the program itself by means of a solid series of course offerings in social, philosophical, and psychological areas. If this integration requires change in the preparation sequence, the change should be made quickly while there is still confusion concerning the purpose of such programs. Once the Great Book is written by a great national leader, everything not following the recipe will be considered suspect.

Assuming that modifications in preparation programs can be made, the course listings must be based upon the purposes cited by the university. Confusion in the mind of the student will arise if this is not done. A mere listing of courses cannot reflect the essence, the art, and the flavor of the courses, but once they are listed, a starting point is established. Although there are some major variations among university programs, accrediting agencies and state certification programs have created an influence which allows a typical administrator preparation program on the doctorate level to be described.

I. The Depth Area:
   1. Basic courses in administration and supervision
2. The administrative core:
   School law and government
   Financial and business management problems in education
   Leadership and policy making
3. Seminar (two required)
4. Field experiences

II. Collateral Areas, at least one or two courses in each:
1. Educational psychology and measurement
2. Curriculum and instruction
3. Guidance and counseling
4. Social, philosophical, and historical foundations

III. Interdisciplinary courses (four courses required):
   Public administration
   Public finance
   Law
   Community relations
   Anthropology
   Sociology
   Politics
   Psychology
   Industrial relations
   Urban studies
   Business management

IV. Approved electives

In an increasing number of universities a practicum in administration and/or an internship is offered as an integral part of the preparation program.

Since this type of list says a great deal about the nature of the preparation program and about the department's expectations, it should be considered carefully before it is adopted and published. Once published, however, it can be modified when necessary. Frequent, periodic review by the staff—and by students, if desired—can reveal the relevance and the acceptance of the courses which are based on the program pattern.

Variation in courses does not mean proliferation of a few ideas ad nauseum. Every course, from Principles of Administration I to an esoteric seminar in theoretical constructs, can be revised
and updated in content and in application. New content is not
guaranteed merely by adding several course offerings. If univer-
sity level educators have difficulty in changing the content of a
basic course, they should have no difficulty in revising seminars.
If the professors are too inexperienced or too cautious to vary
course content in seminars, vocal students will provide the clues
and the direction. In fact, a seminar in crucial issues of leader-
ship would test the mettle of professor and student, and the
results of the test can provide an interesting and important
course in formal and informal leadership for everyone. Students
who receive a grade of B as punishment for leading the leader
can find solace in the future when they recount the anecdote to
their chauffeurs.

To modify a program sequence may require high level con-
sultation before permission can be granted by august boards of
trustees. The professor who is striving to initiate the modifica-
tion should regard such a task as a challenge to his own leader-
ship and administrative skills. If the program modification is valid,
it must be weighed against the effort required to make the change
and the trade-off gains. Changing a well established course struc-
ture may cause a chain of reactions in matters of personnel
assignments, course load, enrollment patterns, scheduling of
facilities, role changes, financial factors, and morale. Since such
considerations are a part of every major decision made by prac-
titioners, academicians should not mind practicing something of
what they teach, the Peter Principle notwithstanding.

The determination of what should be changed or retained can
be a great lesson in team administration. Unless a department of
administration is headed by a tyrant who can dictate to the deans
and others in the university hierarchy, a joint decision is neces-
sary to determine the relevance of any given course. If those who
teach leadership courses cannot agree on the content and scope
of the preparation program, any statement of purpose is inope-
erable. Healthy differences of opinion can be valuable ingredients
in a leadership program, but basic ground rules must be developed
by all concerned. The leadership ability necessary to lead profes-
sors of leadership to agree is the type of skill that students of
leadership strive to learn.
SPECIFIC METHODS AND MATERIALS

Total programs can be developed around field experiences, projects, or internships. Few universities, however, are adventurous enough to implement these new total programs unless there is a major grant available to support the effort. In such instances the effort is usually no more than a pilot project for a select few, and the impact on the "regular" program of leadership preparation is slight. Even the most traditional preparation programs, however, can include some innovative aspects without having to alter the main structure. Without getting into the argument of what is and what is not innovative, there are several specific approaches used in preparation programs for educational leaders which warrant elaboration.

Administrative Internships

Probably the most promising and most advantageous experience for a future administrator is an internship. There are many variations in the scope, nature, and duration of internships, but the essential feature is the supervised, on-the-job opportunity to demonstrate leadership. An internship can be compared to a student teaching experience, except that the intern works as a student administrator; he receives a salary or a stipend; and he is usually a doctoral student. He works for a year, sometimes for a semester, under the tutelage of an experienced administrator and with some supervision from a university faculty member. University credit is given, often towards fulfilling a residency requirement. The internship experience can be in a school, a central of-
office, or a combination of the two. There is a precedent for a rotating internship for administrators who spend several weeks in each of six to ten governmental agencies on the national as well as on the state level. Some internships are restricted to minority group students, some to future urban administrators, some to innovators, and some are open to anyone who qualifies. If the internship is a funded project, the qualifications are spelled out in the proposal, and if the internship is a special arrangement among the intern, the school district, and the university, then the qualifications can be tailor made.

Many of the present successful internship programs sponsored by universities are based upon the model developed by J. Lloyd Trump of the National Association of Secondary School Principals. This program emphasizes innovative curriculum leadership in secondary schools, and although most present programs do not insist upon this emphasis, the structure of the NASSP internship serves as a good model today.

Typically the intern works in a school or central office. He is placed there after being accepted by the university and the local administration. He and his assigned mentor plan activities which require some administrative leadership. The intern is given as much freedom and authority as the designated administrator desires, but generally the intern leads through persuasion rather than from a position of power. The intern is encouraged to take some calculated risks so that he can learn from the experience.
In a desirable internship, the intern works primarily with people and not with things. Moving things is easy; what an intern must learn is that some staff members are petty, intolerant, and often unaware or disinterested in the differences between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation according to some matrix analysis at the .01 level of confidence. He may also learn that some staff members see no sign of wisdom or greatness in his suggestions. The intern keeps logs and other entries to share with his immediate superior and with his university supervisor. If by chance the intern’s superior is a dud and his university supervisor is out of touch with reality, there is still one hope. During regularly scheduled internship seminars, the intern may share insights with his fellow interns. They can cover the entire gamut of human relationships, achievements, frustrations, obstacles, errors. The nature of the discussions can be structured if desired. In case of a problem between the intern and the school district administrator, the university supervisor has a responsibility to be a mediator. The local administrators do not relinquish any of their authority to the university, but part of their agreement with the university is to provide meaningful experiences for the intern. The question of what has meaning lies with all three parties concerned.

**Practicums**

A practicum in administrative leadership is similar to an internship except that it is abbreviated and does not require the supervision of the administrator. In fact, the student may be an administrator while taking the practicum. If he has no administrative post, just like the intern, he has to be placed in a job for the purposes of the experience. A typical practicum is a one semester course in which the student works on a project in a school or agency setting using whatever authority and influence he has to get the job completed. University credit for a practicum experience is given because the student meets at frequent intervals in seminar sessions with the supervising professor and with fellow practicum students. As in internship seminars, the discussions can be varied, but generally the focus in the practicum is on an analysis of each progress report presented. Whether the reports follow a given structure is a matter of professional de-
cision. My own experience with these sessions indicates that the progress reports should include at least the following:

1. Goals
2. Progress to date
3. Leadership role performed
4. Side effects (What else is happening due to the project?)
5. Hindsight views
6. Plans for next steps

In a practicum each student must strive to accomplish the goals he has established, though the goals often have to be changed. But that is just part of becoming a leader.

Leaders need practice in goal setting—before, during, and after gaining a position of leadership. There is no doubt that for good or for ill we are in an era of accountability. Authors have staked out a claim to fame by recounting the truism that some goals are more important than others. The priorities to be established are not predetermined for leaders unless one takes the role of the federal government seriously, but the leaders remain accountable for directions posited. Responsible direction is the task. Practice in developing achievable, responsible, appropriate goals is often lacking in preparation programs, but that can be easily changed.

Reduced to its essence, goal setting merely requires a determination of purpose, benchmark evaluations along the way, modification when necessary, and continued progress toward the end in mind. The wording of the goals, the ranking of the goals, and the means employed to implement the goals can be part of the process, but the essential features of the goals should not be mystifying to anyone, not even to esoteric theoreticians.

If a student learns his goal-setting lessons well in a practicum or internship, he may avoid much future grief. In these field experiences, selecting inappropriate goals may embarrass the student, but the same mistake in a job situation could cause a termination of contract. Better to be embarrassed while an intern than fired while an administrator.

Simulation

The nature and purpose of simulated materials are well known,
but just how varied these materials are may not be as well known, except perhaps to those who are currently enrolled in select university programs for educational leaders. There are tapes, films, filmstrips, manuals, kits, bulletins, letters, notices, and many structured tasks. The initial expense of these materials is high enough to frighten some struggling administration departments, but if the materials are used often, they may turn out to be a good investment, especially if the materials—or the professor—do not become immediately obsolete.

Simulation may be part of other aspects of preparation programs. The use of simulated materials in course work can help to individualize instruction, motivate students, and introduce significant alternatives which might not be realized in any other way. The use of these materials in internships, practicums, and in other field experiences can provide similar advantages, in addition to the advantage of being able to apply conclusions immediately to existing conditions.

Simulation materials are invaluable for focusing on problem solving and on the central issues in school leadership. When these materials are developed intelligently, they cover most situations which administrators face on the job. The major difficulty with simulation, however, is that it obviously is not real and, therefore, may not elicit the true reactions of aspiring leaders. To be calm, detached, and dispassionate when an impersonal problem must be solved as part of a graduate school requirement is quite easy. A complaint about a trampled flower bed during a simulation session may not bother a future administrator, but the same situation in reality can cost an administrator his job if the complaint comes from an irate community power figure.

**Games**

The use and purpose of leadership games are similar to those of simulation, so similar in fact, that some authors classify games as part of simulation. The most commonly used games concern negotiations and the politics of administrative leadership. The successful games provide for a broad range of options to be considered by the players, but the author's ground rules must be accepted. The chief advantage of these games is that they moti-
vate students; even sophisticates find themselves so absorbed in the game that the stakes and issues seem to become real. Tem- pers flare, excuses abound, winners gloat, and losers pout.

The implicit assumption of the games is that people play roles. The participants assume roles about which they can project their views and feelings. Sometimes these overt signs of preconceived role definitions can help the professor and other participants to evaluate the student as a potential leader. Perhaps the level of astuteness and insight needed to make proper evaluations will present a serious challenge to all. No matter how successful the game may be, it is still a game, and cunning would-be leaders can size up a situation and role play as well as many professional actors. Those who were born bored may not be able to relate to a game except in a perfunctory manner. Perhaps games and simulation work best with existentialists and others who profess that they are not sure of what is real.

Case Studies and Episodes

Case studies and episodes for analysis are new again in leadership preparation courses. The case study is differentiated from the episode by the scope, degree of detail presented, and depth of analysis required. Both, however, present situations for the student to evaluate so that he can pose a solution to the problem. The analysis of the situation can be either an individual assignment or the topic for a seminar. Well written case studies and episodes can be purchased or developed by those involved in preparation programs. Probably the best materials are those which provide sufficient information about a given situation, but which do not isolate the issues or suggest the alternatives available. The great value of these approaches is that each student—and the open-minded professor—can learn that there can be wholesome differences of opinion concerning the issue itself as well as the means of solving the problem.

At the heart of case studies and episodes is the decision-making process. A logical analysis of a situation may lead to an emotionally based decision and vice versa—on occasion. Prospective leaders and those who profess to educate them must come to grips regularly, frequently, and purposefully with decision making.
Few people who are affected by the decisions of the leader care about the process. To the majority a process is impersonal, even though decisions often have personal impact. Thus, with all due respect to the models for decision making which can be applied to case studies and episodes, the use of these approaches should emphasize decisions and not process alone. How and why one makes certain decisions has baffled philosophers through the ages, and in recent years, psychologists and sociologists have added their studies of the topic. To repeat, processes for decision making should not be ignored in leadership preparation programs, but they are only means to an end. The prospective leaders must be made aware that the decisions themselves are the ends, at least as perceived by the followers. No one seems to care about an administrator's ability to recite an academic model for decision making if he is unable to decide upon whether to open the doors of the school building early on rainy days.

**Miscellaneous Approaches**

Much can be written about the alleged values and inherent worth of other approaches incorporated into preparation programs for school leaders. Because there is little evidence, however, that these approaches have had widespread acceptance, they will be noted with minimal elaboration.

*Conflict management*—It is no secret that administrators often react to pressures on a basis of urgency rather than priority. These pressures often pose conflicts which must be solved without delay, and those people causing the pressures are often seen as adversaries by the educational leader. It has been duly noted in the literature that some experience in conflict management should be included in preparation programs. Certainly, some of the approaches described in this booklet can be modified to include conflict management. Ask any intern or any professor whose grant has been eliminated.

*Competency-based education*—This approach is receiving more and more attention as a means of improving administrator preparation sequences. Essentially, the competence of the student (which can be determined by test results, experience, measurement by objectives, and other means) will allow him to pursue
certain options in the sequence which are not available to others of lesser competence. Conferences on this topic are becoming popular, but right now only a few universities are formally experimenting with this idea.

Surveys—For years professors of school administration have used graduate students to conduct surveys reported as original work by these professors. Most likely, the practice will continue. The world is waiting with bated breath to learn about the number of outhouses behind school buildings in rural areas.

Despite the heap of trivial surveys conducted every week, the process of surveying people can be of great value as a learning experience for the administration students. Statistics and measurement courses are often regarded as unnecessary obstacles for administration majors, but perhaps some of the information these students fail to understand in such courses can be made practical through survey work. In many universities, graduate students have misconceptions about the job of an administrator. Simple surveys involving small, manageable samples can provide useful insights for these students, especially if the surveys deal with role, tasks, pressures, and other factors related to administering a school. The mere development of a simple survey instrument can be a valuable leadership experience.

If the surveys include interviews, the effort will certainly be worthwhile for students, because interviews reveal so much that cannot be learned any other way. Since a leader deals with people, developing interview techniques should be an asset to future leaders. Present leaders who are too busy to be bothered by interviews—these are the leaders who did not learn their lessons well.

Human relations workshops—The concept of humanizing education has become very popular, at least on the verbal level. As part of a preparation program, future leaders in some universities are now given the opportunity to attend workshops, conferences, and T-group sessions in order to develop skills in human relationships. But sensitivity training, so widely accepted several years ago, is no longer as attractive as it once was. Still, the concept has promise, especially if those who serve as leaders in the movement can maintain the human touch. The concluding comments in this booklet relate to this point.
CONCLUDING COMMENTS

When too much emphasis is placed upon the science of administration and leadership and too little is placed upon the art, the status of leadership is questionable. The necessity of a knowledge of administrative principles and issues cannot be denied, but it is due to other concerns that school leaders rise or fall. Although leading an educational institution may require business acumen, the leader can always employ a business manager who understands the budgetary formulas and processes spelled out by state agencies. Although leading an educational institution may require legal knowledge, the leader can always get expert advice from attorneys.

A leader can be strong and direct, but he must be kind. Leading a school system is not like coaching a sport where a tough Lombardi-type figure can be a great success. Football players are motivated by the recognition and fortune which playing football can provide immediately. They will endure harsh treatment and accept directives without major qualms. Staff members, students, and communities, however, (with few exceptions) do not view their participation in school situations as analogous with athletics. Tough treatment from the leader is not apt to be respected and is seldom tolerated. The power of edicts notwithstanding, the effective leader in a school situation cannot rely solely upon his authority. A school is different from all other social agencies in that it is the arena for formal as well as informal investigation of knowledge and pursuit of truth. An openness must characterize the school in matters of content and method if not in traffic and scheduling patterns.
This openness is a quality which excellent school leaders must possess. Openness does not mean blunt, tactless opinionating. It means a curiosity, a willingness to work with alternatives, a love of people. Honesty and integrity must be the overriding values. However trite these comments are, their importance cannot be overstated. Facts can be learned, edicts can be issued, and students will get older regardless of the type of leadership. Unless school leaders and those who purport to prepare them are intelligent, compassionate, warm, loving people, neither educational leaders nor their schools will ever reach their full potential.

If during the preparation program the prospective leader learns to understand more about himself professionally and personally, he may realize that he will or will not be able to meet the demands of leadership. If he realizes he should not be a leader, he will have learned an expensive but valuable lesson: not everyone can lead effectively. If he realizes he can be a leader, he will have learned a difficult but equally valuable lesson: the obligations of leadership are great.

The prospective leader should learn to ask some basic and penetrating questions of himself after he decides that he can be a leader. In a preceding section of this booklet there is a list of why superintendents get fired. Based on that list and on insights derived as part of a preparation program, the future leader should engage in some introspection concerning the following:

1. Can I make appropriate decisions?
2. Can I accept negative criticism?
3. Can I trust others?
4. Can I afford to take some risks?
5. Can I communicate effectively?
6. Can I afford the necessary time to lead?
7. Can I stand the loneliness of leadership?
8. Am I prepared to be fired?

Introspection alone cannot supply the answers. A prospective leader should strive to get reactions from professors and from fellow students in terms of how others see him as well as how they would answer the questions about themselves. It is easy for a leader, sometimes even one elected to high office, to consider
himself above the need to analyze himself and his motives. During the preparation program, at least, honesty should prevail.

These concluding comments are not intended to demean the importance of the knowledge presented in preparation programs for educational leaders. On the contrary, the courses and the field experiences included in preparation programs provide future leaders with much of the requisite knowledge to perform their jobs. Without this knowledge, however, an awareness of what leadership entails must be implicitly and explicitly woven into the programs. Knowledge alone cannot be the factor that makes leaders successful, whether on the professional or the practitioner level.
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