Portfolio Analysis: Documenting the Progress and Performance of Educational Administration Students

Teresa Northern Miller and Trudy Salsberry

The field of educational administration continues to evolve as practitioners and researchers face the challenges of preparing leaders for schools. Cries for reform in university preparation of school administrators have been documented in a recent University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) monograph, *Better Leaders for America's Schools: Perspectives on the "Manifesto."*[1] Lassley's concerns included the following:

- Academic mediocrity may now be the norm;
- An educational monopoly in teacher and administrative preparation programs creates a barrier which keeps qualified persons from using skills needed to guide schools;
- The accountability movement has documented the weaknesses of American schools;
- Well-grounded professional preparation standards have not existed in the past.

In addition, research as to the validity of administrator preparation programs is lacking. Murphy and Vriesenga[2] reviewed existing research on administrative preparation programs as part of a UCEA project and found:

- The quantity of research on educational administration is quite limited;
- Few faculty are engaged in research regarding educational administration—existing research typically comes from dissertations;
- Research that exists is unfocused and largely survey or quantitative research;
- Existing research has not had much impact on practice.

The study reported here is intended to address both the concerns regarding the lack of successful administrator preparation programs and the need for additional research which can be used to evaluate administrator preparation programs.

Teresa Northern Miller is Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership at Kansas State University. Trudy Salsberry is Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership at Kansas State University.

Traditional training programs housed in institutions of higher education generally offer a series of courses designed and delivered by the professors of such institutions. A series of courses usually results in a degree and/or some form of licensure or certification for several levels of school administration. Rarely are practitioners consulted or included in the training process other than some form of loosely structured internships. Hoyle captured dissatisfaction with the very field of educational administration and thus with formal preparation programs.[3] He noted problems with a modernist physical science approach to the research in the field and a knowledge base in disarray. In addition, he argued that the demands for convenience in licensure and degree acquisition would continue to grow. As the accountability of *No Child Left Behind* requirements increase, demands for major changes in administrator preparation programs have been made in other studies, indicating a need for strengthening school-university partnerships while documenting a link between improved student achievement and strong school leaders.[4] In order to effectively change leadership preparation programs and better meet the new requirements for improved student achievement, reforms need to be made and evaluated.

A university located in the American Midwest has responded to these challenges by developing a series of partnerships with public schools to provide a Master's degree in Educational Leadership as an alternative to the traditional training delivery model still available. Through the development of unique academies, university instructors and school leaders co-plan and co-instruct cohorts of teachers within districts through two to three year programs of field-based administrative preparation. The students in the preparation programs of both delivery formats are assessed through a student-created portfolio, which documents progress and performance on the six standards developed by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC).[5] These are as follows:

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

II. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth;

III. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment;

IV. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources;

V. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

VI. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

The results of a pilot study, consisting of a document analysis of student-created portfolios from both the traditional and academy programs, are presented in this article. In the near future, a larger case study will be conducted to provide a more complete review of all of the significant elements needed to effectively evaluate the preparation program.

Context for the Study

Both traditional and academy program formats have been provided at this university for several years. Increasingly, university faculty are contacted by school leaders to develop more collaborative "field-based, on-site" administrative and teacher leadership programs. In addition, the state recently adopted the ISLLC standards as part of administrative licensure requirements. Accordingly, university faculty and public school personnel have worked collaboratively to align both delivery formats with the ISLLC and state licensure standards. A performance assessment portfolio was identified as the evidence required for completion of the master's degree. Prior to this study, no systematic, summative, and comprehensive analysis had been made. Therefore, an analytic process, based on documentation found in the portfolio, was developed to determine student growth and quality of the training and to provide a lens for program evaluation. The analysis of the portfolio is the first step in a larger study which will include a range of data sources, e.g., graduate interviews, surveys, completion rates, and job placement.

Research Methods

This study used student-created exit portfolios as the database for a qualitative document analysis of two forms of degree program delivery. The two forms of delivery included a traditional format consisting of a series of 30-39 credit hours of formal coursework delivered on campus by university faculty with licensure as an additional option, and a school-university collaborative format with the equivalent of 30-39 credit hours of coursework delivered on-site in school districts working in partnership with the university to deliver a Master's degree with certification as an additional option. In each delivery format, students in the Master's program were required to submit a portfolio documenting their acquisition of knowledge, growth in their performances, and changes or affirmation of the dispositions deemed necessary for school leaders, as defined by the early guiding document prepared by ISLLC. These standards have since been revised and adopted by numerous state education departments for training and licensing.

The student portfolios contained the following items:[6]

- *A resume and program of study*;
- *A self-assessment matrix* for each of the standards completed at the beginning, middle, and end of coursework, with four ratings for student development of knowledge, dispositions and performances– Little Understanding, Basic, Proficient, and Distinguished;
- *An executive summary* of student perceptions of achievement from the beginning of their coursework to the end of their program—a Master's degree and/or licensure;
- *Brief descriptions of artifacts* that documented their performances on each standard.
- *Detailed descriptions and inclusion of showcased (strongest) artifacts* for each standard with the rationale for selection;
- *Narratives relating student Knowledge, Dispositions, and Performances* related to each standard which provided evidence to support the ratings in the self-assessment matrix.

Executive summaries, self assessments, artifacts and descriptions, and narratives were used in this pilot study to assess: (a) the student's perceived range of growth on each of the six standards; (b) recurrent themes in the executive summaries; (c) the quality and relatedness of student artifacts to each of the six standards; (d) the quality of student experiences related to each of the six standards; and (e) the student's ability to show connections between the professional literature and practice.

Criterion-based selection was used to determine the participants in this pilot study.[7] The criteria were as follows:

- The student must have been enrolled in a Master's program in the university's Department of Educational Leadership;
- The student must have graduated with the Master's degree during the academic year of 2003-2004;
- The student must have volunteered for participation.[8]

Ten students, five from each of the two program delivery formats were purposively selected for analysis based on these criteria. Although gender, age, and size of school were identified, the findings were disaggregated only by delivery format because of the small sample size and the process of selection. The ten selected comprised approximately 30% of all those graduating during the specified academic year. All students provided written consent forms and responded to a short demographic questionnaire to establish and confirm common characteristics. The characteristics for these students are listed in Table 1. Students from the traditional format group included two females and three males while students from the academy format group included five females and no males.

A qualitative approach for analysis was used, where the researchers began by jotting ideas in the margins of the documents, then moved to memorandum-writing, trying out themes, and exploring analogies/concepts, resulting in the development of tables and coding categories.[9] These coding categories were used to reduce information into meaningful units for explanation of the results. The data were disaggregated by delivery format, using the ISLLC standards as a framework for reporting. Each data set was examined using a different process which will be discussed in the remainder of this section.

Self–assessment matrix. The self-assessment matrices were analyzed by standard and by the subcategories of knowledge, dispositions, and performances. The matrix and performance levels were introduced to students at the beginning of their program, with the expectation that three sets of ratings would be completed during the degree program—at the beginning, midpoint, and end. The performance ratings: Little Understanding (LU) as the lowest rating; Basic (B) understanding; Proficient (P) as proficient; and Distinguished (D) as the highest rating. Growth was noted with a number reflecting the increase in rankings and the letter of the highest rating. For example, a student who moved two categories, from Little Understanding to Proficient, would be marked 2P while a student who moved one category, from Basic to Proficient, would be marked with a 1P. A student who perceived no growth would be noted only with the letter of rating. Students were informed when they began the program that it would be rare for them to be at the Distinguished rating level, and that they should not view an initial rating of Little Understanding negatively. Department faculty agreed that there

Table 1
Characteristics of Master's Degree Students Submitting Portfolios

Student Code by Type of Program	*Gender M/F*	*Miles from Campus*	*Age Range (years)*	*Years to Complete M.S.*	*Years in Education*	*Earning M.S. and/or License*	*Enrollment and School Type* as of 9/20/03*
Traditional Program							
F1	F	125	41–50	3.0	24	Both	122 Jr/SrH
F2	F	2	20–25	3.0	6	M.S.	341 MS
M1	M	35	26–30	3.0	8	Both	1,295 SrH
M2	M	20	20–25	4.0	6	Both	413 HS
M3	M	95	26–30	3.0	10	Both	182 HS
Academy Program							
F3	F	20	31–40	2.5	15	Both	152 El
F4	F	60	41–50	2.0	7	Both	507 Jr/SrH
F5	F	15	26–30	1.5	15	M.S.	356 Jr/SrH
F6	F	5	31–40	2.5	7	M.S.	152 El
F7	F	15	41–50	2.5	7	Both	152 El

* School type: Jr/SrH = combined junior and senior high school; MS = middle school; HS = high school; El = elementary school.

was no expectation that students would complete the program at a specified level; rather, all students were expected to demonstrate growth from the beginning to the end of their administrative program.

Executive Summaries. Executive summaries were examined for common topics or comments to establish overarching themes and corresponding subthemes. Students reflected on their growth from the beginning to the end of their program. The questions guiding the content analysis for the executive summaries were:

- What specific activities or types of growth did students discuss?
- What types of experiences were most commonly reported by students?
- Have students' ideas about leadership changed? If so, how have they changed?
- What specific types of knowledge, dispositions, and performances were most discussed by students?

Showcased Artifacts. The artifacts were reviewed for quality and accurate portrayal of their relationship to the identified standards. Based on both quality and relationship to the standard, the artifact for each standard was rated as Strong (S), Acceptable (A), or Marginal (M). Strong artifacts included sufficient detail, fit the standard listed, and described a clear leadership role with strong contributions and collaboration. Acceptable artifacts were related to the standard, but described a minor leadership role, e.g., simple participation or a role defined by another. Marginal artifacts did not clearly describe the participant's role, did not fit the standard, and showed no evidence of contribution.

Narratives. The narratives were coded in two ways. First, they were rated as to their ability to demonstrate acquisition of knowledge, dispositions, and performances for each standard. Ratings were either High (H) or Low (L). Narratives receiving a rating of High contained several detailed examples while narratives rated Low contained minimal examples and no details. Narratives were also rated as to the number of connections they made to credible literature. Ratings ranged from 0 to 3. If a narrative mentioned several prominent authors, it was rated 3, while a narrative that mentioned authors who were not as prominent was rated 2. A rating of 1 was given to those narratives that mentioned few prominent authors; and narratives that mentioned no authors received a rating of zero.

Findings

In this section, the findings from the initial review of ten student portfolios are presented. The portfolios revealed some differences across the two delivery formats with indicators of the differences between delivery formats in this study primarily related to the descriptions and types of artifacts selected as evidence of professional growth.

Self-Assessment Matrix. Students in both delivery formats perceived growth. The traditional format matrices reflected more variety of ratings than did those for the academy format. (See Tables 2.1 and 2.2.)[10] Ratings for students in the traditional program ranged from Little Understanding to Distinguished, as follows:

Standard I: Basic/5; Proficient/8; Distinguished/2.
Standard II: Basic/5; Proficient/9; Distinguished/1.
Standard III: Little Understanding/1; Basic/5; Proficient/9.
Standard IV: Little Understanding/1; Basic/5; Proficient/9.
Standard V: Little Understanding/2; Basic/3; Proficient/8; Distinguished/2.
Standard VI: Little Understanding/1; Basic/6; Proficient/6; Distinguished/2.

Table 2.1
Self-Assessment Matrix: Perceptions of Growth and Final Level of Attainment By Knowledge, Dispositions, Performances for ISLLC Standards In a Traditional Program

Student Codes	*Category**	*Standard I*	*Standard II*	*Standard III*	*Standard IV*	*Standard V*	*Standard VI*
F1	Knowledge	B	B	B	B	B	B
	Dispositions	P	P	B	B	P	B
	Performances	B	P	B	P	B	B
F2	Knowledge	1P	1P	2P	1P	1P	2P
	Dispositions	3D	1D	1P	2P	1P	2D
	Performances	3D	2P	2P	2P	2P	2P
M1	Knowledge	1P	2P	1P	1P	1P	2P
	Dispositions	1P	1P	1P	1P	1P	2P
	Performances	2P	1B	1P	1P	1P	1B
M2	Knowledge	1B	1B	1B	1B	1B	1B
	Dispositions	1B	1B	1B	1B	LU	1B
	Performances	1B	1B	LU	LU	LU	LU
M3	Knowledge	1P	2P	2P	2P	2D	1P
	Dispositions	1P	2P	1P	1P	1D	1P
	Performances	2P	2P	1P	1P	1P	2D

* Ratings were: LU = Little Understanding; B = Basic Understanding; P = Proficient; D = Distinguished. Growth was noted by a number reflecting the increase in rankings and the letter of the highest rating. For example, a student who moved two categories, from Little Understanding to Proficient, would be marked 2P. A student who moved one category, from Basic to Proficient would be marked with a 1P. A student who perceived no growth would be noted with the letter of rating, such as LU for Little Understanding.

Academy program students rated themselves either Basic or Proficient, with a majority of the ratings at the same level, as follows:

Standard I: Basic/4; Proficient/11;
Standard II: Basic/5; Proficient/10;
Standard III: Basic/11; Proficient/4
Standard IV: Basic/2; Proficient/13;
Standard V: Basic/6; Proficient/9;
Standard VI: Basic/10; Proficient/5.

The consistency in academy student responses might reflect the cohesiveness developed through the two-year cohort group.

Numerical ratings, ranging 1 to 3, were also used to indicate the amount of growth. For example, students who moved ahead one category received a rating of 1, and so forth. By totaling these across the rows for knowledge, dispositions, and performances, one finds slightly higher perceptions of growth by academy students. Using the totals to determine the amount of growth per standard, the least amount of growth for traditional students was found on Standards III, IV, and V. For academy students, the least amount of growth was found on Standards I, II, and V. There were only minor differences in student ratings on the subcategories of knowledge, dispositions and performances. Both groups perceived growth in all three subcategories.

Executive Summaries. The researchers reviewed each student's executive summary for comments that indicated growth from the beginning of the program to the end. Categories were developed, and responses were coded for students' overall perceptions of growth, perceptions about leadership, and perceptions of growth in applying leadership skills. Based on an intensive coding process, the following student comments were representative of the responses in each of these categories:

> I realized the incredible upward spiral of growth that was needed and expected on my part. (F1)

> I have been able to grow and develop in my understanding of the roles involved within the school system. (F4)

> The coursework...allowed me the chance to expand my knowledge about how schools are organized. (M1)

Changes in student perceptions as to their understanding of leadership were also found in comments:

> My perception of leadership in organizations prior to this coursework was based on a top down, authoritarian model. (F6)

> I felt the leadership myth, that leaders who sometimes keep secrets or withhold information due to a sense of power, was a reality. (F7)

Table 2.2
Self-Assessment Matrix: Perceptions of Growth and Final Level of Attainment By Knowledge, Dispositions, Performances for ISLLC Standards In an Academy Program

Student Codes	*Category**	*Standard I*	*Standard II*	*Standard III*	*Standard IV*	*Standard V*	*Standard VI*
F3	Knowledge	1B	B	1B	B	B	1B
	Dispositions	P	1P	2P	1P	B	B
	Performances	1P	1B	1B	B	1B	1B
F4	Knowledge	2P	1P	1B	1P	1P	2P
	Dispositions	2P	1P	1B	1P	1P	1P
	Performances	2P	1P	1B	1P	1P	1B
F5	Knowledge	1B	1B	1B	2P	1B	1B
	Dispositions	1B	1B	1B	2P	1B	1B
	Performances	1B	1B	1B	2P	1B	1B
F6	Knowledge	1P	1P	1P	1P	1P	1B
	Dispositions	1P	P	P	P	P	1B
	Performances	1P	1P	1P	1P	1P	1B
F7	Knowledge	2P	1P	1B	2P	1P	2P
	Dispositions	2P	1P	1B	2P	P	2P
	Performances	2P	1P	1B	2P	P	2P

* Ratings were: LU = Little Understanding; B = Basic Understanding; P = Proficient; D = Distinguished. Growth was noted by a number reflecting the increase in rankings and the letter of the highest rating. For example, a student who moved two categories, from Little Understanding to Proficient, would be marked 2P. A student who moved one category, from Basic to Proficient would be marked with a 1P. A student who perceived no growth would be noted with the letter of rating, such as LU for Little Understanding.

Several students indicated gains in leadership skills which could be used in their current positions. Representative comments included:

> I will more consciously endeavor to stay up with current research through reading, listservs and other means. (M2)

> I began reading other books related to my teaching position. (F3)

> I've definitely learned to seek out and recommend other professional development opportunities rather than wait for the school district to offer us the knowledge we need. (F6)

All students in both groups perceived some personal growth and gains in knowledge, dispositions, and performances. Also, there were common topics or areas of growth statements. For example, students' personal growth statements often mentioned a change in vision and an awareness of a wider context than their own classrooms, often extending into their respective communities. The views of leadership moved from an authoritarian style of leadership to a more inclusive, collaborative style of leadership. The skills gained were mentioned most often: collaboration; identification of personal strengths and weaknesses; information literacy; and use of technology. Other skills mentioned less frequently were: lifelong learning; staying current with research; communication; and identification of tasks for leadership development.

Artifacts and descriptions. The student portfolios included six showcased artifacts which were analyzed as to quality and depth of leadership roles in which the students engaged. Twenty-one of the 30 showcased artifacts reviewed from the traditional students contained strong evidence of leadership roles while 23 of the 30 artifacts reviewed from the academy students demonstrated strong evidence. (See Tables 3.1 and 3.2.) When comparisons were made by standard, the traditional students' artifacts were strongest for Standards I, IV, V; and for academy students, artifacts were strongest for Standards I, II, IV, VI. Further, for academy students, the most consistent rating (Strong) was for Standard IV(Collaboration). Combining ratings for both formats, artifacts for Standards I and IV were the strongest.

Narrative Descriptions. The narrative descriptions were rated in two ways: (a) Did the narrative description demonstrate that the student had acquired knowledge, dispositions, and performances for each standard; and (b) Did the narrative description provide connections to credible literature? In response to the first question, ratings were either High (H) or Low (L). The first rating was related to the number of examples given to demonstrate knowledge, dispositions, and performances of each standard; narratives receiving a rating of High contained several detailed examples while narratives rated Low contained minimal examples and no details. The rating for the second question was determined by the number of connections the

Table 3.1
Ratings of Students' Showcased Artifacts by ISLLC Standard In a Traditional Program*

Student Codes	*Standard I*	*Standard II*	*Standard III*	*Standard IV*	*Standard V*	*Standard VI*
F1	A	A	A	A	A	A
F2	S	S	S	S	S	A
M1	S	S	S	S	S	S
M2	S	S	S	S	S	S
M3	S	A	A	S	S	S

Table 3.2
Ratings of Students' Showcased Artifacts by ISLLC Standard In an Academy Program*

Student Codes	*Standard I*	*Standard II*	*Standard III*	*Standard IV*	*Standard V*	*Standard VI*
F3	S	S	S	S	S	S
F4	S	S	S	S	S	S
F5	A	A	A	S	A	M
F6	S	S	S	S	A	S
F7	S	S	A	S	S	S

* Ratings were defined as follows: S = Strong, where the artifact contained sufficient detail, fit the category, and the student demonstrated a clear leadership role, strong contributions and collaboration; A = Acceptable, where the artifact fit the category, but the student did not play a dominant role, was involved in a minor role, or was told or given directions; M = Marginal, where the artifact did not clearly fit the category. The student attended, but his/her role was unclear. Here there was no evidence of contribution. The artifact might be classified as busy work or a clerical task, and not distinctly different from work performed in a teacher role.

narrative made to credible literature. Ratings ranged from 0 to 3. If a narrative mentioned several prominent authors, it was rated 3, while a narrative that mentioned authors who were not as prominent was rated 2. A rating of 1 was given to those narratives that mentioned few prominent authors; and narratives that mentioned no authors received a rating of zero.

The overall ratings for narratives across the two programs were relatively equal although there were some differences as to the number of connections made to credible literature. In particular, traditional students cited a higher number of references than academy students. However, the narratives documented students' abilities related to each standard equally well across program delivery formats. Tables 4.1 and 4.2 list the results of this analysis.

Summary

This analysis of portfolios as a performance assessment measure of student proficiencies related to the ISLLC standards for school leaders indicated that both traditional and academy formats were effective in preparing students to apply those standards to school situations. Students in both delivery models perceived growth and were able to demonstrate their skills and performances by creating strong artifacts and completing executive summaries and narratives describing their growth in relationship to each standard. Both programs appear to have yielded a clearer understanding of the guiding framework (ISLLC Standards) and high levels of confidence in leadership abilities. There were, however, differences between the two delivery models. Traditional students perceived a broader range of growth than did those in the academy format. Academy students indicated more consistency in their ratings on the self-assessment than did traditional students. The executive summaries of both groups reflected similar growth comments and patterns. For showcased artifacts, academy students had slightly stronger ratings than did traditional students. Academy students' artifacts were stronger for Standards I, II, IV, VI while traditional students' artifacts were stronger for Standards I, IV and V. The narratives were relatively equal across both formats, with traditional students earning higher ratings on references to prominent authors.

Implications

Based on the analysis of portfolios for this pilot study, the following recommendations warrant consideration for both and current practice and further study:

- Traditional and school-university partnership administrator preparation programs should be continued as valid delivery and performance assessment models for leadership preparation programs;
- Both types of programs should work to increase student understanding of the self-assessment matrix ratings to broaden student abilities to assess their own growth;

Table 4.1
Ratings of the Narrative Descriptions of the Six ISLLC Standards by Knowledge, Dispositions, and Performances in a Traditional Program*

Student Codes	*I (a)*	*I (b)*	*II (a)*	*II (b)*	*III (a)*	*III (b)*	*IV (a)*	*IV (b)*	*V (a)*	*V (b)*	*VI (a)*	*VI (b)*
F1	H	3	H	3	H	3	H	3	H	3	H	3
F2	H	1	H	1	H	1	H	1	H	1	H	1
M1	H	3	H	3	H	3	H	3	H	3	H	3
M2	H	3	H	3	H	3	H	3	H	3	H	3
M3	L	0	L	0	L	0	L	0	L	0	L	0

Table 4.2
Ratings of the Narrative Descriptions of the Six ISLLC Standards by Knowledge, Dispositions, and Performances in an Academy Program*

Student Codes	*I (a)*	*I (b)*	*II (a)*	*II (b)*	*III (a)*	*III (b)*	*IV (a)*	*IV (b)*	*V (a)*	*V (b)*	*VI (a)*	*VI (b)*
F3	H	2	H	2	H	2	H	2	H	2	H	2
F4	H	2	H	3	H	3	H	2	H	2	H	2
F5	H	1	H	2	H	1	H	1	H	1	L	1
F6	H	1	H	1	H	1	H	1	H	1	H	1
F7	H	3	H	2	H	1	H	2	H	2	H	2

* The narratives were coded in two ways: (a) the narratives were rated as to the student's ability to demomstrate acquisition of Knowledge, Dispositions, and Performances in each standard. Ratings were: H = High for narratives with several detailed examples; and L = Low for narratives with minimal examples and no details; (b) The narratives were also rated as to the number of connections to credible literature. A rating of 3 was given for mentioning several prominent authors; 2 for mentioning some authors, not as prominent; 1 for mentioning few prominent authors mentioned; and 0 for no authors mentioned.

- Both types of programs should continue to analyze student reflections (executive summaries) for changes in growth statements, perceived applications of growth in using newly developed leadership skills, perceptions regarding growth in the knowledge, dispositions, and performances related to the ISLLC standards;
- Administrative preparation programs should continue to develop connections among students over the length of their administrative coursework, as well as strong connections to school districts in order to provide quality field-based leadership opportunities for students;
- Administrative preparation programs should continue to increase student knowledge, dispositions and performances related to the ISLLC standards and continue to expose students to a broad range of credible, current leadership literature;
- Portfolio assessment and subsequent analyses should be used to provide rich information to universities and students regarding the success of the preparation programs and documentation of student competencies.

This pilot study reported the results of an analysis of exit portfolios, using primarily qualitative data, from one year of graduates enrolled in two types of delivery systems. The researchers will be gathering additional information through student interviews and analysis of portfolios over a longer period of time. Both researchers are convinced that this type of performance assessment is a powerful tool for the assessment of student competencies. In addition, this type of analysis can provide vital information regarding the validity and strength of administrative preparation programs.

Endnotes

[1] Thomas J. Lasley, II. *Better Leaders for America's Schools: Perspectives on the "Manifesto"* (Columbia, Missouri: University Council for Educational Administration, 2004), 4-9.

[2] Joe Murphy and Michael Vriesenga. *Research on Preparation Programs in Educational Administration: An Analysis*, (Columbia, Missouri: University Council for Educational Administration, 2004), 9-12.

[3] John Hoyle, "Educational Administration: Atlantis or Phoenix?" *UCEA Review* 45 (Winter, 2003): 11-14.

[4] Tim Waters and Sally Grubb, *The Leadership We Need: Using Research to Strengthen the Use of Standards for Administrator Preparation and Licensure Programs* (Aurora, Colorado: McREL, 2004); Gene Bottoms, Kathy O'Neill, Betty Fry and David Hill, *Good Principals are the Key to Successful Schools: Six Strategies to Prepare more Good Principals* (Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board, 2003); Bradley Portin, Paul Schneider, Michael DeArmond and Lauren Gundlach, *Making Sense of Leading Schools: A Study of the School Principalship* (Seattle, Washington: Center on Reinventing Public Education, 2003); Kenneth Leithwood, Karen Seashore Louis, Stephen Anderson, and Kyla Wahlstrom, *How Leadership Influences Student Learning* (New York: Wallace Foundation, 2004).

[5] Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium, *Standards for School Leaders* (Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996).

[6] Items used in the pilot study are in italics.

[7] Margaret D. LeCompte and Judith Preissle. *Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research* 2d ed. (San Diego, California: Academic Press, 1993), 69-78.

[8] No one was required to participate in the study, but all Master's degree students prepared a portfolio.

[9] Robert C. Bogdan and Sara K. Biklen, *An Introduction to Theory and Methods*, 3d ed. (Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, 2003), 161-172.

[10] Student F1 completed only one rating using the self-assessment matrix; so no numbers are used to indicate growth. Others without numbers indicate no change in the rating from beginning to end of the program.