

Duquesne University

Duquesne Scholarship Collection

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Summer 8-7-2021

Increasing Spiritual Leadership: An Analysis of the “And Then Some” Components of an Effective Mentoring Program for Lay Principals in the Altoona-Johnstown Diocese

Thomas Fleming, Jr.

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd>



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

Recommended Citation

Fleming, Jr., T. (2021). Increasing Spiritual Leadership: An Analysis of the “And Then Some” Components of an Effective Mentoring Program for Lay Principals in the Altoona-Johnstown Diocese (Doctoral dissertation, Duquesne University). Retrieved from <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd/2010>

This Immediate Access is brought to you for free and open access by Duquesne Scholarship Collection. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Duquesne Scholarship Collection.

INCREASING SPIRITUAL LEADERSHIP:
AN ANALYSIS OF THE “AND THEN SOME”
COMPONENTS OF AN EFFECTIVE MENTORING PROGRAM FOR
LAY PRINCIPALS IN THE ALTOONA-JOHNSTOWN DIOCESE

A Dissertation

Duquesne University

Duquesne University

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Education

By

Thomas P. Fleming, Jr.

August 2021

Copyright by
Thomas P. Fleming, Jr.

2021

INCREASING SPIRITUAL LEADERSHIP:
AN ANALYSIS OF THE “AND THEN SOME”
COMPONENTS OF AN EFFECTIVE MENTORING PROGRAM FOR
LAY PRINCIPALS IN THE ALTOONA-JOHNSTOWN DIOCESE

By

Thomas P. Fleming, Jr.

Approved June 9, 2021

Connie M. Moss, Ed.D.
Associate Professor and Director
Ed.D. in Educational Leadership
(Committee Chair)

Rick McCown, Ph.D
Professor and Pierre Schouver,
C.S.Sp.Endowed Chair in Mission
(Committee Member)

Fran Serenka, Ed.D
Clinical Associate Professor and Program
Director Educational Administration and
Supervision
(Committee Member)

Gretchen G. Generett, Ph.D.
Dean, School of Education

Gibbs Kanyongo, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Educational
Foundations and Leadership

ABSTRACT

INCREASING SPIRITUAL LEADERSHIP:
AN ANALYSIS OF THE “AND THEN SOME”
COMPONENTS OF AN EFFECTIVE MENTORING PROGRAM FOR
LAY PRINCIPALS IN THE ALTOONA-JOHNSTOWN DIOCESE

By

Thomas P. Fleming, Jr.

August 2021

Dissertation supervised by Dr. Connie M. Moss.

Traditional principal preparation programs address responsibilities in areas such as school management, student achievement, and staff development, among other areas. A principal of a Catholic school must be trained in these areas “*and then some*.” They must perform their responsibilities under the overarching umbrella of spirituality. Catholic school principals are expected to be the spiritual leaders of their buildings. When Catholic school principals are not members of the clergy, they lack formal training in theology and faith development. How are these principals prepared to be spiritual leaders?

The purpose of this study was to evaluate two exemplary Catholic school principal preparation programs to identify components of their training, to identify the unique “*and then some*” qualities necessary for leading Catholic schools, and to identify the

characteristics of a principal mentoring program, which supports the spiritual leader of a Catholic school.

A close reading of the materials acquired from their web sites was conducted to determine similarities and differences between the two programs. The researcher compared the findings from the close reading and the comparative analysis to develop a resulting framework to identify competencies that define a spiritual leader in Catholic schools and how a structured mentoring program could support the development of those competencies. The resulting framework defines those characteristics and reveals a set of competencies that define those characteristics in practice.

Finally, the researcher drew conclusions from the newly designed framework to suggest ways that a comprehensive mentoring program that rises to the level of excellence could be developed to support newly hired lay Catholic school principals by employing the competencies that emerged.

Limitations of this study include the use of publicly published descriptions of the components from the two programs studied that did not include data on the impact of those programs on graduating students, or the effectiveness of the mentoring programs. Implications for future research are shared.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to the memory of my son, Ryan Thomas Fleming, Duquesne Class of 2016, who passed away at the age of 20 in 2014. After failing to complete my dissertation in 2009, I would joke with Ryan that at least one of us would graduate from Duquesne. God had other plans for Ryan. Now, finally, the other one of us is a proud graduate of Duquesne University.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First, thanks be to God for blessing me with everything I have. Through God, all things are possible, including the completion of a journey I began at the Duquesne University School of Education in 2002. I truly believe I have been led by the Holy Spirit along the way.

Thank you to my Dissertation Committee. Dr. Franny Serenka, you have been with me since we were classmates in the IDPEL program. I appreciate your support and encouragement. Dr. Rick McCown, over the course of two doctoral programs, I have learned and grown as a school leader and as a person. You always brought out the best in me. Last, but certainly not least, thank you Dr. Connie Moss! I would not be here without your guidance and support. I am grateful beyond words for your time, expertise, and friendship.

Thank you to my two cohorts. Over the past nineteen years, I developed friendships that made lasting impressions. From the IDPEL Cohort of 2006, Linda, Patrick, Maggie, Jake, and the late Sue, I am forever grateful to you for helping to shape me as a school leader. Getting to know you has been one of the biggest blessings from this journey. From the ProDEL Cohort 4, Father Theo, Lurea, Deanna, Dan, and Dan, although I was at a later age and stage when we traveled through this program, I learned much from your experiences and insights.

To my colleagues in the schools where I worked, Richland, Bishop McCort, and Forest Hills, thank you for your support, encouragement, and friendship along this journey. I have been blessed to work with so many exceptional educators throughout my

career. Now, in retirement, I can be known as Dr. Fleming in all those schools where I no longer work.

Thank you to my mentor and trusted friend, Coach Jerry Davitch, for demonstrating the importance of authentic leadership. Thank you to my college buddies for their interest in and support of my progress toward achieving this goal.

Thanks to my family for their quiet and persistent support. First, to my mother and my late father for providing me with the foundation to become who I am today. Next, to my sisters, Janice (Jeff and Sarah) and Denise for their kindness. Thank you to my father-in-law and late mother-in-law and their daughters, Karen (Tom and Justin) and Paula (Coach Jerry Schmitt and Matt). I would also like to acknowledge my late Aunt Flo for providing me with a home base at Gateway Towers while I took six years of classes at Duquesne.

Finally, and most importantly, thank you to my biggest cheerleaders, my wife Linda and sons Tyler and Ryan in Heaven. Thank you for your unwavering support and encouragement. You are the loves of my life!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	iv
Dedication	vi
Acknowledgements	vii
List of Tables	xiv
List of Abbreviations	xv
CHAPTER ONE: STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
Social, Cultural and Historical Perspectives on the Problem	1
Local Contextual Perspectives.....	6
Candidate’s Leadership Perspectives	10
Specific Problem of Practice	14
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF ACCEPTABLE KNOWLEDGE	15
The Urgency to Prepare Future Leaders	15
The Importance of Principal Preparation Programs	15
Why Principal Training Programs Have Changed.....	16
Characteristics of Effective Principals and Effective Preparation Programs	17
Interactive Learning, Continuous Engagement, and Internships	20
Andragogy as a Framework for Preparation	21
Key Leadership Practices	22
Leadership Preparation Programs for Social Justice.....	22
The Catholic School Principal.....	28
The Pressures of Leading Catholic Schools.....	29

Catholic School Principal as Faith Leader	30
Purpose of the Study	32
The Importance of Mentoring.....	34
The Zone of Proximal Development.....	36
Guided Participation	40
Scaffolding.....	41
The Origins of Mentoring	42
Mentoring Today and into the Future	44
Mentoring Challenges.....	45
Characteristics of Successful Mentoring Programs	45
The Role of Effective Mentor Selection and Training	46
Coaching versus Mentoring.....	47
Effective Protegeship.....	48
Leadership and Followership.....	50
Social Justice Leadership Preparation.....	56
Catholic Social Justice Teachings	60
The Learning Framework within the Catholic Tradition.....	67
Social Entrepreneurship in the Catholic Tradition.....	68
History of Catholic School Principalship	70
Future Challenges of Leading Catholic Schools.....	74
Mentoring Catholic School Principals	77
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS.....	81
Introduction.....	81
Purpose of the Study	82

Data Collection	82
Procedures.....	84
Method of Data Analysis	84
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS	86
Introduction.....	86
The University of Notre Dame Catholic School Principal Preparation Program.....	87
Center for Transformational Educational Leadership	88
The Mary Ann Remick Leadership Program	89
Developing “And Then Some”	90
Organized Retreats	91
A Curriculum Guided by the Gospel	91
Course Sequence	92
Analysis of the Program’s Courses.....	93
Loyola University Chicago’s Catholic School Principal Preparation Program	95
The Catholic School Principal Preparation Program.....	96
Course Work.....	98
On-Boarding Plan.....	100
Research Question 1	101
Research Question 2	104
The University of Notre Dame	104
Loyola University Chicago.....	106
The Catholic School Principal Competencies	106
Mission and Catholic Identity.....	107
Analysis of the Competencies within this Domain.....	108

Governance and Leadership	110
Analysis of the Competencies within this Domain.....	111
Academic Excellence.....	111
Analysis of the Competencies within this Domain.....	112
Operational Vitality.....	113
Analysis of the Competencies within this Domain.....	114
Summary of the “And Then Some” Qualities of Catholic School Principals	115
Research Question 3	119
Coaching	122
On-Boarding Plan and ePortfolio.....	123
Internship	124
The Role of the Internship Candidate	125
The Role of the Mentor Principal.....	125
The Role of the Coach	126
The Responsibilities of the Coordinator of Coaches	126
Internship Assessment	127
Mentor Principal Agreement	127
Candidate Evaluation by Mentor Principal Form	128
Catholic School Principal Competencies.....	129
Performance Narrative.....	131
On-Boarding Plan.....	131
Summary	137
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION	139
Discussion of Findings.....	139

Recommended Actions	148
Contributions to the Field	153
Implications and Implications for Social Justice.....	155
Limitations	165
Implications for Author’s Leadership Agenda and Growth	167
Conclusions.....	170
References.....	172
Appendices.....	211
Appendix A.....	211
Appendix B.....	214

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 4.1 The Curriculum and Course Sequence for the Mary Ann Remick Leadership Program at the University of Notre Dame.....	92
Table 4.2 Summary of the Center for Transformational Educational Leadership.....	94
Table 4.3 Summary of the Mary Ann Remick Leadership Program.....	94
Table 4.4 The Curriculum and Course Sequence for the Loyola University Chicago Principal Preparation Program.....	99
Table 4.5 Summary of Loyola University Chicago Program.....	100
Table 4.6 A Comparison of Essential Qualities Unique to Catholic School Principals by University Program.....	115
Table 4.7 Common Traits Shared by the Two Principal Preparation Programs.....	116
Table 4.8 Unique “And Then Some Traits” by Program.....	118
Table 4.9 Characteristics of the Mentoring Provided to the Candidates.....	136
Table 4.10 Human Resources Focused on Mentoring Principal Candidates by Program.....	136
Table 4.11 The Unique Characteristics of the Mentoring Process By Program.....	137
Table 5.1 Summary of Action Plan for a Framework to Promote Leadership Marked by Enthusiastic and Passionate Examples of Devotion to God.....	149

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Alliance for Catholic Education (ACE)
Catholic Principal Preparation Program (CPP)
Congregation for Catholic Education (CCE)
Critical Success Factors (CSF)
Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC)
Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC)
Loyola University Chicago (LUC)
National Association of Elementary and Secondary School Principals (NAESP)
National Catholic Education Association (NCEA)
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)
National Standards and Benchmarks for Effective Catholic Elementary and Secondary Schools (NSBECS)
Southern Regional Education Board (SREB)
The Leader-Member Exchange Model (LMX)
United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB)
University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA)
University of Notre Dame (UND)

CHAPTER ONE

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Social, Cultural and Historical Perspectives on the Problem

Strong schools with high achieving students, a safe and nurturing climate, with a welcoming school culture, and high staff moral are driven by effective leaders in the principal's office. Principals are responsible for much, if not all, of what occurs in his or her building. The age of accountability and transparency has made the challenges associated with the role of school principal more demanding, and for many in education, less attractive. If schools are to survive and thrive, quality principals are needed now more than ever.

There is urgency to prepare future school leaders. The ranks of United States school leaders are graying and the need to identify and train their replacements is imminent. The U.S department of Labor estimated that 40% of the 93,200 principals are nearing retirement and the need for principals will increase from 10% to 30%. Because of this trend it is necessary to prepare new leadership and to keep those employed from retiring prematurely (Fenwick, 2007). The situation is exacerbated by the fact that principals have shorter careers because they are employed much later in their careers. The American Association of School Administrators has expressed their concerns that not only are young people not being recruited for leadership but also that our country lacks a systematic approach to hiring leaders (Gates, 2003).

To train and retain quality school leaders, they must be prepared properly for the rigors of their job. Additionally, in this era of school accountability the school leadership is more important now than ever before. The quality of educational leadership provided

by school and district leaders is highly dependent on the quality of their leadership preparation experiences (Baker, Orr, & Young, 2007; Archer, 2005; Azzam, 2005; Hess & Kelly, 2005). The preparation of principals has been criticized for containing too much theory and too little practical application (Bottoms & Fry, 2009, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, Orr & Cohen, 2007; Martin & Papa, 2008; Wallace Foundation 2012). Students who are not adequately prepared to become principals represent the failure of the preparation programs to provide the knowledge, skills and competencies needed to successfully fulfill their roles as practicing principals (Hernandez, Roberts, & Menchaca, 2012).

The landscape of principal preparation programs has changed and continues to evolve. During the last twenty years, university-based principal preparation has come under increased scrutiny by external actors as a result of standards-based reforms, accreditation processes and growing interest from public officials, private foundations, district administrators and other stakeholders (Grassman, Cibulka, & Ashby, 2002; Lamgdeleine, Maaxcy, Pounder, & Reed, 2009; Murphy, 2006; Sanders & Simpson, 2005; Seashore Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010; Young & Brewer, 2008). There are now alternative preparation programs and routes to certification supported by districts and foundations that have not previously existed. The rising concern for the development of school leaders capable of leading reform and increasing student learning outcomes for all students is evidenced in state-level educational policy concerns and deliberations (Adams & Copeland, 2007; Sanders & Kearney, 2008; Southern Regional Educational Board, 2007).

Effective principals influence student achievement by working with classroom teachers to refine their instructional practice and provide resources to support professional growth (Blasé & Blasé, 2003; Supovitz, Sirindes, & May, 2010). Research has identified leadership actions that support instructional improvement, which, in turn, boosts student achievement. These qualities include: working with classroom teachers to improve identified instruction; providing resources and professional development aimed at improvements in instructional capacity; coordination of curriculum, instruction, and assessment; regular monitoring of student and teacher performance; and cultivation of a school culture focused on improvements in teaching and learning (Darling-Hammond et al., 2010).

To prepare principals to improve student achievement effective preparation programs should include components such as: clear focus and values about leadership and learning around which the program is coherently organized; standards-based curriculum emphasizing instructional leadership, organizational development, and change management; field-based internships with skilled supervision; cohort groups that create opportunities for collaboration and teamwork in practice-oriented situations; active instructional strategies that link theory and practice, such as problem based learning; rigorous recruitment and selection of both candidates and faculty; and strong partnerships with schools and districts to support quality field-based learning (Davis, Darling-Hammond, Meyerson, & LaPointe, 2005).

One of the most critical elements of an exemplary principal preparation program is the inclusion of field-based experiences (Creighton, 2005; Lauder, 2000; Reames, 2010). The amount of time spent in the field is not as important as the quality of the

activities which must be well structured and relevant to the future leader's responsibilities (Bizzell & Creighton, 2010). These activities should be aligned to professional standards derived from the state or organizational policy (Kersten, Tybus, & White, 2009).

The best field-based training should provide rich experiences in the school context. These contexts help to develop the human aspects of leadership such as learning how to work as a team player and how to build collaborations and partnerships (Fenwick, 2003; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Lawrence & Nohria, 2002). Exemplary field-based activities assist interns to construct new knowledge, facilitate opportunities for reflection and help interns link theory to practice by using concrete real-world experiences within the school community (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2007). Research on the most effective principal preparation programs show that in-depth field experiences and, if possible, a full-time apprenticeship with mentoring, accelerates and deepens the preparation of future administrators (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2007).

Andragogy should serve as a framework for the complex task of preparing principals. Davis and Leon (2011) contend that the widely recognized model of andragogy provided by Knowles, et al. (2005) should be utilized. The assumptions about adult learning are: knowing why; self-actualized self-concept; accumulated life experiences; readiness to learn; orientation to learning; and internal motivation.

When examining how to best prepare future school leaders, key leadership practices should be addressed. In their six-year study of the relationship between school leadership and student learning, Seashore Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, and Anderson (2010) identified four key practices of successful school leaders that remained constant across differing school and environmental contexts. These key practices are: setting

directions; developing people; redesigning the organization; and managing the instructional program. These researchers concluded that it is the principal's ability to create synergy across variables such as fiscal, material, and human, that has the greatest effect on student learning (Seashore Louis, et al, 2010).

An increasingly more important role of the school principal is that of a leader for social justice. Today, principal preparation programs must equip leaders to take on these challenges. Closing achievement gaps and mitigating the marginalized practices often embedded in schools are a few of the challenges which require educational leadership programs that effectively prepare school principals who can meet the most pressing school challenges and who, in particular strive for social justice ends (Hernandez & McKenzie, 2010). It has been suggested by McKenzie, Christman, Hernandez, Capper, Dantley, Gonzales, Cambron-McCabe and Scheurich, (2008) that to address the inequities that exist in schools today, educational leadership programs must feature elements that explicitly prepare leaders to lead for social justice.

A leadership program emphasizing social justice should train principals to develop inclusive practices where aspiring school leaders can 'recognize structures that pose barriers to students' progress and create proactive structures and systems of support for all students at the macro and micro levels" (McKenzie et al, 2008, p. 126). These preparation programs must also help their future leaders to identify socially-just teaching practices as to support the development of socially-just teachers (Hernandez & Bell McKenzie, 2010). Hernandez and Bell McKenzie state, "The new teaching and learning requires faculty in leadership programs to provide future leaders with genuine-not staged-opportunities to learn about effective teaching" (2010).

Previously, principal preparation programs have provided future school leaders with insufficient training in the process of becoming socially just leaders according to Hernandez and Bell McKenzie, (2010). The typical induction period for new principals does not feature on-going feedback. An enhanced preparation program would include an induction period lasting between two to five years which would include additional coursework, ongoing support and a network of school leaders for the enhancement of social justice (Hernandez & Bell McKenzie, 2010).

Local Contextual Perspectives

The researcher's interest in the topic of principal preparation lies specifically with preparing lay principals for their work in Catholic schools. To understand unique nature of Catholic schools and their principals, one must first become familiar with Catholic Education in America. Catholic education in the United States has its historical roots in the industrialization of the cities of the eastern states. From 1830 to 1850, more than one million Catholic immigrants came to the United States and settled in cities where work was plentiful and housing abundant. These Catholic immigrants entered a new life in a new country founded and controlled by Protestants. These Catholics were in a minority and faced prejudice and discrimination, including violent reprisals from the established Protestant population (Walsh, 2003). Much of the prejudice was observable in the school setting (Bryk, Lee, & Holland, 1993). The foundation for the development of Catholic schools in the United States was formed "not that Catholics deliberately set out to create a separated system, but rather that the idea was largely forced upon them by a hostile public system under Protestant control" (Bryk, Lee, & Holland, 1993, p. 24).

New Catholic schools grew slowly. However, as the population and the geography of the United States grew, so did the number of provinces serving the Catholic people. In the 1852 the first of three Plenary Councils was held by the hierarchy of the Catholic Church in the United States. Resulting from these councils was a mandate given to pastors of parishes that building Catholic schools was a priority. (Montejano, & Sabatino, 2012).The council made it clear that schools were to be erected for the education of the children of the parish. Parents of the children of the parish were obligated to send their children to the parish school (Cassidy, 1949).

The Catholic bishops established a parochial school system to keep unity in the Church. Financial strength was provided to the overall population as a result of the country's economic boom. The Catholic immigrant population also benefited from the industrial progress. This newfound wealth of the Catholic laity led to the building of more schools as homage to their faith (Walch, 2003).

As more Catholics from Europe arrived in the United States in the early twentieth century, more Catholic elementary schools attached to new parishes were opened as the population grew in cities and rural communities. Not only did the elementary school population grow, but so did the need for more secondary schools. At this time, Catholic schooling at both the primary and secondary levels was primarily staffed by religious order priests, brothers, nuns, and deacons, who served as faculty and administration. In 1920, ninety-two percent of the staffing of Catholic elementary and secondary schools was religious (McDonald, & Schultz, 2011).

Catholic schools continued to flourish in a period of growth through the end of World War II. The schools were primarily supported by ethnic families from blue-collar

communities. The enrollment in Catholic schools reached its peak in 1960, when more than 5.2 million children were in Catholic elementary and secondary schools (McDonald & Schultz, 2011).

As enrollment was peaking, the number of religious working in those schools rapidly began to decline during the 1970's. From 1950 to 2000, the number of religious staffing Catholic schools went from ninety percent to seven percent (McDonald & Schultz, 2011). By 1990, Catholic schools were staffed primarily by lay teachers and administrators (85%) who brought with them different levels of professional and theological preparation (Montejano & Sabatino, 2012).

Catholic principals must possess the same educational leadership and managerial leadership skills as their public school counterparts, and then some. The United States Catholic Conference defined the Catholic school principal's role across three major areas: educational leader, managerial leader, and spiritual leader, (Ciriello, 1994). The "and then some" is the spiritual leadership role. As the spiritual leaders, Catholic school principals are "transformational leaders who facilitate faith development and Catholic school identity in their school" (Ciriello, 1994, p. 5). How is one trained to be competent in the "and then some" leadership domain? "It should be argued that the same attention being given to public school principal preparation programs must also be granted formation programs for Catholic school principals" (Boyle, 2016). Across the country university principal training programs focus on alignment with adopted leadership standards to meet certification/licensure requirements. How then, do university programs also prepare candidates in the necessary faith leadership components that are so critical to leading effective Catholic school? (Boyle, 2016).

The challenges of the Catholic school principal are many. They have the same duties and responsibilities as their secular counterparts in their roles of educational leader and managerial leader, but what does it take to have the “and then some”? This, “and then some” component of leadership has the principal as faith leader, or spiritual leader. This leader is to guide the faith development and faith life of all constituents within the school (Rieckhoff, 2014). The role as spiritual leader is grounded in the knowledge of the history and philosophy of the Catholic Church. Rieckhoff (2014) states, “The spiritual leader role focusses on faith development and building the Christian community as well as facilitating the moral and ethical development of those in the school community” (p.26).

Studies have examined the perceptions of Catholic school principals in their roles as faith leaders. Over twenty years ago, Wallace (1995) found that 70% of principals rated themselves inadequately prepared in faith leadership, having little or no formal coursework or training.

“The scope of the role of faith leader continues to expand at a challenging time for the Roman Catholic Church with declining Mass attendance, families not practicing their faith, yet sending their children to a Catholic school, and other examples of disconnectedness with parish life” (Rieckhoff, 2014, p. 31). In addition to the pressure of being the spiritual leader of their institutions, Catholic school principals face other unique challenges of “and then some” leadership. Because Catholic schools are enrollment driven, principals are under different pressures than their public school counterparts. A Notre Dame study of 1,685 Catholic school principals nationwide indicated that key challenges exist in financial management, marketing, Catholic identity, enrollment

management, and long-range planning (Schmitt, 2012). Of these top five areas of need, the most important two, enrollment management and financial management, capture the most basic goal of survival: keeping a school open (Schmitt, 2012).

Clearly, the enrollment and financial management is critical to funding Catholic schools. Funding of schools has shifted over time. Up to the mid-20th century, all Catholics were involved in funding and building Catholic schools. Now, in the post-Vatican II era, the burden of paying for rising education costs has shifted to families with children in the system and a few wealthy alumni (McCluskey, 2009).

As a result of this continuing trend, many Catholic schools have been forced to close their doors. Many of the schools that closed were in urban areas, serving mostly African-Americans. This represents the loss of the Church's most laudable and successful social justice mission. The Church's failure to educate the current and future generations of congregants amounts to institutional suicide (McCluskey, 2009).

Candidate's Leadership Perspectives

This researcher, who has over fifteen years as a public school administrator, which included roles as assistant principal, principal, and superintendent of schools, is experienced as an educational school leader. However, as a life-long practicing Catholic, this school leader was woefully ill-equipped to meet the unique challenges facing a Catholic high school principal as a spiritual leader.

The Purpose of the Study is to examine ways to better prepare Catholic school principals who feel ill-prepared to be faith leaders. Boyle (2016) states that because Catholic school principal demands are so unique, explicit development in faith-leadership skills, while also developing the requisite instructional leadership skill is essential.

Without specific development in both of these leadership areas, Catholic schools will not have the qualified leaders they need to ensure their survival. Since there is a spiritual nature of the role of Catholic school administrators, they must act responsibly to ensure the integrity of the mission of their schools (Donlevey, 2007). How is this taught and learned?

The spiritual nature of administrators who were members of the clergy was inherent. However, as lay leaders replace religious men and women in Catholic schools, one can no longer assume that principal candidates will possess working knowledge of the Catholic faith and Catholic school governance structures or the skills needed to build a faith community within the educational community (NCEA, 2009).

Central to the principal's role is that of faith leader and helping others with faith development. The faith aspect of a Catholic school is what gives it a unique quality. In an era when so much has been placed on the shoulders of the principal, the need for ongoing mentoring and supports become essential. The continued success and development of the principal is linked to the supports and systematic processes for their growth and expertise in the position (Rieckhoff, 2014).

Since highly skilled school leaders are not born, nor do they emerge from leadership programs fully prepared to lead, how will they acquire the knowledge and confidence to become effective leaders? It is generally recognized that new principals will need guidance from more experienced school leaders in their early years of administration (Searby, 2008). "Workplace mentoring is critical for inexperienced school leaders as to provide a bridge between theory learned in graduate school and the complex realities of contemporary school leadership. Although formal mentoring processes are

often designed primarily to fulfill organizational needs, mentoring is essentially about learning” (NAESP, 2003).

So much knowledge can be exchanged by a solid mentoring experience. “A healthy mentoring relationship is a prime example of adults engaging in a learning endeavor together” (Searby, 2008). Zachary (2005) writes that mentoring is the quintessential expression of self-directed learning because the individual is responsible for his or her learning.

Central to the foundation of mentoring are Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development and the Brunerian construct of scaffolding. These theories are centered on the notion that people learn more with the assistance from a more capable other than they can alone. Scaffolding is the process of working and learning collaboratively with a more experienced and knowledgeable person. The scaffolding creates a safe place where learning occurs with appropriate levels of challenges and support. This safe place is known as a Zone of Proximal Development (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988, Vygotsky, 1978).

Since mentoring is characterized as a mutual learning partnership, equal attention and emphasis must be given to both sides of this relationship. Alsbury and Hackmann (2006) examined successful mentoring programs and found that effective programs acknowledge the benefits that accrue to both the mentors and protégés. They identified four factors that increased the likelihood of mentoring success: sufficient time to meet, mentors initiating communications, pairings from the same district, and specific interpersonal socialization into the profession and the unique organizational context of each novice administrator that necessitates an individualized process.

A sound mentoring program will address issues of Social justice. Much of the literature around social justice leadership in schools centers on common themes such as: action oriented and transformative, committed and persistent, inclusive and democratic, relational and caring, reflective and oriented toward a socially just pedagogy (Furman, 2011). Each of these themes could be topics for growth in a structured mentoring program. In the Catholic tradition, the first use of the term ‘social justice’ appeared in the writings of an Italian Jesuit, Luigi Taparelli d’Azeglio in 1840 (Newman, 1954, Shields, 1941). His writing drew on the earlier writings of Thomas Aquinas.

Catholic schooling for social justice should foster teaching and learning communities that are inclusive of students across multiple dimensions of diversity. Catholic social justice teaching emphasizes the dignity of the human person and prioritizes creating options for the poor; the institutional Catholic Church consistently calls on Catholic schools to enact this teaching (Congregation for Catholic Education, 1998, 2007; Grace, 2003). To emphasize this mission the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (2005) directed Catholic educators to make their schools accessible, affordable, and available.

Mentoring Catholic school principals is a unique process. The mentoring process for Catholic school principals must be everything that it is for public school principals, “and then some.” Catholic school principals should be mentored to understand that they create a community of leaders and servants. Although these principals have the responsibility for leading their school, they also have the responsibility for transforming society. “This transformation is made possible when each Catholic school principal

contributes to the support of the Church as a whole in supporting each principal within their own diocese” (Jacobs, 2015, p.66).

Jacobs (2015) states that mentoring in Catholic schools is a mission and a ministry. The principals in Catholic schools are responsible for academic learning. Equally as important is that they are responsible for the faith development to all who are entrusted to him or her. The principals are to promote the good news of faith. St. Paul notes, “To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good” (1Corinthians, 12:70). Jacob (2015) adds that the common good is developed and promoted constantly in the faith community of learners.

Specific Problem of Practice

In the Gospel according to St. Matthew (28:19), Jesus gave His followers the directive to teach all nations. Since this time, Catholic education has been a priority of the Church. It supports and continues the Church’s evangelizing mission. Over the years there has been a transition from religious leadership to lay leadership.

These lay school leaders would benefit greatly from a structured mentoring program to increase their spiritual leadership capacity. The literature review that follows will outline the importance of principal preparation programs and the mentoring component in the preparation process. A specific focus on Catholic school principal roles and preparation will be reviewed.

As a result of this study, a design will be created for a structured mentoring program to support lay principals in their spiritual leadership capacity in Catholic Schools in Altoona-Johnstown Diocese.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF ACCEPTABLE KNOWLEDGE

The Urgency to Prepare Future Leaders

The ranks of United States school leaders are graying. The U.S. Department of Labor estimated that 40% of the 93,200 principals are nearing retirement and the need for principals will increase from 10% to 30%. Because of this trend it is necessary to prepare new leadership and to keep those employed from retiring prematurely (Fenwick, 2007). Gates (2003) found that 63% of public school principals were 50 years and younger, 85% were 55 years and younger and 22% were 51-55 years of age. What's more, new principals have shorter careers because they are employed much later in their careers. This situation has led the American Association of School Administrators to express their concern that not only are young people not being recruited for leadership but also that our country lacks a systematic approach to hiring leaders (Gates, 2003).

The Importance of Principal Preparation Programs

The quality of educational leadership provided by school and district leaders is highly dependent on the quality of their leadership preparation experiences (Baker, Orr, & Young, 2007; Archer, 2005; Azzam, 2005; Hess & Kelly, 2005). That preparation, especially for principals, has been criticized for containing too much theory and too little practical application (Bottoms & Fry, 2009, Darling-Hammond, La Pointe, Meyerson, Orr, & Cohen, 2007; Martin & Papa, 2008; Wallace Foundation, 2012). In fact, a 2006 survey by Public Agenda, a nonprofit research organization that reports public opinion and public policy issues, found that nearly two-thirds of principals felt that typical graduate leadership programs “are out of touch” with today’s realities. Their report

underscores the view of the Southern Regional Education Board (2005) that, “traditional models of training principals are still out of sync with the challenges faced by today’s leaders” (p.3). Therefore, it is prudent that principal preparation programs become more innovative and include extensive authentic coursework and field experiences (Orr, 2006).

Although the purpose of principal preparation programs is to prepare students to function successfully in their chosen careers as school principals, this objective may not be reached by all students. Students who are not adequately prepared for this career, represent the failure of the preparation programs to provide the knowledge, skills, and competencies needed to successfully fulfill their role as a practicing principal (Hernandez, Roberts, & Menchaca, 2012).

Why Principal Training Programs Have Changed

During the last twenty years, university-based principal preparation has come under increased scrutiny by external actors as a result of standards-based reforms, accreditation processes and growing interest from public officials, private foundations, district administrators, and other stakeholders (Glassman, Cibulka, & Ashby, 2002; LaMagdeleine, Maxcy, Pounder, & Reed, 2009; Murphy, 2006; Sanders & Simpson, 2005; Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010; Young & Brewer, 2008).

A shift has occurred in the principal preparation landscape as states have passed rules allowing various actors to prepare principals as new institutional providers and alternative certification policies have emerged (Harrington & Wills, 2005; Elmor, 2006; LeTendre, Barbour, & Miles, 2005; Smith, 2008). District and foundation

supported alternative preparation programs and routes to certification have entered the preparation landscape, making the comparison with university-based programs inevitable (Barbour, 2005; Militerllo, Gajda, & Bowers, 2009; Teitel, 2006). As this is occurring, the number of university-based educational leadership programs has risen, with new institutional actors becoming large producers of pre-service principals (Baker, Orr, & Young, 2007).

The rising concern for the development of school leaders capable of leading reform and increasing student learning outcomes for all students is evidenced in state-level educational policy concerns and deliberations (Adams & Copeland, 2005; Sanders & Kearney, 2008; Gray, Fry, Bottoms, & O'Neil, 2007).

Characteristics of Effective Principals and Effective Preparation Programs

Researchers have varying views of what constitutes effective leadership at the building level. Hattie (2009) describes two types of principal leadership, instructional and transformational. Principals who are instructional leaders create safe learning climates, set clear instructional goals and maintain high expectations for both the teachers and students in their schools. The dimensions of instructional leadership that have the greatest impact on student achievement include: being committed to and participating with teachers in professional learning; organizing the evaluation of teaching and curriculum; making strategic decisions for appropriate resources for instruction; setting clear expectations; and being sure that an environment conducive to learning is in place (Hattie, 2009, pp. 83-84).

A different view, advanced by Waters, Marzano, and McNulty (2003) describes effective principal leadership practices as: the ability to read happenings in the school

and use the information to address issues and problems; keeping the faculty current on educational theory and practice; involving teachers in all aspects of decision making; questioning the status quo and implementing change; and creating a culture of shared beliefs and a sense of community.

The connection between a principal's instructional leadership and improved student learning is well-established in the research literature. Many researchers posit that improved instructional leadership is an important element in any school improvement effort (Copeland & Knapp, 2006). Principals influence student learning by shaping the conditions in schools, structuring the instructional program, ensuring accountability among students and teachers, and supporting teachers' work (Blasé & Blasé, 2003; Grissom & Loeb, 2011; Supovitz, Sirinides, & May, 2010).

At the classroom level, principals influence student achievement by working with classroom teachers to refine their instructional practice, and providing resources to support professional growth (Blasé & Blasé, 2003; Supovitz, Sirinides, & May, 2010). Analyses demonstrate that when principals engage in this leadership, it positively influences student learning (Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990; Leithwood & Louis, 2012; Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010).

Researchers have sought to identify leadership actions that support instructional improvement, thus boosting student achievement. These qualities of instructional leadership include: working with classroom teachers to improve identified instruction; providing resources and professional development aimed at improvements in instructional capacity; coordination of curriculum, instruction, and assessment; regular

monitoring of student and teacher performance; and cultivation of a school culture focused on improvements in teaching and learning (Darling-Hammond et al., 2010).

Clearly, the beliefs leadership preparation programs hold about what makes a principal effective, frame the curriculum they design and the practices they use to prepare building leaders. Researchers who investigate leadership programs also differ on their conclusions regarding what makes a program effect. Reeves (2002) framed his research on effective preparation programs through the lens of an investment in the future. He concluded that building a successful principal program includes components such as: identifying prospective leaders; creating an educational leadership preparation program; supporting students, teachers and parents through servant leadership; and creating synergy by blending leadership, learning and teaching (Reeves, 2002).

Davis, Darling-Hammond, Meyerson, & LaPointe (2005) centered their work more clearly on the practices that made up the preparation programs themselves. As a result, they identified seven key features of effective leadership preparation programs that include: clear focus and values about leadership and learning around which the program is coherently organized; standards-based curriculum emphasizing instructional leadership, organizational development, and change management; field-based internships with skilled supervision; cohort groups that created opportunities for collaboration and teamwork in practice-oriented situations; active instructional strategies that link theory and practice, such as problem based learning; rigorous recruitment and selection of both candidates and faculty; and strong partnerships with school and district to support quality field-based learning (pp. 8-15).

Building on previous research, in 2011, The University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA), endorsed six features of effective principal preparation practices. These features include: a rigorous recruitment and selection of students; a strong curriculum focus on instruction and school improvement; a coherent curriculum that is tightly integrated with fieldwork; active-learning strategies; quality internships; and a knowledgeable faculty (Baker et al., 2007; Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, Orr, Cohen, 2007, Pounder, 2011).

Interactive Learning, Continuous Engagement, and Internships

Researchers contend that one critical component of an exemplary principal preparation program is the inclusion of field-based experiences of the program (Creighton, 2005, Lauder, 2000, Reames, 2010). Yet, simply increasing the amount of time spent in the field is not sufficient to create an effective principal; the activities must be of high quality, relevant to the future leader's responsibilities and well structured (Bizzell & Creighton, 2010). These activities should be aligned to professional standards derived from state or organizational policy (Kersten, Trybus, and White, 2009).

Preparation programs that are able to blend coursework with intensive field experiences provide rich opportunities to bring real problems theory and research (Davis & Leon, 2011). Experiencing leadership in the context of a school or district setting further elevates the importance of the human aspects of leadership that include learning how to work as a team player and how to build productive collaborations and partnerships (Fenwick, 2003; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Lawrence & Nohria, 2002).

Field-experience activities have the greatest impact when incorporated continuously throughout the program, based on course content (Darling-Hammond et al.,

2007). Additionally, Darling-Hammond et al., stipulate that exemplary program field-based activities help interns construct new knowledge, facilitate opportunities for deep reflection, and help interns link theory to practice by using concrete real-world experiences within the school and community.

An extensive job-embedded internship that may last as long as a year can provide in-depth experience as long as there is quality feedback and mentoring (Hitt, Tucker, & Young, 2012; Mitgang, & Gill, 2012; The Wallace Foundation, 2011). Research on the most effective principal preparation program shows that in-depth field experiences and, if possible, a full-time apprenticeship with mentoring, accelerate and deepen the preparation of future administrators (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2007).

Andragogy as a Framework for Preparation

Research in leadership and adult learning has made great strides over the years and provides several important principles about leadership development and, by extension, organizational effectiveness (Davis & Leon, 2011). The term andragogy, first coined in 1833 by German elementary school teacher Alexander Kapp, stands in contrast to the principle of pedagogy in which the naïve child is taught subject content by more learned adults who direct and control learning processes (Knowles, et al., 2005). This new line of inquiry revealed that adult learners require a different instructional approach that relies more on self-directed learning, real-world problem solving, and life centered experiences (Davis & Leon, 2011).

Davis and Leon (2011) contend that principal preparation programs adopt the principles of andragogy to the complex task of preparing school principals. Specifically, they contend that the widely recognized model of andragogy provided by Knowles, et al.

(2005) which consists of six assumptions about the development of adult learners be utilized. These assumptions are: knowing why; self-actualized self-concept; accumulated life experiences; readiness to learn; orientation to learning; and internal motivation (Knowles, et al., 2005).

Key Leadership Practices

In their six year study of the relationship between school leadership and student learning, Seashore Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson (2010) identified four key leadership practices of successful school leaders that remained constant across differing school and environmental contexts. They are: setting directions; developing people; redesigning the organization; and managing the instructional program. The researchers concluded that it is the principal's ability to create synergy across variables such as fiscal, material, and human, that has the greatest stimulative effect on student learning (Seashore Louis et al, 2010).

Leadership Preparation Programs for Social Justice

Closing achievement gaps and mitigating the marginalizing practices often embedded in structures of schooling are a few of the challenges which require educational leadership programs that effectively prepare school principals who can meet the most pressing school challenges and who, in particular, strive for social justice ends (Hernandez & McKenzie, 2010). McKenzie, Christman, Hernandez, Capper, Dantley, Gonzales, Cambron-McCabe, and Scheurich, (2008) have suggested that to address the inequities that exist in schools today, educational leadership programs must feature elements that explicitly prepare leaders to lead for social justice.

The selection of students for a principal preparation program is critical to the development of social justice leaders (McKenzie et al., 2008). “Because, in general, students complete principal preparation programs quickly (an average of two years), students should quickly acquire an understanding of-or quickly enhance their existing understanding of social justice work” (Hernandez & Bell McKenzie, 2010, p. 51).

To develop socially-just school leaders, the preparation programs must help their future principals in identifying socially-just teaching practices and in supporting the development of socially-just teachers (Hernandez & Bell McKenzie, 2010). “The new teaching and learning requires faculty in leadership programs to provide future leaders with genuine-not staged-opportunities to learn about effective teaching” (Hernandez & Bell McKenzie, 2010, p.52).

A social justice leadership program should train principals to develop inclusive practices where aspiring school leaders can “recognize structures that pose barriers to students’ progress and create proactive structures and systems of support for all students at the macro and micro levels” (McKenzie et al., 2008, p. 126). Leadership programs should address school structures that segregate and isolate students from each other and that include pull-out programs from particular school groups (Frattura & Capper, 2007). A proactive system of support requires school leaders to reallocate resources so that integrated learning environments can exist for students (Hernandez & Bell McKenzie, 2010).

“Traditionally, principal preparation programs have provided future school leaders with insufficient training in the process of becoming socially just leaders” (Hernandez & Bell McKenzie, 2010 p. 52). Typically, the principals’ induction period

features no on-going feedback. An enhanced preparation program would include an induction period lasting between two and five years which would include additional coursework, ongoing support and a network of school leader for the enhancement of social justice (Hernandez & Bell McKenzie, 2010).

History of Catholic Education in the United States

Catholic education in the United States has its historical roots in the industrialization of the cities of the eastern states. From 1830 to 1850, more than one million Catholic immigrants came to the United States and settled in cities where work was plentiful and housing abundant. These Catholic immigrants entered a new life in a new country founded and controlled by Protestants. The Catholics were in a minority and faced prejudice and discrimination, including violent reprisals from the established Protestant population (Walsh, 2003).

The prejudice was most observable in the school setting (Bryk, Lee & Holland, 1993). “Catholics were not opposed to publically supported schools” as outlined by Horace Mann’s nondenominational common school (Cremin, 1957, p. 24). The concept of a common school spread throughout the United States under Mann’s tenure as Massachusetts secretary of education in the 1830’s and ‘40s. The growing Catholic population became alienated from the common school idea when “...their children would be forced to read the Protestant version of the Bible, to study explicitly anti-Catholic text, to sing Protestant hymns, and to endure other religious insults” (Cremin, 1957, p.24). The battle waged by Catholic parents against the use of the Protestant Bible became the rallying point for dissension against the common school (Buetow, 1985). The foundation for the development of Catholic schools in the United States was formed “not that

Catholics deliberately set out to create a separate system but, rather than the idea was largely forced upon them by a hostile public system under Protestant control” (Bryk, Lee, & Holland, 1993, p. 24).

These new Catholic schools grew slowly. In the early years of the United States, religious orders were the official representatives for the Church to the Catholic faithful. As the population and geography of the United States grew, so did the number of provinces serving the Catholic people. Baltimore was the site of the original ecclesiastical province of the American Republic. In 1852, the first of three Plenary Councils was conducted by the hierarchy of the Catholic Church in the United States (Montejano, & Sabatino, 2012).

The purpose of the First Plenary Council was to respond to the needs of the growing number of Catholics in the United States that had required additional ecclesiastical providences to be established. A concern of the council was to address the necessity of fostering a common discipline and to clarify the rules and regulations for the Catholic Church in the context of residence in a majority Protestant population (Montejano, & Sabatino, 2012).

Building Catholic schools soon became a priority for the Church. Construction of these parochial schools was expedited. The councils mandated, “In the four fundamental rules which were to govern the whole educational legislation, rule one was amended to read that a parochial school must be erected within two years from the promulgation of the council’s legislation unless the bishop saw fit to grant a further delay on account of more than ordinarily grave difficulties to be overcome” (Cassidy, 1949, p. 438).

The council made it clear to pastors of parishes that schools were to be erected for the education of the children of the parish. Parents of the children of the parish were obligated to send their children to the parish school (Cassidy, 1949). The Catholic bishops established a parochial school system to keep unity in the Church. The economic boom developed in the late 1800's provided financial strength to the overall population. The immigrant Catholic population also benefited. The newfound wealth of the Catholic laity led to the building of more schools as homage to their faith (Walch, 2003).

The influx of Catholics from Europe in the early twentieth century, created the opening of Catholic elementary schools attached to new parishes as the population grew in cities and rural communities. As elementary school populations grew, so did the need for secondary schools. Catholic schooling at both levels was primarily staffed by religious order priests, brothers, nuns, and deacons as faculty and administration. In 1920, ninety-two percent of the staffing of Catholic elementary and secondary schools was religious (McDonald & Schultz, 2011).

The Supreme Court landmark case in 1925, *Pierce v. Society of Sisters* legitimized the existence of Catholic schools. The high court ruled that an Oregon law requiring children to attend public schools was unconstitutional. In its decision, the court upheld the right of parents to make educational decisions on behalf of their children while acknowledging the states' right to regulate education, even in nonpublic schools. This case became a major turning point in the development of Catholic education in the United States (Shaughnessy, 2005).

Through the end of World War II, Catholic elementary and secondary schools were primarily supported by ethnic families from blue-collar communities in the cities

and towns that flourished in a period of growth. Record numbers of Catholic school graduates matriculated to some form of higher education. The typical Catholic elementary and secondary schools were small compared to their public school counterparts. At the secondary level the Catholic schools were gender segregated. By 1960, more than 5.2 million children were enrolled in Catholic elementary and secondary school. This was the largest enrollment in the history of Catholic education in the United States (McDonald & Schultz, 2011).

As enrollment in Catholic schools peaked, the number of religious working in those schools rapidly began to decline in the 1970's. From 1950 to 2000, the number of religious staffing Catholic schools went from ninety percent to seven percent (McDonald & Schultz, 2011). By 1990, Catholic schools were staffed primarily by lay teachers and administrators (85 percent) who brought with them different levels of professional and theological preparation (Montejano & Sabatino, 2012).

Catholic schools are governed differently than those of their public school counterparts. The schools at the elementary and secondary levels of a typical (arch) diocese are loosely organized in a system of schools, directed by a superintendent. Autonomy at the site-based level of education in Catholic schools is an expectation derived from Canon Law of the Roman Catholic Church (Code of Canon Law, 1983). The relationship of the local ordinary to the elementary or secondary school is described as autonomous, with the direction of each school independent from a centralized authority (Montejano & Sabatino, 2012).

The ultimate authority for directing Catholic schools in the United States rests with the bishop. The diocesan bishop has the right to oversee the Catholic schools in his

territory, even those which members of religious institutes have founded or direct. He also issues prescripts, which pertain to the general regulation of Catholic schools; these prescripts are valid also for schools, which these religious direct, without prejudice, however, to their autonomy regarding the internal direction of their schools (Can. 896~1).

The Catholic School Principal

The United States Catholic Conference defined the Catholic school principal's role across three major areas: educational leader, spiritual leader, and managerial leader (Ciriello, 1994).

As an educational leader, the principal guides the vision, fosters leadership in others, and oversees all aspects of curriculum and instruction to provide proof of educational achievement. As the spiritual leaders; Catholic school principals are “transformational leaders who facilitate faith development and Catholic school identity in their school (Ciriello, 1994, p. 5). As a managerial leader the principal is responsible for personnel management and institutional management. In addition, the principal oversees finance and development related to the school. (Rieckhoff, 2014).

Because of the importance of the principal's impacting student achievement, their preparation is coming under more scrutiny by legislators and policy makers (Anderson & Reynolds, 2015; Lewis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010). “It should be argued that the same attention being given to public school principal preparation programs must also be granted formation programs for Catholic school principals” (Boyle, 2016).

Standard 6 of the National Standards and Benchmarks for Effective Catholic Elementary and Secondary Schools (NSBECS) (Ozar & Weitzel-O'Neil, 2012) states

that, “An excellent Catholic school has a qualified leader/leadership team empowered by the governing body to realize and implement the school’s mission and vision.” This standard is underscored by Benchmark 6.1 that states, “The leader/leadership team meets national, state, and/or (arch) diocesan requirements for school leadership preparation and licensing to serve as the faith and instructional leader of the school.”

What is significant about that phrase is “faith and instructional leader of the school”? The effective Catholic school leader is to be both the “faith and instructional leader”. Across the country, university principal training programs focus on alignment with adopted leadership standards to meet certification/licensure requirements. At issue then is how do university programs also prepare candidate in the necessary faith leadership components that are so critical to leading effective Catholic schools (Boyle, 2016)?

The Pressures of Leading Catholic Schools

Because Catholic schools are enrollment driven, principals are under different pressures than their public-school counterparts. A Notre Dame study of 1,685 Catholic school principals nationwide indicates key challenges exist in financial management, marketing, Catholic identity, enrollment management, and long-range planning (Schmitt, 2012). These top five areas of need were narrowed to the most important two of enrollment management and financial management, “together capturing the most basic goal of survival: keeping a school open” (p.1).

Survival of Catholic schools depends on funding. The funding of Catholic schools has shifted over time. From the mid-19th to mid-20th century, all Catholics were involved in the funding and building the entire network of Catholic institutions. In the

post-Vatican II era, the burden of paying for rising education costs shifted to families with children in the system and a few wealthy alumni (McCluskey, 1968).

This trend has resulted in the loss of half the number of Catholic schools and over 60% of parochial school students. Today, in the United States 7,248 (6,028 elementary and 1,220 secondary) schools remain, enrolling only 2.2 million students (McDonald & Schultz, 2009). Many of the schools that closed were in urban areas. Closing the schools educating mostly poor Blacks represents the loss of the Church's most laudable and successful social justice mission. The Church's failure to educate the current and future generations of congregants amounts to institutional suicide (McCluskey, 1968).

Catholic School Principal as Faith Leader

The challenges of the Catholic school principal are many, with the duties and responsibilities similar to a secular counterpart in the roles of educational leader and managerial leader. In addition, the Catholic school principal has the duty of serving as the faith leader or spiritual leader, guiding the faith development and faith life of all constituents within the school (Rieckhoff, 2014). "The spiritual leader role focuses on faith development and building the Christian community as well as facilitating the moral and ethical development of those in the school community" (p.26). This role as spiritual leader is grounded in the knowledge of the history and philosophy of the Catholic Church.

The responsibilities of a Catholic school principal are many. Ozar (2010) states, "you must be a strong leader and an excellent professional educator...the job is consuming...the school climate is created by the principal. Catholic school principals

need to be committed faith-filled Catholics; they also need to be bright and generous” (pp.115-116).

In defining the role of a principal as spiritual leader Brownridge (2009) states, ‘this is a role of sacred trust and service in which the principal participates in building the Catholic community by nurturing the faith and the spiritual growth of students and staff’ (p.4). This explanation explains that the principal has specific duties in relation to the Catholic identity of the school and plays a crucial role in achieving the catechetical objectives of the parish (Brownridge, 2009).

Studies have examined the perceptions of Catholic school principals in their roles as faith leaders. Over twenty years ago, Wallace (1995) found that 70% of principals rated themselves inadequately prepared in faith leadership, having little or no formal coursework or training.

Faith leadership rests on spiritual capital that a principal brings to the role, suggesting spiritual competence serves as a critical component. Spiritual capital is a concept involving the quantification of the value of spiritual, moral, or psychological beliefs and practices. Spiritual competence can be operationalized through various means that measure an individual’s religious and spiritual inclinations, such as frequency of church attendance and prayer, as well as one’s belief in the transcendence (Belmonte and Cranston, 2009).

“The scope of the role of faith leader continues to expand at a challenging time for the Roman Catholic Church, with declining Mass attendance, families not practicing their faith, yet sending their children to a Catholic school, and other examples of disconnectedness with parish life” (Rieckhoff, 2014, p. 31),

In her study of Catholic school principals, Rieckhoff, (2014) found that they could be divided into two categories. The first group saw the faith leader role as centrally situated within the other aspects of their job. “It gave them license, power, and the ability to do more” (p.45). These principals saw themselves as faith leaders who were principals. “The faith leader role guided their work, and provided them with comfort when challenges arose” (p.45). “Within this primary faith role, principals were empowered to do more as it guided other areas of leadership, while overlapping additional roles they held... That is, the faith leader principal was driven by this sense of moral purpose and was guided by this lens” (p.46).

The second category of Catholic school principals were those who saw themselves as school leaders, with the role of faith leader as one of the many other duties and responsibilities they held. They perceived a distinct role of the faith leader and described ways they felt ill-prepared to lead in this area (Rieckhoff, 2014).

Purpose of the Study

This study will examine ways to better prepare the second category of Catholic school principals who feel ill-prepared to be faith leaders. “It is imperative that there is an on-going examination of the explicit methods used to foster both the requisite faith and instructional leadership skills necessary to lead these schools” (Boyle, 2016, p.291-2). The universities must find ways to make sure that faith leadership development is not short-changed in favor of licensure/certification requirements. Because Catholic school principal leadership demands are so unique explicit development in faith-leadership skills, while also developing the requisite instructional leadership skill is essential.

Without specific development in both of these leadership areas, Catholic schools will not have the qualified leaders they need to ensure their survival (Boyle, 2016).

Questions concerning the sustainability of Catholic school ethos with an increasing number of non-Catholic students has presented concerns with, amongst other things, religious relativism affecting both Catholic teachers and students as well as raising the difficulties of creating and maintaining a Catholic school faith community. There is a spiritual nature of the Catholic school administrator's role. The Catholic schools have a spiritual mission and the administrators must act responsibly to ensure the integrity of that mission in their schools. (Donlevy, 2007).

Therefore, principals play a critical role in embracing and creatively building a Catholic character and culture in their schools; the principal is the key leader of the Catholic school. Many principals indicated a lack of preparation for the position (Belmonte, & Cranston, 2009).

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) (2006) issued the following statement on the importance of Catholic schools and the need for universities to continue to prepare qualified teachers and leaders for the schools: "We must provide a sufficient number of programs of the highest quality to recruit and prepare our future diocesan and local school administrators and teachers so that they are knowledgeable in matters of our faith, are professionally prepared, and are committed to the Church. These programs will require even more active involvements and cooperation by our Catholic colleges and universities in collaboration with diocesan educational leadership (p. 272).

Catholic school leadership continues to transition from religious to lay with religious or clergy representing only 2.8% of the teaching staff in Catholic schools

(McDonald & Schultz, 2014). The Church has acknowledged the need to develop principal preparation programs that intentionally cultivate the candidates as spiritual leaders (USCCB, 2006).

As lay leaders replace religious men and women in Catholic schools dioceses, Congregational sponsors can no longer assume that principal candidates will possess working knowledge of the Catholic faith and Catholic school governance structures or the skills needed to build a faith community within the educational community (NCEA, 2009).

Central to the mission of the Church is the work of Catholic schools. The National Standards and Benchmarks for Effective Catholic Elementary and Secondary Catholic Schools (NSBECS) had stated, “An excellent Catholic school has a qualified leader/leadership team empowered by the governing body to realize and implement the school’s mission and vision.”

Central to the principal’s role is that of faith leader and helping others with faith development. The faith aspect of a Catholic school is what gives it a unique quality. In an era when so much has been placed on the shoulders of the principal the need for ongoing mentoring and supports becomes essential. The continued success and development of the principal is linked to the supports and systematic processes for their growth and expertise in the position (Rieckhoff, 2014).

The Importance of Mentoring

Highly skilled school leaders are not born, nor do they emerge from traditional graduate programs in school administration fully prepared to lead (Southern Regional Education Board, 2007). It is generally recognized that new principals will need

guidance from more experienced school leaders in their early years of administration (Searby, 2008). The National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP, 2003) in *Making the Case for Principal Mentoring* reported that principals are traditionally “thrown into their jobs without a lifejacket” (p.8), unprepared for the demands of the position, feeling isolated and without guidance. “Workplace mentoring is critical for inexperienced school leaders so as to provide a bridge between theory learned in graduate school and the complex realities of contemporary school leadership. Although formal mentoring processes are often designed primarily to fulfill organizational needs, mentoring is essentially about learning” (p.2).

One of the primary reasons that mentoring relationships fail is that the learning process is not tended to, nor is the focus on learning goals maintained (Zachery, 2000). Clearly, there is a need to help aspiring principals cultivate the disposition of embracing mentoring as an opportunity to further their professional learning goals. Furthermore, it is imperative that future educational leaders understand the critical role they play in preparing themselves for mentoring as their future adult learning partnership (Zachery, 2000).

From a learning perspective, it is essential that future principals have the ability to assess both the strengths and weaknesses of their leadership skills, reflect on these, and then make adjustments as needed. As these aspiring principals enter into the mentoring relationships that will assist them in this process, they should demonstrate the self-direction that is characteristic of adult learners (Knowles, 1980). “A healthy mentoring relationship is a prime example of adults engaging in a learning endeavor together” (Searby, 2008).

In this light, “mentoring is the quintessential expression of self-directed learning. At the heart of self-directed learning (and mentoring) is individual responsibility for learning. Self-responsibility means that the learner accepts ownership and accountability (individually and with others) for setting personal learning objectives, developing strategies, finding resources, and evaluating learning. In a mentoring relationship, the responsibility is mutually defined and shared (Zachary, 2005, p. 225).

As viewed from a Vygotskian and sociocultural perspective on learning, human activities are rooted in social participation and learned with the assistance of others and not in isolation (Lave & Wenger, 1991, Rogoff, 1995, Tharp & Gallimore, 1988, and Wertsch, 1991). The coaching and educating role of the mentor relates to the Brunerian construct of scaffolding (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976). This theory is centered on the notion that people learn more with assistance from a more capable other than what they cannot do alone. This process of working and learning collaboratively with a more experienced and knowledgeable person requires that the person who is delivering the scaffolding creates what is referred to by Vygotsky as a “Zone of Proximal development” a safe place where learning occurs with appropriate levels of challenges and support (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988, Vygotsky, 1978)

The Zone of Proximal Development

Russian philosopher Lev Vygotsky focused more on a student’s potential to learn than on actual ability. Vygotsky argued that there is a gap between what children can accomplish on their own versus what they can accomplish with the assistance of others. Vygotsky saw this gap as the area within which teachers could have the biggest

impact on learning and referred to it as the zone of proximal development (Hobson & Sharp, 2005; Meece, 1997).

“Vygotsky formulated a theory of cognitive development that is based on a student’s ability to learn how to use socially relevant tools (such as money, pencils, and computers) and culturally based signs (such as language, writing, and number systems) through interactions with other students and adults who socialize the students into their culture” (Doolittle, 1997).

Vygotsky stressed the process of internalization. This is when a student first experiences an idea, behavior, or attitude in a social setting, and then internalizes it so that it becomes a part of the student’s mental functioning (Doolittle, 1997). The distinction here is that Vygotsky recognized the impact of other humans within the social setting who help the student make sense of the experience and that each experience is shaped by the culture within which it takes place. Vygotsky writes, “The internalization of socially rooted and historically developed activities is the distinguishing feature of human psychology, the basis of qualitative leap from animal to human psychology” (1978, p. 57).

Internalization involves the student’s actively processing an experience with others, modifying the experience based on past experiences, and then integrating this experience into his or her way of thinking. This process can cause an old way of thinking or understanding to be changed or developed. This mental functioning is a result of the individual actively constructing knowledge with another more capable person as a result of a social experience. This theory of cognitive development has made Vygotsky a major contributor to the research around constructivism (Doolittle, 1997).

The zone of proximal development is central to Vygotsky's theory of cognitive development. This zone is set on the lower end by what an individual can accomplish independently. The upper end of the zone is set by what the individual can accomplish with the assistance of someone more knowledgeable. This knowledgeable other could be a peer, tutor, or teacher. The region of immediate potential for cognitive growth between the upper and lower limits is the zone of proximal development and is created by the person who is scaffolding the learning (Vygotsky, 1978).

In addition to addressing cognitive development, the construct of the zone of proximal development also addresses human learning. When a student requires much assistance in the learning process to accomplishing a task she or he is in the upper end of the zone. The student's zone will move as a result of practice and experience. The movement of the zone in the direction of the instruction is a result of cognitive growth and development. As the learning process continues, a student will be able to accomplish independently what she or he was only able to accomplish previously with much assistance. The degree of difficulty of the task to be learned remains constant while the skill of the learner increases (Doolittle, 1997).

“What lies in the zone of proximal development at one stage is realized and moves to the level of actual development at a second. In other words, what the child is able to do in collaboration today [he or she] will be able to do independently tomorrow” (Vygotsky, 1987, p.211). The zone of proximal development contains three aspects: the use of whole, authentic activities; the need for social interaction; and the process of individual change (Moll, 1990).

According to Vygotsky, educators need to study, teach, and learn higher mental functions as whole and authentic activities. These activities involve applying learned knowledge and skills in completion of a real-world task within a meaningful context. This is preferable to activities that reduce mental functioning to a decontextualized component skill. He disagreed with the reductionist view of inquiry and teaching. He concluded that as cognitive tasks are reduced to a sum of their parts, their essence is lost. Vygotsky also believed that the whole activities must also be relevant to the student for the student to feel a need for the development to occur. Whole activities or authentic situations establish environments in which the zone of proximal development is embedded (Doolittle, 1997).

A crucial component of Vygotsky's framework is the need for social interaction. He concluded that students learn through interactions with others. They internalized the knowledge and skills experienced through these interactions. They then use this knowledge and these skills to guide and direct their own behavior. Therefore, social interaction between those who are less experienced and those who are more experienced with a construct, concept, idea, or skill is an integral part of the zone of proximal development (Doolittle, 1997). Doolittle (1997, pp. 87-88) states, "The essence of the zone of proximal development is the interdependent social system in which cultural meanings are actively constructed by both the student and teacher. It is this interdependence that is central to a Vygotskian view of the educational process."

The third component of Vygotsky's framework is the process of individual change. He believed that the goal of cognitive development is change in the individual. Therefore, the purpose of instruction, informal or formal, should be to stimulate cognitive

growth and development. He also believed that the zone of proximal development is always changing. As a student learns and develops his or her collaborative interactions with another individual lead to the development of culturally relevant behavior (Doolittle, 1997). Vygotsky asserted, “The only good instruction received in childhood is the one that precedes and guides development” (Vygotsky, 1987, p.48). That is why educators who actually impact cognitive growth do so by creating a zone of proximal development that encourages intellectual challenge and provides the level of support needed to reach it.

The three aspects of the zone of proximal development: whole and authentic activities, social interaction, and individual change all influence functional pedagogy. This pedagogy can be useful in the training of future school administrators. Since the zone of proximal development is the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers (Vygotsky, 1978, p.86).

Dziczkowski (2013) contends that “the zone of proximal development suggests that leaders have the potential to achieve a greater degree of success if they seek out assistance from others to complete tasks (p. 353). It follows then that programs focused on fostering leadership growth should intentionally create zones of proximal development for those they intend to nurture and develop.

Guided Participation

Another framework which is a component of effective mentoring is guided participation. Professor Barbara Rogoff, much like Vygotsky, examined the extent of

what children could accomplish with the help of others. Her research promoted the concept of guided participation. Guided participation is when a skill is transferred from the assistant to the learner (Dziczkowski, 2013). Meece (1997) asserts that this transfer is accomplished in three phases: (a) Choosing activities that interest the learner and contain the desired skills to be learned, (b) providing support as learners participate in activities, and (c) adjusting the level of support as learners begin to complete activities and acquire the skills to complete tasks on their own.

Scaffolding

A third component of effective mentoring is scaffolding and it connects to the ideas of the zone of proximal development and guided participation. The concept of scaffolding is much like that of guided participation. American psychologist Jerome Bruner's concept of scaffolding focuses on providing support to learners as they work toward skill mastery (Dziczkowski, 2013). During the scaffolding process instructors can provide both verbal and physical support. Meece (1997) suggests that this support can take the form of demonstrating solutions, simplifying larger tasks into smaller steps, renewing interest in the task, providing encouragement, managing frustration, and offering feedback. It is important to note however, that scaffolding within the zone of proximal development has the greatest impact on learning (Ormrod, 2016). That is because a skill that is too far above what the student can do on his own will cause frustration, even with expert scaffolding. In contrast a skill that the student already can accomplish does not benefit from scaffolding. Finding that "sweet spot" that Vygotsky defined as the zone of proximal development maximizes both the learner's potential and the impact of the instructor's scaffolding efforts.

In a study conducted by Hartland (2003) scaffolding was conceptualized as the process of providing higher levels of initial support for students as they entered the zone of proximal development with the gradual dismantling of the support structure as students progressed towards independence. Eventually, the scaffold would disappear and would be replaced by a new one to help construct the next stage of learning. This process of intentionally removing or decreasing the scaffold as the learner becomes more capable is known as “fading” (Ormrod, 2016).

Regardless of the strategy used by the teacher, each student will construct his or her own meaning based on an interaction between prior knowledge and current learning experience. Ausubel (1968, p. vi) states, “If I had to reduce all of educational psychology to just one principle, I would say this: the most important single factor influencing learning is what the learner already knows. Ascertain this and teach him (*sic*) accordingly.” In other words, the most effective teachers create a zone of proximal development that challenges the learner, provides support as the learner first struggles and then fades that support as the learner becomes more capable. Once the learner has mastered the skill or concept, the instructor creates a new zone of proximal development that challenges the learner to reach even high levels of understanding and proficiency.

The Origins of Mentoring

The roots of mentoring can be traced back to Greek mythology. The term mentor is derived from the Greek mythological character Mentor, who was a close friend of Odysseus. When Odysseus left to join the Trojan War, he entrusted Mentor to care for his son Telemachus. Throughout the *Odyssey*, Athena takes on the form of Mentor to

give advice to Telemachus and Odysseus. This is the reason that today trusted advisers and teachers are referred to as mentors (Parada, 1997).

Throughout history, mentoring has occurred consistently. Yet, the term mentoring hasn't gained popularity until the mid-1970's. Before then, other terms were used. When Woodrow Wilson was the president of Princeton University, he instituted the preceptorial program. This program paired small groups of students with single professors to form more personal and intimate educational relationships (Princeton University, 2013; Tenner, 2004). "That professor, or preceptor, was many times referred to as a philosopher, guide, and friend" (Tenner, 2004, p. B7). However, the professor was never referred to as a mentor. (Dziczkowski, 2013).

The concept of mentoring became more prevalent in the 1970's in both the corporate and educational settings. Several publications in the late 1970's touted the importance of mentoring. Harriett Zuckerman's book, *Scientific Elite: Nobel Laureates in the United States*, published in 1977, established a correlation between the successes of American laureates and mentoring. Zuckerman found that over half of the laureates had collaborated with older laureates and other notable individuals (Tenner, 2004, Zuckerman, 1996).

In 1979, a corporate craze of mentoring was launched when an article was published in the *Harvard Business Review* (Dziczkowski, 2013). That article contained the works of Gerald Roche, the CEO of executive search firm Heidrick and Struggles, Inc. Roche analyzed a survey of recently hired employees and concluded that a majority of new hires had mentors and found greater enjoyment in their careers as a result (Tenner, 2004). In 1977, Clayton Jones made a bold prediction in *The Christian Science*

Monitor when he said that by the 1980's mentors would be "as visible a career tool as a school degree and a resume" (Jones, 1977, p. B10).

Mentoring Today and into the Future

Much of the research on mentoring focuses on the settings and elements of effective delivery in particular settings. For example, mentoring in rural school districts was examined by Duncan and Stock (2010) who found that principals perceived three needs: professional and organizational socialization, use of data for informing decision making, and instructional leadership, and work with difficult faculty.

The proliferation of technology has introduced the concept of e-mentoring, which is an adaptation of traditional mentoring. This is also referred to as cyber mentoring or virtual mentoring. This type of mentoring includes the formation of asynchronous relationships, where the mentor and mentee communicate via electronic media, such as e-mail or discussion boards (Dziczkowski, 2013). Research by (deJanasz, Ensher, & Heun, 2008; Hilbun & Akin, 2007; Shrestha, May, Edirisingha, Burk & Linsey, 2009) revealed that e-mentoring allows for greater flexibility in scheduling, reduces the status disparity between mentor and mentee, and allows for mentor-mentee pairings that may be geographically impossible in a traditional setting.

Dziczkowski (2013) posits that e-mentoring will more likely become an even more attractive and pursued alternative to the traditional mentoring format because of the expansion of global communication, the continued proliferation of technology, and the increased value on individuals' time. She states, "While e-mentoring has produced positive results, it also has revealed the need for future research and application to determine best practices" (2013, p.359).

Mentoring Challenges

Mentoring success is hindered by several factors including time and accountability pressures which inhibit interactions as well contributing to poor mentor/protégé pairing (Clayton, Sanzo, and Myran, 2013). They also discovered that mentoring is more successful if focused on a project and delivered through a structured tool to direct conversation. Still, other studies have emphasized the value of informal peer support and the co-construction of knowledge by both mentor and mentee (Mullen & Tuten, 2010, Searby, 2010).

Characteristics of Successful Mentoring Programs

The most important component of mentoring programs is the development of a supportive mentor-protégé relationship with an emphasis on role, socialization into the profession, reflective conversation, and role clarification. Also, gender and race are two important variables to consider when establishing mentor-protégé pairs. Alsbury and Hackmann (2006) investigated successful mentoring programs and found that effective programs acknowledge the benefits that accrue to both mentors and protégés. They identified four factors that increased the likelihood of mentoring success: sufficient time to meet, mentors initiating communications, pairings from the same district, and specific interpersonal socialization into the profession and the unique organizational context of each novice administrator that necessitates an individualized process. Additionally, the program should incorporate flexibility in scheduling, content, communication processes, and delivery models to accommodate individual needs of both mentors and protégés. Their findings relate to those of Dyer (2010) who found that protégés cited the importance of having opportunities to develop skills in a safe

environment and enjoyed having a sounding board. And, that they appreciated the guidance and direction provided by their mentors.

Several key elements of successful district mentoring programs have been identified in the research. These elements include: focusing on knowledge and skills regarding instructional leadership, management and operations; change and building school community; building protégé confidence; developing a culture of continued leadership development; and the elements such as sufficient time, mentor training, and state funding (Daresh, 2007, Mitgang, 2007, Woosley, 2010). Daresh (2007) found that mentor principals indicated that beginning confidence in administrative skills facilitated later development of instructional leadership competence.

The Role of Effective Mentor Selection and Training

The importance of the selection and training of mentors has been lacking from current literature. Prior studies conducted by Cohn & Sweeney, 1992; Crow & Matthews, 1998; and Walker & Scott, 1994 cited the relationship of mentor training and selection to the success of a mentoring program. Since these studies not much more has been written about mentor selection and training. Graff and Pettengill (2010) conducted a policy analysis and found that fifteen states had a policy that could be evaluated. Within these policies they contained very few requirements to govern the mentoring process. The recommended selection criteria included a minimum number of years of relevant experience, a sound record of success, and self-nomination. An additional recommendation was that a mentor and a protégé have both a geographic proximity and also a similar school background.

Coaching versus Mentoring

More recent studies have examined the effectiveness of coaching on new principals. Some of these studies have focused on several impacts including: shaping reflective, instructionally focused practice; feeling supported during stressful times; having an authentic trusting relationship; and enhancing relationship-building through technology (Roberson, 2011). Meanwhile, James-Ward (2011) found that coaches and school leaders did not always have the same understandings of the district initiatives. Yet, the coaches felt that having time for them to meet together helped reduce role ambiguity and gave coaches time to identify common issues among new principals.

Most new and veteran principals agreed that a coaching program had a positive impact. However; they differed in some of their concerns. The coaches indicated that keeping principals inspired and preparing them to be instructional leaders had the most impact. Yet, the new principals felt the most impact from the coaches in terms of giving feedback to teachers and helping principals to be more reflective (Ward & Salcedo-Potter, 2011).

Current literature has cited several university-based internship programs with coaching components. Strong programs contained full-time, job-embedded internships enhanced by transformational coaching. The coaches were in the schools on a weekly basis and encouraged interns to be reflective, strategic, relational, and proactive (Shoho et al. 2012).

New principals viewed the university-based coaching program positively. Both the coaches and the principals noted that the personalized support was the most significant aspect of the program. Other critical components of the program included: the

coach-principal match, the coach's 3-year commitment to the principal, and the focus of coaching and conversations that began with the administrative basics before moving to instructional leadership (Silver, Lochmiller, Copland, & Tripps, 2009).

In light of the current literature, Crow and Whiteman (2016) contend that “research on mentoring and coaching still lacks rigorous examinations of the effectiveness and outcomes of mentoring programs” (p. 137). They write that large-scale studies of mentoring and coaching effectiveness across multiple programs would move the field away from viewing these leaning tools as panaceas to a more realistic understanding of their costs and benefits. Additionally, they call for empirical studies on mentor and coach selection that can inform this critical element of successful mentoring.

Effective Protegeship

Much of the literature about mentoring centers on the mentor's point of view or focuses on the benefit of the mentor. Research exists on what makes a good mentor (Galbraith, 2001; Johnson, 2006), the states and phases of the mentoring relationship (Chao, Walz & Gardner, 1992; Kram, 1985; Mertz, 2004), and successful mentoring programs (Kochan, 2002, Sprague & Hostinsky, 2002). There is less of an emphasis placed on helping protégés prepare for a mentoring relationship (Daresh & Playko, 1995; Mullen 2006).

When new principals enter into mentoring partnerships, they will need to be prepared to be successful protégés in those relationships. It is essential that educational leadership courses prepare future principals for those mentoring relationships. It is questionable whether the traditional curriculums in educational leadership preparation

programs provide future administrative candidates with the tools for being successful as protégés in their future mentoring relationships (Searby, 2008).

Mentoring is characterized as a mutual learning partnership; however Zachary (2000) emphasized the importance of the protégé taking the initiative in the relationship. The learning partnership supported by Zachary suggests a move away from the concept of ‘mentor as superior’ and ‘protégé as passive subordinate’ to move to a two way, power free and mutually beneficial relationship. In this new model the mentor’s role shifts from ‘sage on the stage’ to ‘guide on the side.’ The mentor takes on the role of a facilitator. The protégé takes responsibility for outlining learning goals, setting priorities, and becoming increasingly self-directed. The mentor and protégé share accountability and responsibility for achieving the protégé’s learning goals (Zachary, 2000).

The skills necessary for becoming an effective protégé include: goal setting, communication, the capacity to seek and act on feedback and reflection (Searby & Tripses, 2007). All of these skills can be developed through practice. Goal setting is an important component for students preparing to enter a formal mentoring relationship. The students are able to identify personal strengths and weaknesses by completing personality inventories. Students are able to practice their active listening skills (Searby, 2008). Reflection is important in the learning process. Zull (2002) states, “While experience is necessary for learning, reflection is required because reflection is searching for connections-literally. Thus, dialogue that promotes reflection is a natural way of leaning” (p.164).

Reflection is important in the mentoring process. Zachary (2005) states, “Transformational learning is facilitated through a process of critical self-reflection” (p.

225). This critical self-reflection process commences as protégés become aware of their existing assumptions, then self-awareness begins. Next, as their existing assumptions are challenged, increased self-understanding can prompt them to let go of self-limiting and often unrealistic assumptions that may be holding them back. When this transformation takes place, the protégés have experienced learning which results in more productive insights and behaviors (Searby, 2008).

Just as skills for protegeship can be developed, so too can the dispositions needed to be successful in a mentoring relationship. These dispositions of an effective protégé are: the willingness to learn, self-knowledge, taking initiative, maintaining confidentiality, and being aware of ethical considerations in the mentoring relationship (Searby & Tripses, 2007). Coursework that requires exercises focusing on enhancing self-awareness, reflection, and ethics can help to develop these dispositions (Searby, 2008).

Leadership and Followership

Much of the literature about leadership by management scholars is focused on the behavior of the leader. It was not until Kelly's article, "In Praise of Followers," published in the *Harvard Business Review* (1988) did the importance of followership gain attention in academic and popular circles. Kelly's seemingly novel proposal was that followers had an active role to play in organizational success. In fact, Kelly believed that success was not solely dependent on dynamic leaders. Followers could be more than passive subordinates.

Chaleff (1995) expanded Kelly's work. He presents a picture of followers as courageous initiators willing to follow another's leadership in a way which allows the

follower to use all of his or her own giftedness. Chaleff's five qualities of courageous followers are: the courage to responsibility, the courage to serve, the courage to challenge, the courage to participate in change, and the courage to take moral action.

For much of civilization there were no leadership theories. There were only leaders and their followers. Early leaders were Great Men who functioned in a pre-industrial and pre-bureaucratic period (Draft, 1999). These Great Men were set apart from other humans because of their leadership talent skills. These traits were assumed to be inborn. They were natural abilities which were thought to be inherited and not acquired (Galton, 1900).

“Those who did not inherit these abilities had no chance to acquire them. The Great Men had their followers, troops, or devotees who followed in their footsteps, obeyed their directives, and faithfully mimicked their actions” (Baker, 2007, p. 51). This view of leaders and followers continued into the 1970's when Hollander (1974) described followers as non-leaders who were essentially passive. “From leadership theories as early as Great Man through the 1970's, the common view of leadership was that leaders actively led and subordinates, later called followers, passively and obediently followed” (Baker, 2007). Typical of the understanding of the relationship, Follett (1996) concluded that one was “either a leader or nothing of much importance” (p.170).

While management scholars were slow to examine the role of followership prior to the 1970's, theorists in other behavioral science fields had been studying the relationship between leaders and followers for some time. Anthropologist Mead (1949) discussed the importance of examining the psychological relationship between leader, lieutenant, and follower and the effect those psychological relationships had on the

individuals. The cultural and anthropological factors that affected the individuals and their roles were also examined by Mead (1949). Hollander (1974) defined a role as “a set of behaviors which are appropriate for a position which an individual fills” (p.19). Heller and Van Til (1982) stated that “leadership and followership are best seen as roles in relation” (p. 406). Kelly (1991) asserted that followership and leadership were roles, not people, and that most managers played the roles of both follower and leader (Kelly, 1988).

Sanford (1950) a sociologist, noted that “leadership is an intricate relation between leader and followers” (p. 183) and that leaders had to meet their followers’ needs to maintain a desirable relationship with them. The “human group,” a connection between leader and a group by whose norm the leader must live (pp. 425-429) was discussed by Homan (1950). In 1961 he expanded on his previous work to describe a process of exchange between leader and group members in which both sides give and take resources (Bargal & Schmid, 1989). Recognition was given to the group member, or follower, as well as to the leader. The work by Homans laid the foundation for social exchange theory. This theory became the antecedent to transactional leadership theory (Hollander & Offerman, 1990) which is one of the forebears of active followership theory.

Researchers began to examine the role of followers. Hollander and Webb (1955) argued that the concept of leader and follower as not an either/or proposition. The two were not found at opposite ends of a continuum. They maintained that the qualities associated with leadership and followership were interdependent and that qualities of followership should be considered as a component of good leadership. Hollander and

Julian (1969) built on the work of Homan's work on the social exchange process when they wrote that leadership encompassed a "two-way influence relationship (p. 390) that contained an "implicit exchange relationship" (p. 395) between leaders and followers over time.

In an empirical study by Tjosvold, Andrews, and Jones (1983), examined causal links between leaders and subordinates, focusing on leaders; cooperative and competitive behaviors. They found that leaders could improve their own success, improve subordinates' reactions to their leadership, increase subordinates' satisfaction, and build morale by emphasizing common goals held by leader and subordinates, help subordinates achieve their goals, encourage subordinate learning and development, exchange information and resources, and share the rewards of their combined efforts.

Social exchange theories contend that social interaction is a form of exchange in which a group member contributed to the group at a cost to himself or herself and received benefits from the group at a cost to the group (Baker, 2007). From these theories, Hollander and Julian, (1969) developed theories about the nature of the social change processes and applied them to leaders and followers. They constructed the leader-follower transaction to be that leaders provided benefits such as direction and followers responded with increased esteem for and responsiveness to the leader. This view of this transaction led to transactional leadership theories. These leadership theories focused on a follower's perceptions and expectations of a leader (Baker, 2007).

Historian Burns (1978) is credited for naming and popularizing the term transactional leadership. This leadership theory noted a "leadership act" (p. 20) in which one initiated an exchange with another. In a leadership act, Burns believed that leader and

follower interact to transform each other and raise each other to higher moral levels. Followers were recognized by Burns as important players in the leadership act.

Another social exchange theory emerged in the 1970s. The Leader-Member Exchange Model (LMX) was another method of viewing followers. Developed by Graen, Scadura, Uhl-Bien, and others, this theory focused on the leader-follower dyad and examined how exchange processes affected the dyadic relationship over time (Schriesheim, Casto, Zhou, & Yammarino, 2001). They found that as the dyadic relationship developed over time, informal exchanges between leader and follower replaced the formal exchanges required by the organization. “The leader relied less on power and influence to negotiate with a follower for whom he or she had increasing trust. The leader began to share power and influence with the follower, empowering the follower to exercise more influence over the leader” (Baker, 2007, p.54).

Noting Graen and Uhl-Bien’s (1995) classification of leadership theories into the three domains of leader, follower, and relationship, Howell and Shamir (2005) asserted that “while LMX theory emphasizes the importance of all three domains, its main contribution has been to shift the focus from the leadership domain to the relationship domain (p. 98).

Attribution theories came about in the 1970’s. These theories presented a different framework for viewing the leader-follower relationship. “These theories posited the importance of recognizing leaders’ and followers’ perceptions about leadership rather than focusing solely on a leader’s trait or how he or she acted” (Baker, 2007, p.54). Either personal internal trait or external constraints were thought to cause the leader’s behaviors

(Bass, 1990). Over time, the focus of implicit leadership theories moved from the leaders' perceptions to the followers' perceptions.

Chaleff's (1995) book, *The Courageous Follower*, proposed a new model of leader-follower relations that was built on a leader's courage to be less than dominant and a follower's courage to be more dominant. This model encouraged the courageous follower to be willing to assume responsibility, to serve, to challenge the leader, to participate in change processes when needed, and to oppose leaders whose acts harmed the organization.

Followers are active and not passive. Barnard (1987) contended that the subordinate held the power to a leader's authority. Without a subordinate's cooperation and assent, the leader had no authority. Litzinger and Schaefer (1982) argued that the leader must be a follower of the organizational goals as understood by his or her own followers. Additionally, a good follower helped to prepare one to be a good leader. Kelley (1988) distinguished between effective and ineffective followers. Distinctive characteristics of an effective follower include: enthusiasm, intelligence, and self-reliant participation. An effective follower saw his or her role as one that was "legitimate, inherently valuable, even virtuous" (p. 143).

Leaders and followers share a common purpose in their interdependent relationship. Follett (1996) wrote that followers and leaders must follow a common purpose on which their work is focused. Burns (1978) explained that leaders and followers had "inseparable functions" (p. 20) but different roles. Hollander (1992) explained that a leader must engage followers in "mutually satisfying and productive

enterprises” (p. 74). Vecchio (1997) added that followers and leaders are interconnected and share responsibility for meeting goals.

There exists a relational nature of followers and leaders. Gilbert (1990) viewed the relationship as one of partners. Hollander restated his contention that the leader-follower relationship was interdependent (1992a) and reciprocal (1992b), involving two-way support and influence (1997). He also believed that the “usual expectation” (1997, p. 13) that the follower role was passive with little power did not fit with the concept of active followers. Berg (1998) endorsed the idea of a collaborative follower-leader relationship. Potter et al. (1996) wrote about the idea of a partnership relationship between leaders and followers in which follower initiative were as important as leader initiatives. Pittman, Rosenbach, and Potter (1998) promoted the idea that the best leader-follower relationship is a partnership. Kelley (1991) agreed with this partnership notion. He contended that both the follower and leader were individually and collectively responsible for the actions of the organization with both roles carrying equal weight.

Social Justice Leadership Preparation

“Social justice is a major concern for many contemporary educational scholars and practitioners” (Furman, 2012, p. 2). As Blackmore (2009) points out, “increased accountability has focused system and media attention on social inequality” so that the “state is no longer able to ignore issues of educational inequality” (p.8). Within the field of educational leadership, many scholars are exploring the meanings of social justice; the nature of leadership for social justice and the implications for leadership preparation programs. Currently, the literature offers little about the actual practice of social justice leadership in K-12 schools and the current capacities needed by school leaders to engage

in this practice. The literature is thin regarding explicit methods for developing these capacities (Furman, 2012). “Current preparation programs aimed toward social justice tend to focus on critical consciousness... [and] find it difficult to prepare leaders to acquire the actual skills needed to make equity-based changes in schools” (Capper, Theoharis, and Sebastian, 2006, p. 218).

A common understanding among many leadership scholars is that social justice focuses on the experiences of marginalized groups and inequities in educational opportunities and outcomes (Furman, 2012). “The concept of social justice focuses on...those groups that are most often overserved, underrepresented, and undereducated and that face various forms of oppression in schools” (Dantley & Tillman, 2010, p.23). Theoharis (2007) adds that social justice means “addressing and eliminating marginalization in schools” (p. 223). The leadership for social justice involves identifying and undoing these oppressive and unjust practices and replacing them with more equitable, culturally appropriate ones, (Furman, 2012). Leadership for social justice investigates and poses solutions for issues that generate and reproduce societal inequities (Dantley & Tillman, 2010). “Social justice leadership is a critical building block in the educational equity project” (Marshall, Young, & Moll, 2010, p. 315).

Much of the literature around leadership for social justice centers on common themes. These themes for social justice leadership in schools include: action oriented and transformative, committed and persistent, inclusive and democratic, relational and caring, reflective, and oriented toward a socially just pedagogy (Furman, 2012).

Social justice leaders are proactive change agents who are engaged in transformative leadership (Shields, 2003). To do the work of a transformative leader, one

must first “develop a heightened and critical awareness of oppression, exclusion, and marginalization” (Brooks & Miles, 2006, p. 5). This critical awareness makes it possible for school leaders to imagine and construct “new institutional possibilities” (Goldfarb & Grinberg, 2001, p. 162). Social justice leaders are activists, continually working for substantive change in their schools (Brooks et al., 2007; Jansen, 2006; Jean-Marie, 2008; Lopez et al., 2010; Theoharis, 2007). Rapp (2002) summarized this theme for social justice by noting that “Leaders for social justice...resist, dissent, rebel, subvert, possess oppositional imaginations and are committed to transforming oppressive and exploitative social relations in and out of schools” (p. 226).

Social justice leaders are committed and persistent (Furman, 2011). These traits are necessary if one is to function as a transformative, activist change agent in challenging contexts. School leaders are required to be deeply committed to a social justice agenda and be “stubbornly persistent” in their efforts (Scheurich & Skrla, 2003).

Inclusive and democratic are two more identified traits of socially just leaders (Furman, 2011). To address social justice and marginalization issues, educational leaders work to create more inclusive practices within their schools (Cooper, 2009; Gerstl-Pepin & Aiken, 2010; Giles et al., 2005; Goldfarb & Grinberg, 2001; Lopez et al., 2010; Merchant & Shoho, 2010; Riehl, 2000; Riester et al., 2002; Ryan, 2006; Theoharis, & Causton-Theoharis, 2008; Wasonga, 2010). Often, inclusion is considered to be the same condition as social justice. “Those who promote inclusion believe that social justice can be achieved if people are meaningfully included in institutional practices and processes” (Ryan, 2006, p.5).

Not only should socially just leaders demonstrate inclusive and democratic practices, they should do so in caring ways. “Social justice leaders work to develop caring relationships based in authentic communication” (Furman, 2012, p.7). Social justice leadership should be relationship-driven, holistic, and morally grounded because relationships are at the crux of educational leadership (Dantley, Beachum, & McCray, 2009). Theoharis (2007) adds that principals who are motivated to work towards social justice and equity build relationships by using purposeful and authentic communication. The communicative practices are important in the context of diversity because real dialogue can assist marginalized groups to be meaningfully included in cultural institutions such as schools. The right dialogical practices provide bridges bringing together disparate and different communities in ways that enable them to overcome powerful barriers (Ryan, 2007).

School leaders for social justice are oriented toward a socially just pedagogy (Furman, 2012). Social justice leaders should continuously examine whether student learning is equitable for all student groups. They should encourage teachers to critically examine their practices for possible bias in regard to race, class, and gender (Kose, 2007). Socially just educational leaders must be proactive in orienting and organizing instruction. They should rethink “the nature of curriculum around the values of social justice” (Furman & Shields, 2005, p. 130).

An attribute that encompasses all of the previous traits of socially just leaders is self-reflection. “As a basis for their leadership practice, social justice leaders engage in critical self-reflection aimed at personal awareness and growth. This self-reflection is seen as a way for leaders to identify and come to grips with their prejudices and

assumptions arising from their cultural backgrounds” (Furman, 2012, p.7). This critical self-reflection includes the “deep examination of personal assumptions, values, and beliefs” (Brown, 2004, p. 89). Dantley (2005) calls for the “psychology of critical self-reflection” which is when “the educational leader comes to grips with his or her own identity” (p.503).

To better prepare socially just school leaders the programs devoted to their development “should promote opportunities for critical reflection, leadership praxis, critical discourse, and develop critical pedagogy related to issues of ethics, inclusion, democratic schooling, and social justice” (Jean-Marie et al. 2009, p. 20). Hafner (2006, 2010) adds that preparation programs should model social justice teaching by attending to students’ personal safety, providing guidelines for group behavior, supporting the personal experience of the student as learner, and attending to social relations within the educational leadership classroom.

Catholic Social Justice Teachings

The first use of the phrase “social justice” in Catholic writings was by a little-known Italian Jesuit, Luigi Taparelli d’Azeglio (Newman, 1954; Shields, 1941). The phrase appears in his book on natural law (1840) which draws profusely on the writing of Thomas Aquinas. It is immediately followed by a discussion of the two particular forms of justice, commutative and distributive. This shows that Taparelli intended to equate the new term “social justice” with the traditional Thomistic term “general” or “legal” justice (Paulnus, 1987).

For Thomas Aquinas, persons, as rational beings, stand at the summit of creation with all other creatures ordained to them. This dignity of the person comes to one from

the nobility of the end one pursues, and more particularly from the ultimate end of one's pursuit, God. It is not an intrinsic dignity that a person possesses by virtue of being an end unto oneself (Aquinas, 1934; De Koninck, 1934). Such persons are endowed with a natural inner dynamism that urges them toward life in society, which is necessary not only to provide the material needs of life but to satisfy human longing for completeness or wholeness, especially in the intellectual and spiritual realm (Thomas, 1934, 1948, 1964). Fortin (1982) writes that this fulfillment occurs only by engaging in activities that involve them in a web of reciprocal relationships which is typically structured within the context of civil society.

This civil society, which enjoys a primacy of nature over the individual, is defined by Thomas as a "multitude of men bound together under some order" (1964: I, 31, 1, ad 2). It constitutes an "accidental whole," one in which persons retain their individuality while being bound together by a real relationship of unity of order (1949: I, 1, 5; 1934: IV, 35). Civil society is a natural grouping of humans bound together "accidentally" but "really" in an orderly way for the pursuit of specific and innate purposes, which are summarized under the name 'the common good' (Paulhus, 1987).

For Thomas a goal of civil society is living virtuously for, as rational and spiritual beings, humans share most of all the things of the spirit. Unlike material things which are depleted when they are shared, spiritual realities are multiplied when shared. Thomas' religious vision of the world led to his notion of the common good. He explained that since we are destined to the enjoyment of God, "the final aim of social life will be, not merely to live virtuously, but through living to attain to the possession of God" (1948: I, p. 14), to rejoice in the beatific vision.

That is because Thomas believed that “whoever promotes the common good of the community, by that very fact promotes his own good as well... for the proper good simply cannot exist outside of the family, or of the city, or Kingdom” (1964: II, p. 47, 10, ad 2).

DeKoninck (1943) writes, “God, good purely and simply universal, is the proper good which all things naturally desire as their loftiest and best good and which gives being to all things (p. 12). Thomas draws the conclusion that more perfect beings seek a more universal good, whereas imperfect ones are content with their own singular material good (1934). They love this common good not insofar as they can share it, but in its ability to be shared with others. They will more readily sacrifice their singular good for the sake of the common good, knowing full well that in doing so they are gaining their own highest proper good.

Likewise, Paulhus (1987) reminds us that social justice must remain as a vital intellectual cog in our vision of a better world because it expresses a vital insight into the nature of the human community. In this way, the concept of social justice provides a powerful unifying purpose that gives direction and value to all of the individuals of the community. The Roman Catholic bishops envisioned “the ability to participate actively in the economic, political, and cultural life of society [as]...an essential expression of the social nature of human beings and of their communitarian vocation (1986: #78). “Social justice imposes on each of us the stringent duty to fulfill our obligations to the whole and, in this way, to achieve our own highest proper good. Understood in this fashion, the concept of social justice assumes its rightful position as the most meaningful of all the moral virtues” (Paulhus, 1987, p. 278).

It follows then that schooling for social justice should foster teaching and learning communities that are inclusive of students across multiple dimensions of diversity. Catholic social justice teaching emphasizes the dignity of the human person and prioritizes creating options for the poor; the institutional Catholic Church consistently calls on Catholic schools to enact this teaching (Congregation for Catholic Education, 1998, 2007; Grace, 2003), including inclusive practices toward those students who traditionally do not fare well in school (Tomasi, 2008).

To enact this emphasis, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (2005) directed Catholic educators toward social justice schooling by making schools accessible, affordable, and available. Recently, Catholic elementary and secondary schools serving significant numbers of traditionally marginalized students have struggled to remain viable (Baker & Riordan, 1998; Bracheare & Ramirez, 2005; Dwyer, 2005; Hamilton, 2008; Hunt, 200; Riordan, 200), despite compelling evidence that they are academically successful when they do (Byrk, Lee, & Holland, 1993; Cibulka, O'Brien, & Zewe, 1982; Coleman, Hoffer, & Kilgore, 1982; Covey, 1992; Fenzel, 2009; Hoffer, Greeley, & Coleman, 1985; Hunt, et al., 2006; Irvine & Foster, 1996; Jespen, 2003; Jeynes, 2006; Vitullo-Martin, 1979).

In much the same way, Jesuit thinking on education and teaching emphasizes education based on “faith that does justice” (Arrupe, 1974, 1994; General Congregation 32, 1975; Kolvenbach, 2000). Kolvenbach explained Jesuit education as one that focuses on the formation of “the whole person of solidarity for the real world” so that students are “touched by direct experience [and] the mind may be challenged to change...and act for the rights of others, especially the disadvantaged and the oppressed (p.155).

This emphasis on the rights of marginalized individuals has resulted in theories of critical pedagogy drawn from the work of critical theorists (i.e., Darder, Baltodano, & Torres, 2003) who use an analytical model to understand and critique social institutions and structures with race, gender, and class as primary lenses for doing so. Crucial among these critical theories the work of Paulo Freire (1955/1970). Influenced by Christian liberation theology, Freire developed a philosophy of teaching that advocated moving students from being passive recipients of knowledge toward the development of a critical consciousness of themselves and their world. This would lead to active work against various forms of oppression and injustice in their communities (Whipp & Scanlan, 2009).

Oldenski (1997) and Chubbuck (2007) used both critical theory and Catholic social teaching or Jesuit pedagogy to inform education that is focused on social justice. Critical pedagogy offers a framework for the critical analysis needed to advocate for the poor and marginalized effectively. This is something that some Catholic educators (Hug, 2000) have argued does not always accompany volunteerism and service often emphasized in Catholic schools. Catholic social teaching (Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, 2005) and Ignatian writing (Arrupe, 1974/1994; Traub, 2008) offer the moral and spiritual vision and rationale needed for moving critical analysis of social institutions to action. This vision can be lacking in critical pedagogy perspective (Chubbuck, 2007; Kincheloe & McLaren, 1994). “This moral vision in Catholic social teaching is grounded in the transcendence of God in all experience, the ethics of the Gospel of Jesus, and the goal of linking justice to faith, all of which compel Christians not only to become

aware of social injustices, but also take action against them” (Whipp & Scanlan, 2009, p. 209).

Whipp and Scanlan (2009) contend that research suggests that secular and religious perspective of justice are inconsistently applied in the organizational structure of Catholic schools. Although social justice values may be taught in the curriculum, they are not deeply engrained in organizational practices, such as recruitment and retention of students and educators, service delivery such as services for students with special needs and students with limited English proficiency, financing such as nontuition-based modes, and governance (Scanlan, 2008). Scholars have also noted that gaps persist between the espoused commitments to justice and models of enacting these commitments for Catholic schools both internationally (Grace, 2003, 2009; Grace & O’Keefe, 2007) and in the United States (Baker & Riordan, 1998; O’Keefe, et al., 2004; O’Keefe & Scheopner, 2009).

Catholic schools should provide ethical care. Gilligan (1982), Held (1995, 2007), Noddings (1984, 2005) wrote that one must get beyond care as a sentiment and focus on one’s moral responsibility to recognize and respond to the needs of others. Characteristics of caring schools are: teachers strive to see that their student grow academically, emotionally, morally, physically, and spiritually; students are oriented toward the growth and well-being of other students; and administrators aim to see not only students but teachers and all others in the school community grow in multiple dimensions (Whipp & Scanlan, 2009).

Noddings (1984, 2005) approached moral education, from the perspective of an ethic of caring, that has four major components: modeling, dialogue, practice, and

confirmation. To learn to care, students must see it in the way that adults in their world behave. They should have opportunities to talk about care and to practice both receiving care and giving it. In the same way, the adults in a school community need to see caring modeled; they need to be able to dialogue about care in their school, and they need opportunities to give and receive care.

Confirmation occurs when the one caring, whether a student, teacher, or administrator, confirms the best possible self in others and attributes the best possible motives to the behaviors of others (Noddings, 1984, 2005). Literature on educational leadership by Beck, (1994) and Starratt, (1994, 2003) has drawn from this ethical care framework to emphasize how school principals can cultivate school communities that unite families, students, and staff around common values and commitments to success, particularly in schools that are becoming increasingly diverse.

The traditions and charisms of a number of Catholic religious orders add a spiritual dimension to the conceptual framework of ethical caring. Since the Middle Ages, communities of Benedictines have invited others to share in the stability of their communal life of prayer, conversation, work, and silence. The Rule of St. Benedict (Benedict of Nursia, 530/1949) places a focus on ways that monastic communities need to demonstrate their hospitality toward others within their communities and beyond. The 53rd Rule of Benedict describes how members of a monastic community should welcome, embrace, be present with, and guide in ways that serve the physical, emotional, and spiritual needs of others. The Benedictines strive to respect all community members and guests “as Christ” and without distinctions based on wealth, creed, race, or gender.

The Jesuits, who follow the life and teachings of St. Ignatius of Loyola, emphasize “cura personalis” or “care for the whole person.” Originally this term was used to describe the responsibility of the Jesuit Superior to care for each man in his community with his unique gifts, insights, challenges, needs, and possibilities, this value is now applied more broadly to include the relationship between educators and students and professional relationships among all those who work in a Jesuit school (Whipp & Scanlan, 2009).

The Jesuit *Ratio Studiorum* (Society of Jesus, 1599/2005) explicitly outlines how those working with young people in Jesuit schools need those to address not only intellectual and academic development but also the affective, moral, and spiritual development of students. School personnel should develop personal caring relationships with their students. They should also model a life guided by a set of values that focus care for others rather than oneself (Whipp & Scanlan, 2009).

The Learning Framework within the Catholic Tradition

Sociocultural theory of learning contends that learning is socially and culturally situated in contexts of everyday living and work (Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Lee, 2007; Moll & Greenberg, 1990; Rogoff, 1990; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1991). Learning is the result of dynamic interactions between individuals, other people, and cultural artifacts. These elements contribute to the social formation of the individual mind (Wertsch, 1991) and lead to the realization of socially valued goals (Engestrom, Miettinen, & Punamaki, 1999).

Lasallian and Ignatian views of learning from the Catholic tradition expand on the sociocultural frameworks in their emphasis on the holistic education of learners that

include not only attention to cognitive and sociocultural dimensions but also emotional and spiritual dimensions of learning in classrooms and schools. These views stem from perspective that human beings whose purpose on earth is rooted in a faith in God that propels them toward service to others and action against injustice (Whipp & Scanlan, 2009).

Dating back to the 17th century, the thinking and writings of St. John the Baptist de LaSalle, founder of the Brothers of Christian Schools (Christian Brothers), have emphasized a call for religious brothers to live in community and offer unserved students a quality education that is grounded in faith, Gospel values, and a spirit of community service to others (Johnston et al., 1997). In much the same way, the writings of St. Ignatius of Loyola in the 16th century, have inspired Jesuits to guide learners toward becoming “men and women for others” (Arrupe, 1974/1994). St. Ignatius viewed learners as individuals who need to construct and experience new meanings and understandings actively from what they already know, feel, value, and imagine. The teacher then guides the learners in reflection on what they have learned. This reflection should lead to action. While this action “may not immediately transform the world into a global community of justice, peace and love... [it] should at least be an educational step in that direction” (International Center for Jesuit Education, 1993, p.28).

Social Entrepreneurship in the Catholic Tradition

The term social entrepreneurship first appeared in the literature in the 1970’s (Banks, 1972). The concept gained popularity a decade later when several foundations promoting social entrepreneurs as change agents emerged (Dees, 2001; Schlee, Curren, & Harich, 2009; Thompson & Doherty, 2006). Martin and Osberg (2007) placed

emphasis on the belief that social entrepreneurship begins with the identification of a situation of exclusion, marginalization, or suffering. These situations could include: unfair trade practices, health care disparities, threatened ecosystems, or educational inequalities. The social entrepreneur combines “inspiration, creativity, direct action, courage, and fortitude” (p. 35) to confront these injustices.

This notion of social entrepreneurship is aligned with Catholic social justice teaching. Catholic social teaching has long held that economic, social, political, and cultural development should reduce oppression and serve the common good (Benedict XVI, 2009; Paul VI, 1967). The Catholic Church emphasizes the importance of providing an education for all, with a preference for those on societies’ margins (Tomasi, 2008). The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (2005) urged reform in the nation’s Catholic schools that make them available, accessible, and affordable. Social entrepreneurship describes efforts to create such reform through innovative financing structures that replace tuition-based approaches or novel service delivery models that create accessibility for students with special needs (Whipp & Scanlan, 2009).

Social entrepreneurship in schools in the form of ambitious, resourceful, strategic, and results-oriented innovations and innovators have been increasingly recognized as the key to many effective school improvement reforms (Fullan, 1997; Hess, 2008; Levine, 2006). Bryk and Gomez (2008) contend that social entrepreneurs can promote research and design that “transform the ways we develop and support school professionals; the tools, materials, ideas and evidence with which they work; and the instructional opportunities we afford students for learning” (p. 182).

By focusing on educating traditionally marginalized students, Catholic schools that are socially entrepreneurial can develop effective service delivery models for students with special needs or limited English proficiency and, at the same time, develop financing and governance structures that promote vibrant schools for such students who are not tuition dependent (Whipp & Scanlan, 2009).

History of Catholic School Principalship

In the Gospel according to St. Matthew (28:19), Jesus gave His followers the directive to teach all nations. For over 2,000 years, Catholic education has been a priority of the Church. It supports and continues the Church's evangelizing mission. Over the years that has been a transition from religious leadership to lay leadership.

During the 19th century, Catholic immigrants came to the United States and wanted to continue to nurture and maintain their faith for future generations. They viewed it as a challenge in a country that was Protestant and intolerant of Catholics. The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1884 adopted as its motto, "Every Catholic Child in a Catholic School." Catholic school enrollment reached its highest enrollment in 1965. Although many Catholic children did not attend Catholic schools, 12% of all students in the United States were educated in Catholic schools (McDonald and Schultz, 2013).

Parish schools and Catholic education were embraced by the American Catholic Church. The rapid growth of these schools and a strong faith foundation was the result of effort by the clergy to establish schools. There was a commitment of religious orders of men and women to staff them while parents embraced the teachings of the Church and the goals of a faith-based education.

The greatest impact to Catholic education occurred as a result of the changes after Vatican II. Most notably was the shift to the laity in leadership and in the classrooms. A decline in the number of religious prompted many schools to close their doors (Kealey & Kealey, 2003). Parents became impacted by the rising cost of tuition to cover the salaries and benefits of lay teachers who replaced the religious brothers and sisters. The presence of religious brothers and sisters within parish communities contributed to its vibrancy. Their celibate lifestyles allowed for religious to be present for all parish and school activities and functions. This presence currently presents a challenge for married lay people with families, who do not reside on the school and parish property. Some have pointed to a loss of Catholic identity and a deficiency of catechesis in some Catholic schools due to a loss of religious men and women who were formed in faith.

Catholic identity in schools was once taken for granted when there was an abundance of religious men and women working in them. During the 1960's a decline in vocations forced the Church to rely on lay people to both teach and eventually assume leadership roles in Catholic schools. This caused questions regarding Catholic identity in Catholic schools to surface and public discourse on the issue has included the opinions of church hierarchy, theologians, philosophers, and lay people.

According to the teachings of the Church, the Catholic identity of a school is determined by its ability to provide a sound education rooted in the Gospel message of Jesus Christ. It must also provide an education that allows all children to reach their God-given potential and to think critically, so that they will contribute in a positive way to their Church, their community, their country, and their world (USCCB, 2005).

In 2008, Pope Benedict XVI met with Catholic educators in Washington, D.C. to define Catholic identity in Catholic schools and to challenge Catholic school leaders to ensure Catholic identity in their schools. He noted that faith should be tangible in our institutions, given expression through liturgy and the sacraments, through prayer, acts of charity and concern for justice and respect for God's creation. Pope Benedict noted, "Only in this way do we really bear witness to the meaning of who we are and what we uphold" (Pope Benedict XVI, 2008, p.1).

As a result, the nascent field of Catholic education scholarship is growing more clearly defined both within the United States and internationally (Grace, 2009; Grace & O'Keefe, 2007; Shulman, 2008; Staud, 2008). To "become a robust field of scholarship and practice," Shulman (2008) suggests, Catholic education scholarship must ask "big questions" that need to be "both tested and deliberated about among the broader communities of scholars and practitioners" (p. 13) in both public and private education. Grace (2009) contends that scholarship on Catholic education is meager. She writes:

On the one hand, the Catholic educational system is the largest faith-based educational mission in the world, having over 200,000 schools and over 1,000 universities and colleges, while, on the other hand, very little systematic scholarship and research attempts to assist, evaluate, and develop this great enterprise as it faces the many challenges of the contemporary world (pp. 7-8).

Promoting a Faith Community

Belmonte and Cranston (2009) confirmed that lay principals play a critical role in embracing and creatively building a Catholic character and culture in their schools. Their findings highlighted that Catholic lay principals continue to be community gatekeepers assuming the responsibility for fostering the faith development of the school community,

promoting the moral and ethical development of the school community, building a Christian community, and developing and implementing the school's philosophy (Cook, 2001, 2004; Flynn & Mok, 2001; Grace, 2002). Being the community gatekeeper, the task of preserving the Catholic character of the school is becoming increasingly more problematic and challenging because of several factors. Those factors include: the influence of the media, the pressure for academic success, people's disengagement from the Church, and other external variables which may be weakening the Catholic habitus in school (Belmonte & Cranston, 2009).

The lay principals' quest for community created a sense of belonging as well as cultivated trust and inclusiveness (Belmonte & Cranston, 2009; Schaps, 2003; Sergiovanni, 2001, 2003, 2005; Stoll, 2003; Stolp & Smith, 1995). "These principals recognized the importance of the promotion of interpersonal relationships in the school as central to creating an ethos and culture that supported the Catholic view of life" (Belmonte & Cranston, 2009, p. 300). The principals indicated that a family-like character was sought as their school habitus. Ideally, the school would operate as an extension of the family. This would be accomplished through a network of relationships, they forged through the generation of social capital advocated by Church authorities (Congregation for Catholic Education (CCE), 1998). "Central to creating a culture of community, principals identified their schools as exhibiting ideals such as providing a safe and secure environment, together with a sense of welcome, celebration and hospitality. Individual care and concern, particularly for those who are struggling to cope with communal expectations were ideals also identified by principals (Belmonte & Cranston, 2009, p. 300-1).

The principals are architects of Catholic school culture and identity they identified their prime roles as determining the quality of religious and academic purposes of their schools and building faith communities among members of their schools (Belmonte & Cranston, 2009). The Church and relevant research by Byrk, Lee & Holland, 1993; CCE, 1977, 1982, 1988, 1998, 2002; Flynn & Mok, 2001; Nuzzi, 2000, 2002; Wallace, 1998, 2000 indicate that principals in Catholic schools are charged with creating school cultures that embrace the teachings and traditions of the Catholic Church, central to which is community. In maintaining the unique character of Catholic schools it is essential that the building of community be fully integrated into daily life and activity of the school (Cook, 2001, 2004; Grace, 2002; O'Donnell, 2001; Spry, 2004; Spry & Duignan, 2003).

Future Challenges of Leading Catholic Schools

The challenges facing current and future Catholic school principals are many. A study by Belmonte and Cranston (2009) found that principals are in a constant struggle to refocus the energies of the school community on a set of values consistent with the mission of Catholic school, and therefore, the promotion of its special character. Principals reported the religious dimension of Catholic schools was being marginalized by the pressure for academic success (Flynn, 1993; Flynn & Mok, 2001), the influence of the media on young minds, by people's disengagement from the Church (Rymarz, 2004; Rymarz & Graham, 2005), and the general secular culture of society (CCE, 1998; Flynn & Mok, 2001; McLaughlin, 2000, 2002; Treston, 2001), and other external variables affecting how their schools are constituted and conducted.

Additionally, there is an increasing pluralism of beliefs and values in Catholic schools. This is reflected in the significant number of non-Catholic students who do not embrace the teachings of the Catholic Church outside of school. These students who do not desire to embrace the Catholic way of life impacts the capacity of principals to promote a Catholic ethos in their schools (Belmonte & Cranston, 2009).

Belmonte and Cranston (2009) found that in light of the growing non-Catholic student population, the principals in their study, particularly those in secondary schools, suggested that it was easier to promote a Catholic ethos in schools where there were higher percentages of Catholic students. This finding aligns with Ryan and Malone's (1996) findings that ongoing increases in the number of non-Catholic students in Catholic schools impact the delivery of the religious education curriculum and the liturgical life of the school and so places the Catholic identity at risk.

The same phenomenon also occurs in what is written about school culture (Deal & Peterson, 2003; Schein, 1997; Stoll, 2003). Consistent with the literature (CCE, 1988, 1998; Heft & Reck, 1991) the Catholic school was seen to be a genuine teaching instrument of the Church. The local parish in particular was called to provide ongoing support and solidarity for schools (CCE, 1988). The priests were expected to support Catholic schools by their words, presence, and actions (Beal et al., 2000; Codd, 2003; Ryan & Malone, 1996; Vatican Council II, 1965/1982).

Although priests are expected to support Catholic schools, Belmonte and Cranston (2009) found that there was general confusion as to the precise nature of the relationship between lay principals and the local Catholic Church. This finding suggests that there was little evidence of a functioning relationship among principals and priests.

The principals in their study reported that many priests were authoritarian and perceived a wide diversity of personalities in priests.

The research of Belmonte and Cranston (2009) revealed that some priests may not have changed their expectations of principals from an era where principals were predominately members of a religious congregation living and working in a parish. This “quasi monastic” legacy described by Hansen (1999, 2000) was identified by lay principals in their study, where priests still held unrealistic expectation of lay principals who were usually married with a family. Because of this, the principals could not be expected to be as accessible or visible as their religious counterparts had once been.

In their study, (Belmonte & Cranston, 2009) indicated that lay principals identified gender issues as impacting their roles. They reported that it was their perception that priests viewed women in a traditional sense as mothers and caregivers (Carlin & Neidhart, 2004; d’Arbon, 2003; Power, 2002), and thus often had little or no regard for women in leadership positions. “At least they seemed skeptical of the capacities of female principals” (Belmonte & Cranston, 2009, p. 305).

Consistent with the literature, the work of Belmonte and Cranston (2009) found that principals were overwhelmed with an ever-expanding list of duties and expectations (Carlin, d’Arbon, Dorman, Duignan, & Neidhart, 2003; Collard, 2003; d’Arbon, Duignan, & Duncan, 2002; Department of Education and Training, 2004; Duignan, 2004; Scott, 2003). “The intrusion into family time and the lack of quality of life relating to the principalship were key issues identified by all principals. There were growing expectations placed on principals that were placing undue stress on personal

relationships and in some cases impacting the health and well-being of principals” (Belmonte & Cranston, 2009, p. 305).

A contemporary challenge for both Catholic and secular schools is to become simultaneously more efficient in their use of resources (e.g., human, fiscal, material, and tools) and more ambitious in their outcome aims that include the elimination of gaps in achievement across race and class (Byrk, 2008, 2009).

Mentoring Catholic School Principals

Sound mentoring of new principals is an important component of their preparation program. The concept of mentoring in the Catholic faith can be traced to Jesus who counseled his disciples two by two before sending them out to spread the gospel. The concept of mentoring in the Catholic faith is built on the principle of establishing and building a learning community that supports new teachers and principals. Mentoring in a Catholic school addresses three areas of development: spiritual, pedagogical, and professional. The new hires should be mentored for mission and ministry (Jacobs, 2015).

The sense of mission is not unusual in Catholic schools and other faith-based schools. These schools were founded for a specific purpose and are associated with a larger faith community. In 1990 and 2005, the Catholic bishops of the United States issued a statement affirming the strong conviction that Catholic schools are of great value to the Church and to the nation (U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2005).

The bishops affirmed that Catholic schools afford the fullest and best opportunity to realize the purposes of Christian education. These purposes are: to provide an atmosphere in which the Gospel message is proclaimed, community in Christ is

experienced, service to our sisters and brothers in the norm, and thanksgiving and worship of our God is cultivated (U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2005),

A mentor in the Catholic schools should respect, inspire and teach the mentee as Jesus did. “You call me ‘teacher’ and ‘master,’ and rightly so, for indeed I am. If I therefore, the master and teacher have washed your feet, you ought to wash one another’s feet. I have given you a model to follow, so that I have done for you, you should also do” (John 13:13-15).

One of the responsibilities of the principal is to create a community in Christ that shares in the faith development of young people. This community of believers impacts all learners. Jesus said, “Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them” (Matthew 18:20).

Leadership in a Catholic school is mission driven. The Church leadership explains this mission to recruit and prepare future Catholic school leaders.

“Among the baptized, all of whom are called to serve the mission of the Church, some experience a further specific call to lay ecclesial ministry. The call may come in a dramatic moment. More often, it comes as the person grows- within the community of faith-in love for God and a desire to do His will. One considers that the graces received could now be put in service to the Church” (U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2005, p. 29).

Kushner, (1997) explained that school leaders must be learning leaders who are constantly learning to lead better. This type of leadership supports and enhances the mission of the school: to provide quality education, based on and grounded in lasting principles, which is delivered in a supportive educational environment. It is the leader’s personal mission and the mission of the school which serves as a framework for leading self, leading others and leading with others.

Principals in a Catholic school are members of the larger community. As such, they practice transcendental leadership. Cardona, (2000) described these leaders as promoting unity by providing equitable exchange rewards appealing to the intrinsic motivation of associates with whom they work and by developing their transcendent motivation; the motivation to do things for others.

Jacobs (2015) states that leaders of Catholic schools are immersed in a community of learners who are committed to service and spirituality. Here, principals are called to lead in the spirit of Jesus Christ. This leadership is one that is based on Gospel servant leadership. Mark's Gospel indicates that the only acceptable leadership within the community of Jesus is servant leadership modeled on Jesus, "who did not come to be served, but to serve and to give his life for a ransom for many" (Mark 10:45).

Jesus is the model for principal leadership in Catholic schools. "The greatest among you must be your servant" (Matthew 23:11). At the Last Supper, Luke describes how Jesus instructs his disciples: "The greatest among you must behave as if he were the youngest, the leader as if he was the one who serves" (Luke 22:26). John's Gospel in the thirteenth chapter explains how Jesus moved from the head of the table, knelt down, and washed His disciples' feet as a sign of servant leadership (Lavery, 2012).

Catholic school principals should be mentored to understand that they create a community of leaders and servants. Although these principals have the responsibility for leading their schools, they also have the responsibility for transforming society. "This transformation is made possible when each Catholic school principal contributes to the support of the Church as a whole in supporting each principal within their own diocese" (Jacobs, 2015, p.66).

Jacobs (2015) contends that mentoring in Catholic school is a mission and a ministry. The principals in Catholic schools are not only responsible for academic learning, but just as importantly are responsible for the faith development of those entrusted to them. The principals promote the good news of faith. St. Paul notes, “To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good” (1 Corinthians. 12:70). “The common good is developed and promoted constantly in the faith community of learners” (Jacobs, 2015, p.67).

CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

Introduction

Strong schools with high achieving students in a safe and nurturing climate taught by a staff having high morale are driven by effective leaders in the principal's office. Across the country there is an urgency to prepare future school leaders as the need to replace graying school leaders exists. This preparation must include key practices such as setting directions, developing people, redesigning the organization, and managing the instructional program (Seashore Louis, et al, 2010),

Principals in Catholic schools must possess the same educational and managerial skills as their counterparts in public school, but they must also be skilled as a spiritual leader. In this study, the researcher refers to these spiritual leadership traits with the phrase "*and then some.*" Principal preparation programs approved in Pennsylvania expose future leaders to a number of professional standards. None of these standards address spiritual leadership. This study will dig deeper into what it means to be a spiritual leader in a Catholic school and how one might improve in this capacity.

This study evaluated two exemplary university programs which prepare Catholic school principals. The programs examined are located at the University of Notre Dame and Loyola University Chicago. Several lines of inquiry were used to address the three research questions that guided the study:

Research Question 1: *What are the distinct characteristics of a preparation program to train principals to lead Catholic schools?*

Research Question 2: *What are the “And Then Some” competencies that a principal at a Catholic school should master?*

Research Question 3: *What are the components of a mentoring program that would both develop and support the competencies of the Catholic school principal as spiritual leader?*

Purpose of the Study

The study examined the notion that Catholic school principals must not only be effective educational leaders, but they must also develop additional competencies—what this study conceptualizes as the “and then some” competencies that define them as spiritual leaders. This examination contributes to our understanding of the characteristics that define a spiritual leader of a Catholic school; what competencies can be used to assess and develop those characteristics; and, what components provide a framework for an effective mentoring program that develops and supports the formation of Catholic school principals as spiritual leaders.

Data Collection

To answer Research Question One: *What are the distinct characteristics of a preparation program to train principals to lead Catholic schools?* The researcher analyzed the existing programs to better understand how stated components and factors contributed to developing this kind of Catholic school leadership. To do this the researcher collected existing data in the form of artifacts and texts from websites and print materials in order to learn more about two exemplary university programs focused on developing effective Catholic school leadership to prepare principals who are the

spiritual leaders of Catholic schools. Both of the programs were chosen because they are highly successful and since they have components specific to leading Catholic schools and utilize mentors in their training processes.

To answer Research Question Two: *What are the “And Then Some” competencies that a principal at a Catholic school should master?*, the researcher collected existing data in the form of artifacts and texts from websites and print materials that highlighted and described more about the unique skills each program sought to develop in effective Catholic school leaders. This analysis informed the understanding of the characteristics of a principal who is the spiritual leader of a Catholic school. Both of the programs examined have components specific to preparing Catholic school principals and both programs utilize mentors in their training processes.

As the spiritual leaders, Catholic school principals are “transformational leaders who facilitate faith development and Catholic school identity in their schools” (Ciriello, 1994, p. 5). In Catholic schools, the principal is the faith leader or spiritual leader. This leader is to guide the faith development and faith live of all constituents within the school (Rieckhoff, 2014). The role of spiritual leader is grounded in the knowledge of the history and philosophy of the Catholic Church. Rieckhoff (2014) states, “The spiritual leader role focuses on faith development and building the Christian community as well as facilitating the moral and ethical development of those in the school community” (p. 26). How then, is one trained to be competent in the spiritual leadership domain? The results of this study will help to illuminate this this question.

To answer Research Question Three: *What are the components of a mentoring program that would both develop and support the competencies of the Catholic school*

principal as spiritual leader?, the researcher collected artifacts and texts from websites and print materials in order to learn more about the each program's focused employing mentors to developing effective Catholic school leadership. The result informed the understanding of the characteristics of a principal mentoring program, which supports the spiritual leader of a Catholic school. Both of the programs have components specific to supporting and developing Catholic school leaders with the assistance of mentors.

Procedures

The researcher examined data from two Catholic school principal preparation programs that address the spiritual leadership domain and the roles that mentors play in the training process. The two programs selected to examine were Loyola University of Chicago and the University of Notre Dame's Leadership Programs. The programs were selected because both were exemplary and highly successful, intentionally develop Catholic School Principals through specifically designed courses and other activities, and, incorporate a mentoring component as part of their preparation programs.

Method of Data Analysis

The general interpretive process of close reading was used to analyze the data from the two identified programs available on their respective websites. The close reading process involved identifying patterns of thinking and acting in order to discover regularities and uncover anomalies (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana 2014). Because of the nature of the text, this involved taking several passes through the data to test the trustworthiness of information and the patterns that emerged. The emerging patterns (Gibbs, 2007) were culled through constant comparative analysis focused on revealing

the similarities and differences contained in the descriptive information to produce a comprehensive account of the findings.

The researcher compared the findings from the close reading and the comparative analysis to develop a resulting framework to identify what competencies define a spiritual leader in Catholic schools and how a structured mentoring program could support the developmental process. This framework defines those characteristics and reveals a set of competencies that will define those characteristics in practice.

Finally, the researcher drew conclusions from the newly designed framework to suggest ways that a comprehensive mentoring program might support newly hired lay Catholic school principals in the Altoona-Johnstown Diocese rise to a level of excellence by employing the described competencies that emerged.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

Introduction

In the Gospel according to St. Matthew (28:19), Jesus gave his followers the directive to teach all nations. Since this time, Catholic education has been a priority of the Church. It supports and continues the Church's evangelizing mission. Over the years, Catholic schools have transitioned from religious to lay leadership.

These lay school leaders would benefit greatly from a structured mentoring program to increase their spiritual leadership capacity. This study is a program evaluation of two Catholic school principal preparation programs that assign mentors to guide the development of their candidates. This evaluation will inform the suggestions for a mentoring program for local principals that will be described and supported in Chapter 5 Discussion of Findings.

The analysis and findings that follow are organized by the study's three research questions. These questions are:

- *What are the distinct characteristics of a preparation program to train principals to lead Catholic Schools?*
- *What are the "And Then Some" competencies that a principal at a Catholic school should master?*
- *What are the components of a mentoring program that would both develop and support the competencies of a Catholic school principal as a spiritual leader?*

The questions are addressed through the analysis of the two exemplary University programs for Catholic school principal preparation included in the study: the University of Notre Dame (UND) and Loyola University Chicago (LUC). Each section begins with a brief discussion of the data collection methods and an overview of each program. This is then followed by a summary of how the information about each program informs the

research question. The summary is presented in a table where each principal preparation program is compared and contrasted. The sections in this chapter conclude by using the findings to summarize what was learned from the analyses.

It is important to note that throughout the following presentation of the findings, descriptions of the beliefs, features, and components of each program were paraphrased or directly quoted from the information that is currently included in each program's website.

The University of Notre Dame Catholic School Principal Preparation Program

The first Catholic school leadership preparation program analyzed is the University of Notre Dame. The information was collected from the web site: <https://ace.nd.edu>. This is the site for the Notre Dame's Alliance for Catholic Education. The site contains information regarding Beliefs and Values, The Need for Zeal, and Frequently Asked Questions. Additionally, the site contains information for advocates of Catholic schools, Research on the Case for Catholic Schools, and the Mary Ann Remick Leadership Program.

The Alliance for Catholic Education's Mary Ann Remick Leadership Program at Notre Dame University carries out the tradition of Blessed Basil Moreau, the founder of the Congregation of Holy Cross. The goal of the program is to form leaders with "zeal-that flame of burning desire to make God known, loved, and served." According to the website, Catholic schools need transformational leaders who will renew and transform their schools to meet the changing needs of our society and Church for years to come.

Notre Dame's website asserts that today's Catholic school leaders require a complex skill set that is distinctive in the education sector. They need to be instructional

leaders who can drive student success by supporting teachers. They must build relationships with community leaders, funding partners, diocesan officials, pastors, and parents. They need to manage responsibilities for compliance, enrollment management, marketing, and grassroots recruiting while simultaneously establishing a rich school culture that holds high expectations for academic achievement and that is, at the same time authentically Catholic. These are the “And Then Some,” attributes explored in the preceding literature review.

The belief at Notre Dame is that excellent professional development can develop Catholic school principals to meet their challenges. The Center for Transformational Educational Leadership is designed to deepen and enrich the capacity of Catholic school principals and leaders, strengthening current principals to become the most remarkable Catholic school leaders in the nation, equally focused and prepared to provide strong instructional leadership, effective managerial and operational leadership, and inspiring spiritual leadership.

Center for Transformational Educational Leadership

The fellows participating in the Center for Transformational Leadership go through a two-year professional development program composed of three components. The first component is participation in the Summer Institute. This intensive weeklong institute is held at the University of Notre Dame over successive summers. This professional development is built around best practices from some of the highest performing schools in the country. The participants engage in many and various opportunities to renew and strengthen their faith including participating in the powerful

prayer and Eucharistic celebrations which are foundational for the University of Notre Dame's Alliance for Catholic Education (ACE) programs throughout the summer.

The second component of the Center for Transformational Leadership is weekly executive coaching. The participants receive weekly one-to-one executive coaching from experienced Catholic school principals focused on their leadership goals. Since the program is job-embedded, this executive coaching provides authentic, timely support for each participant's priority leadership tasks. The coaching sessions also provide clear, ongoing feedback on the leader's growth. In addition to focusing on the customized leadership goals, the executive coaches drive the leader to execute the implementation of best practices from the highest quality schools in the country as identified by the program's administrators. The coaches also continue to instill in the leaders a growth mindset fixated on excellence in the name of Christ.

The third component of the program includes roadmaps for school transformation. The staff at the Center for Transformational Educational Leadership has extensive experience in turning around and creating exceptional faith-based urban schools as identified by the program's administration. As a result, they have created road maps for school transformation. These roadmaps are a guide for leaders to transform their schools to new levels of excellence in academics, school culture, and student spiritual formation. All of these improvements are done to advance the cause for Christ and His church.

The Mary Ann Remick Leadership Program

Recognizing the need for transformational school leaders in Catholic schools across the nation, the University of Notre Dame's Alliance for Catholic Education (ACE), founded the Mary Ann Remick Leadership program in 2002. Mary Ann

Remick, of Rochester, Minnesota, endowed the program in 2006, making it possible for aspiring school leaders to receive world-class leadership formation at an affordable cost. The program was renamed in her honor as gratitude for her commitment to the future Catholic school leadership.

The 25-month long graduate program is delivered over three summers and across two academic years. The program is designed for educators seeking to develop skills to become transformational leaders in their Catholic school communities. Participants who complete the program earn a Master of Arts in Educational Leadership and can be eligible for K-12 administrative licensure.

The first two summer sessions are four weeks long. The third summer session lasts for two weeks and culminates with commencement. While on campus, the Remick leaders are enrolled in course sequences designed to provide skills and knowledge necessary to become exceptional leaders while addressing the Indiana state standards for building-level leadership.

Over the course of the two academic years in the program, the Remick leaders complete leadership internships at their sponsor schools, which is typically the school in which the participant is employed. During this internship the participants work with their school supervisors to ensure that they are provided the opportunity to fulfill the requirements of the internship and online coursework.

Developing “And Then Some” Components

The summer programs provide participants with a multitude of opportunities for prayer and spiritual growth. Participants gather in daily prayer and Mass is offered daily

throughout the summer session. Additionally, other types of communal prayer and worship are available across Notre Dame's campus.

Because leadership is demanding professionally, personally, and spiritually, pastoral support is provided by members of the leadership team. This pastoral support is available year-round to the Remick Leaders.

Organized Retreats

The Remick Leaders attend retreats, both in the summer and every January. These retreats provide them with an opportunity to step away from the demands of their daily life and reflect on their experiences, recharge, and reconnect with the members of their cohort. These retreats are designed to provide opportunities for reflection. They are intended to be moments of quiet grace for school leaders whose lives are often extraordinarily busy. The retreat program includes an opening retreat each summer and a mid-year retreat during each academic year, for a total of five retreats during the course of the program.

A Curriculum Guided by the Gospel

The Integrated Leadership course sequence focuses on infusing ACE's three pillars of professional leadership, community, and spiritual growth into daily life while also fostering an intellectual appreciation and understanding of the history and tradition of Catholic education. Each one credit Integrated Leadership course is taken during each summer session and each fall and spring semester. Each course is taught by clergy who look to Jesus Christ and the communion of saints as models for transformational leadership. The course sequence roots each Remick Leader's vision of school leadership firmly in the good news of the gospel. The leaders develop their own lives of faith while

learning how school leaders can build a community of faith in their schools. They learn concretely how to follow Christ and the saints’ examples as teachers, preachers, conveners, healers, and people of prayer.

Course Sequence

Over the course of three summer sessions and two academic years, the Remick Leaders earn a Master of Arts in Educational leadership and may become eligible for school leadership licensure. The program blends on-campus summer classes with applied online coursework during the academic year, thus optimizing the time and energy of practicing educators.

Each summer, the courses focus on three central leadership domains, instructional leadership, executive management and school culture. These domains are focused to provide the tools and knowledge necessary to become a transformational leader in their community. During the academic year, the online coursework is designed to encourage participant to put the course specific content into practice and apply the targeted skills and knowledge of each course to real life-situations as leaders in their schools.

Table 4.1: The Curriculum and Course Sequence for the Mary Ann Remick Leadership Program at the University of Notre Dame

TERM	COURSES
Summer Year One	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizational Culture of Schools • Organizational Management and Board Governance • Leading Learning: Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment • Discipleship and Root Beliefs: Integrated Leadership
Fall and Spring Semesters- Year One	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human Capital Management • Internship and Practice I • Tools for Self-Knowledge: Reflective Practice, Catholic School Finance and Business Management

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internship and Practice II • Tools for Self-Knowledge: Reflective Practice
Summer Year Two	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leading Change and Transforming Communities • Institutional Advancement and Facilities Management Building a Data-Informed Professional Learning Community • Models of Leadership: Integrated Leadership
Fall and Spring Semesters- Year Two	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership for Inclusive Schools • Inquiry and Intervention • Church Documents I • School Law and Education Policy • Inquiry and Intervention • Church Documents II
Summer Year Three	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Voices of Transformational Leadership and Habits of Lifelong Integrated Leadership

Analysis of the Program’s Courses

As Table 4.1 shows during the first summer session the participants take courses most of which are general principal preparation course with exception of the “And Then Some” course, Discipleship and Root Beliefs. The courses offered in the second summer session are typical of a secular principal preparation program with the exception of Institutional Advancement and Facilities Management. Advancement and development are associated with fundraising and engaging alumni, which is critical for the survival of today’s Catholic schools.

Over the fall and spring semesters of the first academic year the participants take several courses which are common for principal preparation programs. The “And Then Some” course component is Catholic School Finance and Business Management. During the second academic year the “And Then Some” courses are Church Documents I

and II. During the final two-week summer session of the program the participants take Voices of Transformational Leadership and Habits of Lifelong Integrated Leadership.

Tables 4.2 and 4.3 summarize the two programs at the University of Notre Dame that train and supports Catholic school principals.

Table 4.2 Summary of the Center for Transformational Educational Leadership

Participants	Current Catholic school principals
Length of Program	Two years
Key Components	Summer Institute, Weekly Executive Coaching, Roadmaps for School Transformation

Table 4.3 Summary of the Mary Ann Remick Leadership Program

Participants	Educators seeking a Master of Arts in Educational Leadership/K-12 administrative licensure
Length	25 months
Key Components	Three summer and two winter retreats, Integrated Leadership Courses on-line, pastoral support

As Tables 4.2 and 4.3 show, the Center for Transformational Educational Leadership helps to improve the practices of current principals. The weekly one-to-one executive coaching provided by experienced Catholic school principals help to instill a growth mindset to provide excellence in the name of Christ. The Mary Ann Remick Leadership transforms aspiring Catholic school principals into certified educational leaders earning a Masters’ degree. The students are placed into cohorts and attend five retreats on campus over the course of the program. They are provided pastoral support year-round while enrolled in the program.

Loyola University Chicago's Catholic School Principal Preparation Program

The second Catholic school leadership preparation program analyzed is the Loyola University Chicago's Catholic School Preparation Program. The information about Loyola Chicago's program was collected from the website: <https://luc.edu/gcce>. The site contains information for the Andrew M. Greeley Center for Catholic Education. An overview of the Catholic Principal Preparation Program (CPPP): Master's Degree in Administration and Supervision is available there. Additionally, one can download the CPPP Brochure and the Catholic Principal Preparation Handbook.

Before one examines the principal preparation program at Loyola University Chicago, (LUC), one must get a sense of the school's history and values. The school is grounded in Jesuit education which has a 400-year tradition of academic excellence emphasizing the unique bond between teachers and learners. Its School of Education prepares educators, administrators and school psychologists to be competent in the exercise of professional skills, to display respect for diversity, to embrace distributive justice as social justice, and to recognize that education is a life-long process.

The Loyola University Chicago School of Education seeks to develop professionals who use their scholarship to evaluate actions and decisions in light of their ramifications and impact on students, school organizations, and the broader community. The professionals of the future as viewed as thoughtful persons able to analyze situations, set goal, plan and monitor actions, evaluate results, and reflect on their professional thinking.

Policies and Procedures are posted at http://luc.edu/educaton/academics_policies_main.shtml that document the Loyola

University of Chicago School of Education's expectations that professionals are responsive to the long-term social and ethical implications of their decisions and actions. Persons of conscience devoted to the service of others are developed by the School of Education. Additionally, it seeks to develop professionals able to develop and offer educational opportunities for children, adolescents, and adults that enable them to contribute to and benefit from the social, political, and economic opportunities in their lives and to promote social justice. "Professional educators in service of social justice will: know the subjects they teach and how to convey content of those subjects to learners; engage in disciplined inquiry based on informed reason; reflect on experiences of self and others; consider alternative perspectives and pursue a problem-solving orientation; evidence respect for and ability to respond to differences in learners' personal, social, economic and cultural experiences; evaluate the effects of their decisions on others (learners, families, and other professionals in the learning community); provide learning opportunities to support all learners' intellectual, social, and personal development; possess the knowledge and skills to teach all learners well and with rigor; create a learning environment that promotes positive social interactions; be actively engaged in learning and self-motivation; and maintain standards of professional conduct." (Loyola University Chicago, 2013, p.12).

The Catholic School Principal Preparation Program

The introduction of the Catholic School Principal Preparation Program: Master's Degree in Instructional Leadership at LUC is taken from "The Catholic School on the Threshold of the Third Millennium." It states, "Catholic schools are at once places of evangelization of complete formation, of enculturation, of apprenticeship in a lively

dialogue between young people of different religions and social backgrounds. The ecclesial nature of the Catholic school, therefore, is written in the very heart of its identity as a teaching institution. It is a true and proper ecclesial entity by reason of its educational activity, in which faith, culture and life are brought into harmony.” *The Catholic School on the Threshold of the Third Millennium* page 3 of Catholic Principal Preparation Program: Master’s Degree in Instructional Leadership.

The program introduction goes on to state, “Central to the mission of the Church is the work of Catholic Schools.” (Loyola University Chicago, 2013, p.3). The National Standards and Benchmarks for Effective Catholic Elementary and Secondary Schools (NSBECS) state that “an excellent Catholic school has a qualified leader/leadership team empowered by the governing body to realize and implement the school’s mission and vision.” The need for well-prepared leaders for Catholic schools is documented in numerous arenas as well as the challenges that face these leaders.

The LUC Catholic Principal Preparation Program was designed to prepare future principals to meet the complex challenges of leading today’s Catholic Schools. It is stated that this program is uniquely designed to ensure each principal candidate becomes a mission-driven, faith-based instructional leader within the Catholic School context. Upon completion of this three year program the principal candidates will possess the knowledge, skills, and disposition to be highly effective principals promoting the spiritual, academic and social-emotional growth of their students.

The listed features of this program are:

- In-depth coursework focused on immediate application for transforming Catholic schools to create increased student outcomes within a faith-based context.

- Intensive coaching model for entirety of the program
- Successful completion of the program leads to eligibility for licensure as school principal in the State of Illinois
- Program designed by Loyola's School of Education and community partners to ensure that all candidates acquire a solid foundation to be a Catholic school principal who is mission-driven, faith-based instructional leader
- Optional two-week summer course at LUC's Rome Campus to develop global leadership perspectives.

Michael Boyle, Sandria Morten and Richard Guerin, from the Center for Catholic School Effectiveness, School of Education, Loyola University Chicago were the architects of the program's conceptual framework base on the National Standards and Benchmarks for Effective Catholic Schools, (NSBECS, 2012). Contained within this framework are the Catholic School Principal Competencies in each of the four domains. A Catholic school principal is expected to demonstrate leadership in each of the domains.

Course Work

The course work of this program focuses on the unique aspects of being a principal of a Catholic school. There are sixteen courses which includes four one-semester internships and 12 classes of coursework with embedded field experiences and assignments. The courses focus on the pillars of the NSBECS: mission and identity, governance and leadership, academic excellence and operational vitality. Infused throughout the coursework is Catholic identity. Table 4.4 summarizes where the four pillar program foci appear across the 12 courses.

The LUC Principal Preparation Program infuses Catholic School Principal Competencies aligned to the four pillars of the NSBECS throughout the required sixteen courses required to be completed in two and a half years.

Table 4.4 The Curriculum and Course Sequence for the Loyola University Chicago Principal Preparation Program

COURSE	CATHOLIC SCHOOL COMPETENCIES			
	Mission and Identity	Governance and Leadership	Academic Excellence	Operational Vitality
<i>Number of courses where the competency appears</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>10</i>
Mission Driven Leadership for Principals	X	X	X	
Curriculum Development and Implementation			X	
Literacy and Numeracy for Principals			X	
School Supervision for Principals	X	X		X
Three-Tiered Interventions: Advanced Primary Supports	X	X	X	X
Introduction to Educational Statistics			X	
Data-based Decision Making		X	X	X
Principal Internship One	X	X	X	X
Human and Fiscal Resources for Principals		X		X
Principal Internship Two	X	X	X	X
Foundations of Teaching English as a Second Language and Bilingual Education			X	
Instructional Leadership Cultural Context for Informed Decision Making (Rome)	X			
Instructional Leadership for Multicultural Schools	X	X	X	
Three-Tiered Interventions: Secondary and Tertiary Supports	X	X	X	X
Principal Internship Three	X	X	X	X
Law, Policy, and Community for Principals		X		X
Principal Internship Four	X	X	X	X

As Table 4.4 shows, the four pillars are somewhat equally represented across the curriculum with Academic Excellence being the most prevalent with a focus in 13 courses; Governance and Leadership appearing in 12 courses; and, Mission and Identity and Operational Vitality both appearing in 10 courses. Table 4.4 also shows that while most courses have a multiple pillar focus, several courses (Instructional Leadership in Cultural Context for Informed Decision Making, Foundations of Teaching English as a Second Language and Bilingual Education to Education, Introduction to Educational Statistics, and Curriculum Development and Implementation) each focus on only one of the pillars.

On-Boarding Plan

Each principal candidate follows an On-boarding Plan. The plan is continually updated and evaluated by the support team. This document is followed to ensure that the candidate observes 100% of the activities, participates in 100% of the activities, and leads in at least 80% of the activities. The On-boarding Plan is aligned to the National Standards and Benchmarks for Effective Elementary and Secondary Catholic Schools (NSBECS), Southern Regional Educational Education Board (SREB) Critical Success Factors, Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards and Functions, the Loyola Principal Preparation coursework, field experiences, and four-semester internship.

Table 4.5 Summary of Loyola University Chicago Program (<https://luc.edu/gcce>)

Participants	Aspiring Catholic School Principals
Length	36 Months
Key Components	Competencies aligned with National Standards and Benchmarks for Effective

	Catholic Elementary and Secondary Schools, On-Boarding Plan, Support from Mentors and Coaches
--	---

Research Question 1

What are the distinct characteristics of a preparation program to train principals to lead Catholic Schools?

The researcher utilized comparative analysis to produce a comprehensive account of the findings. Ultimately, by analyzing two existing programs that train principals to lead Catholic schools some characteristics were identified. Artifacts and texts from websites and print materials were collected and analyzed. This information was previously described. The programs examined were The University of Notre Dame and Loyola University of Chicago. Both programs have components specific to leading Catholic schools and utilize mentors in their training processes.

The first program the researcher examined was the University of Notre Dame’s Center for Transformational Leaders. It is a professional development program geared for practicing administrators. This program was useful to investigate, because it provides professional development and one-to-one executive coaching from experienced Catholic school principals to current administrators who are seeking ways to improve their school leadership skills. Upon completion of this program the participants are equipped with the skills to take their schools to new levels of excellence in academics, school culture, and student spiritual formation.

There are three distinct components of this two-year program. The first is attendance of the summer institute on campus. The summer institute provides attendees with opportunities for prayer and to attend Eucharistic celebrations designed to help

strengthen one's faith. The second component of this program is one-to-one coaching focused on the individual leadership goals of the participant. The role of the coach is to instill a leadership growth mindset fixated on excellence in the name of Christ. The third component is providing the participants with roadmaps for school transformation based on best practices. All of the improvements are done to advance the cause for Christ and His church.

The University of Notre Dame's Remick Principal Preparation Program lasts for 25 months and culminates with the participant earning a Master of Arts and the opportunity for licensure in the state of Indiana. This program offers several characteristics utilized to train Catholic school principals.

First, during the two 4-week summer sessions and the final 2-week session, there are opportunities on campus for participants to pray and attend Mass to strengthen their faith through worship services. Second, during the internships and on-line course work, pastoral support is provided to all participants in this principal preparation program. Third, in addition to the summer sessions, participants are provided opportunities to attend on campus retreats held in January. These retreats provide time for reflection and prayer.

Another important component of the program's mission to aid in the spiritual leadership of Catholic school principals are specific courses offered to the participants. The Integrated Leadership Course incorporates the three pillars of the Notre Dame ACE program. They are: professional leadership, community and spiritual growth. This course is taught by a priest and focuses on the history and tradition on Catholic education.

The Loyola University Chicago principal preparation program also has components specific to preparing principals to lead Catholic schools. The 12 courses offered focus on the four pillars of the NSBECS: mission and identity, governance and leadership, academic excellence and operational vitality. Catholic identity is infused throughout all of the coursework.

This preparation program consists of a three-year coaching model. The students are paired with coaches who meet with them weekly to discuss the job-embedded classroom assignments. The internship coach is a veteran Catholic school administrator with a proven record for leading effective Catholic schools.

Summary of Findings for Research Question 1

The two programs have these similarities: both are intentional about assisting aspiring Catholic school leaders to strengthen their spiritual leadership, they recognize that one cannot become a better spiritual leader in a vacuum, support is vital. Mentors and coaches are an integral component of this objective.

The differences that can be determined from the information available to the researcher are two. First, the University of Notre Dame program is more holistic and uses stated root beliefs and core values interwoven throughout the course work and field experiences. The second is the use of standards. There is no mention of the National Standards and Benchmarks for Effective Catholic Elementary and Secondary Schools in the information obtained from the University of Notre Dame's web site. However, the Loyola University of Chicago program has competencies, which are aligned to these standards and benchmarks, for the aspiring principals to complete. This is the heart of the analysis.

Research Question 2

What are the “And Then Some” competencies that a principal at a Catholic school should master?

The researcher identified “and then some” traits of Catholic school leaders as identified and nurtured in each of the two Catholic school principal preparation programs analyzed in this study.

The University of Notre Dame

The University of Notre Dame program incorporates a holistic philosophy that infuses its root beliefs and core values are infused in all course work and training of aspiring Catholic school principals. The Remick Leadership Program at the University of Notre Dame prepares transformational school leaders who make God known, loved, and served by managing school resources, implementing rigorous academic programs, and building robust Catholic school communities. There are five root beliefs that guide this mission.

They are:

1. **God in all things.** With Christ as their model, transformational leaders invite all members of the school community to a greater understanding and recognition of God’s presence in creation and an ever-growing love of God the Creator.
2. **We are disciples with hope to bring.** At a time in which so many communities are fraught with pain and suffering, our leaders lead with zeal and sustained and informed by love of Christ, which compels them to bring comfort and help to a broken world.
3. **We are made for each other in the image and likeness of God.** Recognizing the inherent dignity of humanity from the very beginning of creation,

transformational leaders know and expect all students to learn and excel at the highest level possible.

4. **Excellence happens on purpose.** Constantly aware that the small things matter, transformational leaders intentionally build strong school cultures rooted in a shared set of root whatever it takes to ensure that every child succeeds in the classroom, helping them become their truest selves in the image of Jesus Christ.
5. **School leaders drive student success.** Through collaboration and innovation transformational school leaders do whatever it takes to ensure that every child succeeds in the classroom, helping them become their truest selves in the image of Jesus Christ.

There are five core values of the program. They are:

1. **Seek.** Remick Leaders never stop learning. They build a culture of continuous improvement that instills a life-long love of learning in the children they serve.
2. **Persist.** Effort trumps ability. Remick Leaders do whatever it takes to ensure that every child succeeds.
3. **Excel.** Remick Leaders are called to “fan the flame the gift God gave” each teacher, student, and member of the school family. They set a high bar for both academic achievement and spiritual growth, promoting rigor in the classroom while nurturing a living relationship with Jesus Christ.
4. **Love.** Remick Leaders foster a sense of family in their schools, providing safe, loving environments where children learn to thrive with others.

6. **Serve.** To whom much is given, much is beliefs expected. Remick Leaders are other-centered, and they prepare each child to live a life of service to others, the community and the Church.

Loyola University Chicago

Because the LUC program is more prescriptive than Notre Dame's, much of the information gathered to answer this question was gleaned from the LUC program.

Specifically, the Catholic School Principal Competencies used by the mentors serve as a framework for identifying the "and then some" attributes for aspiring school leaders.

The Catholic School Principal Competencies

The LUC program ensures that each participant demonstrates competencies which would be applicable to any principal candidate preparing to lead a secular school in Illinois. The unique nature of the Loyola University Chicago's Catholic School Principal Preparation Program is the focus on how a future lay principal is prepared in "And Then Some" skills required to lead today's Catholic schools.

These, "And Then Some" skills are also measured by the mentor principal on the same four measures as the seventeen competencies required of all principal candidates in Illinois. The Catholic School Principal Competencies contain seventeen additional competencies assessed by the mentor principal. These competencies are adopted from The National Standards and Benchmarks for Effective Catholic Elementary and Secondary Catholic Schools (NSBECS). These benchmarks state that "an excellent Catholic school has a qualified leader/leadership team empowered by the governing body to realize and implement the school's mission and vision."

These competencies are located at the Catholic School Leadership Framework www.creighton.edu/fileadmins/user/CCAS/departments/education/docs/CSL_Framework_10-12-07_01.pdf.

The competencies are posted on Page 68 of LUC's Catholic Principal Preparation Program: Master's Degree in Instructional Leadership. They are listed for each of the four domains: Mission and Vision, Governance and Leadership, Academic Excellence, and Operational Vitality. For each competency the candidate is given a score from 0-3 by the mentor.

Mission and Catholic Identity

The Center for Catholic School Effectiveness (2012) asserts that the teaching mission of the Catholic church includes inviting young people to a relationship with Jesus Christ or deepening an existing relationship with Jesus, inserting young people into the life of the Church, and assisting young people to see and understand the role of faith in one's daily life and in the larger society. "This unique Catholic identity makes our Catholic elementary and secondary schools 'schools for the human person' and allows them to fill a critical role in the future life of our Church, our county and or world" (The Catholic School on the Threshold of the Third Millennium, 1997). The first four standards address the Catholic identity and culture vital to the mission of Catholic schools in the United States.

Standard 1 is: An excellent Catholic School is guided and driven by clearly communicated mission that embraces a Catholic Identity rooted in Gospel values, centered on the Eucharist, and committed to faith formation, academic excellence and service.

Standard 2 is: An excellent Catholic school adhering to mission provides a rigorous academic program for religious studies and catechesis in the Catholic faith, set within a total academic curriculum that integrates faith, culture, and life.

Standard 3 is: An excellent Catholic school adhering to mission provides opportunities outside the classroom for student faith formation, participation in liturgical and communal prayer, and action in service of social justice.

Standard 4 is: An excellent Catholic school adhering to mission provides opportunities for adult faith formation and action in service of social justice.

Analysis of the Competencies within this Domain

Within the Mission and Vision Domain, the competencies used by the LUC mentors to assess the participants are:

- 1.1 Builds and maintains a positive Catholic culture and environment in the school
- 1.2 Leads the community in worship, prayer and service
- 1.3 Provides a high-quality religious education program staffed by qualified teachers
- 1.4 Collaborates with parents as the primary educator of their children.

The four competencies used by the LUC mentors to assess the participants in the Mission and Catholic Identity domain provide an overview of what is required of a Catholic school principal. No one would argue that the four competencies listed above provide a solid framework for basic competencies required of the spiritual leader of a school. Evidence of these competencies could be discussed with the mentor, but they could also be verified by a mentor's visit of the school to assess the Catholic climate and culture.

The analysis of the competencies reveals several gaps and suggests that more competencies could be added within this important foundational domain of Mission and

Catholic Identity. All five of the benchmarks of Standard 1 are centered on the importance of the school's mission statement, yet the LUC competencies do not address the mission statement. A competency should be added that the mentee demonstrates a clear understanding of the school's mission statement and is able to articulate a vision for the school.

Standard 2 is addressed in the LUC competencies, but an additional competency could to strengthen the Catholic culture in the school. The mentee could discuss with the mentor how one could ensure that Catholic culture and faith are expressed in the school through multiple and diverse forms of visual performing arts, music and architecture. Another competency would consider how the theory and practice of the Church's social teachings are essential elements of the curriculum.

The next two standards in this domain address faith formation for the students and the adults under the leadership of the principal. Within these standards are many potential topics to be covered in discussions between the mentors and their mentees. The nine benchmarks within these two standards could be converted into competencies.

The principal provides every student with timely and regular opportunities to learn about and experience the nature and importance of prayer, the Eucharist, and liturgy. The principal provides every student with timely, regular, and age-appropriate opportunities to reflect on their life experiences and faith through retreats and other spiritual experiences. The principal provides every student to participate in Christian service programs to promote the lived reality of action in service of social justice. The principal provides every student with role models of faith and service for social justice among the administrators, faculty, and staff.

The principal provides retreats and other spiritual experiences for the faculty and staff on a regular and timely basis. The principal assists parents/guardians in their role as the primary educators of their children in faith. The principal collaborates with other institutions to provide opportunities for parents/guardians to grow in the knowledge and practice of the faith. The principal provides all adults in the school community to participate in Christian service programs to promote the lived reality of action in service of social justice. The principal ensures that every administrator, faculty, and staff member visibly supports the faith life of the school community.

Governance and Leadership

The Center for Catholic School Effectiveness (2012) asserts that central to the mission of the Church is the work of Catholic school education. The success of this mission depends on key components of effective governance, which provides direction or authority and leadership, which ensures effective operations. This can be seen as a ministry that promotes and protects the responsibilities and rights of the school community. Governance and leadership based on the principles and practices of excellence are essential to insuring the Catholic identity, academic excellence, and operational vitality of the school. Those on the governing body or leadership team in Catholic Schools provide for an environment for teaching of doctrine and Sacred Scripture, the building and experiencing of community, the serving of others, and the opportunity for worship. The next two standards address governance and leadership.

Standard Five is: An excellent Catholic school has a governing body (person or persons) which recognizes and respects the role(s) of the appropriate and legitimate authorities, and exercises responsible decision making (authoritative, consultative,

advisory) in collaboration with the leadership team for development and oversight of the school's fidelity to mission, academic excellence, and operational vitality.

Standard Six is: An excellent Catholic school has a qualified leader/leadership team empowered by the governing body to realize and implement the school's mission and vision.

Analysis of the Competencies within this Domain

Within the Governance and Leadership domain the competencies used by the LUC mentors to assess the participants are:

- 2.1 Promote innovation, change, and collaboration in achieving the Catholic educational mission
- 2.2 Understands Catholic school governance structures, especially the role of parish pastor, pastoral council, parish finance committee, school board, Catholic Schools Office, and state department of Education
- 2.3 Initiates, monitors, and evaluates the strategic planning process to fulfill the school's mission and position the school for the future
- 2.4 Recruits, selects, supervises, and evaluates school personnel in accordance with the Catholic mission of the school
- 2.5 Develops and maintains policies which are congruent with the local Catholic diocese and which support the mission of the school

This domain is adequately covered by the competencies used by LUC to monitor the progress of the principal trainees.

Academic Excellence

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops affirms the message of the Congregation on Catholic Education that intellectual development of the person and growth as a Christian go forward hand in hand. Rooted in this mission of the Church, the Catholic school brings faith, culture, and life together in harmony. The bishops in 2005, noted that "young people of the third millennium must be a source of energy and leadership in our Church and our nation. And, therefore, we must provide young people

with an academically rigorous and doctrinally sound program of education” (Renewing Our Commitment to Catholic Elementary and Secondary School is in the Third Millennium, 2005).

These essential elements of “an academically rigorous and doctrinally sound program” mandate curricular experiences- including co-curricular and extra-curricular activities-which are rigorous, relevant, research-based, and infused with Catholic faith and traditions. The next three standards contain the essential elements for providing a framework for the design, implementation, and assessment of authentic academic excellence in Catholic school education from pre-kindergarten through secondary school.

Standard Seven is: An excellent Catholic school has a clearly articulated, rigorous curriculum aligned with relevant standards, 21st century skills, and Gospel values, implemented through effective instruction.

Standard Eight is: An excellent Catholic school uses school-wide assessment methods and practices to document student learning and program effectiveness, to make student performances transparent, and to inform the continuous review of curriculum and improvement of instructional practices.

Standard Nine is: An excellent Catholic school provides programs and service aligned with the mission to enrich the academic program and support the development of student and family life.

Analysis of the Competencies within this Domain

Within the Academic Excellence domain, the competencies used by the LUC mentors to assess the participants are:

3.1 Inspires and leads the school community toward academic excellence

3.2 Ensures that Catholic teaching and religious values are infused throughout the educational program

3.3 Utilizes data effectively to monitor and make changes in the instructional program

3.4 Develops programs to address the unique needs of students

3.5 Develop a professional learning community to support on-going professional and faith development of faculty and staff

The Academic Excellence domain is covered by the competencies listed above. Although all are important, competencies 3.2 and 3.4 (italicized for emphasis) capture the “And Then Some” qualities of leading an effective Catholic school.

Operational Vitality

The Center for Catholic School Effectiveness asserts that Catholic schools are temporal organizations committed to the Church and the mission of Catholic education including a commitment to a culture of excellence and rigor. They assert that schools exist in an environment of constant socioeconomic challenges grounded in a continuous need for sustainable fiscal planning, human resource and personnel management and professional formation, facilities maintenance and enhancement, and the requirement for institutional advancement and contemporary communication. It is imperative that Catholic schools adopt and maintain standards for operational vitality in these areas and define the norms and expectations for fundamental procedures to support and ensure viability and sustainability.

When schools do not maintain standards for operational vitality, the continuation of academic excellence is in grave jeopardy. Eventually, even an academically rigorous school with a strong Catholic identity will not survive without operational vitality. The standards for operational vitality focus on the operation of the school in four key areas: finances, human resources/personnel, facilities, and institutional advancement. The

leader/leadership team must manage each area and be subject to the direct oversight of the governing body concerning these matters.

Standard Ten is: An excellent Catholic school provides a feasible three to five year financial plan that includes both current and projected budgets and is the result of a collaborative process, emphasizing faithful stewardship.

Standard Eleven is: An excellent Catholic school operates in accord with published human resource/personnel policies, developed in compliance with (arch)diocesan policies and/or religious congregation sponsorship policies, which affect all staff (clergy, religious women and men, laity and volunteers) and provide clarity for responsibilities, expectations and accountability.

Standard Twelve is: An excellent Catholic school develops and maintains a facilities, equipment, and technology management plan designed to continuously support the implementation of the educational mission of the school.

Analysis of the Competencies within this Domain

Within the Operational Vitality domain, the competencies used by the LUC mentors to assess the participants are:

- 4.1 Demonstrates effective stewardship of school resources through the development of both short-term budgets and long-term financial plans
- 4.2 Creates a comprehensive development plan that explores additional sources of revenue (e.g. alumni giving, grants)
- 4.4 Creates innovative marketing strategies to promote the school and its mission to a variety of stakeholders
- 4.5 Coordinates with a variety of external sources (local Catholic diocese, local educational agencies, and other government agencies) to access available public funds
- 4.6 Ensures the safety of the school through strategic facilities management

Within the domain of Operational Vitality, the “And Then Some” qualities are adequately covered by the competencies used by the LUC Principal Preparation Program.

These competencies include formulating a comprehensive development plan, creating innovative marketing strategies, and seeking available public funds.

Summary of the “And Then Some” Qualities of Catholic School Principals

Table 4.6 summarizes the “And Then Some “qualities of Catholic School Principals by program. On the left hand side of the table are essential qualities based on the root beliefs and core values of the Notre Dame University principal preparation program unique to Catholic school principals. On the right are the essential qualities based on the Loyola University Chicago principal preparation program that are unique to Catholic school principals.

TABLE 4.6: A comparison of Essential Qualities Unique to Catholic School Principals by University Program

<p style="text-align: center;">University of Notre Dame <i>Catholic School Principals...</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Loyola University Chicago <i>Catholic School Principals...</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • invite the school community to a greater understanding of God’s presence and love of God. • lead with zeal and provide hope sustained and informed by the love of Christ. • recognize the dignity of humanity made in the image of God and expect all students to learn and excel. • are aware that the small things matter to build a strong school culture. • collaborate to ensure the success of every student helping them to become their truest selves in the image of Jesus Christ. • build a culture of continuous learning. • ensure that every child succeeds • fan the flame the gift God gave setting a high bar for spiritual growth and nurturing a living relationship with Jesus Christ. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • build and maintain a positive Catholic culture and environment. • lead the community in worship, prayer, and service. • provide a high-quality religious education program. • collaborate with parents as the primary educator of their children. • promote innovation while achieving the Catholic School Mission. • understand the Catholic school governance structure especially the role of the pastor. • plan strategically for the future vitality of the school. • manage personnel in accordance with the Catholic mission of the school. • lead the school through polices congruent with local diocese supporting the mission of the school. • inspire and lead toward academic excellence.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • foster a sense of family where children learn to thrive with others. • are other-centered preparing each child to live a life of service to others, the community and the Church. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure Catholic teaching and religious values are infused throughout the programs. • develop on-going professional and faith development of faculty and staff. • demonstrate effective stewardship of school resources. • create a development plan to generate revenue. • create innovative marketing strategies to promote the school and its mission. • coordinate with external sources to access available public funds.
--	--

As Table 4.6 shows, there are several essential qualities of Catholic school principals, which would not, nor could not, be addressed in a secular principal preparation program. All of the items listed in Table 4.6 could be discussed with and evaluated by a mentor familiar with the expectations of Catholic school leaders. The success of the Catholic school is dependent upon the effective leadership of its principal in the areas expected of all school principals, but especially those in the “And Then Some,” areas listed above.

As Table 4.7 shows, there are overlaps between the two Catholic school principal preparation programs.

Table 4.7 Common Traits Shared by the Two Principal Preparation Programs

University of Notre Dame	Loyola University Chicago
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invite the school community to a greater understanding of God’s presence and love of God. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure Catholic school teaching and religious values are infused throughout the programs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead with zeal and provide hope sustained and informed by the love of God. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead the community in worship, prayer and service. • Lead the school through policies congruent with local diocese supporting the mission of the school.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognize the dignity of humanity made in the image of God and expect all students to learn and excel. • Ensure that every child succeeds. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inspire and lead toward academic excellence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are aware that the small things matter to build a strong school culture. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build and maintain a positive Catholic culture and environment.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborate to ensure the success of every student helping them to become their truest selves in the image of Jesus Christ. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborate with parents as the primary educator of their children.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build a culture of continuous learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote innovation while achieving the Catholic School Mission. • Develop on-going professional and faith development of faculty and staff.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fan the flame the gift God gave setting a high bar for spiritual growth and nurturing a living relationship with Jesus Christ. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a high-quality religious education program.

Both programs agree that the principal is responsible for maintaining and strengthening the school’s Catholic identity and positive culture and environment. The principal can accomplish this by leadership marked by enthusiastic and passionate examples of devotion to God and by following the course charted by the diocese and the school’s mission. The programs recognize the importance of each student’s success academically and growth spiritually. The principal is a collaborator who works with parents to ensure the success of every student. The principal is an innovator while building a culture of continuous learning. This continuous learning culture includes professional learning, but more importantly, involves faith development and spiritual growth for the entire school community.

Table 4.8 shows the Catholic school leadership qualities that are unique to each program. These characteristics resulted from a constant comparative analysis of program components to reveal those that did not match a similar component in the other program and therefore could not appear in Table 4.7.

Table 4.8 Unique “And Then Some Traits” by Program

University of Notre Dame	Loyola University Chicago
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foster a sense of family where children learn to thrive with others. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the Catholic school governance structure especially the role of the pastor.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are other-centered preparing each child to live a life of service to others, the community and the Church. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan strategically for the future vitality of the school.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage personnel in accordance with the Catholic mission of the school.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate effective stewardship of school resources.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a development plan to generate revenue.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create innovative marketing strategies to promote the school and its mission.

As Table 4.8 shows, two of the traits unique to the University of Notre Dame are focused on building relationships. A Catholic school principal must foster a sense of family where students must thrive with others. The principal must also prepare students to serve each other, the community and the Church. Six of the traits unique to the Loyola University Chicago program are not relationship driven, but are task driven. These traits are unique to managing a Catholic school. They include: understanding the unique nature and structure of school governance, strategic planning for the school’s future vitality, managing personnel through the lens of Catholic teachings, stewardship of the school’s resources, development, fundraising, and marketing.

Research Question 3

What are the components of a mentoring program that would develop and support the competencies of a Catholic school principal as a spiritual leader?

The findings from phases one and two of this study serve as foundational components to establish a framework for a mentoring program that would both develop and support the competencies of the Catholic school as spiritual leader based on an analysis of highly effective leadership programs.

Both principal preparation programs offer mentor support for the candidates. The Notre Dame program offers pastoral support to their candidates, but did list specific components of this offering. A reasonable assumption to make would be that the three pillars of professional leadership, community, and spiritual growth into daily life are at the forefront of the discussions. It is also assumed that the candidates must understand and demonstrate competence in the root beliefs and core values of the program discussed above.

To answer research question three more specifically, the researcher examined the information from LUC's principal preparation program because it contains a specific framework of competencies aligned to standards for the mentors to use for the evaluation and assessment of the intern.

The framework for a successful mentoring program for a new Catholic school principal is the LUC On-Boarding Plan containing the Catholic School Principal Competencies. This plan was designed in 2013 by Michael Boyle, Sandria Morten, and Richard Guerin, who are members of the Center for Catholic School Effectiveness at the School of Education at Loyola University Chicago. The plan contains the competencies identified previously, but also contains indicators and activities for each competency.

Each indicator or activity is placed within one of three categories. They are: evidence of work done by the candidate as teacher leader; evidence of work done by the candidate in field experiences; and, evidence of work done by the candidate in internship. Once the evidence is presented in the plan, the level of involvement is classified as: observation, participation, or leadership.

LUC's Catholic School Principal Competencies and their companion indicators and activities serve as a solid framework for the mentor and mentee to work through. Sound mentoring of new principals is an important component of a preparation program. The concept of mentoring in the Catholic faith can be traced to Jesus who counseled his disciples two by two before sending them out to spread the gospel. The concept of mentoring in the Catholic faith is built on the principle of establishing and building a learning community that supports new teachers and principals. Mentoring in a Catholic school addresses three areas of development: spiritual, pedagogical, and professional. The new hires should be mentored for mission and ministry (Jacobs, 2015).

A mentor in the Catholic schools should respect, inspire and teach the mentee as Jesus did. "You call me 'teacher' and 'master' and rightly so, for I am. If I therefore, the master and teacher have washed your feet, you ought to wash one another's feet. I have given you a model to follow, so that I have done for you, you should also do" (John 13:13-15).

The mentor is critical in assisting the principal to create a community in Christ that shares in the faith development of young people. This community of believers impacts all learners. Jesus said, "Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matthew 18:20).

Jacobs (2015) states that leaders of Catholic schools are immersed in a community of leaders who are committed to service and spirituality. These principals are called to lead in the spirit of Jesus Christ. This leadership is one that is based on Gospel servant leadership. Mark's Gospel indicates that the only acceptable leadership within the community of Jesus is servant leadership modeled on Jesus, "who did not come to be served, but to serve and give his life for a ransom for many" (Mark 10:45).

Catholic school principals should be mentored to understand that they create a community of leaders and servants. Although these principals have the responsibility for leading their schools, they also have the responsibility for transforming society. "This transformation is made possible when each Catholic school principal contributes to the support of the Church as a whole in supporting each principal within their own diocese" (Jacobs, 2015, p. 66).

Mentors are important in the formation of the "And Then Some" qualities. Jacobs (2015) contends that mentoring in Catholic school is a mission and a ministry. The principals in Catholic schools are not only responsible for academic learning, but just as importantly are responsible for the faith development of those entrusted to them. The principals promote the good news of faith. St. Paul notes, "To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good: (1 Corinthians. 12:70). "The common good is developed and promoted constantly in the faith community of learners" (Jacobs, 2015, p.67).

Each principal candidate in the LUC program follows an On-boarding Plan. The plan is continually updated and evaluated by the support team. This document is followed to ensure that the candidate observes 100% of the activities, participates in

100% of the activities, and leads in at least 80% of the activities. The On-boarding Plan is aligned to the National Standards and Benchmarks for Effective Elementary and Secondary Catholic Schools (NSBECS), Southern Regional Educational Education Board (SREB) Critical Success Factors, Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards and Functions, the Loyola Principal Preparation coursework, field experiences, and four-semester internships.

Coaching

LUC's principal preparation program consists of a three-year coaching model, which begins during the first semester. The students are paired with coaches who meet with them weekly to discuss the job-embedded classroom assignments. This coaching model is based on a support team, which helps to ensure that the candidates have the breadth of experiences to be able to lead. This team is comprised of the candidate, a university faculty supervisor, the coordinator of coaches, the internship mentor principal, and the internship coach. The university faculty supervisor provides support and keeps the candidate on track for completing LUC's requirements. The coordinator of coaches meets with the coaches and candidate twice a year at the internship site and provides feedback, The internship principal and coach are veteran Catholic school administrators with a proven record for leading effective Catholic schools.

Integral to the LUC Catholic School Principal Preparation is the unique three-year coaching model. From the first semester candidates are paired with coaches who meet with them weekly. This begins the process of the candidates practicing their leadership skills by completing class assignments which are job-embedded. This coaching model is based on the foundation of a "support team." The purpose of this team is to ensure that

the candidates have the breadth of experiences to be able to lead. The support team consists of the candidate, the university faculty supervisor, the coordinator of coaches, the internship mentor principal, and the internship coach who is a veteran Catholic school administrator.

On-Boarding Plan and ePortfolio

Another essential element of the principal preparation program is the On-boarding Plan which is created for each candidate at the beginning of the program. The plan will be used to guide the candidate throughout his or her four subsequent internship courses. This plan will be continually updated and evaluated by the candidate's support team. Each On-boarding Plan is aligned to the National Standards and Benchmarks for Effective Elementary and Secondary Catholic Schools (NSBECS), Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) Critical Success Factors, (CSF), Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards and Functions, The Loyola Principal Preparation coursework, field experiences and four-semester internship.

The Catholic Principal Preparation Program uses an ePortfolio (electronic portfolio) system to document the candidate's progress through the program as evidenced through the experiences listed on the On-boarding Plan. This portfolio is a digital collection of work over time that highlights the candidates' skills, abilities, values, experiences and competencies through a broad range of evidence-based learning. The collection may include a variety of artifacts, or relevant documents and media files, that provide a holistic representation of who the candidate is personally, professionally, and academically.

Internship

The requirement for the LUC Catholic Principal Preparation Program Internship is for the candidate to work under the supervision of a practicing administrator for each of the four-semester. The candidate should be assigned a wide range of administrative duties and responsibilities. It is expected that the candidate will assume a leadership role or participate in or observe the decision-making processes in the school. A majority of the internship experience will be in the candidate's home school. This is typically where the candidate is employed. It is expected that the candidate will be able to observe, participate and lead in most of the activities of the On-boarding Plan in this setting.

Additionally, the internship portion of the program requires the candidate to conduct activities in one or more schools away from home because not all activities will be available in the primary internship location. To supplement the home school internship experience, additional experiences will be sought at other cooperating schools. This enables the candidate to be exposed to leadership situations in school settings that represent diverse economic and cultural conditions. It also promoted candidate interaction with a variety of members of the school community. The away school(s) are identified and selected in conjunction with the coach and university supervisor.

The key activities of the internship are:

- engagement of the candidate in instructional activities that involves teachers at all grade levels including teachers in both general education, special education, bilingual education and gifted education settings;
- engagement of the candidate in the observation of the hiring, supervision and evaluation of teachers, other certified staff, noncertified staff, and the development of a professional development plan for teachers; and,
- engagement of the candidate in leadership opportunities to demonstrate that the candidate meets the required competencies for Illinois state certification.

The Role of the Internship Candidate

The internship candidates are expected to take the initiative to broaden their professional experiences. They are expected to put forth additional time and effort to complete hands on learning. The professional growth of the intern is fostered through reflective analysis of his or her skills in problem solving, application, and implementation of leadership skills.

This professional growth is documented through artifacts collected and stored in the On-boarding Plan ePortfolio. The candidates collect and catalogue evidence of mastery of the Catholic School Principal Competencies and SREB Critical Success Factors. The ePortfolio is assessed in an ongoing fashion by the coach and coordinator of coaches, who is a Loyola University Faculty member. The intern is responsible for maintaining the ePortfolio and communicating with the support team (mentor principal, coach and coordinator of coaches). The intern candidate is to post the evidence of learning/mastery of outcomes to the ePortfolio on a regular and consistent basis.

The Role of the Mentor Principal

The mentor principals are building administrators with experience leading Catholic schools. The mentor principal serves as part of the candidate's support team.

The major responsibilities of the mentor include:

- Allows the intern candidate to observe the administrative responsibilities of the building principal;
- Allows the intern candidate to begin to assume the duties and responsibilities of the building administrator;
- Observes and provides feedback to the intern candidate aimed at developing the skills, knowledge, and dispositions defined by the program; and

- Serves as a member of the intern candidate's support team to further the intern candidate's performance toward meeting the goals of the school.

The Role of the Coach

LUC identifies eight major responsibilities of the Coach:

1. Mentors and guides the candidate in completing all aspects of the Catholic Principal competencies, ISLLC Standards and SREB Critical Success Factors to become a transformative principal;
2. Establishes productive working relations with the candidate and mentor principal;
3. Works with the mentor principal to assure that the candidate has access to all classrooms throughout the school year;
4. Conducts weekly visits to the school site in order to observe and provide feedback to the candidate aimed at developing the skills, knowledge and dispositions defined by the program;
5. Meets with the mentor principal on a monthly (or more often, as needed) basis to get his/her perspective on the candidate's performance;
6. Meets with the Coordinator of Coaches and mentor principal to further the candidate's performance consistently meeting the goals for school improvement;
7. Arranges for the development experiences outside of the candidate's site when appropriate in coordination with the internship mentor principal and the LUC program; and
8. Coaches the candidates on all job interview and placement related activities.

The Responsibilities of the Coordinator of Coaches

LUC assigns four major responsibilities to the Coordinator of Coaches:

1. Meets twice per semester with the mentor principal at the internship site of each candidate;
2. Observes, evaluates and provides feedback at least four times a year to each candidate about the candidate's performance on those measures, which align to the final assessments. Additionally, the faculty supervisor provides the candidate summative feedback at the end of each semester on the final assessments aligned to the internship;
3. Meets three times per semester with the candidates as a group to discuss issues related to the student learning and school improvement arising from the internship; and
4. Collaborates with the mentor principals and coaches to complete the assessment of the candidate's performance during the internship.

Internship Assessment

As part of the support team philosophy the faculty supervisors, internship principal mentor, coaches, and coordinator of coaches jointly evaluate each candidate's participation rate, leadership rate and success within each of the Catholic School Principal Competencies and the SREB 36 internship activities. These evaluations occur each semester beginning with the candidate's first semester in the program through graduation. The evaluations occur at the bi-monthly partnership meetings.

The LUC Catholic Principal Preparation Program has a structure for the internship sequence and accompanying assessments. The first, second, and fourth internships occur within the candidate's home building. The third internship is conducted in an away building. A comprehensive rubric is used to assess the candidates. This rubric is required for licensure in Illinois. It specifies how programs evaluate the acquired knowledge and skills of their candidates, as evidenced by clearly defined leadership experiences during the internship phase of the program. The rubric ensures a level of standardization among programs and allows for the customization of programs to meet the need so the program, their district partners and individual candidates.

Mentor Principal Agreement

The LUC Principal Preparation Form requires the mentor principal to sign an agreement. This agreement spells out the expectations for the mentor. The mentor principal has the opportunity to make a significant contribution to the field of education for an aspiring administrator. It highlights the challenge of putting the candidate to work in ways that make the candidate a valuable contributor to the school's operation and, at the same time provide for the candidate's mastery of the competencies of a school

administrator. The mentor is to supply the candidate intern with a wide range of activities that help the candidate become acquainted with all facets of the mentor principal's work. The mentor is to provide opportunities to observe the mentor principal in a variety of situations and provide the candidate intern with duties of increasing responsibility.

Specifically, when the mentor signs the agreement, he agrees to eight responsibilities. Those responsibilities are:

1. Agree to supervise the candidate and meet with him/her to discuss Internship expectations.
2. Sign the Internship Agreement with the University.
3. Meet with the candidate and university professor to discuss experiences and activities in the Internship.
4. Introduce the candidate to the site staff and explain his/her role in the organization.
5. Assign administrative duties and tasks; guide the candidates; and assess progress of the candidate.
6. Schedule weekly conferences with the candidate to discuss his/her activities, to coordinate schedules or give directions, to talk over problems or share thoughts about situations in the work setting that can be helpful to the candidate, etc.
7. Sign the candidate's Weekly Log and Activities List to verify completion of designed activities.
8. Evaluate the candidate upon his/her completion of all course requirements.

Candidate Evaluation by Mentor Principal Form

At the conclusion of the Internship the mentor principal completes an evaluation form. This form is a checklist of skill criteria based on NCATE, Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC)/ISLLC Standards and SREB CSF. There are seventeen secular competencies in which the candidate is evaluated. Additionally, there are twenty "And Then Some," competencies described in the next section.

The mentor is to check the box next to the skill criteria based on how the candidate exhibited the level of competency. The highest rating is Target (3). It is used

when the candidate exceeds expectations for the stated competency. The Acceptable (2) rating is given when the candidate performs at an acceptable level of proficiency for the stated competency. An Unsatisfactory (1) rating is used when a candidate does not perform at an acceptable rate of proficiency for the listed competency and is in need of remediation for the competency. A fourth rating, Not Able to Evaluate (0) is selected when there is no opportunity to observe the competency.

Catholic School Principal Competencies

The competencies listed in Appendix A, would be applicable to any principal candidate preparing to lead a secular school in Illinois. The unique nature of the Loyola University Chicago's Catholic school principal preparation program is the focus on how a future lay principal is prepared in "And Then Some" skills required to lead today's Catholic schools. These, "And Then Some" skills are also measured by the mentor principal on the same four measures as the seventeen competencies required of all principal candidates in Illinois. The Catholic School Principal Competencies contain twenty additional competencies assessed by the mentor principal. These competencies are adopted from The National Standards and Benchmarks for Effective Catholic Elementary and Secondary Catholic Schools (NSBECS). These benchmarks state that "an excellent Catholic school has a qualified leader/leadership team empowered by the governing body to realize and implement the school's mission and vision."

The first category, Mission and Vision, contains four competencies in which the candidate intern is assessed. They are:

- 1.1 Builds and maintains a positive Catholic culture and environment in the school.
- 1.2 Leads the community in worship, prayer, and service.

- 1.3 Provides a high-quality religious education program staffed by qualified teachers.
- 1.4 Collaborated with parents as the primary educator of their children.

The second area of focus for an aspiring Catholic school principal is Governance and Leadership. Within this area are five competencies. They are:

- 2.1 Promote innovation, change, and collaboration in achieving the Catholic educational mission.
- 2.2 Understands Catholic school governance structures, especially the role of the parish pastor, pastoral council, parish finance committee, school board, Catholic Schools Office, and state Department of Education.
- 2.3 Initiates, monitors, and evaluates the strategic planning process to fulfill the school's mission and position the school for the future.
- 2.4 Recruits, selects, supervises, and evaluates school personnel in accordance with the Catholic mission of the school.
- 2.5 Develops and maintain policies which are congruent with the local Catholic diocese and which support the mission of the school.

Academic Excellence is the third area of focus identified by the NSBECS. There are five competencies used in this assessment tool. They are:

- 3.1 Inspires and leads the school community toward academic excellence.
- 3.2 Ensures that Catholic teaching and religious values are infused throughout the educational program.
- 3.3 Utilizes data effectively to monitor and make changes in the instructional program.
- 3.4 Develops programs to address the unique learning needs of students.
- 3.5 Develop a professional learning community to support on-going professional and faith development of faculty and staff.

The fourth area of Catholic School Principal Competencies is Operational Vitality. Six competencies are listed within this category. They are:

- 4.1 Demonstrates effective stewardship of school resources through the development of both short-term budgets and long-term financial plans.
- 4.2 Created a comprehensive development plan that explores additional sources of revenue (e.g., alumni giving, grants).
- 4.3 Develops enrollment management strategies to maintain and grow stable enrollment.
- 4.4 Creates innovative marketing strategies to promote the school and its mission to a variety of stakeholders.

- 4.5 Coordinates with a variety of external sources (local Catholic diocese, local educational agencies, and other government agencies) to access available public funds.
- 4.6 Ensures the safety of the school through strategic facilities management.

Performance Narrative

After the checklist of competencies is completed, the mentor principal has an opportunity with a performance narrative on the evaluation form. The instructions for the Performance Narrative state, “Based on your interactions with and observations of the intern candidate, please identify areas of strength and areas of growth,” Page 70 Participation Handbook. The mentor signs and dates the form before submitting it to the university.

On-Boarding Plan

The Loyola University Chicago Master of Education in Instructional Leadership Principal Preparation Program requires the participants to follow two On-Boarding Plans over the course of the three years of the program. The two distinct plans are followed simultaneously. One covers competencies and activities expected of all principals trained in Illinois. The second covers unique competencies and activities expected of Catholic school principals in the United States.

The first On-Boarding Plan from Loyola University Chicago was written by Susan Sostak, Marla Israel, and Janis Fine in 2013. It is aligned to the thirteen SREB CSF standards and six Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards and functions. The plan lists several requirements for the intern under each category. Additionally, there is a column with the heading, “Through Loyola University’s Principal Preparation Program the intern will...” Under that heading specific activities are listed for the intern to complete. The next column of the plan lists the year and semester in the

Internship cycle in which the activity is to be completed and assessed. The fourth column of the plan is a place for documentation of evidence of work by the candidate as a teacher leader. Beside that column is one for Evidence of work done by the candidate in field experience and one for evidence of work done by the candidate during the internship. The level of involvement is documented by Observation (O), Participation (P), and Leadership (L). The final column of the plan allows for an indication of Mastery of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) Critical Success Factor, Yes (Y), or No (N).

The Second On-Boarding Plan is designed to complement the experiences as defined in the Loyola Chicago Principal On-Boarding Plan. This plan is specific to Catholic School Principal Competencies. It was created by Michael Boyle, Sandria Morten, S. and Richard Guerin, in 2013, for the Center for Catholic School Effectiveness at the School of Education-Loyola University Chicago.

The On-Boarding Plan is aligned to National Standards and Benchmarks for Effective Elementary and Secondary Catholic Schools (NSBECS). Within each of the four standards and benchmarks Indicators/Activities or Potential Indicators/Activities are listed. There are four columns at the heading of each category. There is space on the form to document how each of the standards and benchmarks are achieved. One column documents evidence of work done by the candidate as a teacher leader. The second documents evidence of work done by the candidate in field experiences. The next column documents evidence of work done by the candidate during the internship. The final column of this On-Boarding Plan documents the Level of Involvement, Observation (O), Participation (P), and Leadership (L).

The Indicators/Activities listed in the Catholic School Principal Competencies On-Boarding Plan provide a road map for candidates to have an exposure to the “And Then Some” qualifications required to successfully lead a Catholic school.

The researcher examined all of the indicators and activities to determine those which would best be incorporated into a mentoring program to strengthen a principal’s spiritual leadership and develop “And Then Some,” traits. These indicators are organized by the four categories identified by NSBECS. The indicators and the corresponding activities not unique to Catholic school leadership were eliminated from the following section. For a list of all the Indicators/Activities please see Appendix B.

1. Mission and Identity

- 1.1 Builds and maintains a positive Catholic culture and environment in the school.
 - ...analyzes the mission statement to guarantee a commitment to Catholic identity.
 - ...identify occasions when the mission statement is used as the foundation and normative reference for all planning.
 - ...monitor school program and make recommendations to learn about and experience the nature and importance of prayer, the Eucharist, and liturgy.
- 1.2 Leads the community in worship, prayer and service.
 - ...participate in liturgy, prayer services and other faith-based activities.
 - ...plan and deliver staff retreats, prayer services, and other spiritual experiences for staff.
 - ...model faith and service to students and clearly communicate to staff that this is an expectation of the school.
 - ...develop and/or monitor school program for opportunities to participate in Christian service to promote lived reality of action in service of social justice.
- 1.3 Provides a high-quality religious education program staffed by qualified teachers.
 - ...monitor school program to determine the religion classes are afforded the same level of attention given to other academic subjects.
 - ...work with leaders to ensure that the faculty who teach religion meet (arch) diocesan requirements for academic and catechetical preparation.
 - ...examine the school setting to ensure that Catholic culture and faith is expressed and integrated throughout the school in diverse forms of sign and symbol

- 1.4 Collaborates with parents as the primary educator of their children.
...work with leadership to collaborate with other institutions to foster the faith development of parent/guardians.

2. Governance and Leadership

- 2.1 Promote innovation, change, and collaboration in achieving the Catholic educational mission.
...plans long term professional development for curricular innovations.
- 2.2 Understands Catholic school governance structures; especially the role of the parish pastor, pastoral council, parish finance committee, school board, Catholic schools Office, and state Department of Education.
...attends various diocesan/vicariate meetings.
- 2.3 Initiates, monitors, and evaluates the strategic planning process to fulfill the school's mission and position the school for the future.
...assists leadership in calling together the various constituencies of the school to clarify, review, and renew the school's mission statement.
- 2.4 Recruits, selects, supervises, and evaluates school personnel in accordance with the Catholic mission of the school.
...work with leadership to create/maintain personnel retention strategies.
- 2.5 Develops and maintains policies which are congruent with the local Catholic diocese and which support the mission of the school.
...assures that policies/manuals are in alignment with (arch) diocesan policies/procedures.

3. Academic Excellence

- 3.1 Inspires and leads the school community toward academic excellence.
...create opportunities for service programs and evaluate their effectiveness.
- 3.2 Ensures that Catholic teaching and religious values are infused throughout the educational program.
...work with administration to ensure that the religious education curriculum meets the standards of the (arch) diocese.
...examine the school setting to ensure that Catholic culture and faith is expressed and integrated throughout the school in diverse forms of sign and symbol.
...create opportunities for faculty to use the lens of Scripture and Catholic intellectual tradition in all to help students think critically and ethically about the world around them.
...analyze the school program to identify opportunities for students to receive planned instruction in the Church's social teaching.
- 3.3 Utilizes data effectively to monitor and make changes in the instructional program.
...assists the administration in analyzing the school data to monitor for student achievement.
- 3.4 Develops programs to address the unique learning needs of students.

- ...using Catholic Social Teaching as a lens, work with staff to develop wellness programs, including anti-bullying programs.
- 3.5 Develop a professional learning community to support community to support on-going professional and faith development of faculty and staff. ...develop faith formation activities for staff.

4. Operational Vitality

- 4.1 Demonstrates effective stewardship of school resources through the development of both short-term budgets and long-term financial plans.
 - ...work with administration to develop define, and/or manage school budget to address capital improvements, equipment depreciation, and replacement.
 - ...works with leadership team in working with external partners in developing necessary funding.
 - ...implement strategies to give families access to information about tuition assistance and long-term planning for tuition and Catholic school expenses.
- 4.2 Creates a comprehensive development plan that explores additional sources of revenue (e.g., alumni giving, grants).
 - ...assist leadership team in financial planning in collaboration with experts in non-profit management and funding.
 - ...assist leadership team in developing grant applications from external sources.
- 4.3 Develops enrollment management strategies to maintain and grow stable enrollment.
 - ...assist administration in analyzing demographics to note trends to develop strategic plan to target enrollment.
 - ...assist administration in monitoring and improving the admissions process.
 - ...assist administration in retention strategies for current students.
- 4.4 Creates innovative marketing strategies to promote the school and its mission to a variety of stakeholders.
 - ...works with marketing team to use a variety of media platforms to promote the school.
 - ...work with marketing team to plan marketing events such as Open Houses and tours.
 - ...create a press release promoting an event at the school.
- 4.5 Coordinates with a variety of external sources (local Catholic diocese, local educational agencies, and other government agencies) to access available public funds.
 - ...define revenue sources for the school.
 - ...analyze the school's utilization of available public funds.
- 4.6 Ensures the safety of the school through strategic facilities management.

- ...work with building leadership in developing and/or auditing plans for managing facilities, equipment, and technology.
- ...work with leadership to align physical and technological improvements with mission and are consistent with environmental stewardship.

Table 4.9 summarizes the characteristics of the mentoring opportunities, human resources, and structures inherent in each program.

Table 4.9 Characteristics of the Mentoring Provided to the Candidates

University of Notre Dame	Loyola University Chicago
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pastoral support • School supervisors • Executive coaching • Organized retreats 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internship mentor principal • Internship coach • Use of On-boarding plans • Use of electronic portfolio • University faculty supervisor • Coordinator of coaches • Performance Narrative

As Table 4.9 shows, each program listed components for assisting their candidates to become more effective principals. Table 4.9 also reveals that the Loyola University Chicago listed more detail about their process and how they intentionally support the mentors with criteria and other structures to enable them to better assist and evaluate their mentees.

Table 4.10 Human Resources Focused on Mentoring Principal Candidates By Program

University of Notre Dame	Loyola University Chicago
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School supervisor • Executive coach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internship mentor principal • Internship coach

As Table 4.10 shows both programs provide principal candidates with more than one person to provide them with support and guidance to become effective Catholic school principals.

Table 4.11 The Unique Characteristics of the Mentoring Process by Program

University of Notre Dame	Loyola University Chicago
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pastoral support • Organized retreats 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team approach for support • Use of electronic portfolio • Use of On-boarding plans • Performance narrative

As Table 4.11 indicates there are unique characteristics in each of the programs with respect to the mentoring process. First, the University of Notre Dame provides opportunities for spiritual growth in two ways. It offers organized retreats and pastoral support. The Loyola University Chicago also provides distinct tools for assisting and evaluating their principal candidates. It uses a team approach consisting of several people to provide input and support of the candidates. Additionally, the LUC program describes specific tools used to guide the candidates. These tools include: electronic portfolios, performance narratives, and On-boarding plans.

Summary

The analysis of the artifacts and texts from the programs evaluated revealed practices that could guide the creation of an effective mentoring program for newly hired lay principals in Catholic schools. The findings revealed that such a program should be centered on Catholic core values and beliefs and that these foundational beliefs be infused throughout all of the interactions between the mentee and mentor. What’s more, the program should require that these core values and beliefs are demonstrated by the

mentee and evaluated by the mentor. The program should also have formal agreements signed by the mentor and mentee that outline the expectations for each. The findings also suggest that an effective mentoring program should provide pastoral mentors and former Catholic school principals to serve as resources for the new principals. The findings also highlight the importance of specifically designed activities that enable the mentee to demonstrate and deepen competence with the “And Then Some” qualities. Based on the findings such a program could employ strengths from each of the evaluated programs specifically the root beliefs and core values from the Notre Dame program and along with the On-Boarding Plan aligned to National Standards and Benchmarks for Effective Elementary and Secondary Catholic Schools from the Loyola University Chicago program.

Chapter Five further details a framework for a mentoring program for newly hired lay principals in Catholic schools based on the findings. The framework could be used to more effectively employ mentors to guide the development of the “And Then Some” qualities for newly hired lay Catholic school principals in the Altoona-Johnstown Diocese.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Discussion of Findings

Catholic Principals must possess the same educational leadership and managerial leadership skills as their public school counterparts, and then some. The United States Catholic Conference defined the Catholic school principal's role across three major areas: educational leader, managerial leader, and spiritual leader, (Ciriello, 1994). The “and then some” is the spiritual leadership role and everything else unique to leading a Catholic school. As the spiritual leaders, Catholic school principals are “transformational leaders who facilitate faith development and Catholic school identity in their school” (Ciriello, 1994, p. 5).

How is one trained to be competent in the “and then some” leadership domain? “It should be argued that the same attention being given to public school principal preparation programs must also be granted formation programs for Catholic school principals” (Boyle, 2016). Across the country university principal training programs focus on alignment with adopted leadership standards to meet certification/licensure requirements. How then, do university programs also prepare candidates in the necessary faith leadership components that are so critical to leading effective Catholic school? (Boyle, 2016).

“It is imperative that there is an on-going examination of the explicit methods used to foster both the requisite faith and instructional leadership skills necessary to lead these schools” (Boyle, 2016, p.291-2). The universities must find ways to make sure that faith leadership development is not short-changed in favor of licensure/certification

requirements. Because Catholic school principal leadership demands are so unique explicit development in faith-leadership skills, while also developing the requisite instructional leadership skill is essential. Without specific development in both of these leadership areas, Catholic schools will not have the qualified leaders they need to ensure their survival (Boyle, 2016).

This study is an attempt by the researcher to further explore how to better prepare Catholic school principals by conducting a program analysis of two Catholic school principal preparation programs, the University of Notre Dame and Loyola University Chicago.

The first question that the researcher sought to answer is: What are the distinct characteristics of a preparation program to train principals to lead Catholic Schools?

The researcher determined that the two programs have these similarities: both are intentional about assisting aspiring Catholic school leaders to strengthening their spiritual leadership, and they recognize that one cannot become a better spiritual leaders in a vacuum. Support is vital. Mentors and coaches are an integral component of this objective.

Sound mentoring of new principals is an important component of their preparation programs. The concept of mentoring in the Catholic faith can be traced to Jesus who counseled his disciples two by two before sending them out to spread the gospel. The concept of mentoring in the Catholic faith is built on the principle of establishing and building a learning community that supports new teachers and principals. Mentoring in a Catholic school addresses three areas of development:

spiritual, pedagogical, and professional. The new hires should be mentored for mission and ministry (Jacobs, 2015).

The sense of mission is not unusual in Catholic schools and other faith-based schools. These schools were founded for a specific purpose and are associated with a larger faith community. In 1990 and 2005, the Catholic bishops of the United States issued a statement affirming the strong conviction that Catholic schools are of great value to the Church and to the nation (U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2005).

The bishops affirmed that Catholic schools afford the fullest and best opportunity to realize the purposes of Christian education. These purposes are: to provide an atmosphere in which the Gospel message is proclaimed, community in Christ is experienced, service to our sisters and brothers in the norm, and thanksgiving and worship of our God is cultivated (U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2005),

A mentor in the Catholic schools should respect, inspire and teach the mentee as Jesus did. “You call me ‘teacher’ and ‘master,’ and rightly so, for indeed I am. If I therefore, the master and teacher have washed your feet, you ought to wash one another’s feet. I have given you a model to follow, so that I have done for you, you should also do” (John 13:13-15).

One of the responsibilities of the principal is to create a community in Christ that shares in the faith development of young people. This community of believers impacts all learners. Jesus said, “Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them” (Matthew 18:20).

The differences between the two principal preparation programs that can be determined from the information available to the researcher are two. First, the University

of Notre Dame program is more holistic and uses stated root beliefs and core values interwoven throughout the course work and field experiences. The second is the use of standards. There is no mention of the National Standards and Benchmarks for Effective Catholic Elementary and Secondary Schools in the information obtained from the University of Notre Dame's web site. However, the Loyola University of Chicago program has competencies for the candidate to complete, which are aligned to these standards and benchmarks as noted in Table 4.5.

Next, the researcher sought to identify the "And Then Some" competencies that a principal at a Catholic school should master. As illustrated in Table 4.7, both programs agree that the principal is responsible for maintaining and strengthening the school's Catholic identity and positive culture and environment. The principal can accomplish this by leadership marked by enthusiastic and passionate examples of devotion to God and by following the course charted by the diocese and the school's mission. The programs recognize the importance of each student's success academically and growth spiritually. The principal is a collaborator who works with parents to ensure the success of every student. The principal is an innovator while building a culture of continuous learning. This continuous learning culture includes professional learning, but more importantly, involves faith development and spiritual growth for the entire school community.

Also identified in Table 4.8 are Catholic school leadership qualities which are unique to each program. The University of Notre Dame listed two traits focused on building relationships. They believe that a Catholic school principal must foster a sense of family where student must thrive with others. The principal should also prepare

students to serve each other, the community, and the Church. The researcher identified six traits unique to the Loyola University Chicago program which are not relationship driven, but task driven. These traits are unique to managing a Catholic school. They include: understanding the unique nature and structure of school governance, strategic planning for the school's future vitality, managing personnel through the lens of Catholic teachings, stewardship of the school's resources, development, fundraising, and marketing.

The challenges of the Catholic school principal are many. They have the same duties and responsibilities as their secular counterparts in their roles of educational leader and managerial leader, but what does it take to have the “and then some”? This, “and then some” component of leadership has the principal as faith leader, or spiritual leader. This leader is to guide the faith development and faith life of all constituents within the school (Rieckhoff, 2014). The role as spiritual leader is grounded in the knowledge of the history and philosophy of the Catholic Church. Rieckhoff (2014) states, “The spiritual leader role focusses on faith development and building the Christian community as well as facilitating the moral and ethical development of those in the school community” (p.26).

Studies have examined the perceptions of Catholic school principals in their roles as faith leaders. Over twenty years ago, Wallace (1995) found that 70% of principals rated themselves inadequately prepared in faith leadership, having little or no formal coursework or training.

“The scope of the role of faith leader continues to expand at a challenging time for the Roman Catholic Church with declining Mass attendance, families not practicing

their faith, yet sending their children to a Catholic school, and other examples of disconnectedness with parish life” (Rieckhoff, 2014, p. 31).

In addition to the pressure of being the spiritual leader of their institutions, Catholic school principals face other unique challenges of “and then some” leadership. Because Catholic schools are enrollment driven, principals are under different pressures than their public school counterparts. A Notre Dame study of 1,685 Catholic school principals nationwide indicated that key challenges exist in financial management, marketing, Catholic identity, enrollment management, and long-range planning (Schmitt, 2012). Of these top five areas of need, the most important two, enrollment management and financial management, capture the most basic goal of survival: keeping a school open (Schmitt, 2012).

Belmonte and Cranston (2009) confirmed that lay principals play a critical role in embracing and creatively building a Catholic character and culture in their schools. Their findings highlighted that Catholic lay principals continue to be community gatekeepers assuming the responsibility for fostering the faith development of the school community, promoting the moral and ethical development of the school community, building a Christian community, and developing and implementing the school’s philosophy (Cook, 2001, 2004; Flynn & Mok, 2001; Grace, 2002). Being the community gatekeeper, the task of preserving the Catholic character of the school is becoming increasingly more problematic and challenging because of several factors. Those factors include: the influence of the media, the pressure for academic success, people’s disengagement from the Church, and other external variables which may be weakening the Catholic habitus in school (Belmonte & Cranston, 2009).

The lay principals' quest for community created a sense of belonging as well as cultivated trust and inclusiveness (Belmonte & Cranston, 2009; Schaps, 2003; Sergiovanni, 2001, 2003, 2005; Stoll, 2003; Stolp & Smith, 1995). "These principals recognized the importance of the promotion of interpersonal relationships in the school as central to creating an ethos and culture that supported the Catholic view of life" (Belmonte & Cranston, 2009, p. 300). The principals indicated that a family-like character was sought as their school habitus. Ideally, the school would operate as an extension of the family. This would be accomplished through a network of relationships, they forged through the generation of social capital advocated by Church authorities (Congregation for Catholic Education [CCE], 1998). "Central to creating a culture of community, principals identified their schools as exhibiting ideals such as providing a safe and secure environment, together with a sense of welcome, celebration and hospitality. Individual care and concern, particularly for those who are struggling to cope with communal expectations were ideals also identified by principals (Belemonte & Cranston, 2009, p. 300-1).

The principals are architects of Catholic school culture and identity they identified their prime roles as determining the quality of religious and academic purposes of their schools and building faith communities among members of their schools (Belmonte & Cranston, 2009). The Church and relevant research by Byrk, Lee & Holland, 1993; CCE, 1977, 1982, 1988, 1998, 2002; Flynn & Mok, 2001; Nuzzi, 2000, 2002; Wallace, 1998, 2000 indicate that principals in Catholic schools are charged with creating school cultures that embrace the teachings and traditions of the Catholic Church, central to which is community. In maintaining the unique character of Catholic schools it is

essential that the building of community be fully integrated into daily life and activity of the school (Cook, 2001, 2004; Grace, 2002; O'Donnell, 2001; Spry, 2004; Spry & Duignan, 2003).

As the spiritual leaders, Catholic school principals are “transformational leaders who facilitate faith development and Catholic school identity in their schools” (Ciriello, 1994, p. 5). In Catholic schools, the principal is the faith leader or spiritual leader. This leader is to guide the faith development and faith live of all constituents within the school (Rieckhoff, 2014). The role of spiritual leader is grounded in the knowledge of the history and philosophy of the Catholic Church. Rieckhoff (2014) states, “The spiritual leader role focuses on faith development and building the Christian community as well as facilitating the moral and ethical development of those in the school community” (p. 26).

Finally, the researcher identified the components of a mentoring program that would both develop and support the competencies of a Catholic school principal as a spiritual leader. A mentoring program for Catholic school leaders should include three areas of leadership: leading self, leading others and leading with others. Kushner, (1997) explained that school leaders must be learning leaders who are constantly learning to lead better. This type of leadership supports and enhances the mission of the school: to provide quality education, based on and grounded in lasting principles, which is delivered in a supportive educational environment. It is the leader's personal mission and the mission of the school which serves as a framework for leading self, leading others and leading with others.

Principals in a Catholic school are members of the larger community. As such, they practice transcendental leadership. Cardona, (2000) described these leaders as

promoting unity by providing equitable exchange rewards appealing to the intrinsic motivation of associates with whom they work and by developing their transcendent motivation; the motivation to do things for others.

Jacobs (2015) states that leaders of Catholic schools are immersed in a community of learners who are committed to service and spirituality. Here, principals are called to lead in the spirit of Jesus Christ. This leadership is one that is based on Gospel servant leadership. Mark's Gospel indicates that the only acceptable leadership within the community of Jesus is servant leadership modeled on Jesus, "who did not come to be served, but to serve and to give his life for a ransom for many" (Mark 10:45).

Jesus is the model for principal leadership in Catholic schools. "The greatest among you must be your servant" (Matthew 23:11). At the Last Supper, Luke describes how Jesus instructs his disciples: "The greatest among you must behave as if he were the youngest, the leader as if he was the one who serves" (Luke 22:26). John's Gospel in the thirteenth chapter explains how Jesus moved from the head of the table, knelt down, and washed His disciples' feet as a sign of servant leadership (Lavery, 2012).

Catholic school principals should be mentored to understand that they create a community of leaders and servants. Although these principals have the responsibility for leading their schools, they also have the responsibility for transforming society. "This transformation is made possible when each Catholic school principal contributes to the support of the Church as a whole in supporting each principal within their own diocese" (Jacobs, 2015, p.66).

Jacobs (2015) contends that mentoring in Catholic school is a mission and a ministry. The principals in Catholic schools are not only responsible for academic

learning, but just as importantly are responsible for the faith development of those entrusted to them. The principals promote the good news of faith. St. Paul notes, “To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good” (1 Corinthians. 12:70). “The common good is developed and promoted constantly in the faith community of learners” (Jacobs, 2015, p.67).

As a result of this study the researcher determined that an effective mentoring program for newly hired lay principals in Catholic schools should be centered on Catholic core values and beliefs infused throughout all of the interactions between the mentee and mentor. These core values and beliefs should be demonstrated by the mentee and evaluated by the mentor. The program will have formal agreements signed by the mentor and mentee which outline the expectations for each. The mentoring program will provide pastoral mentors and former Catholic school principals to serve as resources for the new principals.

The activities of the mentee demonstrating competence with the “And Then Some” qualities will be based on the root beliefs and core values from the Notre Dame program and the On-Boarding Plan aligned to National Standards and Benchmarks for Effective Elementary and Secondary Schools from the Loyola University Chicago program. This On-Boarding Plan supports the notion that mentoring is more successful if focused on a project and delivered through a structured tool to direct conversation (Clayton, Sanzo, and Myran (2013).

Recommended Actions

Based on the evaluation of the two Catholic school principal preparation programs that were the focus of the study, the researcher developed the framework for a

mentoring program for the newly hired lay principals in the Johnstown-Altoona Diocese with a specific focus on developing the “And Then Some” competencies. This framework presented in Table 5.1 would expose the principals to the competencies not covered in their traditional secular principal preparation programs. It highlights ways that layers of mentoring could promote a specifically tailored set of on the job training resources and experiences. The framework is summarized in Table 5.1 to note its components and crucial stakeholders that would lead to the outcome of producing Catholic School Leadership that embodies the beliefs and values of a Catholic School Education.

Table 5.1 Summary of Action Plan for a Framework to Promote Leadership Marked by Enthusiastic and Passionate Examples of Devotion to God

Participants and their Responsibility	Key Components	Time Commitment
<u>Newly Hired Lay Principal</u> : grow in the “And Then Some” qualities through reflective analysis of his or her skills	“And Then Some” Focus: <i>To foster a sense of family where students must thrive with others, and prepare students to serve each other, the community, and the Church</i>	One Calendar Year
<u>Mentor</u> : guide the principal in completing all aspects of the Catholic principal competencies	Use of On-Boarding Plan to check tasks such as: <i>understanding of school governance, strategic planning for school’s future vitality, managing personnel through lens of Catholic teaching, stewardship of resources, development, fundraising, and marketing</i>	Weekly Meetings
<u>Pastor</u> : meet with the mentor and mentee to discuss areas of faith development and leadership	Spiritual Guidance <i>focused on the demonstration of leadership marked by enthusiastic and passionate</i>	Monthly Meetings

	<i>examples of devotion to God</i>	
<u>Director of Education:</u> provide summative feedback for mentors and mentees.	Coordinate the Program to ensure that the principal is supported and growth occurs	Monthly Meetings

As Table 5.1 organizes the main components of a mentoring framework that incorporates characteristics from each of the two programs analyzed.

First, the researcher suggests that the mentoring framework embody the holistic components of University of Notre Dame program (See Table 4.8). Notre Dame’s stated root beliefs and core values are interwoven throughout their program’s course work and field experiences. It is suggested that the same strong alignment of core beliefs and values be central to any initiative to mentor new Catholic School principal candidates. One of these beliefs is that a Catholic school principal must foster a sense of family where student must thrive with others and should also prepare students to serve each other, the community, and the Church.

The second component of the proposed framework is modeled after the Loyola University Chicago On-Boarding Plan (See Table 4.8). This plan identifies competencies for the candidate to complete that are aligned with the standards and benchmarks of the National Standards and Benchmarks for Effective Catholic Elementary and Secondary Schools.

The researcher identified six task driven traits unique to the Loyola University Chicago program (see Table 4.8) unique to managing a Catholic school. They include: understanding the unique nature and structure of school governance, strategic planning for the school’s future vitality, managing personnel through the lens of Catholic

teachings, stewardship of the school's resources, development, fundraising, and marketing.

As a result of this study the “And Then Some” competencies that a principal at a Catholic school should master will be enhanced. Both programs identified several of these competencies which are unique to a Catholic school leader (See Table 4.7). The first of these competencies is that the principal is responsible for maintaining and strengthening the school's Catholic identity and positive culture and environment. The principal can accomplish this by leadership marked by enthusiastic and passionate examples of devotion to God and by following the course charted by the diocese and the school's mission.

Another responsibility of the Catholic school principal is the growth of each student's success academically and growth spiritually. Additionally, the principal is a collaborator who works with parents to ensure the success of every student. Finally, the Catholic school principal is an innovator while building a culture of continuous learning. This continuous leaning culture includes professional learning, but more importantly, involves faith development and spiritual growth for the entire school community.

The next critical component of the proposed framework for training Catholic school principals in the Altoona-Johnstown Diocese is the use of a team to guide the development of the newly hired lay principals. Each member of the team would have a specific role crucial to the support and development of the new principals. The model for the team approach was taken from the Loyola University Chicago Principal Preparation Program with one notable addition taken from the University of Notre Dame program.

The crucial addition to the support team in the proposed action plan is the inclusion of a pastor to provide spiritual guidance and support.

The first member of the team is the newly hired lay principal. Ultimately, the principal is expected to take the initiative to broaden their professional experiences and to complete the competencies outlined on the On-Boarding Plan. The principal is expected to grow in the “And Then Some” qualities through reflective analysis of his or her skills.

Assisting and providing guidance in this growth process is the mentor. A mentor should be a veteran Catholic school principal, preferably from the same diocese. This is advantageous because of the familiarity of the school system structure, funding system, and the Bishop’s leadership and initiatives.

The responsibilities of the mentor in this framework would resemble those of the Coach in the Loyola University Chicago internship model. The primary responsibility is to mentor the principal in completing all aspects of the Catholic principal competencies. The mentor should meet weekly with the principal to provide feedback on the principal’s performance. The principal will follow the Catholic Principal Competencies described in this study. These competencies will serve as the structure for discussions between the mentor and principal. The competencies used for assessment in the proposed framework are modified and adapted from the original plan created by Michael Boyle, Sandria Morten, and Richard Guerin in 2013 for the Center for Catholic School Effectiveness at the School of Education- Loyola University Chicago.

The third member of the team would be a pastor in the diocese who would be committed to monthly meetings with the mentor and mentee to discuss areas of faith development and leadership.

Coordinating the team would be the Director of Education. The director's role, would be much like that of the Coordinator of Coaches in the Loyola University Chicago internship experience. In the university setting, the faculty supervisor provides summative feedback at the end of each semester, and meets with the mentor principal and candidate periodically. In the proposed framework, the role would be similar. The director serves as a guide for the mentors. In addition, the director would meet monthly to provide feedback to the mentors and principals as the competencies are discussed and assessed.

Unlike the university principal preparation program, the proposed action plan would be an accelerated training program for Catholic school principals currently working in the field. Coursework is replaced by on-the-job experiences and discussions with members of the support team. The proposed framework for this accelerated Catholic school principal support program would last for one year. This should provide enough time for the principal to complete the Catholic School Principal Competencies. More time could be provided if necessary.

Once completed, the action plan will be presented to the Director of Education for the Diocese of Altoona-Johnstown. This framework for a structured mentoring program could be adopted to guide the unique leadership requirements of newly hired lay principals.

Contributions to the Field

One of the most critical elements of an exemplary principal preparation program is the inclusion of field-based experiences (Creighton, 2005; Lauder, 2000; Reames, 2010). The amount of time spent in the field is not as important as the quality of the

activities which must be well structured and relevant to the future leader's responsibilities (Bizzell & Creighton, 2010). These activities should be aligned to professional standards derived from the state or organizational policy (Kersten, Tybus, & White, 2009).

Because of the importance of the principal's impacting student achievement, their preparation is coming under more scrutiny by legislators and policy makers (Anderson & Reynolds, 2015; Lewis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010). "It should be argued that the same attention being given to public school principal preparation programs must also be granted formation programs for Catholic school principals" (Boyle, 2016).

Standard 6 of the National Standards and Benchmarks for Effective Catholic Elementary and Secondary Schools (NSBECS) (Ozar & Weitzel-O'Neil, 2010) states that, "An excellent Catholic school has a qualified leader/leadership team empowered by the governing body to realize and implement the school's mission and vision." This standard is underscored by Benchmark 6.1 that states, "The leader/leadership team meets national, and state, and/or (arch) diocesan requirements for school leadership preparation and licensing to serve as the faith and instructional leader of the school."

What is significant about that phrase is "faith and instructional leader."? The effective Catholic school leader is to be both the "faith and instructional leader." Across the country, university principal training programs focus on alignment with adopted leadership standards to meet certification/licensure requirements. At issue then is how do university programs also prepare candidate in the necessary faith leadership components that are so critical to leading effective Catholic schools? (Boyle, 2016)?

This study identified similarities and differences in two university Catholic school principal preparation programs. The examination of how they prepare future principals to become faith leaders was central to this study. The information identified in this program evaluation could be used to further strengthen Catholic school principal preparation programs in the future.

The Action Plan proposed as a result of this study could add to the field of knowledge about training newly hired lay principals for Catholic schools. Once implemented, the Action Plan's effectiveness could be measured in future studies.

Implications and Implications for Social Justice

The challenges of the Catholic school principal are many, with the duties and responsibilities similar to a secular counterpart in the roles of educational leader and managerial leader. In addition, the Catholic school principal has the duty of serving as the faith leader or spiritual leader, guiding the faith development and faith life of all constituents within the school (Rieckhoff, 2014). "The spiritual leader role focuses on faith development and building the Christian community as well as facilitating the moral and ethical development of those in the school community" (p.26). This role as spiritual leader is grounded in the knowledge of the history and philosophy of the Catholic Church.

The responsibilities of a Catholic school principal are many. Ozar (2010) states, "you must be a strong leader and an excellent professional educator...the job is consuming...the school climate is created by the principal. Catholic school principals need to be committed faith-filled Catholics; they also need to be bright and generous" (pp.115-116).

“The scope of the role of faith leader continues to expand at a challenging time for the Roman Catholic Church, with declining Mass attendance, families not practicing their faith, yet sending their children to a Catholic school, and other examples of disconnectedness with parish life” (Rieckhoff, 2014, p. 31),

Questions concerning the sustainability of Catholic school ethos with an increasing number of non-Catholic students has presented concerns with, amongst other things, religious relativism affecting both Catholic teachers and students as well as raising the difficulties of creating and maintaining a Catholic school faith community. There is a spiritual nature of the Catholic school administrator’s role. The Catholic schools have a spiritual mission and the administrators must act responsibly to ensure the integrity of that mission in their schools. (Donlevy, 2007).

Therefore, principals play a critical role in embracing and creatively building a Catholic character and culture in their schools; the principal is the key leader of the Catholic school. Many principals indicated a lack of preparation for the position (Belemonte, & Cranston, 2009).

Catholic school leadership continues to transition from religious to lay with religious or clergy representing only 2.8% of the teaching staff in Catholic schools (McDonald & Schultz, 2014). The Church has acknowledged the need to develop principal preparation programs that intentionally cultivate the candidates as spiritual leaders (USCCB, 2006).

As lay leaders replace religious men and women in Catholic schools dioceses, Congregational sponsors can no longer assume that principal candidates will possess working knowledge of the Catholic faith and Catholic school governance structures or the

skills needed to build a faith community within the educational community (NCEA, 2009).

Central to the mission of the Church is the work of Catholic schools. The National Standards and Benchmarks for Effective Catholic Elementary and Secondary Catholic Schools (NSBECS) had stated, “An excellent Catholic school has a qualified leader/leadership team empowered by the governing body to realize and implement the school’s mission and vision.”

Central to the principal’s role is that of faith leader and helping others with faith development. The faith aspect of a Catholic school is what gives it a unique quality. In an era when so much has been placed on the shoulders of the principal the need for ongoing mentoring and supports become essential. The continued success and development of the principal is linked to the supports and systematic processes for their growth and expertise in the position (Reickhoff, 2014).

An increasingly more important role of the school principal is that of a leader for social justice. Today, principal preparation programs must equip leaders to take on these challenges. Closing achievement gaps and mitigating the marginalized practices often embedded in schools are a few of the challenges which require educational leadership programs that effectively prepare school principals who can meet the most pressing school challenges and who, in particular strive for social justice ends (Hernandez & McKenzie, 2010). It has been suggested by McKenzie, Christman, Hernandez, Capper, Dantley, Gonzales, Cambron-McCabe and Scheurich, (2008) that to address the inequities that exist in schools today, educational leadership programs must feature elements that explicitly prepare leaders to lead for social justice.

A leadership program emphasizing social justice should train principals to develop inclusive practices where aspiring school leaders can ‘recognize structures that pose barriers to students’ progress and create proactive structures and systems of support for all students at the macro and micro levels” (McKenzie et al, 2008, p. 126). These preparation programs must also help their future leaders to identify socially-just teaching practices as to support the development of socially-just teachers (Hernandez & Bell McKenzie, 2010). Hernandez and Bell McKenzie state, “The new teaching and learning requires faculty in leadership programs to provide future leaders with genuine-not staged-opportunities to learn about effective teaching” (2010).

Previously, principal preparation programs have provided future school leaders with insufficient training in the process of becoming socially just leaders according to Hernandez and Bell McKenzie, (2010). The typical induction period for new principals does not feature on-going feedback. An enhanced preparation program would include an induction period lasting between two to five years which would include additional coursework, ongoing support and a network of school leaders for the enhancement of social justice (Hernandez & Bell McKenzie, 2010).

Closing achievement gaps and mitigating the marginalizing practices often embedded in structures of schooling are a few of the challenges which require educational leadership programs that effectively prepare school principals who can meet the most pressing school challenges and who, in particular, strive for social justice ends (Hernandez & McKenzie, 2010). McKenzie, Christman, Hernandez, Capper, Dantley, Gonzales, Cambron-McCabe, and Scheurich, (2008) have suggested that to address the

inequities that exist in schools today, educational leadership programs must feature elements that explicitly prepare leaders to lead for social justice.

The selection of students for a principal preparation program is critical to the development of social justice leaders (McKenzie et al., 2008). “Because, in general, students complete principal preparation programs quickly (an average of two year), students should quickly acquire an understanding of-or quickly enhance their existing understanding of social justice work” (Hernandez & Bell McKenzie, 2010, p. 51).

To develop socially-just school leaders, the preparation programs must help their future principals in identifying socially-just teaching practices and in supporting the development of socially-just teachers (Hernandez & Bell McKenzie, 2010). “The new teaching and learning requires faculty in leadership programs to provide future leaders with genuine-not staged-opportunities to learn about effective teaching” (Hernandez & Bell McKenzie, 2010, p.52).

A social justice leadership program should train principals to develop inclusive practices where aspiring school leaders can “recognize structures that pose barriers to students’ progress and create proactive structures and systems of support for all students at the macro and micro levels” (McKenzie et al., 2008, p. 126). Leadership programs should address school structures that segregate and isolate students from each other and that include pull-out programs from particular school groups (Frattura & Capper, 2007). A proactive system of support requires school leaders to reallocate resources so that integrated learning environments can exist for students (Hernandez & Bell McKenzie, 2010).

“Traditionally, principal preparation programs have provided future school leaders with insufficient training in the process of becoming socially just leaders” (Hernandez & Bell McKenzie, 2010 p. 52). Typically, the principals’ induction period features no on-going feedback. An enhanced preparation program would include an induction period lasting between two and five years which would include additional coursework, ongoing support and a network of school leader for the enhancement of social justice (Hernandez & Bell McKenzie, 2010).

“Social justice is a major concern for many contemporary educational scholars and practitioners” (Furman, 2011, p. 2). As Blackmore (2009) points out, “increased accountability has focused system and media attention on social inequality” so that the “state is no longer able to ignore issues of educational inequality” (p.8). Within the field of educational leadership, many scholars are exploring the meanings of social justice, the nature of leadership for social justice and the implications for leadership preparation programs. Currently, the literature offers little about the actual practice of social justice leadership in K-12 schools and the current capacities needed by school leaders to engage in this practice. The literature is thin regarding explicit methods for developing these capacities (Furman, 2011). “Current preparation programs aimed toward social justice tend to focus on critical consciousness... [and] find it difficult to prepare leaders to acquire the actual skills needed to make equity-based changes in schools” (Capper, Theoharis, and Sebastian, 2006, p. 218).

A common understanding among many leadership scholars is that social justice focuses on the experiences of marginalized groups and inequities in educational opportunities and outcomes (Furman, 2011). “The concept of social justice focuses

on...those groups that are most often overserved, underrepresented, and undereducated and that face various forms of oppression in schools” (Dantley & Tillman, 2010, p.23). Theoharis (2007) adds that social justice means “addressing and eliminating marginalization in schools” (p. 223). The leadership for social justice involves identifying and undoing these oppressive and unjust practices and replacing them with more equitable, culturally appropriate ones, (Furman, 2011). Leadership for social justice investigates and poses solutions for issues that generate and reproduce societal inequities (Dantley & Tillman, 2010). “Social justice leadership is a critical building block in the educational equity project” (Marshall, Young, & Moll, 2010, p. 315).

Much of the literature around leadership for social justice centers on common themes. These themes for social justice leadership in schools include: action oriented and transformative, committed and persistent, inclusive and democratic, relational and caring, reflective, and oriented toward a socially just pedagogy (Furman, 2011).

Social justice leaders are proactive change agents who are engaged in transformative leadership (Shields, 2003). To do the work of a transformative leader, one must first “develop a heightened and critical awareness of oppression, exclusion, and marginalization” (Brooks & Miles, 2006, p. 5). This critical awareness makes it possible for school leaders to imagine and construct “new institutional possibilities” (Goldfarb & Grinberg, 2002, p. 162). Social justice leaders are activists, continually working for substantive change in their schools (Brooks et al., 2007; Jansen, 2006; Jean-Marie, 2008; Lopez et al., 2010; Theoharis, 2007). Rapp (2002) summarized this theme for social justice by noting that “Leaders for social justice...resist, dissent, rebel, subvert, possess

oppositional imaginations and are committed to transforming oppressive and exploitative social relations in and out of schools” (p. 226).

Social justice leaders are committed and persistent (Furman, 2011). These traits are necessary if one is to function as a transformative, activist change agent in challenging contexts. School leaders are required to be deeply committed to a social justice agenda and be “stubbornly persistent” in their efforts (Scheurich & Skrla, 2003).

Inclusive and democratic are two more identified traits of socially just leaders (Furman, 2011). To address social justice and marginalization issues, educational leaders work to create more inclusive practices within their schools (Cooper, 2009; Gerstl-Pepin & Aiken, 2009; Giles et al., 2005; Goldfarb & Grinberg, 2002; Lopez et al., 2010; Merchant & Shoho, 2010; Riehl, 2000; Riester et al., 2002; Ryan, 2006; Theoharis & Causton-Theoharis, 2008; Wasonga, 2009). Often, inclusion is considered to be the same condition as social justice. “Those who promote inclusion believe that social justice can be achieved if people are meaningfully included in institutional practices and processes” (Ryan, 2006, p.5).

Not only should socially just leaders demonstrate inclusive and democratic practices, they should do so in caring ways. “Social justice leaders work to develop caring relationships based in authentic communication” (Furman, 2011, p.7). Social justice leadership should be relationship-driven, holistic, and morally grounded because relationships are at the crux of educational leadership (Dantley, Beachum, & McCray, 2008). Theoharis (2007) adds that principals who are motivated to work towards social justice and equity build relationships by using purposeful and authentic communication. The communicative practices are important in the context of diversity because real

dialogue can assist marginalized groups to be meaningfully included in cultural institutions such as schools. The right dialogical practices provide bridges bringing together disparate and different communities in ways that enable them to overcome powerful barriers (Ryan, 2007).

School leaders for social justice are oriented toward a socially just pedagogy (Furman, 2011). Social justice leaders should continuously examine whether student learning is equitable for all student groups. They should encourage teachers to critically examine their practices for possible bias in regard to race, class, and gender (Kose, 2007). Socially just educational leaders must be proactive in orienting and organizing instruction. They should rethink “the nature of curriculum around the values of social justice” (Furman & Shields, 2005, p. 130).

An attribute that encompasses all of the previous traits of socially just leaders is self-reflection. “As a basis for their leadership practice, social justice leaders engage in critical self-reflection aimed at personal awareness and growth. This self-reflection is seen as a way for leaders to identify and come to grips with their prejudices and assumptions arising from their cultural backgrounds” (Furman, 2011, p.7). This critical self-reflection includes the “deep examination of personal assumptions, values, and beliefs” (Brown, 2004, p. 89). Dantley (2005) calls for the “psychology of critical self-reflection” which is when “the educational leader comes to grips with his or her own identity” (p.503).

To better prepare socially just school leaders the programs devoted to their development “should promote opportunities for critical reflection, leadership praxis, critical discourse, and develop critical pedagogy related to issues of ethics, inclusion,

democratic schooling, and social justice” (Jean-Marie et al. 2009, p. 20). Hafner (2006, 2010) adds that preparation programs should model social justice teaching by attending to students’ personal safety, providing guidelines for group behavior, supporting the personal experience of the student as learner, and attending to social relations within the educational leadership classroom.

The term social entrepreneurship first appeared in the literature in the 1970’s (Banks, 1972). The concept gained popularity a decade later when several foundations promoting social entrepreneurs as change agents emerged (Dees, 2001; Schlee, Curren, & Harich, 2009; Thompson & Doherty, 2006). Martin and Osberg (2007) placed emphasis on the belief that social entrepreneurship begins with the identification of a situation of exclusion, marginalization, or suffering. These situations could include: unfair trade practices, health care disparities, threatened ecosystems, or educational inequalities. The social entrepreneur combines “inspiration, creativity, direct action, courage, and fortitude” (p. 35) to confront these injustices.

This notion of social entrepreneurship is aligned with Catholic social justice teaching. Catholic social teaching has long held that economic, social, political, and cultural development should reduce oppression and serve the common good (Benedict XVI, 2009; Paul VI, 1967). The Catholic Church emphasizes the importance of providing an education for all, with a preference for those on societies’ margins (Tomasi, 2008). The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (2005) urged reform in the nation’s Catholic schools that make them available, accessible, and affordable. Social entrepreneurship describes efforts to create such reform through innovative financing

structures that replace tuition-based approaches or novel service delivery models that create accessibility for students with special needs (Whipp & Scanlan, 2009).

Social entrepreneurship in schools in the form of ambitious, resourceful, strategic, and results-oriented innovations and innovators have been increasingly recognized as the key to many effective school improvement reforms (Fullan, 1997; Hess, 2008; Levine, 2006). Bryk and Gomez (2008) contend that social entrepreneurs can promote research and design that “transform the ways we develop and support school professionals; the tools, materials, ideas and evidence with which they work; and the instructional opportunities we afford students for learning” (p. 182).

By focusing on educating traditionally marginalized students, Catholic schools that are socially entrepreneurial can develop effective service delivery models for students with special needs or limited English proficiency and, at the same time, develop financing and governance structures that promote vibrant schools for such students that are not tuition dependent (Whipp & Scanlan, 2009).

Limitations

The researcher acknowledges limitations to this study. The data gathered for this study came solely from the web sites of the University of Notre Dame, and Loyola University Chicago. Although, the information from these websites provided the researcher with ample information to conduct a program evaluation, more information could have been gathered from the participants, instructors, and mentors involved in the programs.

Second, there were no data available from the websites to support claims of effectiveness of the mentoring programs. This aligns with the study by Crow and

Whiteman (2016) who contend that “research on mentoring and coaching still lacks rigorous examinations of the effectiveness and outcomes of mentoring programs” (p. 137). They write that large-scale studies of mentoring and coaching effectiveness across multiple programs would move the field away from viewing these leaning tools as panaceas to a more realistic understanding of their costs and benefits. Additionally, they call for empirical studies on mentor and coach selection that can inform this critical element of successful mentoring.

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) (2006) issued the following statement on the importance of Catholic schools and the need for universities to continue to prepare qualified teachers and leaders for the schools: “We must provide a sufficient number of programs of the highest quality to recruit and prepare our future diocesan and local school administrators and teachers so that they are knowledgeable in matters of our faith, are professionally prepared, and are committed to the Church. These programs will require even more active involvements and cooperation by our Catholic colleges and universities in collaboration with diocesan educational leadership (p. 272).

What training can be done for the Catholic school principals who did not attend Catholic colleges and universities? What support can be provided to them while working as newly-hired principals? These are some of the limitations that exist for current Catholic school principals in need of support for strengthening their faith leadership, while working in their new positions. The Action Plan is proposed to address these limitations.

Additional limitations are attributed to the proposed Action Plan. The plan is proposed to be used in a small diocese in south central Pennsylvania. The effectiveness of

the plan would need to be measured and analyzed in future studies before it could be considered for replication in other areas of the country.

Implications for Author's Leadership Agenda and Growth

The context for this study comes from the personal experiences of the researcher. This researcher, who had over fifteen years as a public school administrator, which included roles as assistant principal, principal, and superintendent of schools, was experienced as an educational school leader. However, as a life-long practicing Catholic, this school leader was woefully ill-equipped to meet the unique challenges facing a Catholic high school principal.

As result of this study, the researcher has gained a greater insight about how to better prepare aspiring Catholic school principals. Not only is the researcher now equipped to develop a framework for a structured mentoring program to support newly hired lay principals in the Altoona-Johnstown Diocese, he is also more knowledgeable to become an effective mentor to these principals.

The spiritual nature of administrators who were members of the clergy was inherent. However, as lay leaders replace religious men and women in Catholic schools, one can no longer assume that principal candidates will possess working knowledge of the Catholic faith and Catholic school governance structures or the skills needed to build a faith community within the educational community (NCEA, 2009).

Central to the principal's role is that of faith leader and helping others with faith development. The faith aspect of a Catholic school is what gives it a unique quality. In an era when so much has been placed on the shoulders of the principal, the need for ongoing mentoring and supports become essential. The continued success and

development of the principal is linked to the supports and systematic processes for their growth and expertise in the position (Rieckhoff, 2014).

Since highly skilled school leaders are not born, nor do they emerge from leadership programs fully prepared to lead, how will they acquire the knowledge and confidence to become effective leaders? It is generally recognized that new principals will need guidance from more experienced school leaders in their early years of administration (Searby, 2008). “Workplace mentoring is critical for inexperienced school leaders as to provide a bridge between theory learned in graduate school and the complex realities of contemporary school leadership. Although formal mentoring processes are often designed primarily to fulfill organizational needs, mentoring is essentially about learning” (NAESP, 2003).

So much knowledge can be exchanged by a solid mentoring experience. “A healthy mentoring relationship is a prime example of adults engaging in a learning endeavor together” (Searby, 2008). Zachary (2005) writes that mentoring is the quintessential expression of self-directed learning because the individual is responsible for his or her learning.

A sound mentoring program will address issues of Social justice. Much of the literature around social justice leadership in schools centers on common themes such as: action oriented and transformative, committed and persistent, inclusive and democratic, relational and caring, reflective and oriented toward a socially just pedagogy (Furman, 2011). Each of these themes could be topics for growth in a structured mentoring program. In the Catholic tradition, the first use of the term ‘social justice’ appeared in

the writings of an Italian Jesuit, Luigi Taparelli d'Azeglio in 1840 (Newman, 1954, Shields, 1941). His writing drew on the earlier writings of Thomas Aquinas.

Catholic schooling for social justice should foster teaching and learning communities that are inclusive of students across multiple dimensions of diversity. Catholic social justice teaching emphasizes the dignity of the human person and prioritizes creating options for the poor; the institutional Catholic Church consistently calls on Catholic schools to enact this teaching (Congregation for Catholic Education, 1998, 2007; Grace, 2003). To emphasize this mission the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (2005) directed Catholic educators to make their schools accessible, affordable, and available.

Mentoring Catholic school principals is a unique process. The mentoring process for Catholic school principals must be everything that it is for public school principals, “and then some.” Catholic school principals should be mentored to understand that they create a community of leaders and servants. Although these principals have the responsibility for leading their school, they also have the responsibility for transforming society. “This transformation is made possible when each Catholic school principal contributes to the support of the Church as a whole in supporting each principal within their own diocese” (Jacobs, 2015, p.66).

Jacobs (2015) states that mentoring in Catholic schools is a mission and a ministry. The principals in Catholic schools are responsible for academic learning. Equally as important is that they responsible for the faith development to all who are entrusted to him or her. The principals are to promote the good news of faith. St. Paul notes, “To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good”

(1Corinthians, 12:70). Jacob (2015) adds that the common good is developed and promoted constantly in the faith community of learners.

Conclusions

There are significant challenges facing Catholic school principals today. None of these challenges are addressed in a secular principal preparation program. Some of these key challenges include: financial management, marketing, Catholic identity, enrollment management, and long-range planning (Schmitt, 2012).

A contemporary challenge for both Catholic and secular schools is to become simultaneously more efficient in their use of resources (e.g., human, fiscal, material, and tools) and more ambitious in their outcome aims that include the elimination of gaps in achievement across race and class (Byrk, 2008, 2009).

This study is an examination of ways to better prepare Catholic school principals who feel ill-prepared to be faith leaders. Boyle (2016) states that because Catholic school principal demands are so unique, explicit development in faith-leadership skills, while also developing the requisite instructional leadership skill is essential. Without specific development in both of these leadership areas, Catholic schools will not have the qualified leaders they need to ensure their survival. Since there is a spiritual nature of the role of Catholic school administrators, they must act responsibly to ensure the integrity of the mission of their schools (Donlevey, 2007).

With the use of an effective mentoring program which strengthens their “And Then Some” qualities, the newly hired lay principals in the Altoona-Johnstown Diocese, like David, will become better equipped to face and overcome their Goliath like challenges.

References

- Adams, J., & Copeland, M. (2007). When learning counts: Rethinking licenses for school leaders. Retrieved July 10, 2017 from *Wallace Foundation website*: <http://www.wallacefoundatin.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/statepolicy/Documents/When-Learning-Counts-Rethinking-Licenses-for-School-Leaders.pdf>.
- Akin, L., & Hilbun, J. (2007). E-mentoring in three voices. *Online Journal of Distance Administration*, 10(1).
- Alsbury, T., L. & Hackman, D. G. (2006). Learning from experience: Initial findings of a mentoring/induction program for novice principals and superintendents. *Planning and Changing*, 37(3/4), 169.
- Anderson, E., & Reynolds, A. (2015). A policymaker's guide: Research-based policy for principal preparation program approval and licensure. University Council for Educational Administration. Retrieved from <http://3fl712qoj4l3y63p2tqpwra.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/UCEA-State-Policy-Report-website-version-Nov2015-v2.pdf>.
- Archer, J. (2005). Study blasts leadership programs. *Education Week*, 24(27), 1-18.
- Arrupe, P. (1994). Men for others. In C. E. Melrose (Ed.), *Foundations* (pp. 31-40). Washington, D.C.: Jesuit Secondary Education Association. (Original work published in 1974).
- Ausubel, D., P. (1968). *Educational psychology: A cognitive view*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

- Azzam, A. (2005). The unprepared administrator. *Educational Leadership*, 62(8), 88-89.
- Baker, S. D. (2007). Followership: The theoretical foundation of a contemporary construct. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 14(1), 50-60.
- Baker, D. R., & Riordan, C. (1998). The “eliting” of the common American Catholic school and the national education crisis. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(1), 16-23.
- Baker, B.D., Orr, M.T., & Young, M.D. (2007), Academic drift, institutional production, and professional distribution of graduate degrees in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(5), 279-318. journal.sagepub.com.
- Banks, J. A. (1972). *The sociology of social movements*. London: Macmillan.
- Barbour, J. D. (2005). Non-university-based principal preparation programs: Analysis and discussion of findings. Paper presented at the Convention of the University Council for Educational Administration, Nashville, TN.
- Bargal, D., & Schmid, H. (1989). Recent themes in theory and research on leadership and their implications for management of the human services. *Administration and social work*, 13(3-4). 37-54.
- Barnard, C. (1987). The theory of authority in L. E. Boone & D. D. Bowen (Eds.). *The great writings in management and organizational behavior* (2nd ed., pp. 92-104), New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Beal, J. P., Coriden, J. A., & Green, T. J. (Eds.). (2000). *New commentary on the code of cannon law*. New York: Paulist Press.

- Beck, L. G. (1994). *Reclaiming educational administration as a caring profession*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Belmonte, A., & Cranston, N. (2009). The religious dimension of lay leadership in Catholic schools: Preserving Catholic culture in an era of change. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 12(3), 294-319.
- Benedict XVI. (2009). *Caritas in veritate* [Human development in charity and truth]. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana. Retrieved July, 6, 2017, from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedicct_xvi/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvienc_20090629_caritas-in-veritate_en.html
- Benedict of Nuseia. (1949). *The holy rule of St. Benedict* (B. Verheyen, Trans.). Atchison, KA: St. Benedict's Abbey. Retrieved July 12, 2017, from <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/benedict/rule2/files/rule2.html> (original work published 530).
- Berg, D. N. (1998). Resurrecting the muse: Followership in organizations. *The psychodynamics of leadership*, 27-52.
- Board, Southern Regional Education. (2005). *The principal internship: How can we get it right*. Atlanta, GA: Author.
- Bottoms, G., & Fry, B., (2009). *The district leadership challenge: Empowering principals to improve teaching and learning*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Boyle, M. J. (2016). Introduction to the focus section: Preparing leaders in light of the standards. *Journal of Catholic Education*, 19(3). Retrieve on July 14, 2017 from, <http://dxdoi.org/10.15365/joce.1903142016>

- Bizzell, B., & Creighton, T. (2010). Using a leadership practice field to develop aspiring principals. Retrieved July 16, 2017, from <http://cnx.org/content/m35638/1.1/>
- Blackmore, J. (2009). Leadership for social justice: A transnational dialogue. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 4(1), Article 5. Retrieved July 6, 2017, from <http://www.ucea.org/jrle>.
- Blasé, J. R., & Blasé, J. (2003). *Handbook of instructional leadership: How successful principals promote teaching and learning* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Boyle, M., Morten, S. & Guerin, R., (2013), Catholic school competencies, Center for Catholic School Effectiveness, School of Education, Loyola University Chicago.
- Boyle, M. J., Haller, A., & Hunt, E., (2016), The leadership challenge: preparing and developing Catholic school principals. *Journal of Catholic Education*, 19(3), 293.
- Bracheare, M., & Ramirez, M. (2005, February 25). Latino, black parishes hit hardest by decision. *Chicago Tribune*. Retrieved June, 17, 2017, from <http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/cjo-05002250210feb25,1,3629470.story?coll=chi-newsloca-held>.
- Brooks, J. S., & Miles, M. (2006). From scientific management to social justice....and back again? Pedagogical shifts in the study and practice of educational leadership. *International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning*, 10, Article 21. Retrieved June, 15, 2017, from <http://ucalgary.ca/iejll>
- Brooks, J. S., Jean-Marie, G., Normore, A. H., & Hodgins, D. W. (2007). Distributed leadership for social justice: Exploring how influence and equity are stretched over an urban high school. *Journal of School Leadership*, 17(4) 378-408.

- Brown, K. M. (2004). Leadership for social justice and equity: Weaving a transformative framework and pedagogy. *Educational administration quarterly*, 40(1), 77-108.
- Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational researcher*, 18(1), 32-42.
- Brownridge, J. (2009). *Effective Catholic school principals and what they do*. Ajax, Ontario: Education Administrator Associates.
- Byrk, A. (2008). Catholic schools, Catholic education, and Catholic educational research: A conversation with Anthony Byrk. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 12(2), 135-147.
- Byrk, A. (2009, January). *Catholic schools and the common good: Future directions and challenges*. Paper presented at the Catholic Higher Education Collaborative Conference, Los Angeles, CA.
- Byrk, A. S., & Gomez, L. (2008). The future of educational entrepreneurship: Possibilities for school reform. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Byrk, A. S., Lee, V. E., & Holland, P. B. (1993). *Catholic schools and the common good*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Capper, C. A., Theoharis, G., & Sebastian, J. (2006). *Toward a framework for preparing leaders for social justice*. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44(3), 209-224.
- Cardona, P. (2000). Transcendental leadership. *The Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 21(4), 201-206.

- Carlin, P., d'Arbon, T., Dorman, D., Duignan, P., & Neidhart, H. (2003). *Leadership succession for Catholic schools in Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania: Final report*. Strathfield, New South Wales, Australia: Australian Catholic University.
- Carlin, P., & Neidhart, H. (2004, November/December). *Developing school leaders with the commitment and capacity to pursue the common good*. Paper presented at the Association for Research in Education Conference, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.
- Cassidy, F. P. (1949). Catholic education in the third plenary council of Baltimore. *The Catholic Historical Review*, 34(4), 414-436. Retrieved June 15, 2017, from, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25014953>.
- Chaleff, I. (1995). *The courageous follower: Standing up to and for our leaders*. San Francisco, Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Chao, G. T., Waltz, P. M., & Gardner, P. D. (1992). Formal and informal mentorships: A comparison on mentoring functions and contrast with nonmentoring counterparts. *Personnel Psychology*, 45, 619-636.
- Chubbuck, S. M. (2007). Socially just teaching and the complementarity of Ignatian pedagogy and critical pedagogy. *Christian High Education*, 6(3), 239-265.
- Cibulka, J. G., O'Brien, T. J., & Zewe, D. (1982). *Inner-city private elementary schools: A study*. Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press.
- Ciriello, M. (1994). *The principal as spiritual leader: Volume II*, Washington, DC: Department of Education, United States Catholic Conference Inc.

- Clayton, J. K., Sanzo, K. L., & Myran, S. (2013) Understanding mentoring in leadership development: Perspectives of district administrators and aspiring leaders. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 8(1), 77-96.
- Codd, A. (2003). The school and parish: Changing patterns of involvement. In N. Prendergast & L. Monahan (Eds.), *Reimagining the Catholic school* (pp. 128-140). Dublin, Ireland: Veritas.
- Code of Canon Law: Latin-English Edition (1983). Washington, DC: Cannon Law Society of America.
- Cohn, K. C., & Sweeney, R. C. (1992). "Principal mentoring programs: are school district providing the leadership?" paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA, April 22.
- Coleman, J. S., Hoffer, T., & Kilgore, S. (1982). *High school achievement: Public, Catholic and private compared*. New York: Basic Books.
- Collard, J. (2003). Principal wellbeing in complex times. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 31(1), 2-14.
- Congregation for Catholic Education. (1998). *The Catholic school on the threshold of the third millennium*. Rome: Vatican Polyglot Press.
- Congregation for Catholic Education. (2007). *Educating together in Catholic schools: A shared mission between consecrated persons and lay faithful*. Rome: Vatican Polyglot Press.
- Congregation for Catholic Education. (1977). *The Catholic school*. Strathfield, New South Wales, Australia: St. Pauls.

- Congregation for Catholic Education. (1982). *Lay Catholics in schools: Witnesses to faith*. Strathfield, New South Wales, Australia: St. Pauls.
- Congregation for Catholic Education. (1988). *The religious dimension of education in a Catholic school*. Strathfield, New South Wales, Australia: St. Pauls.
- Congregation for Catholic Education. (2002). *Consecrated persons and their mission in schools: Reflections and guidelines*. Boston: Pauline.
- Copeland, M., & Knapp, M. (2006). *Connecting leadership with Learning: A framework for reflection, planning and action*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Cook, T., J. (2001a). *Architects of Catholic culture: Designing and building Catholic culture in Catholic schools*. Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association.
- Cook, T., J. (2001b). Recruitment, preparation, and retention of Catholic high school religion teachers. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 4(4), 530-554.
- Cook, T., J. (2004a). Charism: A Catholic school's mark of distinction. *Momentum*, 35(1), 18-21.
- Cook, T., J. (2004b, August). *Responding to leadership challenges in Catholic education in the US: The lived reality*. Paper presented at the Third International Conference on Catholic Education Leadership, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.
- Cooper, C. W. (2009). Performing cultural work in demographically changing school: Implications for expanding transformative leadership frameworks. *Educational administration quarterly*, 45(5), 694-724.

- Covey, J. J. (1992). *Catholic schools make a difference: Twenty-five years of research*. Washington, D. C.: National Catholic Education Association.
- Creighton, T. (2005). Toward a leadership practice field. Retrieved July 19, 2017, from <http://cnx.org/content/m12743/1.8/>
- Cremin, L. A. (1957). *The republic and the school: Horace Mann on the education of free men*. New York: Teachers College.
- Crow, G., & Matthews, L. J. (1998). *Finding one's way: How mentoring can lead to dynamic leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Crow, G., & Whiteman, R. S. (2016). Effective preparation program features: A literature review. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 11(1), 120-148.
- d'Arbon, T. (2003, September). *Future principals for schools of the future*. Paper presented at the National ACEL Conference Council for Educational Leaders, Darling Harbour, New South Wales, Australia.
- d'Arbon, T., Duignan, P., & Duncan, D. J. (2002). Planning for future leadership of schools: An Australian study. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40(5), 468-485.
- Dantley, M. E. (2005). The power of critical spirituality to act and to reform. *Journal of School Leadership*, 15(5), 500.
- Dantley, M., Beachum, F., & McCray, C. (2009). Exploring the intersectionality of multiple centers within notions of social justice. *Journal of School Leadership*, 18(2), 124-133.

- Dantley, M. E., & Tillman, L. C. (2010). *Social justice and moral transformative leadership*. In Marshall, C., Oliva, M. (Eds.), *Leadership for social justice* (2nd ed., pp.19-34). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Darder, A., Baltodano, M., & Torres, R. D. (2003). *The critical pedagogy reader*. New York: Routledge Falmer Press.
- Daresh, J., C. (2007). Mentoring for beginning principals; Revisiting the past or preparing for the future?. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, 20(4).
- Daresh, J. C., & Playko, M. A. (1995, April). Mentoring in educational leadership development: What are the responsibilities of the protégés? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco. ED 381 874.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Meyerson, D., LaPointe, M., & Orr, M. T. (2010). *Preparing principals for a changing world: Lessons from effective school leadership programs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., Meyerson, D., Orr, M. T., Cohen, C. (2007). *Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Lessons from exemplary leadership development programs*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Educational Leadership Institute, Stanford University. Retrieved July 17, 2017, from, <http://srnleads.org>.
- Davis, S. H., & Leon, R. J. (2011). How not to prepare school principals. *Planning and Changing*, 42(3), 274-287.

- Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., Meyerson, D., & LaPointe, M. (2005). *Review of research. School leadership study. Developing successful principals*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.
- Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (2003). *Shaping school culture: The heart of leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Dees, J. G., (2001). The meaning of “social entrepreneurship.” Durham, NC: Duke Center for Advancement of Social Entrepreneurship. Retrieved July 2, 2017, from http://www.caseatduke.org/documents/dees_sedef.pdf.
- deJanasz, S. C., Ensher, E. A., & Heun, C. (2008). Virtual relationships and real benefits: using e-mentoring to connect business students with practicing managers. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnerships in Learning*, 16(4), 394-411.
- Department of Education and Training. (2004). *The privilege and the price: A study of principal class workload and its impact on health and wellbeing*. Melbourne, Victoria, Australia: Author.
- Documents of the thirty-second congregation of the Society of Jesus*. (1975). Washington, D. C.: The Jesuit Conference.
- Donlevy, J.K. (2007). Non-Catholic students impact on Catholic teachers in four Catholic high schools. *Religious Education*, 102(1), 4-24.
- Doolittle, P. E. (1997). Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development as a Theoretical Foundation for Cooperative Learning. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 8(1), 83-103.
- Draft, R. L. (1999). *Leadership theory and practice*. Fort Worth, TX: Dryden.

- Duignan, J., (2004). Forming capable leaders: From competencies to capabilities. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Leadership*, 19(2), 5-13.
- Duncan, H. E., & Stock, M. J. (2010). Mentoring and coaching rural school leader: What do they need?. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 18(3), 293-311.
- Dwyer, J. (2005, February 13). Once mighty. Catholic schools find status is diminished. *New York Times*, p. 37.
- Dyer, M. A. (2010). *Perception of the first year campus administrators' Texas state-mandated mentoring program*. Stephen F. Austin State University.
- Dziczkowski, J. (2013, July). Mentoring and leadership development. In *The Educational Forum*, (Vol. 77, No. 3. pp. 351-360). Taylor & Francis Group.
- Edmonds, R., (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 15-24.
- Engestrom, Y., Miettinen, R., & Punamaki, R. L. (1999). *Perspectives on activity theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Elmor, R. (2006). Breaking the cartel. *Phi Delta Kappan* (March, 2006), 517-518.
- Fenwick, T. (2007). Developing organizational practices of ecological sustainability: A learning perspective; *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 28(7), 632-645.
- Fenwick, T. J. (2003). Learning through experience: *Troubling orthodoxies and Intersecting questions*. Malabar, FL: Krieger.
- Fenzel, L. M. (2009). *Improving urban middle schools: Lessons from the Nativity schools*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

- Flynn, M. (1993). *The culture of Catholic schools: A study of Catholic schools 1972-1993*. Homebush, New South Wales, Australia: St. Pauls.
- Flynn, M., & Mok, M. (2001). *Catholic schools 2000*. Sydney, New South Wales, Australia: Catholic Education Commission.
- Follett, M. P. (1996). The essentials of leadership. In P. Graham (Ed.), Mary Parker Follett: *Prophet of management* (pp. 163-177). Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing
- Fortin, E. (1982). The new rights theory and the natural law. *The Review of Politics*, 44(4), 590-612.
- Frattura, E., & Capper, C. A. (2007). *Leading for social justice: Transforming school for all learners*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). New York: Continuum. (Original work published in 1955).
- Fullan, M. (1997). *What's worth fighting for in the principalship?* New York: Teachers College Press.
- Furman, G. (2012). Social justice leadership as praxis: Developing capacities through preparation programs. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(2), 191-229.
- Furman, G., & Shields, C. (2005). How can educational leaders promote and support social justice and democratic community in schools. *A new agenda for research in educational leadership*, 119-137.
- Galbraith, M. (2001). Mentoring development for community college faculty. *Michigan Community College Journal: Research and Practice*, 7(2), 29-39.

- Galton, F. (1900). *Hereditary genius: An inquiry into its laws and consequences* (Vol. 27). Macmillan
- Gates, S.M., Ringel, J.S., & Santibanez, L. (2003). Who is leading our schools?: An overview of school administrators and their careers, (No. 1679) Rand Corporation.
- Gerstl-Pepin, C., & Aiken, J. A. (2010). Democratic school leaders: Defining ethical leadership in standardized context. *Journal of School Leadership*, 19(4), 406-444.
- Gibbs, G. R. (2007) *Analyzing qualitative data*. London: Sage Publications.
- Gilbert, G., R. (1990). Effective leaders must be good followers too. *Government Executive*, 22(6). 58.
- Giles, C., Johnson, L. , Brooks, S., & Jacobson, S. L. (2005). Building bridges, building community: Transformational leadership in a challenging urban context. *Journal of School Leadership*, 15(5), 519.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychology theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Glassman, N., Cibulka, J., & Ashby, D. (2002). Program self-evaluation for continuous improvement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. 38(2), 257-288.
- Goldfarb, K. P., & Grinberg, J. (2001). Leadership for social justice: Authentic participation in the case of a community center in Caracas, Venezuela. *Journal of School Leadership*, 12, 157-73.
- Grace, G. (2002). *Catholic schools: Mission, markets and morality*. London: Routledge.

- Grace, G. (2003). "First and foremost the Church offers its educational service to the poor": Class, inequality and Catholic schooling in contemporary contexts. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 1(1), 35-53.
- Grace, G. (2009). On the international study of Catholic education: Why we need more systemic scholarship and research. *International Studies in Catholic Education*, 7(1), 6-14.
- Grace, G. & O'Keefe, I. M. (2007). Catholic schools facing the challenges of the 21st century: An overview. In G. Grace & J. M. O'Keefe (Eds.), *International handbook of Catholic education: Challenges for school systems in the 21st Century* (Vol. 1, pp. 1-14). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.
- Graff, S., & Pettengill, B. (2010). *Effective selection and matching criteria for mentors of beginning principals*. Saint Louis University.
- Gray, C., Fry, B., Bottoms, G., & O'Neil, K. (2007). Good principals aren't born-they're mentored: Are we investing enough to get the school leaders we need. *Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board*, 8.
- Grissom, J.A., & Loeb, S. (2011). Triangulating principal effectiveness: How perspectives of parents, teachers, and assistant principals identify the central importance of managerial skills. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(5), 1091-1123.

- Hafner, M. M. (2006). Teaching strategies for developing leaders for social justice. In Marshall, C., Oliva, M. (Eds.), *Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions in education* (pp. 167-193). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Hafner, M. M. (2010). Teaching strategies for developing leaders for social justice. In Marshall, C., Oliva, M. (Eds.), *Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions in education* (2nd ed., pp.194-218). Boston, MAA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R., (1996). Reassessing the principals' role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1995. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(1), 5-44
- Hamilton, S. W. (Ed.). (2008, April). *Who will save America's urban Catholic schools?* New York: Thomas Fordham Institute.
- Hansen, P. (1999). *Neonarrative of Catholic primary school lay principalship: Towards a reshaping of the role*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Queensland, Australia.
- Harrington, C., & Wills, B. (2005). Decertifying the principalship: The politics of administrator preparation in Florida. *Educational Policy*, 19(1), 181-200.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
- Heft, J., & Reck, C. (1991). *The Catholic identity of Catholic schools*. Washington, D. C.: National Catholic Education Association.
- Held, V. (Ed). (1995). *Justice and care: Essential readings in feminist ethics*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

- Held, V. (2007). *The ethics of care: Personal, political, and global*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Heller, T., & Van Til, J. (1982). Leadership and followership: Some summary propositions. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 18(3), 405-414.
- Hensen, P. (2000). The shape of Catholic primary school lay principalship: Round pegs in square holes? *Journal of Religious Education*, 48(4), 28-34.
- Hernandez, F., & McKenzie, K. B. (2010). Resisting social justice in leadership preparation programs: Mechanisms that subvert. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 5(3), 48-72.
- Hernandez, R., Roberts, M., & Menchaca, V. (2012). Redesigning a principal preparation program project: A continuous improvement model. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 7(3).
- Hess, F., M. (2008). *The future of educational entrepreneurship: Possibilities for school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Hess, R. M., & Kelly, A. P. (2005). The accidental principal: What doesn't get taught in educational leadership schools? *Education Next*, 5(3), 34-40.
- Hobson, A. J., & Sharp, C. (2005). Head to head: a systematic review of the research evidence on mentoring new head teachers. *School leadership & management*, 25(1), 25-42.
- Hoffer, T., Greeley, A. M., & Coleman, J. S. (1985). Achievement growth in public and Catholic schools. *Sociology of Education*, 58(2), 74-97.
- Hollander, E. P. (1974). Processes of leadership emergence. *Journal of Contemporary Business*, 3, 19-33.

- Hollander, E., P. (1992a). The essential interdependence of leadership and followership. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 1(2), 71-75.
- Hollander, E., P. (1992b). Leadership, followership, self, and others. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 3(1), 43-54.
- Hollander, E. P. (1997). How and why active followers matter in leadership. *The balance of leadership and followership*, 11-28.
- Hollander, E. P., & Offerman, L. R. (1990). Relational features of organizational leadership and followership. *Measures of leadership*, 83-97.
- Hollander, E. P., and Julian, J. W. (1969). Contemporary trends in the analysis of leadership processes. *Psychological bulletin*, 71(5), 387.
- Hollander, E. P., & Webb, W. B. (1955). Leadership, followership, and friendship: an analysis of peer nominations. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 50(2), 163.
- Howell, J. M., & Shamir, B. (2005). The role of followers in the charismatic leadership process: Relationships and their consequences. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(1), 96-112.
- Hitt, D. H., Tucker, P.D., & Young, M. D. (2012). The professional pipeline for educational leadership: Informing educational policy-A white paper developed to inform the work of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. Retrieved July 12, 2017, from www.ucea.org/storage/pdf/PipelineWhitePaper-web.pdf
- Homans, G. C. (1950). *The human group*. New York: Harcourt Brace & World.

- Hug, J. E. (2000, May 20). Educating for justice: Any university's major mission is to work for global transformation. *America*, 182(18), 16-19.
- Hunt, T. C. (2000). The history of Catholic schools in the United States: An overview. In T. C. Hunt, T. E. Oldenski, & T. J. Wallace (Eds.), *Catholic school leadership: An invitation to lead*. New York: Falmer.
- Hunt, T. C., Bauch, P., Cattaro, G. M., Smith, K., Nuzzi, R., & Casino, S. (2006, April). Catholic schools in the public interest: Past, present, and future. Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- International Center for Jesuit Education. (1993). Ignatian pedagogy: A practical approach. Rome: Author. Retrieved June, 15, 2017, from <http://www.sjweb.info/documents/education/pedagogy/en.doc>.
- Irvine, J. J., & Foster, M. (Eds.). (1996). *Growing up African American in Catholic schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Jacobs, M. M. (2015). Catholic School Mentoring for Mission and Ministry. *Mentoring with Meaning: How Educators Can be More Professional and Effective*, 49.
- James-Ward, C. (2011). The development of an infrastructure for a model of coaching principals. *The International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 6(1), 1-12. Retrieved May 13, 2017, from <http://enx.org/content/m37139/1.2/>
- James-Ward, C., & Salcedo-Potter, N. (2011). The Coaching Experience of 16 Urban Principals. *Journal of School Public Relations*, 32 (Spring), pp. 122-207.
- Jansen, D. (2006), Leading against the grain: The politics and emotions of leading for social justice in South Africa. *Leadership and policy in schools*, 5(1), 37-51.

- Jean-Marie, G. (2008, October). Leadership for social justice: An agenda for 21st century schools. In *The Educational Forum* (Vol. 72, No. 4, pp. 34-354). Taylor & Francis Group.
- Jean-Marie, G, Normore, A. H., & Brooks, J. S. (2009). Leadership for social justice: Preparing 21st century school leaders for a new social order. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 4(1), 1-31.
- Jespen, C. (2003). The effectiveness of Catholic primary schooling. *Journal of Human Resources*, iS(4), 928-941.
- Jeynes, W. (2006, April). A meta-analysis: The effects of Catholic and Protestant schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Johnson, S. (2006). The neuroscience of the mentor-learning relationship. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, No. 110, Summer 2006
- Johnston, J., Rodriguez, A., Corral, M., Hofer, M., Josse, P., Rummery, G., (1997). *The Lasallian mission of human and Christian education: A shared mission*. Landover, MD: Christian Brothers.
- Jones, C. (1977, February 14). Mentors. Links to the next decade. *The Christian Science Monitor*, 69(57), B10.
- Kealey, C. M., & Kealey, R. J. (2003). *On their shoulders: A short biographical history of American Catholic Schools*. National Catholic Educational Association.
- Kelly, R. E. (1988). In praise of followers. *Harvard Business Review*, 66, 142-148.

- Kelly, R. E. (1991). Combining followership and leadership into partnership. *Making organizations competitive. Enhancing networks and relationships across traditional boundaries*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Kersten, T., Trybus, M., and White, D. (2009). Improving administrative internship programs: Perceptions of Illinois Principals. Retrieved May 14, 2017, from <http://cnx.org/content/m23291/1.1>
- Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. L. (1994). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 138-157). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kolvenbach, P. (2000, October). *The service of faith and the promotion of justice in American Jesuit higher education*. Address at the Bannan Institute for Jesuit Education and Christian Values, Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, CA. Retrieved May 27, 2017, from http://scu.edu/news/attachments/kovenbach_speech.html
- Kose, B. W. (2007). Principal leadership for social justice: Uncovering the content of teacher professional development. *Journal of School Leadership*, 17(3), 276.
- Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education* (revised and updated) Chicago, IL: Chicago Association Press.
- Knowles, M. S., Holton III, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (2005). *The adult learner* (6th ed.). Burlington, MA: Elsevier.
- Kochan, F. K., (Ed.). (2002). *The organizational and human dimensions of successful mentoring programs and relationships*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

- Konick, Charles, De. (1934). *De la primauté du bien commun contre les personnalistes*.
Quebec: Editions de l'Université Laval and Montreal: Fides.
- Kram, K. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Kushner, R. (1997, August). A Model for a Mission. Paper presented at the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. Vail, CO.
- LaMagdeleine, D., Maxcy, D. D., Pounder, D. G., & Reed, C. J. (2009). The context of university-based educational leadership preparation. In M. Young, G. Crow, J. Murphy, & R. Ogawa (eds.) *Handbook on leadership education* (pp. 129-156). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lauder, A. (2000). The new look in principal preparation programs. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84(617).
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Lavery, S. L. (2012). The Catholic school principal: A transcendent leader? *Journal of Catholic School Studies*, 84(1), 36-42.
- Lawrence P. R., & Nohria, N. (2002). *Driven: How human nature shapes our choices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lee, C. D. (2007). *Culture, literacy, and learning: Taking bloom in the midst of the whirlwind*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Leithwood, K. A., & Jantzi, D., (1990). Transformational leadership: How principals can reform school cultures. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 1(4), 249-280.

- Leithwood, K. A., & Lewis, K. S., (2012). *Linking leadership to student learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- LeTendre, B., Barbour, J., & Miles, B. (2005). Mapping the terrain on leadership preparation-Comparing current state policies and alternatives and university based program availability, state-by-state. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the University Council of Educational Administration, Nashville, TN.
- Levine, A. (2006). *Educating school leaders*. New York: Education Schools Project.
- Litzinger, W., & Schaefer, T. (1982). Leadership through followership. *Business Horizons*, 25, 78-81.
- Lopez, G. R., Gonzalez, M. L., & Fierro, E. (2010). *Educational leadership along the US-Mexico border: Crossing borders/embracing hybridity/building bridges*. In Marshall, C., & Oliva, M. (Eds.), *Leadership for social justice* (2nd ed., pp.100-119). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K. A., Wahlstrom, K. L., & Anderson, S. E. (2010). *Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement.
- Marshall, C., Young, M. D., & Moll, L. (2010). The wider societal challenge: An afterword. In Marshall, C., Olivia, M. (Eds.), *Leadership for social justice* (2nd ed., pp. 315-327), Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Martin, G. E. & Papa, R. (2008). Examining the principal preparation and practice gap. *Principal*, 88(1), 12-14, 16.

- Martin, R. L., & Osberg, S. (2007, Spring). Social entrepreneurship: The case for definition. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 29-39.
- McCluskey, N. G. (1968). Catholic education faces its future. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- McDonald, D., & Schultz, M.M. (2011). *The annual statistical report on schools, enrollment and staffing: United States Catholic elementary and secondary schools 2010-2011*. Arlington, VA: National Catholic Education Association.
- McDonald, D., & Schultz, M. (2009). United States Catholic Elementary and Secondary Schools 2008-2009: A Statistical Report on Schools, Enrollment and Staffing. National Catholic Education Association, Washington, DC.
- McDonald, D., & Schultz, M. (2013). United States Catholic elementary and secondary schools 2012-2013. Arlington, VA: National Catholic Educational Association.
- McDonald, D., & Schultz, M. (2014). United States Catholic Elementary and Secondary Schools 2013-2014: A Statistical Report on School, Enrollment and Staffing. National Catholic Education Association, Washington, DC.
- McLaughlin, D. (2000). Quo vadis the Catholic education? A post conciliar perspective. In D. McLaughlin (Ed.), *The Catholic school: Paradoxes and challenges* (pp.24-41). Strathfield, New South Wales, Australia: St. Pauls.
- McLaughlin, D. (2002, April). *Authentic leadership: The challenge for people looking for meaning*. Keynote address at the Principals annual Conference, Diocese of Rockhampton, Queensland, Australia.
- McKenzie, K. B., Christman, D. E., Hernandez, F., Capper, C. A., Dantley, M., Gonzales, M. L., Cambron-McCabe, N., and Scheurich, J. J. (2008). From the field: A

- proposal for educating leaders for social justice. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(1), 111-138.
- Mead, M. (1949). Problems of leadership and mental health. *World Federation for Mental Health Bulletin* (1949-1952) 1(6), 7-12.
- Meece, J. L. (1997). *Child and adolescent development for educators*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Merchant, B. M., & Shoho, A. R. (2010). *Bridge people: Civic and educational leaders for social justice*. In Marshall, C., Oliva, M. (Eds.), *Leadership for social justice* (2nd ed., pp. 120-138). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Mertz, N. T. (2004). What's a new mentor, anyway? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(4), 541-560.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook (Third edition)*. California: SAGE.
- Militello, M., Gajda, R., & Bowers, A. (2009). The role of accountability policies and alternative certification on principals' perceptions of leadership preparation. *Journal of Research in Leadership Education*, 4(2), 30-66.
- Mitgang, L., D. (2007). Getting Principal Mentoring Right: Lessons from the Field. Perspective. *Wallace Foundation, The*.
- Mitgang, L., & Gill, J. (2012). Becoming a leader: Preparing school principals for today's schools. Retrieved May 27, 2017, from Wallace Foundation website: www.wallacefoudation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/principal-training/Documents/Becoming-a-Leader-Preparing-Principals-for-Todays-Schools.pdf

- Moll, L. C. (1990). Vygotsky's zone of proximal development: Rethinking its instructional implications. *Infancia y aprendizaje*, 13(51-51), 157-168.
- Moll, L. C., & Greenberg, J. (1990). Creating zones of possibilities: Combining social contexts for instruction. *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology*, (pp. 319-348). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Montejano, A., & Sabatino, F. (2012). Transitioning from public education to Catholic school leadership: What do I need to know and who can help me learn it? *Scholarly Essays on Catholic School Leadership*: Arlington, VA: National Catholic Education Association.
- Mullen, C. A. (2006). *Making the most of mentoring: A graduate student guide*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Education/ Rowman & Littlefield.
- Mullen, C. A., & Tuten, E. M. (2010). Doctoral Cohort Mentoring: Interdependence, Collaborative Learning, and Cultural Change. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, 4(1), 11-32.
- Murphy, J. (2006). Some thoughts on rethinking the pre-service education of school leaders. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 1(1). Retrieved June, 13, 2017, from http://www.ucea.org/JRLE/issue_vo11.php.
- National Association of Elementary School Principals. (2003). *Making the case for Principal Mentoring*. Providence, RI: Brown University.
- National Catholic Education Association. (2009). A brief overview of Catholic schools in America. <http://www.ncea.org/about/historicaloverviewofcatholicschoolsinamerica.asp>.

- National Conference of Catholic Bishops. (1986). *Economic Justice for All: Pastoral Letter on Catholic Social Teaching and the U.S. Economy*. Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference.
- National Standards and Benchmarks for Effective Catholic Elementary and Secondary Schools. (2012, Feb). *Momentum*, 43, 14-23. Retrieved April 30, 2017, from <https://search-proquest-com.authenticate.library.duq.edu/docview/952881993?accountid=10610>
- Newman, N. (1954). *Foundations of Justice*. Cork: University Press.
- Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Noddings, N. (2005). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Nuzzi, R. J. (2000). To lead as Jesus led. In T. C. Hunt, T. E. Oldenski, & T. J. Wallace (Eds.), *Catholic school leadership: An invitation to lead* (pp. 259-270). London: Falmer Press.
- Nuzzi, R. J. (2002). Catholic identity. In T. C. Hunt, J. A. Ellis, & R. J. Nuzzi (Eds.), *Catholic schools still make a difference: Ten years of research 1991-2000* (pp. 9-20). Washington, D. C.: National Catholic Educational Association.
- O'Donnell, S. (2001). *The character and culture of the Catholic school*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- O'Keefe, J. M., Greene, J. A., Henderson, S., Connors, M., Goldschmidt, E., & Shervish, K. (2004). *Sustaining the legacy: Inner-city Catholic elementary schools in the United States*. Washington, D. C.: National Catholic Education Association.

- O’Keefe, J. M., & Scheopner, A. J. (2009). Bridging the gap: Urban Catholic schools addressing educational achievement and opportunity gaps in the United States. *International Studies in Catholic Education*, 1 (1), 15-29.
- Oldenski, T. (1997). *Liberation theology and critical pedagogy in today’s Catholic school: Social justice in action*. New York: Garland Press.
- Orr, M., (2006). Mapping innovation in leadership preparation in our nation’s schools of education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(7), 492-499.
- Ormrod, C. A. (2016). Scaffolding the Mathematical “Connections”: A New Approach to Preparing Teachers for the Teaching of Lower Secondary Algebra. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(6).
- Ozar, L. (2010). Voices from the field: Interviews with three prominent Catholic school educators about leadership and collaboration. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 14(I), 114-127.
- Ozar, L. A., & Weitzel-O’Neil, P. (Eds.), (2012). *National standards and benchmarks for effective Catholic elementary and secondary schools*. Chicago, IL: Loyola University Chicago, Center for Catholic School Effectiveness.
- Paul VI. (1967). Populorum progression [On the development of peoples]. Retrieved June 4, 2017, from http://www.vatican.vayholy_father/paul_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vienc_26031967_populorum_en.html.
- Paulhus, N. J. (1987). Uses and Misuses of the Term “Social Justice” in the Roman Catholic Tradition. *Journal of Religious Ethics*, 15(2), 261-282.

- Parada, C. (1997). *Greek Mythology Link: Mentor 4*. Retrieved June 4, 2017 from [http:// www.maicar.com/GML/Mentor4.html](http://www.maicar.com/GML/Mentor4.html).
- Pittman, T., S., Rosenbach, W., E. & Potter, III, E. H. (1998). Followers as partners: Taking the initiative for action. *Contemporary issues in leadership*, 107-120.
- Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace. (2005). *Compendium of the social doctrine of the Church*, Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Potter, E. H., III, Rosenbach, W., E., & Pittman, T., S. (1996). Leading the new professional. In R. L. Taylor & W. E. Rosenbach (Eds.), *Military leadership: In pursuit of excellence* (3rd ed., pp. 145-152). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Pounder, D. G. (2011). Leader preparation special issue: Implications for policy, practice, and research. *Educational administration quarterly*, 47(1), 258-267.
- Princeton University. (2013). The preceptorial system. Retrieved June 3, 2017, from http://princeton.edu/admissions/whatsdistinctive/experienc/the_preceptorial_system/.
- Power, T. (2002). Dancing on a moving floor: Lay women and the principalship in Catholic primary education. In D. J. Duncan & D. Riley (Eds.), *Leadership in Catholic education: Hope for the future* (pp. 86-100). Sydney, New South Wales, Australia: Harper Collins.
- Rapp, D. (2002). Social justice and the importance of rebellious, oppositional imaginations. *Journal of School Leadership*, 12(3), 226-245.
- Reams, E. (2010). Shifting paradigms: Redesigning a principal preparation program's curriculum. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 5(12.5).

- Reeves, D. B. (2002). *The daily disciplines of leadership: How to improve student achievement, staff motivation, and personal organization*. San Francisco, SA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rieckhoff, B. S. (2014). The development of faith leadership in novice principals. *Journal of Catholic Education*, 17(2).
- Riehl, C., J. (2000). Critical Literature on the Practice of Educational Administration. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(1), 55-81.
- Riester, A. F., Pursch, V., & Skrla, L. A. (2002). Principals for social justice: Leaders of school success for children from low-income homes. *Journal of School Leadership*, 12(3), 281-304.
- Riordan, C. (2000). Trends in student demography in Catholic schools, 1972-1992. In J. Youniss & J.J. Convey (Eds.), *Catholic schools at the crossroads: Survival and transformation* (pp. 33-54). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Roberson, I., P. (2011). *She talked me down off the Ledge: Listening to New Principals and their Experience of Being Coached*. University of California, Berkeley. Retrieved June 13, 2017, from <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/37h86882g>
- Rogoff, B. (1995). Observing sociocultural activity on three planes: participatory appropriation, guided participation, and apprenticeship. In J.V. Wertsch, P del Rio., & Alvarez (Eds.), *Sociocultural studies of mind* (pp. 139-164), New York, NY; Cambridge University Press.
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ryan, J. (2006). Inclusive leadership and social justice for schools. *Leadership and Policy in schools*, 5(1), 3-17.

- Ryan, J. (2007). Dialogue, identity, and inclusion: Administrators as mediators in diverse school contexts. *Journal of School Leadership*, 17(3), 340.
- Ryan, M., & Malone, P. (1996). *Exploring the religion classroom: A guidebook for Catholic schools*. Wentworth Falls, New South Wales, Australia: Social Science Press.
- Rymarz, R. (2004). Lost generation: The cultures of generation X Catholics. *Australian Catholic Review*, 82(2), 144-154.
- Rymarz, R., & Graham, J. (2005). Going to church: Attitudes to church attendance amongst Australian core Catholic youth. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 26(1), 55-64.
- Sanders, N., & Kearney, (Eds.), (2008). *Performance expectations and indicators for educational leaders*. Washington, D. C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Sanford, F. H. (1950). *Authoritarianism and leadership*. Philadelphia: Institute for Research in Human Relations.
- Schaps, E. (2003). Creating a school community. *Educational Leadership*, 60(6), 31-33.
- Schein, E. H. (1997). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Scheurich, J. J., & Skrla, L. (2003). *Leadership for equality and excellence: Creating high-achievement classroom, schools, and district*. Corwin Press.
- Schlee, R. P., Curren, M. T., & Harich, K. R. (2009). Building a marketing curriculum to support courses in social entrepreneurship and social venture competitions. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 31(1), 5-15.

- Schriesheim, C., A. Casto, S., L. Zhou, X., T., & Yammarino, F., J. (2001). The folly of theorizing “a” but testing “b”: A selective level-of-analysis review of the field and a detailed leader-member exchange illustration. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 515-551.
- Scanlan, M. (2008). The grammar of Catholic schooling and radically “catholic” schools. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 12(1), 25-54.
- Schmitt, W. (2012). *Survey of principals by Remick Leadership Program see challenges*. Retrieved June 12, 2017, from <http://ace.nd.edu/news/survey-of-principal-by-remick-leadership-program-sees-challenges>.
- Scott, G. (2003). *Learning principals: Leadership capabilities and learning research in the New South Wales Department of Education and Training*. Sydney, New South Wales, Australia: University of Technology Sydney, Quality Development Unit.
- Searby, L. J. (2008). A mentoring mindset: Preparing future principals to be effective protégés. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 3(1), n1.
- Searby, L., J. (2010). Preparing future principals: Facilitating the development of a mentoring mindset through graduate coursework. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 18(1), 5-22.
- Seabry, L., & Tripses, J. (2007, August). Preparing future school administrators for meaningful mentoring relationships: A comparison of processes in two universities. Paper presented at the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. Chicago, IL.

- Sergiovanni, T., J. (2001). *Leadership: What's in it for schools?* London: Routledge Falmer.
- Sergiovanni, T., J. (2003). The lifeworld at the center: Values and actions in educational leadership. In N. Bennett, M. Crawford, & M. Cartwright (Eds.), *Effective educational leadership* (pp. 14-24). London: Paul Chapman.
- Sergiovanni, T., J. (2005). *Strengthening the heartbeat: Leading and learning together in schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shaughnessy, M. A. (2005). *The law and Catholic school: A guide to legal issues for the third millennium*. Washington, DC: National Catholic Education Association.
- Shields, C. M. (2003). Good intentions are not enough: *Transformative leadership for communities of difference*. Scarecrow Press.
- Shields, L. (1941). *The History of Meaning of the Term Social Justice*. South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Shoho, A.R., Barnett, B. G., Martinez, P. (2012). Enhancing “OJT” internships with interactive coaching.” *Planning and Changing* 43(1/2): 161.
- Shrestha, C., May, S., Edirisingha, P., Burk, L., & Linsey, T. (2009). From face-to-face to e-mentoring: Does the “e” add any value for mentors? *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 20(2), 116-124.
- Shulman, L. (2008). Preliminary thoughts on creating a field as it might apply to Catholic education. In J. Staud (Ed.), *The Carnegie conversation on Catholic education* (pp. 12-14). Notre Dame, IN: Alliance for Catholic Education.
- Silver, M., Lochmiller, C. R., Copland, M. A., & Tripps, A. M. (2009). Supporting new school leaders: Findings from a university-based leadership coaching program for

- new administrators. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnerships in Learning*, 17(3), 215-232.
- Smith, B. (2008). Deregulation and the new leader agenda: Outcomes and lessons from Michigan. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(1), 30-65.
- Society of Jesus. (2005). official *Ratio Studiorum: The official plan for Jesuit education* (C. Pavur, Trans.) St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources. (Original work published in 1599).
- Southern Regional Education Board. (2007). Good principals aren't born-they're mentored: Are we investing enough to get the school leaders we need: Atlanta, GA: Author.
- Sprague, M., & Hostinsky, V. (2002). Model mentoring. *Principal Leadership High School Ed.* 3(1), 365-340.
- Spry, G. (2004). *Framing leadership in Queensland Catholic schools: A report*. Strathfield, New South Wales, Australia: Catholic Educational Leadership, Flagship of Australian Catholic University.
- Spry, G., & Duignan, P. (2003). *Framing leadership in Queensland Catholic schools*. Strathfield New South Wales, Australia: Australian Catholic University.
- Starratt, R. (1994). *Building an ethical school: A practical response to the moral crisis in schools*. Washington, D. C.: Falmer Press.
- Starratt, R. (2003). *Centering educational administration: Cultivating meaning, community, responsibility*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Staud, J. (Ed.), (2008). *The Carnegie conversation on Catholic education*. Notre Dame, IN: Alliance for Catholic Education Press.

- Stoll, L. (2003). School culture and improvement. In M. Preedy, R. Glatter, & C. Wise (Eds.), *Strategic leadership and educational improvement* (pp. 93-108). London: Paul Chapman.
- Stolp, S., & Smith, S. C. (1995). *Transforming school culture: Stories, symbols, values, and the leader's role*. Eugene, OR: Eric Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED386783).
- Supovitz, J., Sirinides, P., & May, H. (2010). How principals and peers influence teaching and learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(1), 31-56.
- Teitel, L. (2006). Mapping the terrain of 'alternative' leadership education: Lessons from universities. *Phi Delta Kappan* (March, 2006), 500-507.
- Tenner, E. (2004). The pitfalls of academic mentorships, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 50(49), B7-B10.
- Tharp, R. G., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning, and schooling in social context*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational administration quarterly*, 43(2), 221-258.
- Theoharis, G. (2007). Navigating rough waters: A synthesis of the countervailing pressures against leading for social justice. *Journal of School Leadership*, 17(1), 4
- Theoharis, R., & Causton-Theoharis, J. N. (2008). Oppressors or emancipators: Critical dispositions for preparing inclusive school leasers. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 41(2), 230-246.

- Thomas Aquinas, St. (1934). *Summa Contra Gentiles*. Torino: Marietti.
- Thomas Aquinas, St. (1948). *De Regimine Principum*. Torino: Marietti.
- Thomas Aquinas, St. (1964). *Summa Theologiae*. Black friars' edition. 60 vols. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Tomasi, S. M. (2008, November). Provides everyone with the tools to contribute. Address presented at the UNESCO 48th International Conference on Education, Geneva, Switzerland. Retrieved, June 14, 2017, from <http://www.zenit.org/article-24453?1=English>.
- Thompson, A., & Doherty, B. (2006). The diverse world of social enterprise: A collection of social enterprise stories. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 33(5/6), 361-375.
- Traub, G. W. (Ed.), (2008). *A Jesuit education reader*. Chicago: Loyola Press.
- Treston, K. (2001). *Wisdom schools: Seven pillars of wisdom for Catholic schools*. Brisbane, Queensland, Australia: Creation Enterprises.
- United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (2008). Doctrinal elements of curriculum framework for the development of catechetical materials for young people of high school age. Washington, DC: Author.
- United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. (2005). *Renewing our commitment to Catholic elementary and secondary schools in the third millennium*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Vatican Council II. (1982). *Gravissimum educationis* [Declaration on Christian education]. In A. Flannery (Ed.), *Vatican Council II: The conciliar and*

- postconciliar documents* (pp. 725-737). Northport, NY: Costello. (Original work published 1965).
- Vecchio, R., P. (1997). Leadership and gender advantage. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(6), 643-671.
- Vitullo-Martin, T. (1979). *Catholic inner-city schools: The future*. Washington, D. C.: United States Catholic Conference.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L., S. (1987). Speech and Thinking. In L.S. Vygotsky, *Collected Works, Vol. 1* (pp. 39-285). R. Rieber & A. Carton (Eds.), Minick, N., Tr. New York: Plenum.
- Walker, A., & Scott, K, (1994). Mentoring programs for aspiring principals: getting a solid start, *NASSP Bulletin*, 78(588), pp. 72-7.
- Wallace Foundation, (2012, June). *The making of the principal: Five lessons in leadership training*, New York, NY: Author.
- Wallace Foundation, (2011). The school principal as leader: Guiding schools to better teaching and learning. Retrieved July 9, 2017, from <http://wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/effective-principal-leadership/Documents/The-School-Principal-as-Leader-Guiding-Schools-to-Better-Teaching-and -Learning.pdf>
- Wallace, T. J. (1995). Assessment of the preparedness of lay Catholic high school principals to be faith leaders. In T. Hunt, E. Joseph, & R. Nuzzi, (Eds.), *Catholic*

- schools still make a difference: Ten years of research 1991-2000*. Washington, DC: National Catholic Education Association.
- Wallace, T. J. (1998). The faith leadership issue. *Momentum*, 29(2), 46-49.
- Wallace, T. J. (2000). We are called: The principal as faith leader in the Catholic school. In T. C. Hunt, T. E. Oldenski, & T. J. Wallace (Eds.), *Catholic school leadership: An invitation to lead* (pp. 191-203). London: Falmer Press.
- Walsh, T. (2003). *Parish school: American Catholic parochial education from colonial times to the present*. Washington, DC: National Catholic Education Association.
- Walters, T., Marzano, R., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. Denver, CO: McREL International.
- Wasonga, T. A. (2010). Leadership practices for social justice, democratic community, and learning: School principals' perspectives. *Journal of School Leadership*, 19, 200-224.
- Wertsch, J., V. (1991). A sociological approach to socially shared cognition. In L. B. Resnick, J.M. Levine, & S. D. Teasley (Ed.). *Perspectives on socially cognition* (pp. 85-100). Retrieved July 9, 2017, from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1009004>.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Whipp, J., & Scanlan, M. (2009). Catholic institutions of higher education and K-12 schools partnering for social justice: A Call for Scholarship. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, (13)2.

- Wood, D. J., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17, 89-100.
- Woosley, A., M. (2010). *New Principals in the Trenches: Does Mentoring Impact Leadership Development for New School Leaders?* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Retrieved July 9, 2017, from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304727072>.
- Young, M. D., & Brewer, C., (2008). Fear and the preparation of school leaders: The role of ambiguity, anxiety and power in meaning making. *Educational Policy*, 22(1). 106-129.
- Zachery, L. (2000). *The mentor's guide: Facilitating effective learning relationships*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.
- Zachary, L. (2005). *Creating a mentoring culture: The organization's guide*. San Francisco: Josey Bass.
- Zuckerman, H. (1977). *Scientific Elite: Nobel Laureates in the United States*. Transaction Publishers.
- Zuckerman, H. (1996) *Scientific Elite*. New Brunswick, NJ, Transaction Publishers.
- Zull, J. E. (2002). *The Art of Changing the Brain*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Appendices

Appendix A

The secular competencies measured by the mentor evaluation.

- ELCC 1.1 Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning for a school. (ISLLC Standard 1: Function A, SREB CSF 1)
- ELCC 1.2 Candidates understand and can collect and use data to identify school goals, assess organization effectiveness, create, and implement plans to achieve school goals. (ISLLC Standard 1: Function B, SREB CSF 1)
- ELCC 1.3 Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable school improvement. (ISLLC Standard 1: Functions C and D, SREB CSF 1)
- ELCC 1.4 Candidates understand and can evaluate school progress and revise school plans supported by school stakeholders. (ISLLC Standard 1: Function E, SREB CSF 1)
- ELCC 2.1 Candidates understand and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students. (ISLLC Standard 2: Function A, SREB CSF 2)

- ELCC 2.2 Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous and coherent curricular and instructional program. (ISLLC Standard 2: Function B, SREB CSF 2)
- ELCC 2.4 Candidates understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning in a school-level environment. (ISLLC Standard 2: Function H, SREB CSF 2 and 3)
- ELCC 3.5 Candidates understand and can ensure teacher and organizational time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning. (ISLLC Standard 3: Function E, SREB CSF 10)
- ELCC 5.4 Candidates understand and can evaluate potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school. (ISLLC Standard 4: Function D, SREB CSF 4)
- ELCC 4.2 Candidates understand and can mobilize community resources by promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of the diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources within the school community. (ISLLC Standard 4: Function B, SREB CSF 6)
- ELCC 4.3 Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers. (ISLLC Standard 4: Function C, SREB CSF 7)
- ELCC 4.1 Candidates understand and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information

pertinent to the improvement of the school's educational environment. (ISLLC Standard 1: Function A, SREB CSF 5)

ELCC 4.4 Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive school relationships with community partners. (ISLLC Standard 4: Function D, SREB CSF 7)

ELCC 5.2 Candidates understand and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school. (ISLLC Standard 5: Function B, SREB CSF 4)

ELCC 5.1 Candidates understand and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure that schools are accountable for every student's academic and social success. (ISLLC Standard 5: Function A, SREB CSF 4)

ELCC 6.3 Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies. (ISLLC Standard 6: Function C, SREB CSF 12)

ELCC 6.2 Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment. (ISLLC Standard 6: Function B, SREB CSF 12)

Appendix B

The Catholic School Principal Competencies On-Boarding Plan Indicators/Activities

1. Mission and Identity

- 1.1 Builds and maintains a positive Catholic culture and environment in the school.

...analyzes the mission statement to guarantee a commitment to Catholic identity.

...identify occasions when the mission statement is used as the foundation and normative reference for all planning.

...conducts an audit to verify the presence of the mission statement in public places and contained in official documents.

...monitor school program and make recommendations to learn about and experience the nature and importance of prayer, the Eucharist, and liturgy.

- 1.2 Leads the community in worship, prayer and service.

...participate in liturgy, prayer services and other faith-based activities.

...plan and deliver staff retreats, prayer services, and other spiritual experiences for staff.

...work with staff to ensure that every student is offered timely, regular, and age-appropriate opportunities to reflect on their life experiences and faith.

...model faith and service to students and clearly communicate to staff that this is an expectation of the school.

...develop and/or monitor school program for opportunities to participate in Christian service to promote lived reality of action in service of social justice.

- 1.3 Provides a high quality religious education program staffed by qualified teachers.

...monitor school program to determine the religion classes are afforded the same level of attention given to other academic subjects.

...work with leaders to ensure that the faculty who teach religion meet (arch) diocesan requirements for academic and catechetical preparation.

...examine the school setting to ensure that Catholic culture and faith is expressed and integrated throughout the school in diverse forms of sign and symbol

- 1.4 Collaborates with parents as the primary educator of their children.

...work with leadership to create programs that strengthen parents/guardians role as primary educators.

...work with leadership to collaborate with other institutions to foster the faith development of parent/guardians.

2. Governance and Leadership

- 2.1 Promote innovation, change, and collaboration in achieving the Catholic educational mission.

...works with leadership team to implement educational innovation.

...plans long term professional development for curricular innovations.

- 2.2 Understands Catholic school governance structures; especially the role of the parish pastor, pastoral council, parish finance committee, school board, Catholic schools Office, and state Department of Education.
- ...identify occasions when the mission statement is used as the foundation and normative reference for all planning.
 - ...attends school board meetings.
 - ...works with various committees, such as finance, parent organizations, or athletic board.
 - ...attends various diocesan/vicariate meetings.
- 2.3 Initiates, monitors, and evaluates the strategic planning process to fulfill the school's mission and position the school for the future.
- ...assists leadership in calling together the various constituencies of the school to clarify, review, and renew the school's mission statement.
 - ...work to ensure that every group constituents can articulate and explain the mission.
- 2.4 Recruits, selects, supervises, and evaluates school personnel in accordance with the Catholic mission of the school.
- ...work with leadership to create/maintain personnel retention strategies.
- 2.5 Develops and maintains policies which are congruent with the local Catholic diocese and which support the mission of the school.
- ...work with leadership to ensure full compliance with human resource policies.

...work with leadership to develop and/or maintain building human resource policies/manuals are in alignment with (arch) diocesan policies/procedures.

3. Academic Excellence

3.1 Inspires and leads the school community toward academic excellence.

...create opportunities for service programs and evaluate their effectiveness.

...works with building leadership in school improvement process.

3.2 Ensures that Catholic teaching and religious values are infused throughout the educational program.

...work with administration to ensure that the religious education curriculum meets the standards of the (arch) diocese.

...examine the school setting to ensure that Catholic culture and faith is expressed and integrated throughout the school in diverse forms of sign and symbol.

...create opportunities for faculty to use the lens of Scripture and Catholic intellectual tradition in all to help students think critically and ethically about the world around them.

...analyze the school program to identify opportunities for students to receive planned instruction in the Church's social teaching.

3.3 Utilizes data effectively to monitor and make changes in the instructional program.

...assists the administration in analyzing the school data to monitor for student achievement.

...collaborates with school administration to develop school improvement plans to address areas of growth.

3.4 Develops programs to address the unique learning needs of students.

...access for Tier One programming.

...work with the leadership to support the development of teachers' assistance teams.

...using Catholic Social Teaching as a lens, work with staff to develop wellness programs,

including anti-bullying programs.

3.5 Develop a professional learning community to support community to

support on-going professional and faith development of faculty and staff.

...working with leadership, use teaming strategies to build/embrace PLCs.

...develop faith formation activities for staff.

4. Operational Vitality

4.1 Demonstrates effective stewardship of school resources through the

development of both short term budgets and long-term financial plans.

...work with administration to develop define, and/or manage school budget to address capital improvements, equipment depreciation, and replacement.

...works with leadership team in working with external partners in developing necessary funding.

...create an analysis of the financial plan to indicate understanding of delineation of costs for key areas.

...assists the leadership in creating a budget to include projected revenue sources and a statement of actual and projected expenditures.

...assist the leadership in monitoring the implementation of financial plans that are conducted with current and effective business practices.

...implement strategies to give families access to information about tuition assistance and long-term planning for tuition and Catholic school expenses.

4.2 Creates a comprehensive development plan that explores additional sources of revenue (e.g., alumni giving, grants).

...assist leadership team in financial planning in collaboration with experts in non-profit management and funding.

...assist leadership team in developing grant applications from external sources.

4.3 Develops enrollment management strategies to maintain and grow stable enrollment.

...assist administration in analyzing demographics to note trends to develop strategic plan to target enrollment.

...assist administration in monitoring and improving the admissions process.

...assist administration in retention strategies for current students.

- 4.4 Creates innovative marketing strategies to promote the school and its mission to a variety of stakeholders.
- ...works with marketing team to use a variety of media platforms to promote the school.
 - ...work with marketing team to plan marketing events such as Open Houses and tours.
 - ...create a press release promoting an event at the school.
- 4.5 Coordinates with a variety of external sources (local Catholic diocese, local educational agencies, and other government agencies) to access available public funds.
- ...define revenue sources for the school.
 - ...assists the leadership in creating a budget to include projected revenue sources and a statement of actual and projected expenditure.
 - ...analyze the school's utilization of available public funds.
- 4.6 Ensures the safety of the school through strategic facilities management.
- ...work with building leadership in developing and/or auditing plans for managing facilities, equipment, and technology.
 - ...work with administration to develop, define, and/or manage school budget to address capital improvements, equipment depreciation, and replacement.
 - ...work with leadership to align physical and technological improvements with mission and are consistent with environmental stewardship.

...demonstrate general knowledge of all operating systems on campus
(heating, electrical systems, fire alarms, plumbing, security).

...review maintenance supervision procedures and works with
maintenance staff to develop project management plans for maintenance
procedures.