

Educational Leadership Educator Disposition Assessment

Educational Leadership EDA Technical Guide

Adrienne Wilson, Ed.D.
Gina Almerico, Ph.D.
Pattie Johnston, Ph.D.
Suzanne Ensmann, Ed.D.

2019

Copyright 2019 Wilson, Almerico, Johnston, Ensmann

Educational Leadership Educator Disposition Assessment

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
Administration.....	3
Suggested Points of Assessment.....	4
EDL Checkpoints.....	4
Informing Candidates about the EDLDA.....	7
Suggested Intervention/Remediation	8
Glossary of Terms.....	11
Psychometric Terms.....	11
Other Terms.....	11
Criterion of Measure.....	19
Disposition Indicators and Associated Behaviors.....	20
Methodology.....	20
Use of Instrument	23
Calibration Training.....	23
References.....	24

Introduction

If asked to describe what traits are characteristic of a good educational leader, it is very likely most individuals would agree that good leadership is characterized by trust, integrity, vision, respect, honesty, cooperation, and compassion. Most know what strong effective educational leadership looks and feels like and it is evident when such attributes go awry. Ineffective leadership is toxic; it pollutes a work environment by engendering mistrust, suspicion, frustration, anger, and dishonesty. With high expectations for student academic achievement, the need for high-quality educational leaders is crucial in today's educational arena. Along with preparing future leaders with the needed skill based leadership competencies, institutions of higher learning must also ensure that candidates possess solid leadership dispositions. The behaviors indicative of effective leadership, identifying them, and fairly assessing them, are the focus of this work.

Effective school leaders are reported to have a strong positive impact on the learning of the students under their leadership. Research, although scant, has begun to characterize specific traits and dispositions needed by school leaders to successfully lead a school, elicit respect from their staff, students and community, and positively impact student learning. For instance, in explaining the importance of Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL), the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2015) suggested effective school leaders possess the ability to influence student learning by creating challenging learning environments that also provide supportive, caring, and compassionate conditions conducive to learning. Additional behaviors of strong leaders identified in the PSEL Standards included the ability to develop and support teachers, create positive work conditions, and engage in meaningful endeavors both in and outside of the classroom. In this technical guide, the authors define dispositions in general, develop an understanding of dispositions specific to the job of an educational leader, and then describe the development of the Educational Leadership Disposition Assessment (EDLDA).

Much of what is expected in the preparation of educational leaders today, related to defining and assessing dispositions has a direct implication with accreditation. As part of national and state accreditation requirements, educator preparation programs offering advanced degrees in Educational Leadership are charged with tracking and monitoring the knowledge, skills and dispositions of candidates training for the profession. Teaching, tracking, monitoring, and assessing candidate subject matter knowledge of educational leadership as well as their understanding of the theories of leadership are expected as part of the process of acquiring a license or certification. Therefore, most institutions offering advanced educational leadership degrees have designed and use tools to measure candidate's knowledge and skills based on state and national standards (Brewer, Lindquist, & Altemueller, 2011).

The research increasingly informs us that knowledge and skills within the profession simply are not sufficient to prepare educational leaders. There is more to consider: dispositions. Schute and Kowal (2005) acknowledged the importance of the traditional focus in Educational Leadership programs in areas such as, human resources, law, finance, and assessment. They emphasized, however, that the traditional preparation is not sufficient. Their research stressed the importance of developing dispositions appropriate to the profession. They claimed possession and demonstration of proper dispositions can ultimately determine career success as a school leader. A challenge for programs training future school leaders is determining how to define and develop dispositions of effective leaders, how to fit them into the program's mission/framework, and how to assess them using valid and reliable measures. To fulfill accreditation standards used in higher education, program faculty are challenged to develop or discover psychometrically sound tools for use in measuring the dispositional behaviors of candidates. Researchers in the field of Educational Leadership (Melton, Mallory, & Green, 2010; Schulte & Kowa, 2005) concur that there is a strong need for valid and reliable instruments developed to measure the dispositions of educational leaders.

The EDLDA tool was created to meet accreditation standards found in national and state bodies that accredit and approve educator preparation programs. The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Advanced-Licensure Program Standards A1, A2, A3, and A5 require educator preparation programs address and assess candidate dispositions. The EDLDA provides evidence for programs using the package to successfully meet each standard. The Educational Leadership Disposition Assessment (EDLDA) also meets Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation (AAQEP) Standards 1 and 2 (2018). Additionally, the tool aligns to the National Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) Standards as further described this document.

Administration of Instrument

The Educational Leadership Disposition Assessment (EDLDA) instrument was designed with careful consideration of the psychometric properties associated with informal assessments so that any inferences made about the dispositions of an educational leadership candidates' disposition are more likely to be true. Psychometric evaluation efforts were made that far extend expectations associated with informal assessments. The effort was done grounded in a sincere attempt to try to clear any confusion about the expectations so that growth in dispositions may be enhanced during coursework and subsequent clinical experience. The instrument is intended to be used at multiple points in the program to track and monitor candidate dispositions that are associated with positive leadership in P-12 learning environments. Disposition categories are aligned with the National Educational Leadership Standards (2018).

The suggested checkpoints for when the instrument is to be administered throughout the EDL preparation program are identified in the Educational Leadership Disposition Assessment (EDLDA) timeline found below. The timeline can be customized to any Educational Leadership Program. The checkpoints provide systematic review of candidate dispositions as they progress through the program. At any time, however, the instrument is available to faculty, the internship coordinator, administrative mentors working with candidates during the internship, and other educational leaders who share professional insights regarding the dispositions of the candidate.

The EDLDA instrument is used to both raise concerns and identify exemplary dispositional behavior of candidates as they progress throughout the program. It can be used initially to inform candidates about programmatic dispositional expectations as well as assess baseline dispositional data. From there, the EDLDA can be used as candidates' progress through the program to document when changes have occurred in dispositions and under what set of circumstances. Candidates are expected to demonstrate the dispositions identified on the EDLDA in coursework and in the field.

It is recommended that candidates informally complete a self-assessment of the EDLDA at the start of the program (recommended on the timeline). The self-assessment will provide candidates the opportunity to reflect on their individual dispositions to identify their strengths and any areas for growth during their tenure in the program. The EDLDA is also expected to serve as a teaching tool for candidates throughout their course work and field based experiences. The timeline below highlights suggested implementation of the disposition instrument throughout the course of a program to support candidate dispositional development. Assessment in the final phase of internships allows Educational Leadership Programs to collect data regarding the effectiveness of the assessment and remediation of candidates. Doing so allows scores from initial assessments to be compared with scores from final internship data to determine effectiveness and dispositional growth.

Suggested Points of Assessment

It is recommended that Educational Leadership candidate dispositions are formally rated by education faculty at regular intervals during their studies as detailed in the table below.

Educational Leadership Checkpoints

Candidates will be assessed at four checkpoints while in the Educational Leadership Program. The assessment sequence is as follows:

Checkpoint One – Beginning of First Semester

Assessed By: EDL Program Coordinator and the Educational Review Committee

Data Assessed: Candidate self-assessment using EDLDA , Internship application

Results of Assessment: The self-assessment is part of the application process and is reviewed by the EDL Program Coordinator and the Educational Review Committee. Based on self-assessment data, the EDL Program Coordinator consults with any students of concern.

Checkpoint Two – End of First Semester

Assessed By: EDL Program Coordinator, Administrative Mentor, and the Educational Review Committee

Data Assessed: Educational Leadership Internship Evaluations, Super Tasks/Critical Tasks uploaded into the EPPs management system (e.g., Watermark/Livetext), **Educational Leadership Disposition Assessment (EDLDA)**, Internship Plan, Internship Hours Log Sheet

Results of Assessment:

- Candidate is recommended to continue in program, records are updated in the EPP's data management system (e.g., Google docs).
- Candidate is referred to the Department Chair and the Educational Review Committee who offers recommendations for intervention/remediation.
- The Department Chair, Educational Review Committee and the faculty member teaching EDU 680 Professional Development work on an intervention/remediation plan as documented in the Candidate Intervention/Remediation Plan form; paperwork is filed in departmental file and a copy is sent to the education advisor.
- Candidates needing intervention/remediation enroll in EDU 680 Professional Development and work one-on one with EPP faculty for intervention/remediation the next semester.

Checkpoint Three – End of Second Semester

Assessed By: EDL Program Coordinator, Administrative Mentor, and the Educational Review Committee

Data Assessed: Educational Leadership Internship Evaluations, Super Tasks/Critical Tasks uploaded into the EPPs management system (e.g., Watermark/Livetext), **Educational Leadership Disposition Assessment (EDLDA)**, Internship Plan, Internship Hours Log Sheet

Results of Assessment:

- Candidate is recommended to continue in program, records are updated in the EPP's data management system (e.g., Google docs).
- Candidate is referred to the Department Chair and the Educational Review Committee who offers recommendations for intervention/remediation.
- The Department Chair, Educational Review Committee and the faculty member teaching EDU 680 Professional Development work on an intervention/remediation plan as documented in the Candidate Intervention/Remediation Plan form; paperwork is filed in departmental file and a copy is sent to the education advisor.
- Candidates needing intervention/remediation enroll in EDU 680 Professional Development and work one-on one with EPP faculty for intervention/remediation the next semester.

Checkpoint Four – End of Third (Last) Semester

Assessed By: EDL Program Coordinator, Administrative Mentor, and the Educational Review Committee

Data Assessed: Educational Leadership Internship Evaluations, Super Tasks/Critical Tasks uploaded into the EPPs management system (e.g., Watermark/Livetext), **Educational Leadership Disposition Assessment (EDLDA)**, Internship Plan, Internship Hours Log Sheet, other data as documented on the Educational Leadership Individual Program Completion Record (graduation checklist), such as the state licensure exam

Results of Assessment:

- Candidate is cleared to graduate from the program, paperwork (graduation checklist) is filed in departmental file and a copy is sent to the education advisor.
- Candidates who have failed to meet graduating requirements, such as failing to successfully pass the state teacher licensure exam will earn a grade of “I” or “Incomplete” and will not be eligible to graduate from the institution. Once all requirements are fulfilled, a passing grade will be issued.
- Candidate is referred to the Department Chair and the Educational Review Committee who offers recommendations for intervention/remediation.
- Candidate needing remediation could result in delayed graduation if results compromise successful completion of the internship.

The EDLDA data per candidate is entered into the electronic data management system by the College/School/Department of Education staff assistant at admission. The EDLDA can be used by faculty, adjuncts, administrative mentors, and internship coordinators at any point in the candidate’s progression through the program. When this is the case, the candidate is notified, the completed EDLDA is submitted to the Program Coordinator and entered into the electronic data management system by the staff assistant.

In the CAEP Evidence Guide, the CAEP Data Task Force recommended education programs consider specific data improvement efforts. Among those recommendations is the use of common assessments. The EDLDA can be offered as a common disposition assessment to providers who use this instrument. CAEP acknowledges that the use of a common assessment, such as the EDLDA can serve as an anchor measure that would permit data to be compared annually across peers, cohorts, institutions, states, regions, and countries. Institutions have the option of working with the EDLDA developers who will conduct a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) which tests for statistical significance in three or more vectors of means to provide a comparative analysis of the data. For instance, if on the average University “A” students have a rating of 1.5/2.0 and University “B” students have a rating of 2.0/2.0 per disposition we can:

1. Tell if it is a statistically significant difference, and
2. If it is statistically significant, the institutions will use the data to figure out why.

Institutions also have the option of having a comparative analysis calculated with “like” universities or they can compare how candidates (by cohort) performed from one year to the next. Analyses could extend the statistical investigation by providing overall university means by each of the fifteen (15) dispositions.

Another option includes the generation of an annual data report to all EDLDA users so that institutions can conduct comparisons to external references (which CAEP defines as a responsibility for quality assurance) to use in decision making and informed evidence-based continuous improvement.

The EDLDA data is easily disaggregated to identify underlying patterns of behavior at the individual and program levels.

Informing Candidates about the Educator Disposition Assessment (EDLDA):

Educational Leadership majors are informed of the use and purpose of the EDLDA in coursework at the start of the program, in the student handbook, and in other materials published by the college/school/department. Candidates are aware that the dispositions identified in the EDLDA are categorized descriptions of educational leadership behaviors that affect positive influence in the professional setting and promote gains in P-12 student learning. They are aware that a score of “0” on any disposition indicates insufficient demonstration of a given dispositional trait. It is recommended that the first exposure to the EDLDA is in the first administrative internship with subsequent discussions and activities regarding dispositions and their importance in the educational setting.

Candidate Intervention/Remediation

It is recommended candidates who demonstrate insufficient development of professional dispositions participate in intervention/remediation. The following statement may be included in the application and student handbook:

The candidate who fails to meet any state mandated candidate performance assessment benchmark and fails to evidence acceptable mastery of any identified element of the state and national standards or who receives an unacceptable dispositional rating in the EDLDA is referred to the Department Chair/Administrator and then the educator review committee for intervention/remediation. The committee will recommend specific candidate interventions intended to help the candidate achieve the expected targets and benchmarks. Intervention/remediation activities may include, but are not limited to, reduced course load, audit of same course, and guided study. Intervention/remediation always requires enrollment in a zero to three (0-3) credit hour course: Professional Development.

The evaluation of dispositions must include performance feedback to students when issues or concerns are raised followed with an intervention/remediation plan for professional development. Implementation of the EDLDA helps Educational Leadership Programs identify dispositional strengths and weaknesses of candidates at the individual and aggregate levels and can provide data-based evidence for professional development, curriculum impact, and programmatic change. It is recommended providers implement within their management system, an educator review committee where faculty are charged with the responsibility of reviewing dispositions submitted indicating issues with student dispositions. It is also recommended a formal structure for intervention/remediation is developed as part of the management system. For instance, an intervention/remediation course (offered for 0-3 credits hours) could be required for any candidate in need of dispositional development. An example of a candidate intervention/remediation plan is found below:

Candidate Intervention/Remediation Plan

The form is completed by the professor working with the candidate in the intervention/remediation course (EDU 680 Professional Development). Completed forms are submitted to the Department Chair and are then placed in the candidate's departmental file. A copy is to be sent to the education faculty advisor.

Candidate: _____ Major: _____ Date: _____

Candidate Intervention/Remediation

The candidate who fails to meet any CAEP/state mandated candidate performance assessment benchmark and fails to evidence acceptable mastery of any identified element of the state standards and the associated indicators/NELP Standards at the accomplished or exemplary level, or fails to demonstrate acceptable performance of dispositions is referred to the Admission, Retention, and Dismissal (ARD) Committee for intervention/remediation. The Department Chair and committee will recommend specific candidate interventions/remediation intended to help the candidate achieve the expected targets and benchmarks. Intervention/remediation always requires enrollment in a zero - three (0-3) credit hour course: EDU 680 Professional Development. The candidate requiring intervention/remediation will receive an Incomplete (I) grade in the course where the weakness is demonstrated and will receive a letter grade once the critical candidate performance assessment task is satisfactorily completed in EDU 680. If the critical task is not satisfactorily completed the candidate will earn a Failing (F) grade in the course and must repeat the course/practicum. Dispositions are assessed throughout the program of study. If a candidate is referred due to dispositional concerns, he/she is required to participate in some form of intervention/remediation which is documented on this form and kept in the student's/candidate's file. If the student/candidate dispositions fail to improve, the Department Chair/administrator/educator review committee have the option of dismissing the individual from the program.

Reason for Intervention/Remediation (check all that apply):

_____ State/NELP Standards Not Met:

Comments _____

_____ Academic Progress:

Comments _____

_____ Dispositions:

Comments _____

_____ Other:

Comments _____

Intervention/Remediation Plan:

Please list the State/NELP Standards not met, if appropriate.

I have read and understand the Candidate Intervention/Remediation Plan and its full implications regarding my continued progress in the Educational Leadership Program at the University.

Candidate's Signature: _____ Date: _____

EDU 680 Faculty Signature: _____ Date: _____

Faculty Issuing Rating Leading to Remediation Signature: _____ Date: _____

End of semester outcomes/results of intervention/remediation (check all that apply):

_____ Candidate failed to meet requirements of the State/NELP Standards at an acceptable level:

Comments

_____ Candidate met requirements of the State/NELP Standards at an acceptable level:

Comments

_____ Candidate failed to fulfill academic/dispositional progress goals:

Comments

____ Candidate fulfilled academic/dispositional progress goals:

Comments

____ Other:

Comments

Faculty Follow Through:

____ Candidate critical task is re-uploaded to data-base system and re-graded to indicate acceptable performance

____ Candidate grade is changed from an "I" in the original course to the earned grade

____ Candidate grade for EDU 680 is entered

Plan of Action:

____ Candidate progresses in the Educational Leadership Program

____ Candidate is dismissed from the Educational Leadership Program

Additional Comments:

EDU 680 Faculty

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Faculty Issuing Rating Leading to Remediation Signature: _____ Date: _____

Glossary of Terms

Psychometric Terms

Q-Sort: The systematic study of participant viewpoints. Q-methodology is used to investigate the perspectives of participants who represent different stances on an issue, by having participants rank and sort a series of statements.

Construct Validity: Validity that refers to the degree to which evidence and theory support the interpretations of test scores entailed by proposed uses of tests. The process of validation involves accumulating evidence to provide a sound basis for the proposed score interpretation. Validation may be viewed as developing a sound argument to support the intended interpretation of test scores (AERA, APA, NCME, 2014).

Inter-rater Reliability: Inter-rater reliability is a statistical measure that determines the level of consistency in rank ordering of ratings across raters. It yields a quantitative score specifying how much consensus exists in the ratings provided by raters. The rater is an individual who is assessing or scoring a particular behavior, performance, or skill. The inter-rater reliability score indicates how similar the data collected by different raters are (AERA, APA, NCME, 2014).

Predictive Validity: Predictive validity refers to evidence that indicates how accurately task or test data collected at one time predicts criterion scores obtained at a later time (AERA, APA, NCME, 2014).

Other Terms

Administrative Internship Experience: Experiences where an educational leadership candidate participates in a wide variety of leadership experiences within an educational setting. All leadership experiences are aligned with the leadership state and national standards.

Administrative Mentor: The designated licensed and experienced school administrator who works with an Educational Leadership candidate. This person mentors, coaches, guides, and evaluates the candidate throughout the internship experience.

CAEP: The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation whose mission is to advance outstanding educator preparation through evidence-based accreditation that guarantees excellence and promotes continuous improvement to strengthen P-12 student learning.

Candidate: Master's level student in an Educational Leadership Program.

Dispositions: Attitudes, beliefs, commitments, ethics, and values (Taylor & Wasicsko, 2000; Thompson, Ransdell, & Rousseau, 2005) towards students, families, colleagues and the community (NCATE, 2000). They can be described as innate qualities (Taylor & Wasicsko, 2000) or ways of behaving.

EDL: Educational Leadership.

EDLDA: The Educational Leadership Disposition Assessment (Wilson, Almerico, Johnston, & Ensmann, 2018) instrument used to measure dispositions in educational leadership candidates.

Educator Review Committee: A committee who recommends specific candidate interventions intended to help the candidate achieve an acceptable/satisfactory level of performance on the critical candidate performance assessment tasks. Remediation activities may include, but are not limited to, reduced course load, audit of same course, and guided study. It is recommended that intervention/remediation requires enrollment in a zero (0) to three (3) credit course: Professional Development.

NELP Standards: The National Educational Leadership Preparation Standards (NELP) Standards (2018), which are aligned to the Professional Standards for Educational Leadership (PSEL) serve a distinct purpose in that they provide specificity around performance expectations for beginning level building and district leaders. Whereas the PSEL standards define educational leadership broadly, the NELP Standards specify what novice leaders and program graduates should know and be able to do as a result of completing a high quality educational leadership preparation program.

Criterion of Measure

Likert Scale: The Likert Scale is used to assess the variable of dispositions from among a range of potential responses as indicated below.

Needs Improvement: A dispositional measure indicating minimal evidence of understanding and commitment to the disposition.

Developing: A dispositional measure indicating some evidence of understanding and commitment to the disposition.

Meets Expectations: A dispositional measure indicating considerable evidence of understanding and commitment to the disposition.

Disposition Indicators and Associated Behaviors

Confidence:

Indicators at the Meets Expectations Level

- Demonstrates self-assurance as evidenced by decisiveness in decision-making.
- Demonstrates the ability to lead others by being supportive in efforts to develop followers who act in the best interest of the school and students.
- Shows consistency between their values, beliefs, and actions by developing the positive psychological states of confidence, high self-esteem, and resilience in themselves and others.

Self-confidence is conceptually similar to the construct of self-efficacy. Leadership self-confidence and leadership self-efficacy have been treated as interchangeable terms in the literature (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Leadership self-efficacy refers to one's confidence in their capacity or ability to successfully lead a group. Self-confidence and self-efficacy are not identical concepts but are closely associated in that self-confidence is a trait that impacts leadership performance through the mediating mechanism of leadership self-efficacy. In other words, whereas self-confidence is a personal trait that is often displayed by leaders in a variety of roles and situations, leadership self-efficacy reflects leaders' confidence specific to the leadership role and situation. Thus, self-confidence appears to indirectly influence leadership practices and effectiveness through its impact on leadership self-efficacy.

Determined/Perseverance:

Indicators at the Meets Expectations Level

- Demonstrates persistence (grit) and does not give up easily even when confronted with challenging situations.
- Demonstrates strong commitment and consistent follow through on tasks and responsibilities.

Resilience is described as a personal quality that predisposes individuals to bounce back in the face of loss. Resilient leaders, however, do more than bounce back—they bounce forward. Resilient school leaders take action that responds to new and ever-changing realities, even as they maintain the essential operations of the schools they lead (Reeves & Allison, 2009, 2010). Determined leaders remain focused and hopeful of their vision and are able to push through adversity and unexpected challenges. Furthermore, effective leaders maintain a growth mindset and look at challenges as an opportunity to strengthen their leadership capacity.

Vision:

Indicators at the Meets Expectations Level

- Collaboratively leads, develops, and communicates a school vision that reflects a core set of values and principles.
- Ability to see the big picture when making key decisions.
- Embeds the vision in all decisions, expectations, and daily practice.
- Communicates a clear vision openly with a voice characterized by purpose.

Effective school leaders have a continuous vision for improvement that guides how they operate. Their high expectations guide their leadership capacity to move teaching and learning in an upward progression. School leaders who embody vision are able to get buy in from faculty, staff, students, parents, and community stakeholders. Furthermore, effective leaders are not afraid to expand or to scale back their vision when appropriate. They actively seek input from those around them. Effective school leaders have both a short-term vision to meet immediate needs, and a long-term vision to meet future needs.

Driven to Learn:

Indicators at the Meets Expectations Level

- Accepts constructive feedback for continuous improvement of professional behaviors.
- Proactively demonstrates life-long learning for self and others.
- Consistently reflects on learning and professional practice.

The best leaders are the best learners. Effective leaders take the initiative to stay abreast of current trends in education and find ways to enhance their leadership capacity on a regular basis. Seeking opportunities for professional growth also includes being open to constructive feedback from mentors and other leaders in the field and developing a consistent reflective practice to support their needed areas of growth. Strong leaders not only engage in their own professional growth, but also encourage such professional development in others.

Conflict Resolution:

Indicators at the Meets Expectations Level

- Effectively has difficult conversations demonstrating the idea that dealing with conflict directly is the best thing for both sides.
- Proactively resolves disagreements with a calm, non-defensive, and respectful reaction and identifies win-win solutions in a timely manner.
- Respectfully listens to understand conflict and each person's/group's point of view before acting or offering a resolution.

Effective leaders are efficient problem solver. They are able to find effective solutions that benefit all parties involved. They are not afraid to think outside the box. They understand that each situation is unique and that there is no one ubiquitous approach for dealing with challenges. Additionally, effective leaders are proactive problem solvers who respond timely and are not swayed by others to think that problems and conflict cannot be resolved.

Embraces Diversity and Equity:

Indicators at the Meets Expectations Level

- Promotes a climate that makes the school welcoming, inclusive, and accepting of all students by treating others fairly and by not showing partiality to any persons or groups.
- Demonstrates critical consciousness of culture and race by embracing the diverse needs, interests, and strengths of all students, staff, and the larger community.
- Demonstrates cultural responsiveness and promotes such responsiveness among the school at large.
- Possessing an appreciation and value for cultural and academic diversity requires a mindset of inclusivity.

Culturally aware educators consider the differences of others and do not allow such diversity to dictate their actions adversely. Inclusion permeates in all areas of leadership, teaching, and learning and is evident in instructional activities, the classroom community, the school community at large, and through interpersonal interactions. Additionally, culturally aware leaders promote an environment where students feel safe because the leader has created a positive and respectful environment. In essence, school leaders are to be culturally aware and responsive, which entails recognizing the importance of including students' cultural references in all aspects of learning (Ladson-Billings, 1994).

Relationship Skills:

Indicators at the Meets Expectations Level

- Possesses an ability to create positive and professional relationships with faculty, staff, and students by supporting others within and outside of their presence.
- Demonstrates dedication towards collaboratively building positive relationships with community stakeholders for the benefit of school improvement and P-12 student growth.
- Creates a climate of respect and rapport among faculty, staff, and students by demonstrating sensitivity to feelings of others at all times.
- Conducts self in an ethical manner and conducts relationships in a way that cultivates ethical actions in others.

Effective school leaders build positive relationships by putting others first. They make humble decisions that may not necessarily benefit themselves, but instead are the best decisions for the faculty, students, stakeholders, and school at large. These decisions may instead make a leaders' job increasingly difficult, however a leader makes the necessary decisions to help where and when they are needed. Relational leaders embrace an open-door policy and are not dismissive of others. They are able to make teachers, parents, students, and stakeholders feel important. A leader understands that others around them are contributors to the academic success of students and is evident in their interactions with all stakeholders.

High Expectations for All:

Indicators at the Meets Expectations Level

- Committed to high expectations, high quality instruction, and collective accountability.
- Inspires others to accomplish challenging work.
- Demonstrates personal accountability for one's self as evidenced by modeling behaviors of high expectations.

Literature consistently emphasizes that having high expectations for all students and making those high standards clear and public is key to closing the achievement gap between and raising the overall achievement of all students (Louis et al., 2010). Effective principals are responsible for establishing a schoolwide vision of commitment to high standards and the success of all students (Porter et al., 2008). Additionally, an effective principal ensures that academic success becomes the driver of instruction by motivating the entire faculty to adopt a schoolwide learning improvement agenda that focuses on goals for student progress (Portin et al., 2009). Lastly, effective school leaders take accountability for such expectations by modeling the desired teacher behaviors through their leadership consistently.

Positive Attitude:

Indicators at the Meets Expectations Level

- Is an advocate and spokesperson for the school to all stakeholders.
- Demonstrates a growth mindset towards challenging tasks.
- Anticipates and responds in a positive or constructive manner at all times.
- Displays a sense of what is appropriate and considerate in dealing with others as evidenced by being thoughtful of others' feelings and skilled at handling difficult and delicate situations.

An attitude is regarded as a positive or negative point of view that shapes one's perspectives, thought processes, and behaviors. According to Souza and Marcos (2010), attitude determines what each individual will see, hear, think and do and can be positive or negative. It is very clear

that a leader's way of thinking guides his or her actions inside and outside of educational settings. While school leaders should be competent in their knowledge of content and pedagogy, it is also equally important that leaders understand the impact of possessing a positive attitude within the constructs of teaching and learning. Research suggests that the positivity of a school leader can have a significant impact on the academic success of students.

Effective Communication:

Indicators at the Meets Expectations Level

- Communicates openly, honestly, and purposefully while exhibiting poise and professionalism, even when it is uncomfortable or unpopular.
- Creates open communication channels with others that includes multiple forms of communication (e.g., oral, written, digital).
- Articulates a clear point of view in an accurate and concise manner.
- Actively listens to diverse perspectives and uses the process of communication to link individuals, groups, and the school to build relationships, establish trust, and earn respect for self and others.

Effective communication entails possessing the ability to demonstrate command of the English language while engaging in a range of contexts and for a variety of different audiences and purposes. This includes the ability to tailor written and oral communication to any audience, using appropriate styles and approaches. Educational leaders must be able to express themselves in a manner where recipients understand the message in a receptive rather than defensive way. Written correspondence and oral communication must be delivered clearly and with tact.

Integrity:

Indicators at the Meets Expectations Level

- Demonstrates strength when making decisions that are ethical and in the best interest of the students and school at large as evidenced by the ability to reflect on, communicate, cultivate, and model integrity, trust, fairness, transparency, and collaboration.
- Accepts total personal and professional accountability for own behavior and the educational processes of the school.
- Is consistent in words, actions, and deeds with no gaps between what he/she says and what he/she does. Leader is dependable; follows through on promises, keeps his/her word.

Integrity is one of the top attributes of a strong school leader. Integrity includes actions, values, methods, measures, principles, expectations and outcomes. It connotes a deep commitment to do the right thing for the right reason, regardless of the circumstances. People who live with

integrity are incorruptible and incapable of breaking the trust of those who have confided in them. For school leadership, integrity is vital as it underpins every other leadership disposition. Choosing the right, regardless of the consequence, is the hallmark of integrity. Integrity requires humility. Humble leaders know that everyone has a different approach, value system, and reason for doing what they do. Lastly, leaders with integrity seek to understand all perspectives, and weigh consequences before making a decision. For the purposes of the EDLDA, ethical practices and expectations should be aligned to the state and national school leadership code of ethics.

Creates a Positive Culture:

Indicators at the Meets Expectations Level

- Fosters shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation by promoting positive morale.
- Delegates work/tasks appropriately as evidenced by distributed leadership.
- Recognizes and celebrates efforts of others in a timely and consistent manner.
- Successfully generates an environment of trust and authentic relationships.

Research indicates that “a healthy school environment” is characterized by basics as “safety and orderliness,” as well as less tangible qualities such as “supportive and responsive attitudes” toward students, and a sense by teachers that they are part of a community of professionals focused on good instruction. Effective principals ensure that all adults and children at their school focus on learning as the center of their daily activities (Goldring, Murphy, Elliott, & Cravens, 2007).

Possesses Professional Beliefs Commitment, and Work Ethic:

Indicators at the Meets Expectations Level

- Fosters a collective belief that the school will make a difference in the academic, social and emotional lives of students.
- Demonstrates an unwavering commitment towards the school and professional responsibilities as evidenced by a consistent producing high quality work.

Brehm et.al. (2006) suggested that professionalism can be divided into the three categories; 1) professional parameters, 2) professional behaviors, and 3) professional responsibilities. The first category, professional parameters, deals with the legal and ethical rules educators must follow such as the Code of Professional Conduct delineated by state boards of education. Other examples include local, state, and federal laws pertaining to educational and instructional issues. Professional behaviors include observable actions such as, developing and maintaining positive relationships with administrators, colleagues, parents, and students; modeling the

appearance and attitudes of a professional educator, and being reliable and dependable. Professional responsibilities include active involvement of one's professional association, volunteering for school or community functions and attending school events.

Adaptable in Working with Staff and Stakeholders:

Indicators at the Meets Expectations Level

- Collaboratively engages staff and stakeholders to seek and consider diverse perspectives.
- Actively cultivates relationships and solicits stakeholder input to make informed decisions.
- Differentiates leadership approach based on the different needs of those individuals being led.

A professional school culture requires leaders who are willing to share, support, and explore collaboratively with others. Developing a collaborative culture will result in reducing teacher attrition, improving student learning, and creating the type of school that everyone searches for when they decide to become an educator. Studies show that when teachers, school leaders, and stakeholders collaborate, students perform better. However, successful collaboration begins with possessing certain dispositional qualities and behaviors. Collaboration requires an openness to give and receive feedback coupled with a willingness to grow professionally. True collaboration also involves mutual respect to work towards a common goal.

Self-Aware of Strengths and Weaknesses:

Indicators at the Meets Expectations Level

- Demonstrates the social emotional competence needed to maintain composure in challenging situations by being proactive rather than reactive.
- Demonstrates full awareness of their disposition, and can self-reflect to determine how their behaviors influence the people with whom they work and serve, and recognize any behavior that they need to change in order to lead more effectively.

Being self-aware is also referred to as self-management and is the ability to effectively regulate one's thoughts, emotions and behaviors in a variety of situations in a manner that is uncompromising to those being led or the schooling organization as a whole. This includes the ability to manage stress, control impulses, self-motivate, and establish, pursue, and achieve personal and academic goals.

Psychometric Features of Sound Measures of School Leadership Dispositions

A sound assessment of "school leadership dispositions" requires evidence of construct validity and estimates of inter-rater reliability. Specifically, the identification of the behaviors representing good dispositions and the level of agreement as to the representativeness of

these behaviors by experts provides evidence of the construct validity of the measure (AERA, APA, & NCME, 2014). Evidence of construct validity suggests that all appropriate dispositional behaviors are included in the measure so that the measure is actually assessing what it is reporting to assess. In the case of disposition assessments, the measure should include all indicators that represent dispositions of educational leaders and no indicators that do not represent disposition. This assurance may be evidenced by efforts made towards getting a collective agreement as to what dispositions to include. Specifically, a common method is compiling a list of all possible research-based indicators and asking experts to rate the representativeness of each one. Highly rated indicators are retained and turned into Likert items on the measure or assessment.

Once agreed upon dispositional behaviors have been identified, the indicators may still be open to subjectivity when rating. Raters/experts may agree to the factors but disagree upon or understand what is meant by each indicator. For example, what “integrity” is to one rater may not be the same to another evaluator. Further refinement of each behavior may help raters better understand exactly what is meant by each one. In fact, professional standards suggest assessment makers estimate the likelihood of separate evaluators having similar ratings of the same educational leader (AERA APA, & NCME, 2014). The level of agreement or inter-rater reliability by evaluators is estimated by calculating the correlation between ratings of the same persons between two evaluators.

Survey Content

The EDLDA consists of dispositions and related indicators identified through the research and are explicitly aligned with the NELP Standards. It is recommended institutions align their respective state standards with the NELP Standards identified in the instrument.

Methodology

Selection of Participants

Solicitation for participation was extended to educational leadership practitioners in a public school district in the Southeastern Region of the United States, candidates in a Master’s of Educational Leadership Program in a mid-sized liberal arts university, and experts in the field at a fall CAEP conference. Participation qualifications included having experience in educational leadership either as a school leader, district leader, teacher leader, professor of educational leadership, or candidate currently enrolled in an Educational Leadership Program. Data collection included several phases, of which participants were notified that their participation was voluntary.

Data Collection

The goal of this study was to operationalize leadership dispositions validated in the research to determine the meaning of each and to create an instrument to assess candidate dispositions in Educational Leadership Programs. The methodology for this study is mixed methods and, in part, replicates the process described in Green and Cooper (2013), but was completed in several phases as described below. In all, data collection for this research included dissemination of two online surveys and several focus group discussions.

Phase One

The investigators reviewed the most recent literature to identify behaviors of educational leadership dispositions and identified 38 frequently cited dispositions of effective school leaders. To further test the validity of the 38 dispositions, the researchers disseminated an online survey to subject matter experts (N = 33) asking them to rate the essentialness of each disposition in relation to educational leadership. The ratings were on a Likert scale of 1 to 4, with 1 meaning not representative; 2 indicating somewhat representative; 3 indicating representative; and 4 reflecting that the behavior was essential to the identified disposition. In addition to a Likert rating for each disposition, the survey also included fields for additional comments. Based on survey results, dispositions with a mean score of 3.4 or less were eliminated. Survey data indicated all 38 dispositions as representative of effective educational leadership dispositions, however open ended responses from the survey suggested noticeable areas of repetitively between certain dispositions. Based on survey data and feedback, the list was reduced to 28 dispositions. The researchers then advanced their work by conducting an extensive literature review to operationalize the list of 28 by including descriptive language to illustrate each disposition. With a list of 28 dispositions and a set of descriptive behaviors for each, the researchers conducted another validity check, which is discussed in phase two.

Phase Two

The next phase of data collection involved disseminating a 2nd online survey to receive large scale feedback from educational leadership practitioners regarding the 28 identified dispositions and associated descriptive behaviors. The online survey, constructed using the Qualtrics platform, was disseminated to school leaders throughout a large metropolitan area in the Southeastern Region of the United States and to participants attending a session at the 2018 fall CAEP conference (N = 130), which resulted in a 72% response rate. The anonymous survey asked participants to rate the degree to which each behavioral descriptor was representative of the prescribed disposition. The ratings were on a Likert scale of 1 to 4, with 1 meaning not representative; 2 indicating somewhat representative; 3 indicating representative; and 4 reflecting that the behavior was essential to the identified disposition. After calculating the mean scores, the investigators eliminated behaviors with mean scores lower than 3.5 on a 4-point scale.

Phase Three

After eliminating behaviors due to statistical insignificance, as described in phase two, the researchers conducted a series of focus groups during phase three. The first focus group consisted of 13 subject matter experts, who were asked to examine the 28 dispositions and

associated behaviors using the Q-sort method. In small groups, participants discussed the dispositional behaviors and determined which disposition was a best fit for each associated behavior. Each small group presented their Q-sort results, which lead to a full group discussion regarding the validity of each of the 28 dispositions and behaviors, which resulted in the elimination of eight dispositions due to overlap.

The last focus group with subject matter experts (N = 5) involved a final review of the now 20 dispositions and behaviors. This focus group did not engage in a Q-sort, however their efforts included a review and discussion of the dispositions and behaviors to determine the validity of each item. The researchers felt this was necessary because the five subject matter experts also volunteered to participate in the construction of the EDLDA (Educational Leadership Disposition Assessment) instrument. Qualitative data collected from this focus groups resulted in the elimination of four dispositions (because they were already mentioned in the descriptive behaviors in other areas) and the addition of one disposition.

Data collection resulted in the development of the Educational Leadership Disposition Assessment (EDLDA), which includes fifteen dispositions with indicators (descriptive behaviors) for each identified leadership disposition. The EDLDA is formatted as a rubric with three rating categories (meets expectations, developing, needs improvement).

Interrater reliability was conducted using educational leadership professors in a Master's of Educational Leadership program in a mid-sized university located in the Southeastern Region of the United States. Using the EDLDA, two instructors rated a set of educational leadership candidates (N = 11) whom they had both instructed during the same semester. Both instructors are practitioners in the field of educational leadership with more than 20 years of experience in education. The correlation coefficient for each disposition is reflected below.

Confidence	0.81
Determined/Perseverance	0.81
Vision	0.90
Driven to Learn	0.90
Conflict Resolution	1.00
Embraces Diversity and Equity	0.81
Relationship Skills	0.90
High Expectations for All	0.81
Positive Attitude	0.72
Effective Communication	0.81
Integrity	0.81
Creates a Positive Culture	0.90
Work Ethic	0.72
Adaptable	0.72
Self-Aware	0.81

EDA Racial Bias, Gender and Ambiguity Examination

The research team conducted a check for racial bias, gender bias, and ambiguity within the assessment with a group of experts (N=18). Subject matter experts included school district leaders, educational leadership faculty members, and one classroom teacher with a degree in educational leadership. Participants were asked to review the dispositions on the EDLDA to identify any perceived racial bias, gender bias, or ambiguity present in the indicator descriptions. The bias and ambiguity test illuminated questions from participants that warranted clearer language in the descriptors for confidence, integrity and adaptable. Minor adjustments were made based on expert feedback. All other dispositional descriptors were free of racial bias, gender bias, and ambiguity.

Additional Evidence of Construct Validity

Another step conducted by the current research team was to provide additional evidence of construct validity by aligning the fifteen research-based dispositional indicators with the NELP Standards. This alignment may be seen as evidence of construct validity because there is agreement of dispositional indicators and therefore, more assurance that the instrument is actually measuring what it reports to be measuring. Lack of alignment is a threat to the construct validity of any tool designed to assess dispositions because standards suggest the importance of assessments capturing all indicators of the construct (AERA APA, & NCME, 2014).

The final EDLDA instrument includes fifteen indicators of educational leadership dispositions with associated behaviors. They have the additional evidence of construct validity because they are aligned with the NELP Standards.

Use of Instrument

Calibration Training

It is recommended that all EDLDA users participate in an online calibration training with the EDA research team. The purpose of a calibration trainings is to provide users with a clear collective understanding of the three scoring levels used in the EDLDA and well as provide an understanding of the operational descriptions of the fifteen dispositions included in the instrument. Calibration trainings are interactive as faculty members are encouraged to attend the online training together. For this reason, the calibration exercises provide opportunities for new raters to compare their scoring to master scorers' ratings to check their agreement before using the tool (Taylor & Wasicsko, 2000).

References

American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association & National Council on Measurement in Education. (2014). *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation (AAQEP) (2018) Standards. Retrieved from <https://aaqep.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/AAQEP-Expectations-Framework-February-2018-2.pdf>

Brehm, B., Breen, P., Brown, B., Long, L., Smith, R., Wall, A., & Warren, N.S. (2006). Instructional design and assessment. An interdisciplinary approach to introducing professionalism. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 70(4), 1-5.

Brewer, R., Lindquist, C. & Altemueller, L. (2011). The disposition improvement process. *International Journal of Instruction*, 4, 206-216.

Council of Chief State School Officers (2013) *InTASC: Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progression for Teachers 1.0*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Green, R., & Cooper, T. (2013). An identification of the most preferred dispositions of effective school leaders. *National Forum of Applied Educational Research Journal*, 26, 55–76.

Goldring, E., Porter, A. C., Murphy, J., Elliott, S. N., & Cravens, X. (2007). *Assessing learning-centered leadership: Connections to research, professional standards, and current practices*. Retrieved from Wallace Foundation website: <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/principal-evaluation/Pages/Assessing-Learning-Centered-Leadership.aspx>.

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2002). *The leadership challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishing Co.

Louis, K.S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K., & Anderson, S. (2010). *Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings*. New York: The Wallace Foundation. Available at www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Pages/Investigating-the-Links-to-Improved-Student-Learning.aspx.

Melton, T., Mallory, B., & Green, J. (2010). Identifying and assessing dispositions of educational leadership candidates. *CAEPA Educational Leadership and Administration*, 22, 46-60.

National Policy Board for Educational Leadership. (2018). *National Educational Leadership Preparation Standards*.

Porter, A.C., Murphy, J., Goldring, E., Elliott, S.N., Polikoff, M.S., & May, H. (2008). *Vanderbilt assessment of leadership in education: Technical manual, version 1.0*. New York: The Wallace Foundation. Available at www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/principal-evaluation/Pages/Vanderbilt-Assessment-of-Leadership-in-Education-Te

Portin, B.S., Knapp, M.S., Dareff, S., Feldman, S., Russell, F.A., Samuelson, C., (2009). *Leadership for learning improvement in urban schools*. New York: The Wallace Foundation. Available at www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/district-policy-and-practice/Pages/Leadership-for-Learning-Improvement-in-Urban-Schools.aspx.chnical-Manual-1.aspx.

Reeves, D. B., & Allison, E. (2009). *Renewal coaching: Sustainable change for individuals and organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Reeves, D. B., & Allison, E. (2010). *Renewal coaching workbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schulte, L. E., & Kowal, P. (2005). The validation of the Administrator Dispositions Index. *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program Development*, 17, 5-87.

Souza, Barros .S. de and Marcos F. E. (2010). Physics: How do they affect the reality of the classroom and models for change. <http://www.physics.ohio-state.edu/Jossen/ICPE/02.html>.

Taylor, R., & Wasicsko, M. (2000). *The dispositions to teach*. Southern Region Association of Teacher Educators Conference. Lexington.