



Leadership Orientations of FY00 eMINTS Principals



Susan Tharp

July 2002

July 26, 2002

Leadership Orientations of FY00 eMINTS Principals

This report classifies FY00 eMINTS principals according to their leadership orientation. School visits were conducted during the 1999-2000 and the 2000-2001 school years. On-site visits including interviews with the principals and the eMINTS classroom teachers, illustrate four general leadership orientations among the FY00 principals. Principals with a *collaborative* orientation acted as catalysts to the full implementation of eMINTS. Principals with a *regulating* orientation limited the full implementation of eMINTS. Principals with a *disconnected* orientation had little impact on the implementation of eMINTS in their buildings. In addition to these three main orientations, a fourth, "hybrid" orientation was identified. These leadership orientations are clearly related to the ways eMINTS teachers conduct their lessons. This report describes FY00 principal leadership orientations and to what extent leadership orientation affected the integration of the eMINTS program.

Introduction

Instructional leadership is often reported as a key factor in school improvement. This report describes four leadership orientations found among forty-five FY00 eMINTS principals. Thirty-nine were interviewed twice, once in 2000 and again in 2001. Six principals were new to their schools in 2001. The leadership orientations were devised by analyzing the interviews and observations of the thirty-nine principals who were leading eMINTS buildings for at least two years. The leadership orientations were then applied to the six new principals.

The schools participating in the FY00 eMINTS cohort were significantly larger than other Missouri schools with the same grade spans. This is reflected in both the size of student enrollment and the total FTE in the building. In the 2000-2001 school year the average eMINTS school had an enrollment of 438 students, compared to 367 for the non-eMINTS schools. eMINTS schools had an average of 41 FTE compared to 34 FTE for non-eMINTS schools. In sum, eMINTS schools were larger and more complex than similar schools in the state.

The "leadership orientations" described below were derived from several sources of information: conversations with principals about their participation in the eMINTS program, informal observations of principal interactions with eMINTS teachers, and teacher comments about their principals.

During the period of this analysis the eMINTS program offered no formal training for participating principals, and provided minimal opportunities for principals to communicate with each other. The results of this analysis suggest a clear relationship

This report is one product of the eMINTS evaluation project. Other reports and their overall evaluation plan are available at <http://www.emints.org/evaluation>.

The eMINTS Evaluation focuses on student impacts, teacher impacts, changes in learning environments, and outcomes of project services.

between the character of the principal's orientation towards the eMINTS program and the types of lessons participating teachers engage in. This analysis suggests that the eMINTS program has an opportunity to work with principals to support the development of their teachers.

Limitations of the Orientation Profile

The categories of principal orientation described in this report are based on information gathered from the principal interviews, teacher interviews, and informal observations made by the evaluation team. The information in this report addresses the principals' relationship to the eMINTS program based on a relatively limited set of comments and observations. No attempt was made to collect information about all aspects of a principal's management style.

Criteria for the Leadership Orientation Profile of FY00 eMINTS Principals

In an attempt to identify behaviors related to both internal and external linkages of the FY00 eMINTS building administrators, evaluators developed the Leadership Orientation Profile (see Appendix A)¹. This profile locates principals into one of four general leadership categories: "collaborative," "regulating," "disconnected," and "hybrid." These categories differ in four critical dimensions: (a) the principal as an administrator, (b) principal and staff relations, (c) principal and student interactions, and (d) evidence of community involvement in the school. These four dimensions characterize individual principals' orientation to their school and the task of supporting the new teaching practices associated with the eMINTS program. A total of ten indicators were examined among the four dimensions. When 70% of the indicators were consistently present, the principal was classified in that orientation. When less than 70% of the indicators fell into a particular orientation, but fell into two or three orientations, they were classified as hybrid.

Characteristics of Collaborative, Regulating, and Disconnected Orientations

The differences between collaborative, regulating and disconnected orientation highlight the different ways principals related to their faculties, their students and their communities. Most principals showed a mix of key characteristics, as seen in Table 1, 28.9% of the principals were placed in the collaborative category; 20.0% were placed in the regulating category; 11.1% were placed in the disconnected category, and 40.0% were classified as hybrid. These orientations were very stable; no differences in leadership orientation were discovered in the thirty-nine principals who were observed in the program for two years.

¹ The profile was drawn from The School Portfolio by Victoria Bernhardt; the Southern Regional Education Board's review of literature on Leading School Improvement: What Research Says, available at www.wreb.org; and the International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning, available at www.ucalgary.ca/~iejll/volumbe5/hughes.html

Table 1
Leadership Orientation of FY00 Principals
(in Percent)

Principal Classification	Observed in 2000 and 2001	Observed in 2001	All Principals	Number of Principals
Collaborative	28.2	33.3	28.9	13
Regulating	20.5	16.7	20.0	9
Disconnected	7.7	33.3	11.1	5
Hybrid	43.6	16.7	40.0	18
All Principals	100.0	100.0	100.0	45
Number of Principals	39	6	45	

Four Critical Dimensions of the Collaborative Orientation

In the collaborative orientation, principals support all aspects of the school community. Power and control were shared. It was recognized that working together would meet the needs of the school better than working alone. A comment from a principal with a collaborative orientation:

What we do is value the teachers’ knowledge and their professionalism and value their expertise in what they do . . . I try very seldom to ever make a decision that affects them without their input.

A central theme within the collaborative orientation was one of shared power and control. The principals talked about inclusion and there appeared to be systems in place for an ongoing dialogue. Administrators, teachers, staff, and students learned from each other and with each other. Risk-taking was permitted. One principal with a collaborative orientation said, “Those teachers are risk takers and that’s part of the reason that they were chosen. And, I’m a risk taker.” Members of the school community were free to contribute their ideas, their ideas were listened to, and their ideas were part of the decision-making process. Linkages for those principals with a collaborative orientation meant making contact with, and wanting to be known and to know, staff, students, and community. There were no blocks to communication. According to one principal:

I’m part of our teachers’ team. I really work on building cohesiveness among the staff. I think most of the teachers can talk to me on a personal and professional level. We have a pretty close relationship.

Principal as Administrator

Communication flow, information exchange, and decision-making were examined in this factor.

Communication was consistent and meaningful between all levels in the school. There was a two-way influential relationship. Language suggested inclusiveness: “we as a staff,” “our team,” “it’s a collaborative thing,” “to work together,” “we made those decisions,” “our goal,” “we’re all putting our heads together” and “open door policy,”

were heard. Because of the open flow of communication, one principal noted, “I know the teachers understand and appreciate the dedication of the two teachers who are eMINTS teachers.”

Information exchange was varied and continual. Staff bulletins, e-mails and face-to-face encounters were the norm.

Decision-making was transparent and participatory. With an emphasis on co-leadership, the principal solicited and supported decisions of the staff. One evident decision having to do with the eMINTS project was the furniture purchase and placement. The principals included the teachers in the process. In some cases, the teachers visited other schools before making the selection. One teacher said of the principal, “Our principal asked me to draw up some designs of what I would ideally like.” The teachers had their rooms wired to conform to their teaching preference, even if the wiring was different than other rooms in the school. In some cases, rooms were re-wired when the original idea did not work for the teacher as planned.

Principal and Staff Relations

Strong partnerships, support for innovation, and provisions for staff to work together were the hallmarks of principal and staff relations in the collaborative orientation.

The collaborative orientation paid attention to the interrelatedness and interdependency of the school as a system. A strong partnership fostered a sense of ownership. In one school, the principal had a team of teachers’ interview potential candidates, “so they have input into someone who works with them.” For example, eMINTS teachers were encouraged to teach professional development sessions for their non-eMINTS peers. The principal talked of using “our own teachers to show what expertise that they have.”

Opportunities the principals used to promote staff working together were numerous and varied. The list included: study groups, action research, collaborative days, grade-level meetings, in-service professional development, faculty meetings, at-risk committees, social committees, building climate committees, technology committees, and celebration teams. Here was how one principal summed it up, “We’ve worked on team building.”

Principals described how their orientation helped their staff members, recognized the interrelatedness to each other and to the students. Faculty with principals in the collaborative orientation category did not operate as a set of discrete classrooms, but one element of the whole school. Three different principals commented, “They’ve been real gracious to do as much as they could to make [other] teachers feel like they were welcome” in their classes; “They’ve been great to share information with other teachers;” “They’ve taught teachers, they’ve taught other groups of children, they’ve team taught, they’ve done all kinds of things.” Indication of the all for one, and one for all attitudes of the staff follows:

- eMINTS teachers provided in-service and workshops for non-eMINTS teachers
- eMINTS teachers became mentors
- eMINTS teachers shared material and web sites

- eMINTS teachers opened their rooms for colleagues use
- eMINTS students were “loaned” to assist in other classes, with other teachers, and with the building principal.
- eMINTS teachers brought other classrooms into their rooms and worked with the other teachers.

The eMINTS innovation was recognized and encouraged throughout the building. In one school, the principal allowed a special needs student to attend an in-service on the smart board. The principal said that it not only helped the student, but the teachers in the building to understand that “our students are becoming our teachers.” Teachers were recognized during staff meetings and given extrinsic rewards, such as coupons, extra storage, or simply given acknowledgement of their contributions. “I try to do things to let them know they are appreciated but also how important the job is that they are doing.” Because eMINTS did require extra time the principal “tried to relieve [the teachers] of some of the other things in the building, and not make as many demands on those two teachers as far as committee work.”

Principals with a collaborative orientation enabled the staff to work together. There were examples of principals rescheduling planning periods so that staff could meet within the school day; and giving eMINTS teachers extra release time for planning and developing professional development activities. A critical difference between this orientation and others was that working together was an explicit goal of the principal and not left to chance.

Principal and Student Interaction

Principals in the collaborative orientation category, were aware of individual student achievement, had daily contact with students, and rewarded students for appropriate behavior.

There was evidence that the principals knew the achievement, progress, and accomplishments of the students. “The kids can research by far better than students that have not had the opportunity of an eMINTS classroom. Their research ability, not just on the computer, but in hard copy improved.”

Across the board, these principals could describe what was going on in the classes:

“[The students] did a web quest on the Pueblo Indians and the quest was why they became extinct. They got to follow a scientist and a journalist on their daily communications. I think that really helped the kids understand Native Americans.

They knew about student use of technology and computer applications, such as graphic organizers, web quests, Power Points, Excel, and the Smart Board. But more importantly, they were aware of what the technology afforded academically and the instructional methods for integrating technology into the curriculum:

They have learned to work together because they have shared the computer; they have learned life skills in that respect. They can take

information, they can simplify it, [and] they can create graphs. They can do any kind of comparisons; they can research. They have obtained to a higher degree those kinds of skills than we were doing in the regular classroom. And, I think we've stretched those kids...I would say that the learning that was taking place has been probably the greatest benefit, as well as social skills that they have developed.

The teacher interviews conveyed that one of the reasons that the principals were receptive to inquiry-based teaching was that their principals recognized the benefit to the students.

Principals in the collaborative category routinely spent part of each school day with the student body. Many illustrations were witnessed while visiting the schools, the principals:

- greeted students as they got off the bus,
- joined the students for breakfast,
- administered a practice test,
- supervised a lunch shift,
- read to classes,
- directed car riders, and
- engaged in classroom activities with students.

Students had contact with and were rewarded by the principal when they exhibited positive behavior. Being pictured in a hall of fame rewarded good student citizens. Improved students were rewarded with certificates, pencils, stickers, or public recognition in the newsletter, morning announcements or an assembly. Good attendance was rewarded with a party for the class.

They'll [students] bring me a ticket and tell me what they did to get the ticket. There is a lot more focusing on the whole child and that character development beyond...test scores. We have to raise good kids too, so there's a little more emphasis on that well roundedness as opposed to...academics.

One teacher said that the principal made requests of research from the students. The principal was overwhelmed with the students' work and "couldn't praise the kids enough, and that's important to the kids that [principal] recognizes what they are doing."

Community and School Involvement

Community, volunteer, and parent involvement were actively sought. On entering the school, one was greeted with a prominent welcome sign, a guest book, and/or visual displays. One principal expressed it as:

Parental involvement, we constantly have parent volunteers in the building. That's one thing I think we make parents real comfortable coming in. You know there are volunteers, a lot of volunteers, who come in and volunteer with the kids.

Many examples of reaching out into the community were found. Retired senior volunteers helped to grade papers, lunch buddies arrived to eat with students, businesses

augmented class resources through “partners in education” programs, parents set student behavior expectations in parent advisory councils, and parents joined their students for math nights and technology nights. The community could access the schools outside of school hours for scout meetings, alumni association meetings, and community clubs. These represent a sampling of the school and community interface.

Four Critical Dimensions of the Regulating Orientation

In the regulating orientation, the building principal was the person in charge of the school. The power and control come from that office. In the words of a principal holding a regulating orientation, “I have the final say so.”

In one example of a principal with a regulating orientation, the eMINTS teachers in that school volunteered to complete an application for the eMINTS Expansion program. The principal attempted to assemble the application alone, and consequently, the grant did not get submitted. The principal’s response was, “That’s the way it goes.”

A central theme within the regulating orientation was one of principal power and control. The principals talked about the staff following their lead. Staff was expected to respond to the initiatives and directives of the principal. Principal expectations included implementing structured schedules and enforcing uniform classroom behavior. A primary focus was on student grades and achievement standards. Risk-taking was discouraged. One principal imparted what was “passed on to my staff.” If a staff person could sell the principal on an idea, the response was, “It’s your baby, go for it, if it fails, you’ve failed.” Relationships for those principals were a minor concern; productivity was the main concern.

Principal as Administrator

As in the collaborative orientation, communication flow, information exchange, and decision-making were examined for the regulating orientation.

Communications were typically from the principal to the staff. Directives were apparent in the language used, “my goals, here as an administrator,” “my focus was,” “I made things happen here.” and “I’d tell them what we wanted.”

The information exchange was in the form of orders, delegations, and instructions. The orders flowed from principal to staff. One principal described the building as “very structured.” There was an emphasis on creating and enforcing rules, and staff following those rules. Teachers reported that faculty meetings were infrequent, rushed, and when the faculty met, the principal controlled the agenda.

With little regard for others suggestions or opinions, the principal with the regulating orientation made decisions for the school. For example, in the discussions of acquiring furniture for the eMINTS classrooms, principals in the regulating category took responsibility for all of the details: “I got the measurements.” “I looked through the

catalogues.” “I made the diagrams.” “I wanted to get the biggest table.” “I picked what looked like would probably be the best.”

Principal and Staff Relations

In schools with principals in the regulating category, eMINTS was perceived as primarily a technology or computer project. Limited opportunities for cooperation and partnerships within the school were a second indicator. Thirdly, teachers were operating in discrete classrooms, doing solitary work. The principal saw the teachers as responsible for their own success or failure.

A misconception that many principals had was that eMINTS was all about technology. Often those with a regulating orientation, referred to the eMINTS class as a “computer lab.” When they talked about the eMINTS class they referred to the equipment and the computer applications. A question about active engagement brought the response of “I’ve observed them hunting on the Internet.” They rarely spoke of the inquiry-based component or the cooperative learning component. In fact, they often were not convinced of the benefits of these teaching strategies. When asked what they would tell another principal about eMINTS, they singled out the technology aspect.

The principal was the provider of information and the staff and students were the receivers of information. Meetings were infrequent. One principal summed it up with, “I’m not big on staff meetings.” An example of limited partnerships follows:

A teacher was informed that the building principal would sit down with the teacher and “do some talking before [a decision] was made.” However, in the principal interview, it was said that the principal had already made the decision in question.

Teachers were expected to have little responsibility outside of their own classroom. There was little if any common planning time. The principals with this orientation said that the teachers could meet after school, or during lunch. One said common planning time was “just not doable.” Another principal said that there was not enough time for the eMINTS teachers to share with the other staff members.

Teachers verified the regulating staff relations in their interviews. One teacher said that the principal would like to see all the teachers doing the same thing. That teacher’s response to the sameness was “How boring would that be?” In another school, a teacher was stressed because it was difficult to explain during a “staffing” with the principal, why there were not more paper and pencil grades to show. Another example comes from a teacher whose lessons are “hardly ever teacher-centered.” The principal is not used to the eMINTS teaching style because it is not from the principal’s background. One teacher summed up the feelings of working with a principal with a regulating orientation by saying that the principal does not want to move forward. If something has worked in the past, “why try to change it?”

Principal and Student Interaction

The principal was aware of the students as data, contact with students was primarily in the office, and students were controlled primarily through negative consequences in the regulating orientation.

When the principals were asked about the students, they largely responded with achievement data. Or before responding to a question, they had to check the data, or to be sure, they would have to look at the data. For example, "I'm not positive about that because I didn't look at those figures." One teacher holds that "The MAP is just a test and there are other things in life besides doing well on that test. I'm O.K. until my MAP scores are not up there and the principal comes and sees me." When one principal talks about the reason for a student reading initiative, it was because "it's going to be very important in MAP testing, and in the way we perform on MAP." Another principal remarked,

You know you've got to teach the test [MAP], you're a fool not to teach the test. You know this is the way they're [students] are going to be tested. Why would you not teach in that manner?

There was a conversation between this principal and one of the eMINTS teachers. The teacher said that a lot more could be done with the program. The teacher was hesitant:

We have testing and we have all these things being pushed on us for testing. And, I'm scared to just say, well let me just try this whole new thing right now.

Contact with students was primarily in the office. It was not unusual to spend the day in the building and find the principal with a regulating orientation, in the office the majority of the day.

Students were mainly controlled through negative consequences. Detentions, warnings, corporal punishment, teachers taking misbehaving students to the office were more apparent in the school lead by a principal with a regulating orientation. One principal said, "I do handle all the discipline." Another remarked, "We miss a lot of recesses." A third example:

I've noticed that I have to be meaner and meaner so that things don't get out of control. And so, I have rules and if they break the rules by fighting on the ground, or very certain things, then they get a paddling.

Community and School Involvement

The principal with the regulating orientation employed traditional methods of community involvement. Yearly parent teacher conferences and open houses were cited. When asked if the school was opened up for the community in any way, one response was, "Not really. We have open house. In this building we don't do a whole lot of community coming in. Really don't do any of it."

Four Critical Dimensions of the Disconnected Orientation

In the disconnected orientation, the principal exerts little power or control. The linkages between principals and teachers are tenuous and ill defined. When an interviewer asked about students in the eMINTS classroom, the only response was that the children were “excited.” One teacher in the school remarked, “I’ve been disappointed in that [principal] doesn’t come down and see what we are doing a little bit more often, without a special invitation to be here.”

Largely disengaged from the staff, a marker for this orientation was minimal influence and minimal contact. As the linkages were loose and vague, there were no clear guides for involvement. The principals talked about one thing going on in the school, and the teachers held a different perspective. Few demands were placed on any of the staff and few incentives were present for staff. When asked the difference between a good school and a great school, the response from one principal was, “I don’t think there’s that much difference, really.”

Principal as Administrator

Again, as in the collaborative and regulating orientation, communication flow, information exchange, and decision-making were factors examined. Principals with a disconnected orientation were in place to communicate orders from the superintendent to the staff. When a problem was encountered, the strategy was to pass the blame on to someone else. The communication style most associated with this classification was noncommittal. One principal depicted “front line communication” as a “drawback.”

Information exchange was lacking, or at best laissez-faire. The language used by principals in this category disconnected orientation shows that they are often unaware of what was going on their school. During one interview, questions were repeatedly referred to the assistant superintendent, the curriculum director, the teachers, or other district personnel. This same principal said, “Too much information was not a good thing.” The second year’s interview was a repeat of the first. The principal got off the topic easily, frequently answered a different question than was asked, and again could not talk about fundamental things about the school.

The principals in the disconnected category exerted minimal influence with decisions for the school. When asked about how the building principal perceived the eMINTS project, one teacher responded, “I really don’t know. I’m not sure how [principal] feels about that.”

When speaking about decisions, the philosophy of one principal was that things “happened as they happened.”

Principal and Staff Relations

In schools with a disconnected principal there was no consensus on the intent of eMINTS. For example, one principal was unsure of which class he witnessed the students “going to town” on the computers. From this encounter the statement was made, “I don’t know, I can turn one on and I can turn it off, and I can get my e-mail, and that’s about it.”

That's what I have a secretary for, and I'm not going to make any bones about it, that's what I have her for."

The disconnected principal rarely initiated or followed through on actions. Little contact was made in the classroom. As one principal says, "as far as in the room, I haven't been involved in that." The principal goes on to say that, "I hire the teacher to take care of the classroom." In talking about the eMINTS teachers, the principal was vague, "there will be nice little comments to make about their instruction, just as I would if they were doing something else."

Teachers verified the disconnected staff relations in their interviews. One teacher said, that the principal let them vent, but added, "You know, [principal] listens to us and it probably goes in one ear and out the other."

Principal and Student Interaction

In this orientation, the principal had minimal contact with the students. Unaware of what was going on in the classroom; comments about the students were indefinite. Nothing more specific than "busy as little beavers." When asked about student work hanging in the hallways, the principal could not speak to it. The principal was not sure and would have to "double check." Likewise, the same principal could not speak to changes in student work since eMINTS, "I don't think that I could say that I have looked at that in a way that could tell me that for sure at this point."

One teacher lamented that on many occasions the principal with a disconnected orientation, has said that a visit would be made to the class. Regrettably, the principal does not follow through.

Community and School Involvement

Those with a disconnected orientation did not actively engage the community or parents in the school. When one community member had a misconception about the eMINTS project, the principal did not make any effort to educate the community member. Another principal with a disconnected orientation did not seem interested in interfacing with parents.

On a very negative note, you know, I sometimes wonder if parents today don't want their kids to do well. They don't want them to have to work very hard, and they don't want to be miss put.

Teacher Lessons by Principal Leadership Orientation

What impact does the leadership orientation of the principal have on the conduct of eMINTS lessons? Much of the eMINTS professional development program is focused on encouraging teachers to use student-centered, inter-disciplinary, constructivist lessons. Since teaching practice exists in the context of a school, and the principal is largely responsible for setting this context, it is logical to expect that differences in the ways principals lead their buildings would influence the ways eMINTS teachers conduct their

classes. The combination of the principal leadership orientation categories and teacher lesson typology categories allows us to investigate the interaction between principal leadership and classroom teaching practice.

The teacher lesson typology is described in the report; *A General Typology of eMINTS Lessons*². Four general classes of lessons were identified: teacher centered, student-centered, facilitated, student-centered unfacilitated, and hybrid. The main contrast is between teacher-centered lessons and student-centered, facilitated lessons. Teacher-centered lessons are traditional lecture lessons, where the teacher controls the content and conduct of the lesson. Student-centered facilitated lessons are the inter-disciplinary, project-based and constructivist lessons envisioned by the eMINTS project.

According to *A General Typology of eMINTS Lessons* report 43.5% of lessons observed in the 2000-2001 school year were classified as "student-centered, facilitated". Table 2 shows a clear relationship between principal leadership orientation and observed lesson type. The first panel shows that half of "student-centered, facilitated" lessons were observed in schools with collaborative principals, while the largest groups of other lessons were observed in schools with hybrid principals. The second panel of Table 2 shows that schools with collaborative principals over three-quarters of observed lessons (76.0%) were classified as "student-centered facilitated", while the remainder were classified as "hybrid". In contrast, one-third of the lessons observed in schools with principals classified as "regulating" were classified as "teacher-centered".

The results of Table 2 suggest a clear picture of teacher change, namely, teachers with principals who are active in their schools and supportive of the eMINTS innovation are more likely to apply their eMINTS training to create student-centered, constructivist lessons. Evidence for the pattern of change is seen in Table 3.

Table 3 compares the classification of lessons observed in the 1999-2000 school year with the classification of lessons observed in the 2000-2001 school year. These two years of observations cover the FY00 teachers' participation in the eMINTS Professional Development Program. In Table 3, differences in observed lessons are organized into three categories: "Improved", i.e., identifying teachers who moved closer to using student-centered, facilitated lessons in between 1999-2000 and 2000-2001; "Did not Improve", i.e., identifying teachers who moved away from using student-centered, facilitated lessons in between 1999-2000 and 2000-2001, "No Change", i.e., identifying teachers whose lessons were classified in the same categories each year.

² Available at <http://emints.more.net/evaluation>

Table 2
Teacher Lesson Typology Classification in 2000-2001 by Principal Leadership Orientation
(in Percent)

Teacher Lesson Typology Classification	Principal Leadership Orientation				All Teachers	Number of Teachers
	Collaborative	Regulating	Disconnected	Hybrid		
<i>Row Percentages</i>						
Teacher-Centered	0.0	26.3	15.8	57.9	100.0	
Hybrid	25.0	16.7	12.5	45.8	100.0	
Student-Centered Facilitated	51.4	10.8	8.1	29.7	100.0	
Student-Centered Unfacilitated	0.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	100.0	
All Teachers	29.4	17.6	11.8	41.2	100.0	
<i>Column Percentages</i>						
Teacher-Centered	0.0	33.3	30.0	31.4	22.4	19
Hybrid	24.0	26.7	30.0	31.4	28.2	24
Student-Centered Facilitated	76.0	26.7	30.0	31.4	43.5	37
Student-Centered Unfacilitated	0.0	13.3	10.0	5.7	5.9	5
All Teachers	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	85
Number of Teachers	25	15	10	35	85	

Table 3 shows that 64.0 percent of teachers in schools with collaborative principals improved their lessons between 1999-2000 and 2000-2001. In contrast, one-third of teachers with principals in the “regulating” category, and 40.0% of teachers with principals in the “disconnected” category did not improve their teaching. Teachers with principals in these categories actually moved away from the instructional methods emphasized by the eMINTS Professional Development program. It is also clear from Table 3 that about forty percent of the teachers with principals in the “regulating”, “disconnected” and “hybrid” categories did not consistently change their teaching practices during this period. In contrast, only 32.0 percent of teachers with collaborative principals did not change, and most of these teachers were observed teaching student-centered, facilitated lessons in both years.

Table 3
Change in Teacher Lesson Category, 1999-2000 to 2000-2001 school years by
Principal Leadership Orientation
(in Percent)

School Year		Principal Leadership Orientation				
1999-2000	2000-2001	Collaborative	Regulating	Disconnected	Hybrid	All Teachers
<i>Improved</i>		64.0	20.0	20.0	25.7	35.3
Teacher-Centered	Student-Centered Facilitated	12.0	6.7	0.0	2.9	5.9
Hybrid	Student-Centered Facilitated	44.0	13.3	10.0	5.7	18.8
Student-Centered Unfacilitated	Student-Centered Facilitated	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	1.2
Teacher-Centered	Hybrid	4.0	0.0	10.0	8.6	5.9
Student-Centered Unfacilitated	Hybrid	4.0	0.0	0.0	5.7	3.5
<i>Did not Improve</i>		4.0	33.3	40.0	28.6	23.5
Hybrid	Student-Centered Unfacilitated	0.0	13.3	10.0	2.9	4.7
Student-Centered Facilitated	Hybrid	4.0	6.7	10.0	5.7	5.9
Hybrid	Teacher-Centered	0.0	13.3	20.0	17.1	11.8
Student-Centered Facilitated	Teacher-Centered	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	1.2
<i>No Change</i>		32.0	46.7	40.0	45.7	41.2
Teacher-Centered	Teacher-Centered	0.0	20.0	10.0	11.4	9.4
Hybrid	Hybrid	12.0	20.0	10.0	11.4	12.9
Student-Centered Facilitated	Student-Centered Facilitated	20.0	6.7	20.0	20.0	17.6
Student-Centered Unfacilitated	Student-Centered Unfacilitated	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	1.2
All Teachers		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Conclusion

This analysis examined the leadership orientations of eMINTS principals from the first cohort of eMINTS classes. The analysis classified principals into four general categories, called “leadership orientations”. Some principals explicitly worked to foster a collaborative environment in their buildings by involving themselves in the overall school community. Others took a more traditionally hierarchal and administrative approach. Another group of principals were disconnected from their buildings, participating only when necessary. The largest group of principals exhibited a mix of characteristics.

In considering the relationship between principals’ leadership orientations and teacher instructional activities, teachers in schools with collaborative principals are more likely to use the student-centered, constructivist strategies encouraged by the eMINTS program than teachers with other types of principals. Further, teachers with collaborative principals were more likely to improve their teaching activities between 1999-2000 and 2000-2001.

Reasons for this are clear; the adoption of new teaching activities is an inherently risky endeavor and collaborative principals create environments that tolerate, even encourage risk taking.

The eMINTS Professional Development program is focused on teachers. However, these results suggest that paying some attention to the ways principals manage their buildings, in particular, encouraging principals to be more collaborative in their leadership, will assist eMINTS teachers in making use of their training.

Appendix A

EMINTS PRINCIPAL PROFILES ORGANIZED BY FOUR CONSTRUCT FACTORS

Orientation	Principal As Administrator	Principal/Staff Interrelations	Principal/Student Interaction	Community Involvement
Collaboration	<p>Communication flow, 2-way</p> <p>Information exchange, info. broker, varied</p> <p>Decision making, transparent & participatory</p>	<p>Strong partnerships, active teams, committees</p> <p>EMINTS innovation recognized and encouraged</p> <p>Provisions for staff to work together: release time, extra subs</p>	<p>Aware of individual student achievement</p> <p>Student control: rewarded for appropriate behavior</p> <p>Student/Principal contact throughout day</p>	<p>Planned involvement with community</p>
Regulation	<p>Communication flow, top-down</p> <p>Information exchange, rules, directives, instructions</p> <p>Decision making, authoritarian, little input.</p>	<p>Limited partnerships, infrequent staff meetings</p> <p>EMINTS seen as another computer lab</p> <p>Discrete classrooms</p>	<p>Aware of students as data</p> <p>Student Control: primarily by negative consequences.</p> <p>Student/Principal contact primarily in principal's office</p>	<p>Limited types of community involvement</p>
Disconnection	<p>Communication flow, orders from others i.e. superintendent</p> <p>Information exchange, language proves principal unaware of info.</p> <p>Decision making, minimal influence with decisions</p>	<p>Unequal Partnerships Preferential Treatment</p> <p>Vague generalized comments about eMINTS, rarely specific</p> <p>Little support for teachers</p>	<p>Unaware of individual Student Achievement</p> <p>Student controlled in same manner previous administration handled.</p> <p>Student/Principal contact minimal</p>	<p>Perceived risks of community involvement</p>

This report is one product of the eMINTS evaluation project. Other reports and their overall evaluation plan are available at <http://www.emints.org/evaluation>.

The eMINTS Evaluation focuses on student impacts, teacher impacts, changes in learning environments, and outcomes of project services.