FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP IN

URBAN SCHOOL REFORM

A Dissertation

by

RODNEY PRESCOTT McCLENDON

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August 2007

Major Subject: Agricultural Education

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP IN

URBAN SCHOOL REFORM

A Dissertation

by

RODNEY PRESCOTT McCLENDON

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved by:

Chair of Committee,	Christine D. Townsend
Committee Members,	Richard L. Cummins
	Alvin Larke, Jr.
	Kenneth E. Paprock
Head of Department,	Christine D. Townsend

August 2007

Major Subject: Agricultural Education

ABSTRACT

Faculty Perceptions of Presidential Leadership in

Urban School Reform. (August 2007)

Rodney Prescott McClendon, B.A., Morehouse College;

J.D., Emory University

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Christine D. Townsend

The study examined urban university faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform. The population for this study consisted of faculty members from five urban research universities. All of the universities are members of the Great Cities' Universities (GCU) coalition, an alliance of 19 public urban research universities that are collaborating to address educational challenges in their communities. The study entailed a purposive sample with universities chosen on the basis of their membership in the GCU. The subjects were 245 faculty members from colleges of education and colleges of arts and sciences at the five urban research universities.

All participants completed the Urban Faculty Questionnaire (UFQ), a confidential, web-based questionnaire designed by the researcher. The questionnaire consisted of five statements about general perceptions of urban school reform, 30 statements about perceptions of the university presidents' leadership roles in the specific institutions' urban school reform initiatives, eight statements regarding personal characteristics and a section for optional additional comments. The statements

corresponded to seven internal scales of analysis. The seven scales were (a) Perceptions of Urban School Reform, (b) University Structure and Culture, (c) Presidential Awareness, (d) Internal Relationships, (e) External Relationships, (f) Resources and Support and (g) Accountability and Recognition.

The data show faculty believe urban schools need reform. Faculty also believe universities located in urban communities should be involved actively in urban school reform. Faculty generally do not take personal responsibility, however, for urban school reform initiatives at their universities. Faculty seem more aware of their presidents' external relationships than their internal relationships in urban school reform. Faculty tend to agree that their presidents build strong relationships with the local business community and with the local political community; however, they tend only somewhat to agree that their presidents build strong relationships with local public school representatives and local families and citizens. The study also reveals that no statistically significant difference exists in faculty perceptions of their presidents' leadership in urban school reform by the faculty members' academic college, academic rank, years of service at their current institutions, highest academic degree earned, gender and ethnicity.

DEDICATION

Dear God, I thank You for who You are and all You do, constantly exceeding my greatest expectations. In the daylight and the twilight, you give me strength to continue when I am weak, and when I am weary, you carry me. I pray that who I am and the work I do will continue to be pleasing in your eyes and for your name's sake.

Luke 12:48 reminds me *". . . to whom much is given, much is expected. . . ."* I have been given so much. This work is the culmination and celebration of a life's journey. I stand on the shoulders of giants, many of whom were denied a formal education, but they had great dreams and made spectacular sacrifices for those whom would follow. I honor, with this work, all of those individuals—known and unknown. In particular, I pay tribute to Mrs. Beatrice F. Britton, my "adopted" grandmother for whom the cotton fields were her classroom. Although you have been gone more than two decades, your admonition to me as a young boy to "git all the education you can" inspires and sustains me still. I kept my promise.

I dedicate this work to my parents. My mother, Mrs. Sallie Irene (Allen) McClendon, when the public school system gave up on me, you declared, "Not this one!" Sitting in your rocking chair, you made me read to you every night and then tested me on what I had read. You taught me to love to read and to love to learn. You saved this "junior first grader's" life. My daddy, Mr. Eugene Edward McClendon, you taught me to be a strong man. You taught me always to speak truth to power and in the words of Grandpa Willie, "to do better than . . . because the family must always progress." I love you both, and my greatest honor is being your seventh son.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing to her sons in *The Measure of Our Success,* Dr. Marian Wright Edelman, the first Black woman admitted to the Mississippi bar and the founder and president of the Children's Defense Fund, admonished her boys to follow the teachings of Dr. Howard Thurman and "listen for the sound of the genuine" in themselves and others. Twelve years ago when I discovered this concept, I also became familiar with an old adage, *If you find a turtle on a fence post, you know that it had some help getting there.* As I culminate this challenging academic journey to my doctorate of philosophy in leadership, education, and communications, I humbly and gratefully acknowledge the sound of *and* my interaction with the genuine, who helped make this accomplishment possible.

Almost five years ago to the date of my dissertation defense, Dr. Robert M. Gates, newly appointed as the 22nd president of Texas A&M University, asked me to become his chief of staff—the first chief of staff to the president in the history of the University. In that discussion, I asked if he would be supportive of me pursuing my doctorate, and he responded that not only would he be supportive, but he insisted upon it. One year later, he reminded me of his expectation and gave me more than a "gentle" nudge to get started. Bob, for almost five years, you supported, encouraged and pushed me to finish my doctorate. You set the standard for presidential leadership, and I am forever grateful for your mentorship and your and Becky's friendship. I am proud to say that as you answer daily the call to duty as the 22nd U.S. Secretary of Defense, one of your "lesser-known initiatives" at Texas A&M of having me earn my doctorate degree

vii

has been realized.

My doctoral faculty committee set the standard for student support, care and collegiality. I especially recognize Dr. Christine D. Townsend, committee chair. In our first discussion about me enrolling in the doctoral leadership program, you promised that if I enrolled, you and the entire leadership department would challenge me, support me, and ensure I completed the degree. You stayed true to your word, and I could not have completed this study without you. Dr. Richard (Dick) L. Cummins, you have been a great mentor and friend prior to and throughout this 12-hour exercise. Your constructive feedback and repositioning of the "lens" needed to examine various issues have been invaluable. Dr. Alvin Larke, Jr., your confidence in me and your constant encouragement were relentless. You taught me early the importance of setting benchmarks by which to complete this process in a timely fashion, and with your academic course being the first in my doctoral program, you helped me get back into the groove of being a student. I know I am but one of many whom you have supported on this academic journey. Dr. Kenneth Paprock, you joined the committee later, and quickly became an invaluable contributor. Your international perspective stretched my paradigm, and your commitment to see me through to completion even in the face of your own personal challenges is beyond inspiring. Dr. James Lindner, although you were asked to substitute during my defense, there is nothing about you that says "substitute." From helping me design and improve the research instrument to helping me input, analyze, and interpret the data in a crash course fashion, you always were available and amazing.

Diane K. Carr, my assistant in my "other" job and my friend, I cannot thank you enough for your support, whether it was listening to my ideas and struggles or arranging and re-arranging my calendar so that I could honor my professional and my academic commitments. You promised you would take good care of me, and you have.

Dr. Carol L. Patitu and Wanda J. Watson, this journey in many ways is your legacy. Both of you, independent of each other but seemingly in tandem, for years pushed me to get my doctorate. You both have such confidence in me and my potential that one of my biggest fears is to fall short of your expectations. Carol, your phone calls and e-mails over the years have helped to nudge me along. And, Wanda, the benefits of your friendship through calls, visits, picking up my laundry or shoes, etc. when I needed to study can never be counted or repaid properly. And, "Bandit" wasn't necessary.

To all of my friends who have continually proven that one doesn't have to be a friend in need to be a friend indeed. Diana Perez, Esq., our friendship has continued to grow over the years, and I am blessed to know you. Your regular reminders that I will be "awesome" and that you are praying for me mean more than you will ever know. Audrey Robinson, Esq., girl, you are the ultimate fan club and support system. Our friendship for 17 years, mostly at a geographical distance, is amazing. Just your reminders that "it can't be any worse than law school" kept me on track. Reginald Goins, "Chief," you and Angie are the friends who stick as close as a brother and sister. Since our days at Morehouse, you have called me "Doc," knowing without waver that I would one day earn my doctorate degree. Dinara Seitova, we started this journey together, and have leaned on each other throughout. I look forward to calling you "Doctor" very soon.

Reeta Grimes, you always remind me to take care of myself and you always are there to make sure I do. What time is it already? Kimberly Dickerson and Sandra Bryant, you both have a strange infatuation with statistics; how fortunate I am that you do. More so, you have a rare knack for selfless support. I will be here to celebrate your "crossing over" soon. Karan Chavis and Craig Blakely, sister- and brother- friend, not only do you call just to say, "You go, Boy," but you also are the ones who remind me and the entire Luther Crew (Kassandra, Sherylon, Greg, Harold, Bobby, Paul and Hugh) that good food, beverages and friends stirred with the crooning of Mr. Vandross in the background are a perfect excuse to gather and celebrate. Vanessa Diaz de Rodriguez, you are a dear friend and a great sounding board. Dr. Richard (Rick) Giardino, you always help me find a way out of no way and then you and Fran feed me oh so well. Dr. Kenneth Ashworth, what can I say, you are still the wise fox. I don't know where I would be academically or professionally without your sage advice and your and Emily's friendship. To the Fab 5 (Julie, David, Bobby and Clarence), I miss you and always need you.

I saved for last my sisters and my brothers, not because you are least important, but because you deserve to be the lasting thought in this section. Myra, Kenneth, Nadine, Reginald, Gary, Eric, Alton, Bryan (Keith) and your families, you all have always allowed me to shine, without any sibling rivalry or resentment. In fact, you brag on your little brother. Myra, as the oldest and one of the first Black students to integrate the local high school, you are our pioneer. Your regular advice, support and sacrifice for me and all of us are a God-send. The remaining siblings, you each inspire me to be better and to appreciate daily the blessing of family. I am honored to be your baby brother.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

With the onset of the industrial revolution, Blacks near the turn of the 20th century migrated in large numbers from rural areas to urban areas in search of better opportunities (Du Bois, 1917; Franklin, 1980; Karenga, 1982). The growth of urban centers as it related to public funding for education represented a double-edged sword. Higher paying jobs translated into more taxable wealth, some of which was diverted to funding public education (Du Bois; Franklin). However, Franklin noted that the concentration of larger numbers of individuals reduced the per capita contribution to education (Franklin). The current disparities in academic achievement among African American, Latino and other students who attend American urban schools are the legacy of these century-old disparities, as well as those discriminatory practices that led to the mobilization of Blacks (Akbar, 1984).

During the early 18th century and the height of the American slave trade of Africans, lack of education and the predominance of ignorance were prevalent among Whites and Blacks (Franklin, 1980). As the new world began to evolve and the "need" to keep enslaved Africans ignorant of the benefits of economic mobility and freedom

_____

This dissertation follows the style and format of the *Journal of Agricultural Education.*

derived from a substantive education, laws were enacted that made it a crime to teach Negroes to read (Franklin; Karenga, 1982). In spite of these laws, many Negroes indeed learned to read. A few slave owners and some of their wives, overseers and children taught a small number of adult Negroes and their children how to read and write (Franklin). In at least one case, a slave owner in Mississippi took pride in bragging that all 20 of his Negroes could read (Franklin).

Near and during the turn of the 19th century—mostly in the New England and northern states—Whites taught Negro children in private and public institutions (Franklin, 1980). Additionally, separate schools for Negro children began to emerge as a result of efforts of concerned Whites and various religious and humanitarian organizations (Franklin). In 1810, the state of New York mandated that masters teach all slave children to read the Scriptures (Franklin). By 1840, Negroes in Wilmington, DE, could attend school with White children (Franklin). Additionally, Negroes—those who had attained some prominence and "ordinary" people—established schools to serve Negro children. Historians estimated that by June 1863, about 5,000 Negroes were enrolled in school (Franklin).

Franklin (1980) suggested that regardless of the origins of the schools, "most Negro schools had poor facilities, inadequate supplies, and insufficient teachers, but Negroes attended them in larger and larger numbers" (p. 210). He added:

> In 1880 there were 714,884 Negroes in school in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North and South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas. By 1910 the number had increased to 1,426,102;

and by 1930 there were 1,893,068 in school. In the same states the enrollment of white children increased even more rapidly, with the consequent diversion of educational funds to schools for whites, thereby depriving blacks of adequate facilities and well-trained teachers. (p. 402)

Simultaneously, in the South, the doctrine of "separate but equal" schools was a farce as funding to Black schools never matched that given to White schools (Franklin, 1980; Williams, 1987). As Franklin noted:

In 1900 for every $2 spent for the education of blacks in the South, $3 was spent on whites; but in 1930 $7 was spent for whites to every $2 spent for blacks. In 1935-1936 the current expenditures per white pupil in ten Southern states averaged $37.87, while such expenditures per black pupil averaged $13.09. (p. 403)

For individual state expenditures, the inequities were even worse. According to Williams:

In 1930, South Carolina spent ten times as much on educating each white child as on each black child. Other southern states did little better— Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, and Alabama devoted five times more money to the education of white children than to that of black children. (p. 2)

These funding disparities, which translated into visible, tangible inequities, too often meant overcrowded classrooms, insufficient number of books and school supplies, facilities with leaking roofs and no heat and plumbing (Franklin; Williams).

In preparation for the school desegregation cases that eventually led to the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, the lawyers recognized they had to "put a face" on the negative impact segregated schools had on Black students (Williams, 1987). In fact, lawyers set out to show that "separate schools could never be equal" (Williams, p. 19). The lawyers were determined to show the "psychological, intellectual, and financial damage" that resulted from segregation "precluded equality" (Williams, p. 19). The lawyers were influenced by a study conducted in 1939 and 1940 by psychologist Kenneth Clark and his wife, Mamie Phipps (Williams). Clark and Phipps utilized Black and White dolls in interviews with children from a non-segregated school in New York and a segregated school in Washington, D.C. to determine how children perceived themselves. They found that students who attended segregated schools had lower self-esteem than students who attended integrated schools. The lawyers in *Brown* retained Clark to conduct the same study in Clarendon County, SC, as part of the combined desegregation cases in the South (Williams). Clark recalled:

> I remember one child in Arkansas, a little boy, from the earlier study.
> When I asked him the key question ["Which doll is most like you?"], he
> looked up and smiled, laughed, and pointed to the brown doll, and said,
> "That's a nigger. I'm a nigger." I found that as disturbing, if not more
> disturbing, than the children in Massachusetts who would refuse to

answer the question, or would cry and run out of the room. (Williams, p. 23)

On May 17, 1954, Chief Justice Earl Warren delivered the unanimous opinion of the Court, seeming to rely on evidence from the dolls test (Williams, 1987):

Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other tangible factors may be equal, deprive children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? We believe it does . . . . To separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way very unlikely to ever be undone.

We conclude unanimously, that in the field of public education the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal (p. 25). Therefore we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. (Franklin, 1980, p. 409)

Given the loose timeline of a "prompt and reasonable start toward full compliance" to desegregate (Franklin, 1980, p. 410), 10 years later, inequity in education and other sectors of public life remained, as evident in an excerpt from

a speech by President Lyndon Baines Johnson, delivered shortly after the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Johnson noted, "We seek not just freedom, but opportunity. We seek not just legal equality but human ability. Not just equality as a right and a theory, but equality as a fact and equality as a result" (Bauman, Bustillos, Bensimon, Brown, and Bartee, 2005, p. 2).

More than 50 years since the Court ruled in *Brown* and more than 40 years since President Johnson outlined the challenges facing America, pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade (P-12) public education in America still is wrought with inequities that, as Justice Warren predicted, ". . . may affect their hearts and minds in a way very unlikely to ever be undone" (Williams, 1987, p. 25). That negative effect is even more profound in urban areas.

Statement of the Problem

In large part, students in American urban schools are not prepared academically to go to college and persist to graduation (Zimpher & Howey, 2004). Most notably, there are 7.4 million students enrolled in the nation's largest urban public school systems (Council of the Great City Schools, 2004). Only 57.5% of students in urban school districts graduate, compared to suburban school districts (72.7%), small/large towns (69.1%) and rural districts (71.9%) (Swanson, 2004b). With few exceptions, the conditions that are barriers to these students' academic preparedness are typical of the urban centers in which many university presidents' and chancellors' universities are located. Specifically, a teacher shortage exists in America and those who enter the

profession have a high attrition rate, especially in urban areas (Croasmun, Hampton, & Herrmann, 1999; Zimpher & Howey; NCES, 2005). The greatest teacher shortage is in urban centers, usually consistent with environments where both need and poverty are high (Croasmun et al.; Zimpher & Howey; NCES).   American schools remain disproportionately segregated by race and social class, and minority and poor children represent the majority of urban school students (Zimpher & Howey). Public funding for these urban schools has not kept pace with funding for schools located in more affluent communities (Gilderbloom, 2002; Zimpher & Howey). The majority of college graduates entering the teaching profession are White (NCES; Zimpher & Howey), and the majority of new teachers choose not to teach in impoverished schools (NCES; Zimpher & Howey). Of those new teachers who accept teaching positions in urban schools, many are ill-prepared for the cultural barriers that arise (Croasmun et al.; Zimpher & Howey).

Further, either through channeling or choice, the least qualified teachers are teaching poor and minority children in urban schools (Zimpher & Howey, 2004). This current culture, pervasive in many urban schools, is the result of some combination of long-term social trends, historical events, lack of public funding, lack of visionary leadership, neglect, distrust, bureaucratic silos, etc. (Gilderbloom, 2002; Zimpher & Howey). Hence, in many urban schools, a climate promoting a standard of excellence is nonexistent (Hoy and Miskel, 2005).

With limited resources and unlimited demands on state budgets, investments in higher education represent opportunity costs to K-12 education, healthcare, roads,

prisons, etc. (The Institute for Higher Education Policy and Scholarship America, 2004). At a time when higher education challenges are great (shrinking budgets, increasing public expectations of accountability, legal disputes, etc.), the expectation for urban university presidents and chancellors to lead the way in urban school reform can be perceived simply as an additional burden (Zimpher & Howey, 2004).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine various leadership roles that university presidents perform in supporting their universities' urban school reform initiatives. More specifically, the study explored college of education and college of arts and sciences faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership roles in urban school reform. Additionally, the researcher examined the question of whether differences exist among faculty from the colleges of education and the colleges of arts and sciences in their perceptions of the presidents' leadership roles in urban school reform. Finally, the study considered whether faculty perceptions of their presidents' leadership in urban school reform initiatives differed significantly by the faculty members' academic rank, years of service at the institution, highest degree earned, gender and ethnicity.

Significance of the Study

The results of this study revealed whether differences exist in college of education and college of arts and sciences faculty members' general perceptions of urban school reform, as well as their perceptions of their presidents' involvement and effectiveness in various leadership roles related to urban school reform initiatives. It also probed whether differences exist in faculty perceptions based on their academic rank, highest degree earned, gender, years of service at the institution and ethnicity. From the results, university stakeholders may be able to assess and perhaps improve their universities' efforts to effectuate better positive changes in urban schools.

Operational Definitions

At Risk students: those who, because of limited English proficiency, poverty, race, geographic location, or economic disadvantage, face a greater risk of low educational achievement or reduced academic expectations (Tompkins and Deloney, 2006)

Campus Stakeholders: ideally, each member of the university community; in particular, university administrators and faculty

Great Cities' Universities (GCU): an alliance of 19 public urban research universities that are collaborating to address challenges in their communities (Zimpher & Howey, 2004)

Minority: Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino/Latina, Alaskan/Native American and Asian/Pacific Islander ethnic origins generally; in the context of minority

educational disparities, unless otherwise denoted, minority includes only Black/African American and Hispanic/Latino/Latina; in this study, the terms Black, African American and Negro and the terms Hispanic, Latino and Latina are used interchangeably

Rural: any incorporated place, Census Designated Place, or non-place territory and defined as rural by the Census Bureau. A rural area may be within or outside of a Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area or Metropolitan Statistical Area of a large or mid-size city (Swanson, 2004b).

Suburb: any incorporated place, Census Designated Place, or non-place territory within a Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area or Metropolitan Statistical Area of a large or mid-size city and defined as urban by the Census Bureau (Swanson, 2004b)

Town: an incorporated place or Census Designated Place with a population greater than or equal to 2,500 and located outside a Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area or Metropolitan Statistical Area (Swanson, 2004b)

Urban/Central City: a central city of Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (Swanson, 2004b); see also definition of "urban university" this section below

Urban School Reform/Renewal: planned [collaborative] efforts designed to change schools to correct perceived educational problems (Tyack and Cuban, as cited in Hess, 1999)

Urban University: "a university located in or close to an area which the Census Bureau classifies as all territory, population, and housing units located within an urbanized area (UA) or an urban cluster (UC). UA and UC boundaries are delineated to encompass densely settled territory, which consists of:

· core census block groups or blocks that have a population density of at least 1,000 people per square mile and

· surrounding census blocks that have an overall density of at least 500 people per square mile

Under certain conditions, less densely settled territory may be part of each UA or UC"

(U.S. Census Bureau, 2000)

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

To understand fully perceptions of presidential leadership in urban school reform, this study examined literature going back 90 years and traced urban school reform to its origins of nearly 100 years ago. Further, the study examined the evolution of challenges to African Americans receiving a quality education back to the 18th century, the height of the American slave trade of Africans. In the 18th century, teaching enslaved Africans to read was illegal; yet, a few slave owners and some of their wives, overseers and children defied the law and taught their slaves basic reading and writing skills (Franklin, 1980; Karenga, 1982).

Even as a few schools for slave children began to emerge, those schools were wrought with poor facilities, inadequate supplies and insufficient teachers (Franklin). Today, many American schools, especially in urban communities, are wrought with poor facilities, inadequate supplies and insufficient teachers (Zimpher & Howey, 2004). Consequently, the achievement gap and national high school graduation rates for African American and Latino youths, who predominate these schools, are significantly lower than their White and Asian peers (Bauman et al., 2005; Swanson, 2004a). In the 100 years since urban school reform efforts began, the public's general perception is that university engagement with public schools is superficial or missing (DePaola, 1998; American Association of State Colleges and Universities [AASCU], 2002; Stukel, as cited in Gilderbloom, 2002). University presidential leadership is critical to changing

both the perception and the reality that universities are not engaged fully with the communities of which they are a part and with whom they should be partners (AASCU).

Need for Urban School Reform

More than 50 years since the United States Supreme Court ruled in the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* public school desegregation case that the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place in the field of public education (Williams, 1987), pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade (P-12) public education in America still is wrought with inequities (Zimpher & Howey, 2004). As Chief Justice Warren predicted, these inequities ". . . may affect their [children's] hearts and minds in a way very unlikely to ever be undone" (Williams, p. 25). In many urban schools, a climate exists in which students are considered "at risk" (Tompkins and Deloney, 2006; see also Hoy and Miskel, 2005).

The term "at risk" traditionally has been used in the public health field to describe patients susceptible to attracting a particular disease or illness (Tompkins and Deloney, 2006). In the 1980s, educators began to use the term to describe students who were susceptible to failure in public schools and in life due to a wide array of factors (Tompkins and Deloney). Some practitioners identify at risk students very narrowly as those susceptible to dropping out of school; however, at risk factors are much broader (Tompkins and Deloney). The U.S. House of Representatives, in the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1994* (as cited in Tompkins and Deloney), defined an at risk student as one "who, because of limited English proficiency, poverty, race, geographic

location, or economic disadvantage, faces a greater risk of low educational achievement or reduced academic expectations" (pp. 99-100). Perhaps equally important as the technical definition of at risk students are the behaviors and conditions that often result from being actually at risk. In both urban and rural communities, a growing presence exists of adolescent issues such as promiscuity, pregnancy, alcohol and drug abuse, tobacco usage, delinquency, excessive absenteeism, physical and sexual abuse, homelessness, attempted suicide, etc. (Tompkins & Deloney). These behaviors and conditions are factors which contribute to low educational achievement or reduced academic expectations (Tompkins & Deloney).

If one focuses purely on educational achievement, the achievement gap, which spans the time from early childhood through adulthood and is measured by test scores and grades, between minority students is significant (Bauman et al., 2005). According to the 1999 College Board (as cited in Bauman et al.), African American and Latino/a second- and third-grade test scores and grades lag their White and Asian counterparts. Additionally, African American and Latino/a fourth- and eighth-grade students trail their White and Asian peers in both reading and mathematics, and the gap has not closed in the last 15 years (Bauman et al.). The national high school graduation rate for the 2001 cohort of high school students is a dismal 68% (Swanson, 2004a). A significant disparity exists in graduation rates by ethnicity: American Indian (51.1%), Hispanic (53.2%) and Black (50.2%), compared to Asian/Pacific Islander (76.8%) and White (74.9%) (Swanson). Additionally, there are 7.4 million students enrolled in the nation's largest urban public school systems (Council of the Great City Schools, 2004). Only 57.5% of

students in urban school districts graduate, compared to suburban school districts (72.7%), small/large towns (69.1%) and rural districts (71.9%) (Swanson, 2004b).

Urban School Challenges

Test Scores and Cultural Background

Cooper (1989) has rejected the notion that achievement gap may be more related to ethnic background than high concentrations of minority students in segregated, under-funded schools. He cited historical practices in which teachers and school administrators consider test scores as "self-fulfilling prophecy":

Tests predicted how children would perform certain school tasks, and teachers taught in ways that confirmed those predictions. Children who scored poorly on reading tests, for example, were placed in slow-reading groups that were taught as if all of their members were slow in reading; thus, the instruction would confirm the tests' predictions. Unfortunately, the test scores often did not represent children's abilities to perform the task that the tests purported to measure. Furthermore, research has shown that children respond to instruction in the way that is expected of them; if they are expected to be slow, and are then taught as if they are slow, children begin to respond in the way others in the group respond, even though the response pattern and the group they are in may be inappropriate. Yet, children often were relegated to the slow reading group even though their assignments were made upon the basis of a

prediction and not upon observed behavior. Those children rarely, if ever, got out of the slow groups, and, more often than not, minorities were, and still are relegated to the lowest tracks on the basis of test performance.

. . . Most standardized reading tests cannot properly predict performance in those cases because the assumptions which underlie the tests construction are inappropriate for the urban student . . . . such tests require that children work alone, and urban children often have little interest, experience, tolerance, or incentive for that. Typically, urban children (as well as students from other settings) are together much of the time at home and at play, and they learn to rely upon each other for support. They receive social reinforcement for and associate self-confidence and ego-strength with group membership and group activity. When such children are required to work individually, i.e., to take reading tests, they may have short attention spans, may lose interest, and, as a consequence, may not perform at their best. (p. 3)

Teacher Expectations and Role Models

Additionally, Cooper (1989) noted the importance of teachers' expectations. Specifically, if teachers expect urban children to misbehave and not strive for success, students likely will rise to that low expectation. Conversely, if teachers set high standards for urban children and expect them to achieve those standards, with the proper

support, those students likely will rise to those high expectations (Cooper). In Lee's 1995 study, academically successful African American male high school students were asked to describe the teachers whom they liked best and who had had the most influence on their career paths. Generally, the students cited teachers who expressed real care, had a sense of humor and spent extra time helping them with school work.

In a broader study, *The State of Our Nation's Youth*, when asked to identify one particular person whom they would consider to be a role model, high school students overwhelmingly identified their role model as a family member (46%) as compared to sports persons (7%) or entertainers (12%). One percent of the respondents indicated they were "not sure." Within the group who chose a family member as a role model, 40% selected their mother and 26% selected their father. Friends and family friends also ranked in double digits, while other entities—most notably teachers—ranked somewhat lower: teacher/educator (7%), religious leader (6%), business leader (3%) and political leader (2%) (Horatio Alger Association of Distinguished Americans, Inc., 2001). The low ranking of teachers is disconcerting, especially given the growing number of research reports that point to teachers as the single most influential factor in public school students achieving success (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future [NCTAF], 2003; U.S. Department of Education, 1999).

Thus, instead of leaders focusing attention on the benefits minority children purportedly receive from attending school with White children, concentrating on trying to understand better minority and poor children's cultural backgrounds and learning styles seems appropriate. According to Ferguson (1991) (as cited in Tompkins and

Deloney, 2006), race variables are "stand-ins for factors that are correlated with race but not otherwise represented . . . (e.g., peer culture, ethnic idiosyncrasies in grammar)" (p. 5). Additionally, once those aspects of these children's paradigms are considered appropriately, teachers seemingly should be taught to adjust their expectations and teaching methods to accommodate these students' learning styles. Excellence—not the influence of White children—should be the standard to which school systems should aspire.

Teacher Responsibility for Student Success

Various reform initiatives and federal and state accountability measures historically have focused on student responsibility for their academic performance (NCTAF, 2003). While individuals always must bear some responsibility for their performance, numerous well publicized, highly respected reports have begun to shift the focus from students, who in large part are the victims of a system which has not kept its promise (NCTAF). There is a growing consensus that well-prepared teachers are the critical component to helping failing schools and students achieve excellence (NCTAF; U.S. Department of Education, 1999). Yet, at a time when the importance of teachers' roles in urban school reform are most visible, more inexperienced and under-prepared teachers are found in schools that can least afford to have inexperienced and under-prepared teachers—low-income, urban communities and rural districts (NCES, 2005; Zimpher & Howey, 2004). Particular to urban school systems and to the point of urban schools being least able to afford inexperienced and under-prepared teachers, the

Council of the Great City Schools (1987) (as cited in Cooper, 1989) conducted a study of 44 of the nation's largest urban school systems and found: "75% minority enrollment (Black, Hispanic, and Asian); 33% of students come from families receiving public assistance; 80% of school children qualify for free or reduced priced lunches; ten different languages are spoken by students; teacher shortages in central city schools exceed teacher shortages in all other schools by 250%" (p. 2). More than 15 years later, statistics available from the Council of the Great City Schools (2004) indicate a decline in the percentage of children who qualify for free or reduced lunches (a function of family household income), but the growing number of students and their diverse cultures are significant: 77.5% minority enrollment: African American (38%), Hispanic (32%), Asian/Pacific Islander (6.2%) and Alaskan/Native American (0.6%); 63.6% of school children qualify for free or reduced priced lunches; and, 200 different languages are spoken.

According to the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (2003), to be considered "highly qualified," beginning teachers should:

· Possess a deep understanding of the subjects they teach

· Evidence a firm understanding of how students learn

· Demonstrate the teaching skills necessary to help all students achieve high standards

· Create a positive learning environment

· Use a variety of assessment strategies to diagnose and respond to individual learning needs

· Demonstrate and integrate modern technology into the school curriculum to

support student learning

· Collaborate with colleagues, parents and community members, and other

educators to improve student learning

· Reflect on their practice to improve future teaching and student achievement

· Pursue professional growth in both content and pedagogy

· Instill a passion for learning in their students

For teachers to exhibit the aforementioned skills and practices, they actually must be in the classroom, and more importantly they must be in the classrooms where the needs are greatest (Zimpher & Howey, 2004). The existence of a teacher shortage in America is a commonly heard assertion that deserves more careful scrutiny. The problem is two-fold: teacher shortages in specialized fields and teacher attrition (Council of the Great City Schools, 2004).

Teacher Shortages

The first problem relates to a shortage of teachers in more specialized fields such as mathematics, science, special education and bilingual education (Council of the Great City Schools, 2004). A 2000 national study commissioned by the Council of the Great City Schools, titled "The Urban Teacher Challenge," revealed that nearly all of the nation's big-city school districts reported in a survey an immediate need for teachers in math (95%), science (98%), special education (98%), bilingual education (73%), English-as-a-Second Language (68%) and educational technology (68%). Additionally,

73% of the responding urban school districts reported an immediate need for minority teachers. Although minority students in the responding districts comprised almost 69% of the student population, minority teachers in these same districts represented only 36 % of the teaching force (Council of the Great City Schools). While the demand for teachers in these specialized fields is high, the supply pool from the nation's colleges of education—"the chief source for qualified teaching candidates"—is shallow (Council of the Great City Schools). Most teacher education students fervently pursue "over-subscribed" programs such as elementary education, social studies/history and early childhood education, despite the critical shortages in other fields (Council of the Great City Schools).

Teacher Attrition Factors

The second problem relates to teacher attrition. According to the NCTAF (2003), overall, with the exception of the aforementioned specialized fields, a sufficient number of new teachers are entering the profession each year to accommodate the nation's teaching needs. However, a third of those new teachers leave the profession within the first three years of teaching and nearly half of those new teachers leave the profession within the first five years (NCTAF). Currently, more teachers leave the profession on an annual basis than who enter the profession annually. Hence, teacher attrition arguably has reached the level of being a national crisis (NCTAF).

Clearly, the first step in addressing the teacher attrition crisis is to assess the causes of their departure. Regarding urban schools, one might assume teachers'

departures predominantly are associated with characteristics and behaviors of the students. However, at least one California survey and follow-up analysis of teachers who have left the profession does not support that assumption (NCTAF, 2003). Teachers in this particular survey cited salary and poor working conditions—including inadequate facilities, less availability of textbooks and supplies, fewer administrative supports, large class sizes and inability to collaborate with more experienced, highly qualified teachers—as reasons for their departures (NCTAF).

One should note the aforementioned findings are from only one state survey. An older national survey found some overlap with the state survey findings such as less availability of textbooks and supplies and fewer administrative supports; however, teachers also reported discipline and difficulties with parents as reasons for leaving (NCES, 2005). Henry (1986) added that beginning teachers often are given the most difficult teaching assignments, including teaching outside their subject area (as cited in Patton, 2004). In the face of these expectations, many quickly realize their teacher education programs did not prepare them adequately for the realities of the teaching assignments (Croasmun et al., 2005).

Some individuals may argue that teacher attrition is not the most pressing concern. They posit that the nation's historical approach to dealing with teacher attrition has been more detrimental to our students than the teacher attrition problems; the nation has addressed the teacher shortage by compromising quality teaching (NCTAF, 2003). Standards for entry into the profession, quality teacher preparation, licensure and other building blocks to quality teaching all have been sacrificed in favor of filling the

numerical gap (NCTAF). The NCTAF rightly asserted, "teacher shortages never justify placing uncertified teachers in schools" (p. 7).

Role of Universities in Urban School Reform

Universities as Partners in Urban School Reform

Urban School Reform collaborations can involve pre-kindergarten through twelfth (P-12) grades with universities, businesses, civic organizations, private foundations, etc. (Mickelson, Kritek, Hedlund, and Kaufmann, 1988). Educational collaborations between universities and public schools have existed for more than 100 years, in varying forms of functionality, but more often in varying forms of dysfunction (Mickelson et al.; Peel, Peel, and Baker, 2002). Prior to the 1950s, early efforts between K-12 and universities focused on teacher training and college admissions, with the true focus being more on universities' needs than on what schools needed (Mickelson et al.). For reasons likely associated with the aforementioned imbalance in focus, interest in collaborations waned in the early 1950s (Mickelson et al.).

As the United States and Russia engaged in the "space race," the desire to prepare students highly competent in math and science who could contribute to winning the space race spurred a revival of university-school collaborations in the late 1950s. In the 1960s and 1970s, "social issues" such as civil rights and the Vietnam War became the hot-button topic, and once again, interest in university-school collaborations faded from the radar (Mickelson et al.). The 1980s ushered in renewed interest in these partnerships primarily in response to several high profile national reports on the

condition of education in urban areas (e.g., "A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform") and attention from national public and private organizations and foundations such as the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), the Ford Foundation and the Johnson Foundation (Brown, as cited in Mickelson et al.), as well as external pressure such as court-ordered desegregation in Boston (Genova, as cited in Mickelson et al.).

Also, as the external pressures began to mount, universities and schools became more cognizant that problems in education at the secondary and the college level were intertwined integrally (Mickelson et al., 1988). Thus, they expanded collaborative efforts to include curriculum enhancement, instructional improvement, professional development for school teachers and research regarding many joint concerns (Mickelson et al.). Since the 1980s, more national reports and standards, more global competition, more public scrutiny, etc. have been the catalysts to enhanced collaborations such as bridge programs, tutoring, certifying competency of teachers, university's guaranteeing teachers can teach in their field, teacher mentoring, alliances between Education and Arts and Sciences faculty to work with schools, more research on social issues, involving the family, diversity training, etc. (AASCU, 2002; Mickelson et al.; Zimpher & Howey, 2004). Yet, only pockets of success exist in urban school reform; systemic progress virtually is nonexistent (AASCU; Zimpher & Howey, 2005).

Urban universities' fates are tied inextricably to the communities in which they are located (AASCU, 2002; Gilderbloom, 2002), and universities' commitment to fundamental change in this alliance should be reflected in its mission statements

(Gilderbloom). In an era of diminishing resources, the historical practice in which urban universities could ignore the poverty, crime and squalor on its fringes, while focusing internally on its academic reputation has become more unacceptable (AASCU; DePaola, 1998). These "outside" factors, if not addressed, will find their ways into the "ivory towers" of academia through reality and perception (Gilderbloom). DePaola concurred, noting the public perception is that ". . . these institutions fail to serve the public need and the professionals who lead them may be placing career interests above public interests . . . . The Public also is concerned about an apparent inadequate devotion to teaching . . ." (p. 3). Increasingly, urban universities are expected by the public to take the lead in convening general public and political support to address better everyday community issues such as elementary and secondary education, crime and poverty (Stukel, as cited in Gilderbloom). The American Association of State Colleges and Universities in 2002 went as far as to describe this public mandate as a call to "public engagement" or "shorthand for describing a new era of two-way partnerships between America's colleges and universities and publics they serve" (AASCU, p. 7). Defined specifically, public engaged institutions are ". . . fully committed to direct, two-way interaction with communities and other external constituencies through the development, exchange, and application of knowledge, information, and expertise for mutual benefit" (AASCU, p. 10).

Barriers to University-School Collaborations

Perhaps the most notable barrier to successful university-school collaborations has been a real and perceived arrogance on behalf of urban universities that in a collaborative the university representatives are the "experts" who are there to help the school representatives improve upon their failures (Mickelson et al., 1988; see also Gilderbloom, 2002; Zimpher and Howey, 2005). Other major barriers to successful university-school collaborations are inter- and intra- entity distrust—often rooted in historical discord, betrayal, disappointment and hurt (Zimpher & Howey, 2004). For example, in the case of Wayne State University, many in the community distrusted the university because they believed it had cavorted with government officials in a scheme that placed one of the local public schools in Detroit under the university's auspices (Reid, 2004). At the University of Missouri-Kansas City (UMKC), President Martha Gilliland faced negative, external perceptions rooted in historical distrust. President Gilliland eloquently described two main streets that bisect Kansas City North to South and how "oddly enough, the differences in perceptions and conversations about race and class roughly parallel the two streets . . ." (Gilliland, 2004, p. 154). This physical and philosophical divide, combined with Kansas City's refusal to embrace voluntarily the 1954 *Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka* public school desegregation decision, has presented a great challenge for the university leadership as it has tried to reach out to minority communities (Gilliland).

Even within a university, negative perceptions sometimes are barriers to university-school collaborations. Faculty sometimes perceive past and current

administrations as non-consultative, non-responsive to faculty needs, opposed to shared governance, and unfair in rewarding faculty in the tenure and promotion process for community-related service (Birnbaum, 1992a; Gilderbloom, 2002; Zimpher & Howey, 2005). At the University of Memphis (UM), barriers existed based on mutual perceptions between the School of Education and the School of Arts and Sciences that the university administration showed favoritism to the other (Raines, 2004). Unfortunately, similar stories of external and internal angst are not exclusive to the University of Missouri Kansas City or the University of Memphis (Zimpher & Howey, 2004).

University Presidential Leadership in Urban School Reform

Provosts, deans, faculty and students are key elements to successful collaborations with urban schools; however, fully engaged institutions are led by active and visible presidents (Mickelson et al., 1988; see also Gilderbloom, 2002; AASCU, 2002). Zimpher and Howey (2005) agreed and added, ". . . systemic partnership would assume that the leadership of both the university and its participating school districts personally enjoin the partnership agenda" (p. 269). They noted too many instances in which one college within a university partnered effectively with one school in a whole district, and the university leadership declared success in urban school reform (Zimpher & Howey). Michael, Schwartz, and Balraj (2001) reinforced the importance of presidents' personal enjoinment in university-school collaborations, emphasizing the presidency as:

. . . a crucial role that is more important than ever before. It may be true that we have moved from a description of the presidency that implied total domination of an institution to a contemporary description of the presidency that implies an impermanence. Nevertheless, such changes in conception of reality do not deny the importance of the president. He or she occupies the key position in the institution; the link between the internal and external constituencies; the person who voices the values and purposes for which the institution stands. It is the president who must articulate the potential for service of our institutions of higher learning. (p. 332)

College and university presidents and chancellors must be held accountable for making sure their graduates are prepared for the realities of their teaching assignments and for building school-university-community collaborations (Zimpher & Howey, 2004; see also Gilderbloom, 2002; NCTAF, 2003; U.S. Department of Education, 1999). They must assume active and visible leadership roles in building these partnerships; they consciously must work to avoid an air of superiority and control (Gilderbloom, 2002; Zimpher & Howey, 2005).

In the final report of *Touching the Future: Presidents' Task Force on Teacher Education*, the American Council on Education (ACE) presented a 10-point action agenda for college and university presidents (ACE, 2002):

1. Take the lead in moving the education of teachers to the center of their

institutions' agendas.

2. Clarify and strengthen the strategic connection between teacher education and the mission of their institutions.

3. Mandate campus-wide reviews of the quality of their institutions' teacher education programs.

4. Commission—in conjunction with their governing boards—rigorous, periodic, independent appraisals of the quality of their institutions' teacher education programs.

5. Require that education faculty and courses are coordinated with arts and sciences faculty and courses.

6. Ensure that their teacher education programs have the equipment, facilities and personnel necessary to educate future teachers in the uses of technology.

7. Be advocates for graduate education, scholarship, and research in the education of teachers.

8. Strengthen inter-institutional transfer and recruitment.

9. Ensure that graduates of their teacher education programs are supported, monitored, and mentored once they enter the teaching profession.

10. Speak out on issues associated with teachers and teaching and join with other opinion leaders to shape public policy.

With limited resources and unlimited demands on state budgets, investments in higher education represent opportunity costs to K-12 education, healthcare, roads, prisons, etc. (The Institute for Higher Education Policy and Scholarship America, 2004). A 1999 study by the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education projected that 39 of the 50 states would face long-term state deficits, impacting funding for higher education and other important public needs (The Institute for Higher Education Policy and Scholarship America). Thus, as states have decreased appropriations to public colleges and universities, many of those institutions have made up the difference by passing along the financial shortfall to students and parents in the form of increased tuition and fees (Gladieux, 2000). Between 1980 and 1998, the average inflation-adjusted tuition more than doubled (113% at public four-year institutions and 114% at private four-year institutions) (Gladieux). Simultaneously, as grant aid has declined and tuition has increased, median family income levels have not kept pace, rising only 22 percent during the same 1980-1998 period (Gladieux).

Zimpher and Howey (2005) posited a four-fold rationale to justify the audacity to suggest that university presidents add to their internal agenda of budgets, technology initiatives, research agendas, teaching, etc. the challenge of urban school reform (pp. 1-3):

1.   University presidents have a convening power that can mobilize resources across the broader community to address educational problems.

2.   University presidents, as educators, understand educational issues regardless as to whether they are in the college setting or P-12 education.

3.   The universities in which presidents serve have resources—beyond
       financial—to help address the problems in urban schools.

4.   As the educators of a large number of graduates who teach in urban
       centers, the university ultimately has some responsibility, and perhaps
       even liability, for the successes and failures of urban youth.

The AASCU (2002) captured the essence of institutions fully committed to urban school reform through university-school collaborations as ones that have a president leading the charge and where public engagement is thriving. The AASCU emphasized:

It is the CEO who ensures that public engagement is woven throughout the campus vision, goals and values. It is the CEO who challenges the campus to think more deeply, act more intentionally, and commit more broadly to the public engagement mission. It is the CEO who when necessary, uses his or her "bully pulpit" to challenge the status quo and overcome inertia in order to align all elements of the institution to support public engagement as a core campus mission. It is the CEO who, by wit and will, works to align the complex array of internal and external stakeholders to support the public engagement mission. Finally, it is the CEO who ensures that public engagement is infused into every dimension of campus life and holds the campus accountable for its performance on public engagement initiatives.

Great campus leaders motivate and inspire. They call the institution to a higher level of public service, and, in the process, they awaken in their campuses new energy and enthusiasm for the tasks at hand. Great campus leaders believe in their institutions and the role that they can and must play in improving the lives of people and in strengthening the fabric of communities. Finally, and most importantly, great campus leaders take the risks and spend the capital—political, financial, and even emotional—to lead the change that all of this entails. If public engagement is to thrive, campus CEOs must take the first step to challenge their institutions to be stewards of their regions, stewards of place. (p. 37)

Faculty Perceptions of Presidential Leadership in Urban School Reform

Flawn (1990) asserted, "The Faculty is the heart and soul of the university. . . . A university can be no better than its faculty" (p. 67). Michael, Schwartz, and Balraj (2001) concurred, adding, ". . . institutions fulfill their mission primarily through their faculty members" (p. 335). Yet, as Birnbaum (1992b) pointed out, "Relationships between college and university faculties and their presidents often are contentious. . ." (p. 1). In fact, he noted that in a 1988 national survey, only 57% of full-time faculty reported being satisfied with their chief administrative officers. Further, Fujita and Birnbaum have conducted studies which suggested that even presidents who enjoyed constituents' perceptions of being highly effective when they took office tend to be

perceived as less effective at the time of leaving office (Birnbaum). Seemingly an inverse relationship exists between presidential effectiveness and term in office (Birnbaum).

While little disagreement exists in the literature on the importance of faculty support as a factor in perceived presidential effectiveness generally (Birnbaum, 1992a; Flawn, 1990; Michael et al., 2001), the literature virtually is silent on faculty perceptions of presidential leadership in urban school reform. In fact, the most comprehensive, recent work on perceptions of presidential leadership in urban school reform is Zimpher and Howey's (2004) book, entitled *University Leadership in Urban School Renewal*, in which 14 of the 16 chapters not written by the authors are written by urban university presidents themselves. While self perceptions of leadership effectiveness generally are not congruent with how others perceive one's leadership (Atwater & Yammarino, as cited in Hooijberg & Choi, 2000), P. B. Kenen and R. H. Kenen (1978) found that faculty perceptions of influence and power may ". . . differ by institution, shift with the standing of the observer—with rank, sex, and experience in governance—and vary with the question to be decided" (p. 113). Given these findings, one is left to extrapolate that a study which investigates faculty perceptions of university leadership in urban school reform may very well differ by these characterizations, as well as the faculty members' years of service at the institution, highest academic degree earned and ethnicity.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Statement of the Problem

Many students in American urban schools are not prepared academically to go to college and persist to graduation. Most notably, there are 7.4 million students enrolled in the nation's largest urban public school systems (Council of the Great City Schools, 2004). Only 57.5% of students in urban school districts graduate, compared to suburban school districts (72.7%), small/large towns (69.1%) and rural districts (71.9%) (Swanson, 2004b). With few exceptions, the conditions that are barriers to these students' academic preparedness are typical of the urban centers in which many urban universities are located. Specifically, a teacher shortage exists in America and those who enter the profession have a high attrition rate, especially in urban areas (Croasmun et al., 1999; NCES, 2005; Zimpher & Howey, 2004). The greatest teacher shortage is in urban schools, usually consistent with environments where both need and poverty are high (Croasmun et al.; NCES; Zimpher & Howey). American schools remain disproportionately segregated by race and social class, and minority and poor children represent the majority of urban school students (Zimpher & Howey). Public funding for these urban schools has not kept pace with funding for schools located in more affluent communities (Gilderbloom, 2002; Zimpher & Howey). The majority of college graduates entering the teaching profession are White, and the majority of new teachers choose not to teach in impoverished schools (Zimpher & Howey; see also NCES). Of

those new teachers who accept teaching positions in urban schools, many are ill-prepared for the cultural barriers that arise (Croasmun et al.; Zimpher & Howey).

Further, the least qualified teachers are assigned to teach poor and minority children in urban schools (Zimpher & Howey, 2004). This current culture, pervasive in many urban schools, is the result of some combination of long-term social trends, historical events, lack of public funding, lack of visionary leadership, neglect, distrust, bureaucratic silos, etc. (Gilderbloom, 2002; Zimpher & Howey). Hence, in many urban schools, a climate promoting a standard of excellence is nonexistent (Hoy and Miskel, 2005).

With limited resources and unlimited demands on state budgets, investments in higher education represent opportunity costs to K-12 education, healthcare, roads, prisons, etc. (The Institute for Higher Education Policy and Scholarship America, 2004). At a time when higher education challenges are great (shrinking budgets, increasing public expectations of accountability, legal disputes, etc.), the expectation for urban university presidents and chancellors to lead the way in urban school reform can be perceived simply as an additional burden (Zimpher & Howey, 2004).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine various leadership roles that university presidents perform in supporting their universities' urban school reform initiatives. More specifically, the study explored college of education and college of arts and science faculty members' general perceptions of urban school reform, as well as their

perceptions of their presidents' leadership roles in urban school reform. Additionally, this study examined the question of whether differences exist among faculty from the colleges of education and the colleges of arts and sciences in their perceptions of their presidents' leadership roles in urban school reform. Finally, the study considered whether faculty perceptions of their presidents' leadership in urban school reform initiatives differed significantly by the faculty members' academic rank, years of service at their institution, highest degree earned, gender and ethnicity.

Research Design

The researcher used a descriptive and correlational design for this study. The instrument, designed by the investigator, was utilized to measure faculty perceptions of their university presidents' leadership in their institutions urban school reform initiatives. The independent variables were the faculty members' academic college, academic rank, years of service at the institution, highest academic degree earned, gender and ethnicity. The dependent variables were perceptions of presidential leadership.

Overall Objectives

Objective 1: Examine faculty members' perceptions of pre-college urban school reform.

Objective 2: Explore faculty members' perceptions of presidential leadership in urban school reform as related to their universities' structure and culture.

Objective 3: Assess faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership in urban school reform in the context of their presidents' awareness of urban school reform issues and factors.

Objective 4: Examine faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform as related to their presidents' internal relationships.

Objective 5: Examine faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform as related to their presidents' external relationships.

Objective 6: Examine faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership roles in urban school reform as related to their presidents providing resources and support.

Objective 7: Examine faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform as related to their presidents holding personnel accountable for progress and recognizing the efforts of those involved in urban school reform initiatives.

Null Hypotheses

H_{01} = No statistically significant difference exists between college of education and college of arts and sciences faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives.

H_{02} = No statistically significant difference exists between faculty members' academic rank and their perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives.

H_{03} = No statistically significant difference exists between faculty members' years of service at their current institutions and their perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives.

H_{04} = No statistically significant difference exists between faculty members' highest academic degree earned and their perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives.

H_{05} = No statistically significant difference exists between faculty members' gender and their perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives.

H_{06} = No statistically significant difference exists between faculty members' ethnicity and their perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives.

Population and Sample

The population for this study consisted of faculty members from five urban research universities. The sample was drawn from the faculty rolls in the colleges of education and the colleges of arts and sciences for whom valid e-mail addresses could be obtained at those five institutions. The confidential, web-based questionnaire was sent electronically to 1,276 faculty members for whom valid e-mail addresses could be obtained at five urban research universities. Of the 1,276 questionnaires e-mailed, 377 responses were returned, yielding a 29.5% response rate. The investigator looked at the data and determined that 132 respondents failed to answer entire scales of questions. The investigator made the decision to omit those responses. From the 377 responses received, 245 (65%) provided valid data which could be analyzed.

All of the universities are members of the Great Cities' Universities (GCU) coalition, an alliance of 19 public urban research universities that are collaborating to address educational challenges in their communities. The study entailed a purposive sample with universities chosen on the basis of their membership in the GCU.

Instrumentation

The investigator developed a questionnaire to assess perceptions of presidential leadership in urban school reform initiatives (See Appendix A). The questionnaire consisted of five statements about general perceptions of urban school reform, 30 statements about perceptions of the university presidents' leadership roles in the specific institutions' urban school reform initiatives, eight statements regarding personal

characteristics and a section for optional additional comments. The statements corresponded to seven internal scales of analysis. The seven scales were (a) Perceptions of Urban School Reform, (b) University Structure and Culture, (c) Presidential Awareness, (d) Internal Relationships, (e) External Relationships, (f) Resources and Support and (g) Accountability and Recognition.

Responses for scales two through seven were selected from a seven-point Likert-type scale: 1 – Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 – Disagree Somewhat, 4 – Neither Agree nor Disagree, 5 – Agree Somewhat, 6 – Agree and 7 – Strongly Agree. Responses for scale one were selected from dichotomous questions with responses of 1 – Disagree and 2 – Agree. Interpretation of the Likert-type scale is as follows: 1 – Strongly Disagree = 1–1.49; 2 – Disagree = 1.5–2.49; 3 – Somewhat Disagree = 2.5–3.49; 4 – Neither Agree nor Disagree = 3.5–4.49; 5 – Somewhat Agree = 4.5–5.49; 6 – Agree = 5.5–6.49; and, 7 – Strongly Agree = 6.5–7.

To establish internal validity, the investigator conducted a field test by sending an e-mail to 10 faculty and staff at Texas A&M University, all of whom have earned their Ph.D.s or are advanced doctoral students, requesting feedback on the document as a means of establishing construct validity. The response rate was 80%. The investigator made minor adjustments to the instrument based on the feedback of the aforementioned faculty and staff members and a course instructor who teaches research instrument development. The researcher then conducted a pilot test by selecting 10 faculty members from Texas A&M University to review the web-based questionnaire for face validity,

clarity and navigational ease. The response rate was 100%. The researcher made additional minor adjustments to the instrument based on the faculty members' feedback.

The researcher used SPSS^R procedure RELIABILITY to compute reliability for the questionnaire that was used in this study. Reliability was established by calculating Cronbach's alpha coefficient. As shown in Table 1, the reliabilities for the six scales were as follows: University Structure and Culture ($r = .76$), Presidential Awareness ($r = .94$), Internal Relationships ($r = .93$), External Relationships ($r = .89$), Resources and Support ($r = .90$) and Accountability and Recognition ($r = .91$).

Table 1
Reliability Coefficients (Alpha) for Questionnaire

Scale	n	Alpha
University Structure and Culture	234	.76
Presidential Awareness	240	.94
Internal Relationships	241	.93
External Relationships	237	.89
Resources and Support	237	.90
Accountability and Recognition	235	.91

Data Collection

The five targeted universities all are members of the GCU coalition. The sample was drawn from the faculty rolls in the colleges of education and the colleges of arts and sciences at those five institutions. The study entailed a purposive sample with subjects chosen on the basis of their institutions' membership in the GCU. Faculty e-mail addresses were obtained from the universities' websites. Faculty members were sent a pre-notice e-mail one day prior to receiving the actual web-based questionnaire. On May

9, 2007, the confidential, web-based questionnaire was sent electronically to 1,276 urban research university faculty members. Two reminders to complete the questionnaire were sent only to non-responders on May 14, 2007, and May 16, 2007, respectively, based the researcher's observation of responses leveling. The questionnaire was closed on May 17, 2007.

An acceptable return rate was pursued by explaining the purpose and benefits of the study and emphasizing the minimal time commitment to complete the questionnaire. Of the 1,276 questionnaires e-mailed, 377 responses were returned, yielding a 29.5% response rate. The investigator looked at the data and determined that 132 respondents failed to answer entire scales of questions. The investigator made the decision to omit those responses. From the 377 responses received, 245 (65%) provided valid data which could be analyzed. The data was compiled by Texas A&M University Measurement and Research Services, and the researcher entered the data into a statistical software package.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics in the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS^R, 14.0). The alpha level for data analysis was set *a priori* at .05. The independent variables for the study were (a) academic college, (b) academic rank, (c) years of service at current institution, (d) highest academic degree earned, (e) gender, and (f) ethnicity. The dependent variables for the study were faculty perceptions of presidential leadership. The SPSS^R procedure RELIABILITY was used to determine internal consistency of the six internal scales.

Objective 1

Frequencies and percentages were calculated to describe faculty members' perceptions of pre-college urban school reform. The use of frequencies and percentages is appropriate to describe categorical data (Gall, Gall, and Borg, 2007).

Objectives 2-7

Six scales measured faculty members' perceptions of presidential leadership in urban school reform: (a) university structure and culture, (b) presidential awareness, (c) internal relationships, (d) external relationships, (e) resources and support, and (f) accountability and recognition. The perceptions of presidential leadership in urban school reform were described by cumulatively summating the scores for individual items within each scale for each respondent. The summated scores then were used to calculate the mean scale scores and standard deviations for each item and the means and standard deviations for each scale overall.

Null Hypothesis 1

The researcher conducted one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and *t*-tests to determine if statistically significant differences existed between faculty members' academic college and their perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform.

Null Hypothesis 2

The study considered each of the six scales by faculty members' academic rank and subjected the data to a one-way ANOVA. An *F*-value was calculated to determine whether a statistically significant difference existed at a variance of .05.

Null Hypothesis 3

The study considered each of the six scales by faculty members' years of service at their current institution and subjected the data to a one-way ANOVA. An *F*-value was calculated to determine whether a statistically significant difference existed at a variance of .05.

Null Hypothesis 4

The study considered each of the six scales by faculty members' highest academic degree earned and subjected the data to a one-way ANOVA. An *F*-value was calculated to determine whether a statistically significant difference existed at a variance of .05.

Null Hypothesis 5

The researcher conducted one-way ANOVA and *t*-tests to determine if statistically significant differences existed between faculty members' gender and their perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform.

Null Hypothesis 6

The study considered each of the six scales by faculty members' ethnicity and subjected the data to a one-way ANOVA. An *F*-value was calculated to determine whether a statistically significant difference existed at a variance of .05.

Delimitations and Limitations

This study was delimited by design to universities with membership in the GCU coalition. Additionally, the original focus of the study was to assess differences in presidential self-perceptions of their leadership in their universities' urban school reform initiatives and their faculty members' perceptions of the presidents' leadership in their universities' urban school reform initiatives. The first 5 presidents contacted by the researcher through their chiefs of staff and executive assistants to participate in the study also were asked as a condition of their participation to encourage their faculties also to participate. Further, the presidents were asked to authorize the appropriate university official to give the researcher access to the universities' listservs for faculty members in their colleges of education and colleges of arts and sciences. Of the 5 presidents whose assistants were contacted, 2 presidents after several days of considering the request declined to participate. The remaining 3 presidents who were contacted missed two mutually agreed upon deadlines to issue a decision on participation in the study. Only 1 president, who was contacted as an alternate when the first president declined to participate, agreed immediately to participate and to assist the researcher by authorizing access to the university's faculty listserv and encouraging that university's faculty also

to participate in the study. The researcher believes the decision of the presidents not to endorse or participate in the study contributed to a lower response rate (29.5%) than would have existed had the presidents chosen to support the study. Thus, the generalizability of the study may be limited by the size of the response rate.

Because the presidents chose not to participate in the study, the researcher, in consultation with the researcher's doctoral faculty committee, amended the research protocol to focus only on faculty perceptions of their presidents' leadership in urban school reform. Hence, this study is delimited by design to exclude presidential self-perceptions of their leadership in urban reform.

Limitations of this study may result from some faculty members' substitution of their chief academic officers' leadership in urban school reform for their presidents' leadership in this area. Also, generalizations from this study may be limited to those whom responded to the questionnaire and to institutions with similar characteristics as those which participated in the study, i.e., each of these urban institutions through its membership in the GCU has a stated commitment to address urban school challenges in their communities.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine various leadership roles university presidents perform in supporting their universities' urban school reform initiatives. More specifically, the study explored college of education and college of arts and sciences faculty members' general perceptions of urban school reform, as well as their perceptions of their presidents' leadership roles in urban school reform. Additionally, the researcher examined the question of whether differences exist among faculty from the colleges of education and the colleges of arts and sciences in their perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform. The study considered whether faculty perceptions of their presidents' leadership in urban school reform initiatives differed significantly by the faculty members' academic rank, years of service at the institution, highest degree earned, gender and ethnicity. For this study, seven overall objectives were developed and tested:

Objective 1: Examine faculty members' perceptions of pre-college urban school reform.

Objective 2: Explore faculty members' perceptions of presidential leadership in urban school reform as related to their universities' structure and culture.

Objective 3: Assess faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership in urban school reform in the context of their presidents' awareness of urban school reform issues and factors.

Objective 4: Examine faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform as related to their presidents' internal relationships.

Objective 5: Examine faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform as related to their presidents' external relationships.

Objective 6: Examine faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership roles in urban school reform as related to their presidents providing resources and support.

Objective 7: Examine faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform as related to their presidents holding personnel accountable for progress and recognizing the efforts of those involved in urban school reform initiatives.

Additionally, six null hypotheses were developed and tested:

H_{01} = No statistically significant difference exists between college of education and college of arts and sciences faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives.

H_{02} = No statistically significant difference exists between faculty members' academic rank and their perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives.

H_{03} = No statistically significant difference exists between faculty members' years of service at their current institutions and their perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives.

H_{04} = No statistically significant difference exists between faculty members' highest academic degree earned and their perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives.

H_{05} = No statistically significant difference exists between faculty members' gender and their perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives.

H_{06} = No statistically significant difference exists between faculty members' ethnicity and their perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives.

Description of Sample

The population for this study consisted of faculty members from five urban research universities. The sample was drawn from the faculty rolls in the colleges of education and the colleges of arts and sciences for whom valid e-mail addresses could be obtained at those five institutions. All of the universities are members of the Great Cities' Universities (GCU) coalition, an alliance of 19 public urban research universities that are collaborating to address educational challenges in their communities. The study entailed a purposive sample with universities chosen on the basis of their membership in the GCU.

The investigator secured faculty members' names and e-mail addresses from the colleges of education and the colleges of arts and sciences on-line directory accessed from each university's electronic homepage. The confidential, web-based questionnaire was sent electronically to 1,276 faculty members at the five universities. Of the 1,276 questionnaires e-mailed, 377 responses were returned, yielding a 29.5% response rate. The investigator looked at the data and determined that 132 respondents failed to answer entire scales of questions. The investigator made the decision to omit those responses. From the 377 responses received, 245 (65%) provided valid data which could be analyzed. SPSS^R FREQUENCY analysis was used to examine the respondents' academic college, gender and their perceptions of pre-college urban school reform. As shown in Table 2, the distribution of faculty by college at each university was as follows: University A – Arts and Sciences (60.4%) and Education (39.6%); University B - Arts and Sciences (43.6%) and Education (56.4%); University C – Arts and Sciences

(59.1%) and Education (40.9%); University D – Arts and Sciences (100%); University E – Arts and Sciences (67.3%) and Education (32.7%). For the College of Arts and Sciences, 19.2% of the respondents were from University A; 15.9% were from University B; 17.2% were from University C; 23.2% were from University D; and, 24.5% were from University E. For the College of Education, 22.1% were from University A; 36% were from University B; 20.9% were from University C; 0% was from University D; and, 20.9% were from University E. A total of 237 faculty participated in the study. University A represented 20.3% of total respondents; University B represented 23.2% of total respondents; University C represented 18.6% of total respondents; University D represented 14.8% of total respondents; and, University E represented 23.2% of total respondents. Of the total faculty members responding, 151 (63.7%) were faculty in colleges of arts and sciences, and 86 (36.3%) were faculty in colleges of education.

Table 2

Cross-tabulation of Respondents by University and College

University		Arts & Sciences	Education	Total
		College		Total
University A	Count	29	19	48
	% within University A	60.4%	39.6%	100.0%
	% within College	19.2%	22.1%	20.3%
University B	Count	24	31	55
	% within University B	43.6%	56.4%	100.0%
	% within College	15.9%	36.0%	23.2%
University C	Count	26	18	44
	% within University C	59.1%	40.9%	100.0%
	% within College	17.2%	20.9%	18.6%
University D	Count	35	0	35
	% within University D	100.0%	0%	100.0%
	% within College	23.2%	0%	14.8%
University E	Count	37	18	55
	% within University E	67.3%	32.7%	100.0%
	% within College	24.5%	20.9%	23.2%
Total		151	86	237
		63.7%	36.3%	100.0%
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note. University A had eight respondents who did not indicate a college. No faculty in the College of Education from University D responded. The investigator believes the College may have had a firewall in place to block external e-mail applications.

Findings Related to Overall Faculty Perceptions

The first objective of overall faculty perceptions was to examine faculty members' perceptions of pre-college urban school reform. As shown in Table 3, 95.5% of respondents agreed that urban schools need reform. Similarly, 95% of respondents believed universities located in urban communities should be involved actively in urban school reform. Participants' favorable responses declined precipitously when the questions shifted from the ideal to what the respondents perceived to be reality. Sixty-nine and a half percent (69.5%) believed their university is making a positive impact on

urban school reform initiatives in their communities, and 49.8% believed urban school reform initiatives at the national level are making a positive impact. When asked if they personally were involved in their universities' urban school reform initiatives, 33.6% of respondents answered affirmatively.

Table 3

Faculty Perceptions of Pre-College Urban School Reform

Statements	Disagree		Agree	
	f	*%*	*f*	*%*
Urban schools are in need of reform.	11	4.5	231	95.5
Universities located in urban communities should be involved actively in urban school reform.	12	5.0	230	95.0
My university is making a positive impact on urban school reform initiatives in my community.	68	30.5	155	69.5
National urban school reform initiatives are making a positive impact.	108	50.2	107	49.8
I personally am involved in my university's urban school reform initiatives.	162	66.4	82	33.6

The second objective of overall faculty perceptions was to explore faculty members' perceptions of presidential leadership in urban school reform as related to their universities' structure and culture. Table 4 shows the only items with which participants tended to agree was "My university has a strategic plan that is current." However, when asked whether urban school reform is addressed explicitly in their universities' strategic plans, faculty members tended neither to agree nor disagree. Overall, participants tended somewhat to agree with the items in the university structure and culture scale.

Table 4

Faculty Perceptions of University Structure and Culture

Statements	n	M^a	SD
My university has a strategic plan that is current.	242	5.6	1.5
My university's strategic plan is utilized effectively to guide the operation of the university.	245	5.1	1.6
The College of Education at my university primarily is responsible for urban school reform.	242	4.9	1.5
Urban school reform is an institutional priority.	245	4.8	1.6
My president is a vocal supporter of effective teacher education programs.	244	4.8	1.7
Urban school reform is linked effectively to my university's mission.	245	4.6	1.6
Urban school reform is addressed explicitly in my university's strategic plan.	241	4.4	1.5
The College of Education at my university is responsible exclusively for urban school reform initiatives.	244	3.3	1.6

Note. Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Disagree Somewhat, 4=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 5=Agree Somewhat, 6=Agree, 7=Strongly Agree.
[a] A mean cumulative university structure and culture score was calculated by averaging item responses: *M*=4.7, *SD*=0.9.

The third objective of overall faculty perceptions was to assess faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership in urban school reform in the context of their presidents' awareness of urban school reform issues and factors. Table 5 shows the only item with which respondents tended to agree was "My president seizes opportunities to promote university, school and community collaborations." Overall, participants tended somewhat to agree with the items in the presidential awareness scale. The only statement in which participants indicated they neither agreed nor disagreed was "My president is effective at choosing the most opportune times to promote urban school reform initiatives."

Table 5

Faculty Perceptions of Presidential Awareness

Statements	*n*	*M*[a]	*SD*
My president seizes opportunities to promote university, school and community collaborations.	245	5.5	1.5
My president understands historical relationships between the university and the local community.	244	5.4	1.6
My president effectively addresses historical barriers to university and community partnerships.	245	4.9	1.6
My president is receptive to new ideas regarding urban school reform.	244	4.8	1.4
My president has a working knowledge of issues associated with urban school reform.	244	4.8	1.5
My president understands the university culture as it relates to urban school reform.	243	4.7	1.6
My president is effective at choosing the most opportune times to promote urban school reform initiatives.	244	4.4	1.5

Note. Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Disagree Somewhat, 4=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 5=Agree Somewhat, 6=Agree, 7=Strongly Agree.
[a] A mean cumulative university structure and culture score was calculated by averaging item responses: *M*=4.9, *SD*=1.3.

The fourth objective of overall faculty perceptions was to examine faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform as related to their presidents' internal relationships. Table 6 shows most faculty members neither agree nor disagree with the items contained in the internal relationships scale. The only statement with which faculty somewhat agreed was "My president listens attentively to faculty and other campus stakeholders who are involved actively in urban school reform initiatives." Overall, respondents tended neither to agree nor disagree with the items in the presidential internal relationships scale.

Table 6

Faculty Perceptions of Presidential Internal Relationships

Statements	*n*	*M*[a]	*SD*
My president listens attentively to faculty and other campus stakeholders who are involved actively in urban school reform initiatives.	243	4.5	1.4
My president appoints the right people to lead urban school reform initiatives.	244	4.4	1.3
My president supports the right people to lead urban school reform initiatives.	243	4.4	1.3
My president effectively creates a shared vision of the university's role in urban school reform.	244	4.3	1.5
My president meets regularly with campus stakeholders in urban school reform initiatives.	243	4.0	1.3

Note. Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Disagree Somewhat, 4=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 5=Agree Somewhat, 6=Agree, 7=Strongly Agree.
[a] A mean cumulative university structure and culture score was calculated by averaging item responses: *M*=4.3, *SD*=1.2.

The fifth objective of overall faculty perceptions was to examine faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform as related to their presidents' external relationships. Participants tended to agree that their presidents build strong relationships with the local business community and also with the local political community. They tended somewhat to agree that their presidents build strong relationships and partnerships with local public school representatives and with local families and citizens. Table 7 shows that, overall, the respondents' tended somewhat to agree with the items in the presidential external relationships scale.

Table 7

Faculty Perceptions of Presidential External Relationships

Statements	*n*	*M*[a]	*SD*
My president builds strong partnerships with the local business community.	241	5.8	1.4
My president builds strong relationships with the local political community.	241	5.6	1.4
My president builds strong partnerships with local public school representatives.	242	4.6	1.5
My president builds strong relationships with local families and citizens.	242	4.5	1.4
My president effectively cultivates urban school reform support from the university's Board of Trustees/Regents.	243	4.4	1.4

Note. Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Disagree Somewhat, 4=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 5=Agree Somewhat, 6=Agree, 7=Strongly Agree.
[a] A mean cumulative university structure and culture score was calculated by averaging item responses: *M*=5.0, *SD*=1.2.

The sixth objective of overall faculty perceptions was to examine faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform as related to their presidents providing resources and support. As Table 8 shows, overall, faculty members tended neither to agree nor disagree with the items in the resources and support scale.

Table 8
Faculty Perceptions of Resources and Support

Statements	*n*	*M*[a]	*SD*
My president understands the financial costs of urban school reform initiatives.	244	4.3	1.4
My institution ensures necessary administrative resources to support urban school reform initiatives.	245	3.9	1.4
My president is involved personally in raising money for urban school reform initiatives.	243	3.9	1.3
My president is involved personally in reallocating internal funds to support urban school reform initiatives.	240	3.8	1.2
My institution provides adequate financial resources to support urban school reform initiatives.	244	3.7	1.3

*Note. S*cale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Disagree Somewhat, 4=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 5=Agree Somewhat, 6=Agree, 7=Strongly Agree.
[a] A mean cumulative university structure and culture score was calculated by averaging item responses: *M*=3.9, *SD*=1.1.

The seventh objective of overall faculty perceptions was to examine faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform as related to the presidents holding personnel accountable for progress and recognizing the efforts of those involved in urban school reform initiatives. As Table 9 shows, overall, faculty members tended neither to agree nor disagree with the items in the accountability and recognition scale.

Table 9
Faculty Perceptions of Accountability and Recognition

Statements	n	M^{a}	SD
My president recognizes efforts in urban school reform which pre-date his/her presidency.	239	4.1	1.1
My university regularly assesses its progress in urban school reform.	240	4.0	1.3
My president fairly holds academic deans accountable for measurable progress in urban school reform.	243	3.9	1.2
My president expects regular progress reports on the university's urban school reform initiatives.	243	3.9	1.2
My president fairly holds the Chief Academic Officer accountable for measurable progress in urban school reform.	242	3.8	1.1

Note. Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Disagree Somewhat, 4=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 5=Agree Somewhat, 6=Agree, 7=Strongly Agree.
[a] A mean cumulative university structure and culture score was calculated by averaging item responses: M=3.9, SD=1.0.

Findings Related to Null Hypothesis One

The objective of this null hypothesis was to examine whether a statistically significant difference exists in faculty perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform based on faculty members' academic college. Null hypothesis one stated H_{01} = No statistically significant differences exist between college of education and college of arts and sciences faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives. Participants in the colleges of arts and sciences and the colleges of education tended to agree somewhat with the university structure and culture, presidential awareness and external relationships scales. Respondents in the colleges of arts and sciences and the colleges of education tended neither to agree nor disagree with the internal relationships, resources and support and accountability and recognition scales. As shown in Table 10, participants' perception of

their presidents' leadership role did not exhibit a statistically significant difference by college: College by university structure and culture, $t(235)=1.1$, $p>.05$; College by presidential awareness, $t(235)=0.4$, $p>.05$; College by internal relationships $t(234)=0.4$, $p>.05$; College by external relationships, $t(233)=0.9$, $p>.05$; College by resources and support, $t(235)=1.4$, $p>.05$, and College by accountability and recognition, $t(234)=0.7$, $p>.05$.

Table 10
Faculty Perceptions of Presidents' Leadership Role by College

College	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
University Structure and Culture					
Arts and Science	151	4.6	0.8	1.1	0.21
Education	86	4.7	1.2		
Presidential Awareness					
Arts and Sciences	151	4.9	1.2	0.4	0.65
Education	86	5.0	1.5		
Internal Relationships					
Arts and Sciences	150	4.3	1.1	0.4	0.70
Education	86	4.3	1.4		
External Relationships					
Arts and Sciences	149	5.0	1.1	0.9	0.38
Education	86	4.9	1.3		
Resources and Support					
Arts and Sciences	151	4.0	1.0	1.4	0.15
Education	86	3.8	1.2		
Accountability and Recognition					
Arts and Sciences	150	4.0	1.0	0.7	0.49
Education	86	3.9	1.1		

Note. Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Disagree Somewhat, 4=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 5=Agree Somewhat, 6=Agree, 7=Strongly Agree.

Findings Related to Null Hypothesis Two

The objective of this null hypothesis was to examine whether a statistically significant difference exists in faculty perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform based on faculty members' academic rank. Null hypothesis two stated H_{02} = No statistically significant differences exist between faculty members' academic rank and their perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives. Participants who selected "other" as their rank tended to agree somewhat with the accountability and recognition scale, while participants who selected "assistant professor," "associate professor," or "professor" neither agreed nor disagreed with the internal relationships, resources and support and accountability and recognition scales. Respondents at all professorial levels tended to agree somewhat with the university structure and culture, presidential awareness and external relationships scales. As shown in Table 11, participants' perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform did not have statistically significant differences by university structure and culture, $F(3, 240)=0.1$, $p>.05$; presidential awareness, $F(3, 240)=0.8$, $p>.05$, internal relationships, $F(3, 239)=0.2$, $p>.05$; external relationships, $F(3, 238)=0.6$, $p>.05$; and resources and support, $F(3, 240)=0.4$, $p>.05$. A statistically significant difference was found between academic rank and accountability and recognition, $F(3, 238)=2.8$, $p<.05$. A Tukey post hoc analysis showed a statistically significant difference between the rank Other ($M=4.5$, $SD=0.8$) and Assistant Professor ($M=3.9$, $SD=1.0$), Associate Professor ($M=3.9$, $SD=0.9$), and Professor ($M=3.8$, $SD=1.2$).

Table 11
Faculty Perceptions of Presidents' Leadership Role by Academic Rank

Academic Rank	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
University Structure and Culture					
Assistant Professor	69	4.6	1.1	0.1	0.95
Associate Professor	87	4.6	0.9		
Professor	65	4.7	1.0		
Other	23	4.7	0.8		
Presidential Awareness					
Assistant Professor	69	4.8	1.4	0.8	0.52
Associate Professor	87	4.9	1.2		
Professor	65	5.1	1.4		
Other	23	5.0	1.0		
Internal Relationships					
Assistant Professor	69	4.3	1.2	0.2	0.91
Associate Professor	87	4.2	1.2		
Professor	65	4.3	1.4		
Other	22	4.3	0.9		
External Relationships					
Assistant Professor	69	4.8	1.3	0.6	0.64
Associate Professor	87	5.1	1.0		
Professor	64	5.0	1.4		
Other	22	5.0	0.9		
Resources and Support					
Assistant Professor	69	3.9	1.1	0.4	0.79
Associate Professor	87	3.9	1.0		
Professor	65	3.9	1.3		
Other	23	4.1	0.8		
Accountability and Recognition					
Assistant Professor	69	3.9	1.0	2.8	0.04*
Associate Professor	87	3.9	0.9		
Professor	65	3.8	1.2		
Other	21	4.5	0.8		

Note. Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Disagree Somewhat, 4=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 5=Agree Somewhat, 6=Agree, 7=Strongly Agree.
*p<.05.

Findings Related to Null Hypothesis Three

The objective of this null hypothesis was to examine whether a statistically significant difference exists in faculty perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform based on faculty members' years of service at their current university. Null hypothesis three stated H_{03} = No statistically significant differences exist between faculty members' years of service at their current institutions and their perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives. Respondents at each range of years and overall tended to agree somewhat with the university structure and culture, presidential awareness and external relationships scales. Participants tended neither to agree nor disagree with the internal relationships, resources and support and accountability and recognition scales. As shown in Table 12, participants' perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform did not differ significantly by university structure and culture, $F(5, 229)=0.3$, $p>.05$; presidential awareness, $F(5, 229)=1.0$, $p>.05$, internal relationships, $F(5, 227)=1.0$, $p>.05$; external relationships, $F(5, 228)=0.9$, $p>.05$; resources and support, $F(5, 229)=0.9$, $p>.05$; and, accountability and recognition, $F(5, 227)=1.7$, $p>.05$.

Table 12

Faculty Perceptions of Presidents' Leadership Role by Years of Service at Current University

Years of Service at Current Institution	n	M	SD	F	p
University Structure and Culture					
1-2 years	40	4.6	0.9	0.3	0.92
3-7 years	68	4.7	1.0		
8-10 years	23	4.8	1.0		
11-15 years	33	4.7	1.1		
16-20 years	29	4.8	1.0		
20+ years	42	4.6	1.0		
Presidential Awareness					
1-2 years	40	4.8	1.1	1.0	0.40
3-7 years	68	4.8	1.3		
8-10 years	23	5.1	1.4		
11-15 years	33	4.9	1.4		
16-20 years	29	5.4	1.3		
20+ years	42	4.9	1.4		
Internal Relationships					
1-2 years	39	4.3	0.8	1.0	0.44
3-7 years	68	4.2	1.2		
8-10 years	23	4.6	1.5		
11-15 years	33	4.4	1.1		
16-20 years	29	4.5	1.3		
20+ years	42	4.1	1.4		
External Relationships					
1-2 years	39	5.0	0.9	0.9	0.47
3-7 years	68	4.8	1.3		
8-10 years	23	5.2	0.9		
11-15 years	33	5.1	1.2		
16-20 years	29	5.3	1.1		
20+ years	41	5.0	1.5		
Resources and Support					
1-2 years	40	4.0	0.7	0.9	0.49
3-7 years	68	3.8	1.1		
8-10 years	23	4.3	1.2		
11-15 years	33	4.0	1.1		
16-20 years	29	3.9	1.2		
20+ years	42	3.8	1.3		

Table 12 continued

Years of Service at Current Institution	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Accountability and Recognition					
1-2 years	40	4.1	0.5	1.7	0.14
3-7 years	67	3.9	0.9		
8-10 years	23	4.4	1.1		
11-15 years	32	3.9	0.9		
16-20 years	29	4.1	1.2		
20+ years	42	3.7	1.2		

Note. Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Disagree Somewhat, 4=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 5=Agree Somewhat, 6=Agree, 7=Strongly Agree.

Findings Related to Null Hypothesis Four

The objective of this null hypothesis was to examine whether a statistically significant difference exists in perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform based on faculty members' highest academic degree earned. Null hypothesis four stated H_{04} = No statistically significant differences exist between faculty members' highest academic degree earned and their perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives. Participants overall tended to agree somewhat with the external relationships scale. Respondents who selected "Master's Degree" and "Doctoral Degree" agreed somewhat with the university structure and culture, presidential awareness, and external relationships scales. Overall, respondents tended neither to agree nor disagree with the university structure and culture, internal relationships, resources and support and accountability and recognitions scales. As shown in Table 13, participants' perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform statistically did not differ significantly by university structure and culture, $F(3, 241)=2.4$, $p>.05$; presidential awareness, $F(3, 241)=1.3$, $p>.05$, internal

relationships, $F(3, 240)=1.6$, $p>.05$; external relationships, $F(3, 239)=0.8$, $p>.05$; resources and support, $F(3, 241)=1.7$, $p>.05$; and, accountability and recognition, $F(3, 249)=1.2$, $p>.05$.

Table 13

Faculty Perceptions of Presidents' Leadership Role by Highest Academic Degree Earned

Highest Academic Degree Earned	n	M	SD	F	p
University Structure and Culture					
Bachelors Degree	1	3.6	0.0	2.4	0.07
Master's Degree	13	4.8	0.9		
Doctoral Degree	224	4.7	1.0		
Other Terminal Degree	7	3.8	1.7		
Presidential Awareness					
Bachelors Degree	13	5.0	1.1	1.3	0.26
Master's Degree	224	4.9	1.3		
Doctoral Degree	7	4.0	2.0		
Other Terminal Degree	1	4.0	0.0		
Internal Relationships					
Bachelors Degree	1	3.6	0.0	1.6	0.20
Master's Degree	13	4.5	0.8		
Doctoral Degree	223	4.3	1.2		
Other Terminal Degree	7	3.4	1.6		
External Relationships					
Bachelors Degree	1	4.0	0.0	0.8	0.48
Master's Degree	13	5.1	0.9		
Doctoral Degree	222	5.0	1.2		
Other Terminal Degree	7	4.4	1.8		
Resources and Support					
Bachelors Degree	1	4.0	0.0	1.7	0.17
Master's Degree	13	4.2	0.8		
Doctoral Degree	224	3.9	1.1		
Other Terminal Degree	7	3.1	1.6		

Table 13 continued

Highest Academic Degree Earned	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Accountability and Recognition					
Bachelors Degree	1	4.0	0.0	1.2	0.32
Master's Degree	12	4.3	0.8		
Doctoral Degree	223	3.9	1.0		
Other Terminal Degree	7	3.5	1.9		

Note. Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Disagree Somewhat, 4=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 5=Agree Somewhat, 6=Agree, 7=Strongly Agree.

Findings Related to Null Hypothesis Five

As Table 14 shows, the gender of respondents was dispersed almost equally: 50.8% male and 49.2% female.

Table 14
Sample Demographics: Gender of Respondents

Gender	*f*	*%*
Male	124	50.8
Female	120	49.2
Total	244	100.0

Note: One respondent did not indicate a response.

The objective of this null hypothesis was to examine whether a statistically significant difference exists in faculty perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform based on faculty members' gender. Null hypothesis five stated $H_{05} =$ No statistically significant differences exist between faculty members' gender and their perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives. On each scale, male and female respondents' responses were consistent. Male and female participants tended to agree somewhat with the university structure and culture, presidential awareness and external relationships scales. Male and female respondents neither agreed nor disagreed with the internal relationships, resources and support and

accountability and recognitions scales. As shown in Table 15, participants' perception of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform statistically did not differ significantly by gender: gender by university structure and culture, $t(242)=1.1$, $p>.05$; gender by presidential awareness, $t(242)$, $=0.1$, $p>.05$; gender by internal relationships $t(241)=0.2$, $p>.05$; gender by external relationships, $t(240)=1.1$, $p>.05$; gender by resources and support, $t(242)=0.5$, $p>.05$; and gender by accountability and recognition, $t(240)=0.7$, $p>.05$.

Table 15
Faculty Perceptions of Presidents' Leadership Role by Gender

Gender	n	M	SD	t	p
University Structure and Culture					
Male	124	4.6	1.0	1.1	0.27
Female	120	4.7	1.0		
Presidential Awareness					
Male	124	4.9	1.3	0.1	0.90
Female	120	4.9	1.3		
Internal, Relationships					
Male	124	4.3	1.2	0.2	0.81
Female	119	4.3	1.2		
External Relationships					
Male	122	4.9	1.3	1.1	0.30
Female	120	5.1	1.1		
Resources and Support					
Male	124	4.0	1.2	0.5	0.62
Female	120	3.9	1.0		
Accountability and Recognition					
Male	124	3.9	1.1	0.7	0.47
Female	118	4.0	0.9		

Note. Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Disagree Somewhat, 4=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 5=Agree Somewhat, 6=Agree, 7=Strongly Agree.

Findings Related to Null Hypothesis Six

The objective of this null hypothesis was to examine whether a statistically significant difference exists in faculty perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform based on faculty members' ethnicity. Null hypothesis six stated H_{06} = No statistically significant differences exist between faculty members' ethnicity and their perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives. Overall, participants by ethnicity tended to agree somewhat with the university structure and culture, presidential awareness and external relationships scales. Respondents tended neither to agree nor disagree with the internal relationships, resources and support and accountability and recognition scales. Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino/Latina and White/Non-Hispanic respondents agreed somewhat with the external relationships scale. Black/African American and White/Non-Hispanic respondents tended to agree somewhat with the university structure and culture, presidential awareness, internal relationships, external relationships, resources and support and accountability and recognitions scales. Hispanic/Latino/Latina respondents represented the only group to disagree somewhat on any scale: internal relationships, resources and support and accountability and recognition. As shown in Table 16, participants' perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform statistically did not differ significantly by university structure and culture, $F(4, 234)=1.0$, $p>.05$; presidential awareness, $F(4, 234)=3.0$, $p>.05$, internal relationships, $F(4, 233)=1.4$, $p>.05$; external relationships, $F(4, 232)=0.6$, $p>.05$; resources and support, $F(4, 234)=2.2$, $p>.05$; and, accountability and recognition, $F(4, 232)=2.2$, $p>.05$.

Table 16

Faculty Perceptions of Presidents' Leadership Role by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
University Structure and Culture					
American Indian or Alaska Native	2	4.5	3.2	1.0	0.44
Asian/Asian American	11	4.6	0.6		
Black/African American	20	4.7	1.2		
Hispanic/Latino/Latina	10	4.1	1.0		
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	4.5	3.2		
White/Non-Hispanic	196	4.7	1.0		
Presidential Awareness					
American Indian or Alaska Native	2	4.6	2.0	3.0	0.20
Asian/Asian American	11	4.8	1.1		
Black/African American	20	5.2	1.5		
Hispanic/Latino/Latina	10	3.6	1.3		
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	4.6	2.0		
White/Non-Hispanic	196	5.0	1.3		
Internal Relationships					
American Indian or Alaska Native	2	4.7	1.6	1.4	0.22
Asian/Asian American	11	4.3	0.9		
Black/African American	19	4.4	1.3		
Hispanic/Latino/Latina	10	3.4	1.1		
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	4.7	1.6		
White/Non-Hispanic	196	4.3	1.2		
External Relationships					
American Indian or Alaska Native	2	5.7	1.0	0.6	0.63
Asian/Asian American	11	4.7	1.3		
Black/African American	19	5.0	1.4		
Hispanic/Latino/Latina	10	4.6	1.1		
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	5.7	1.0		
White/Non-Hispanic	195	5.0	1.2		
Resources and Support					
American Indian or Alaska Native	2	4.8	1.1	2.2	0.07
Asian/Asian American	11	4.1	0.6		
Black/African American	20	4.0	1.1		
Hispanic/Latino/Latina	10	3.0	1.2		
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	4.8	1.1		
White/Non-Hispanic	196	4.0	1.1		

Table 16 continued

Ethnicity	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Accountability and Recognition					
American Indian or Alaska Native	2	4.7	1.0	2.2	0.07
Asian/Asian American	10	3.8	0.7		
Black/African American	20	3.7	1.2		
Hispanic/Latino/Latina	10	3.2	1.1		
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	4.7	1.0		
White/Non-Hispanic	195	4.0	1.0		

Note. Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Disagree Somewhat,
4=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 5=Agree Somewhat, 6=Agree, 7=Strongly Agree.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine various leadership roles that university presidents perform in supporting their universities' urban school reform initiatives. More specifically, this study explored colleges of education and colleges of arts and sciences faculty members' general perceptions of urban school reform, as well as their perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform. Additionally, the researcher examined the question of whether statistically significant differences exist among faculty from colleges of education and colleges of arts and sciences in their perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform. Finally, the researcher considered whether faculty perceptions of their presidents' leadership in urban school reform initiatives differed significantly by faculty members' academic rank, years of service at the current institution, highest degree earned, gender and ethnicity.

Summary of Review of Literature

With the onset of the industrial revolution, Blacks, near the turn of the 20th century, migrated in large numbers from rural areas to urban areas in search of better opportunities (DuBois, 1917; Franklin, 1980; Karenga, 1982). The growth of urban centers as related to public funding for education represented a double-edged sword. Higher paying jobs translated into more taxable wealth, some of which was diverted to funding public education (Du Bois; Franklin). However, Franklin noted that the concentration of larger numbers of individuals reduced the per capita contribution to education (Franklin). Simultaneously, in the South, the doctrine of "separate but equal" was a farce as funding for Black schools never matched that given to White schools (Franklin; Williams, 1987). These funding disparities translated into visible, tangible inequities that too often meant overcrowded classrooms, insufficient number of books and school supplies, facilities with leaking roofs and no heat and plumbing (Franklin; Williams). These horrid conditions then translated into urban school children being poorly educated (Franklin; Williams).

Urban school reform collaborations were a promising by-product of poor public school education in urban areas. These collaborations today exist in various forms, including pre-kindergarten through twelfth (P-12) grades partnerships with universities, businesses, civic organizations, private foundations, etc. (Mickelson et al., 1988).

Educational collaborations between universities and public schools have existed for more than 100 years, in varying forms of functionality, but more often in varying forms of dysfunction (Mickelson et al., 1988; Peel et al., 2002). Prior to the 1950s, early

efforts between kindergarten through twelfth (K-12) grades and universities focused on teacher training and college admissions, with the true focus being more on universities' needs than on what schools needed (Mickelson et al.). For reasons likely associated with the aforementioned imbalance in focus, interest in collaborations waned in the early 1950s (Mickelson et al.).

As the United States and Russia engaged in the "space race," the desire to prepare students highly competent in math and science who could contribute to winning the space race spurred a revival of university-school collaborations in the late 1950s (Mickelson et al., 1988). In the 1960s and 1970s, "social issues" such as civil rights and the Vietnam War became the hot-button topic and once again interest in university-school collaborations faded from the radar (Mickelson et al.). The 1980s ushered in renewed interest in these partnerships primarily in response to several high profile national reports on the condition of education in urban areas (e.g., "A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform") and attention from national public and private organizations and foundations such as the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), the Ford Foundation and the Johnson Foundation (Brown, as cited in Mickelson et al.), as well as external pressure such as court ordered desegregation in Boston (Genova, as cited in Michelson et al.).

Also, as external pressures began to mount, universities and schools became more cognizant that problems in education at the secondary and the college level were integrally intertwined. Thus, they expanded collaborative efforts to include curriculum enhancement, instructional improvement, professional development for school teachers

and research regarding many joint concerns (Mickelson et al., 1988). Since the 1980s, more national reports and standards, more global competition, more public scrutiny, etc. have been the catalysts to spark enhanced collaborations such as bridge programs; tutoring; certifying competency of teachers; university's guaranteeing teachers can teach in their field; teacher mentoring; alliances between Education and Arts and Sciences faculty to work with local schools; more research on social issues; involving the family; diversity training, etc. (AASCU, 2002; Mickelson et al.; Zimpher & Howey, 2004). Yet, only pockets of success in urban school reform exist; systemic progress virtually is nonexistent (AASCU, 2002; Zimpher & Howey, 2005).

In large part, students in American urban schools are not prepared academically to go to college and persist to graduation (Zimpher & Howey, 2004). Most notably, there are 7.4 million students enrolled in the nation's largest urban public school systems (Council of the Great City Schools, 2004). Only 57.5% of students in urban school districts graduate, compared to suburban school districts (72.7%), small/large towns (69.1%) and rural districts (71.9%) (Swanson, 2004b). With few exceptions, few exceptions, the conditions that are barriers to these students' academic preparedness are typical of the urban centers in which many university presidents' and chancellors' universities are located. Specifically, a teacher shortage exists in America, and those who enter the profession have a high attrition rate, especially in urban areas (Croasmun et al., 1999; NCES, 2005; Zimpher & Howey, 2004). The greatest teacher shortage is in urban centers, usually consistent with environments where both need and poverty are high (Croasmun et al.; NCES; Zimpher & Howey). American schools remain

disproportionately segregated by race and social class, and minority and poor children represent the majority of urban school students (Zimpher & Howey). Public funding for these urban schools has not kept pace with funding for schools located in more affluent communities (Gilderbloom, 2002; Zimpher & Howey). The majority of college graduates entering the teaching profession are White (Zimpher & Howey; see also NCES), and the majority of new teachers choose not to teach in impoverished schools (Zimpher & Howey; see also NCES). Of those new teachers who accept teaching positions in urban schools, many are ill-prepared for the cultural barriers that arise (Croasmun et al.; Zimpher & Howey).

Further, either through channeling or choice, the least qualified teachers are teaching poor and minority children in urban schools (Zimpher & Howey, 2004). This current culture, which is pervasive in many urban schools, is the result of some combination of long-term social trends, historical events, lack of public funding, lack of visionary leadership, neglect, distrust, bureaucratic silos, etc. (Gilderbloom, 2002; Zimpher & Howey). Hence, in many urban schools, a climate promoting a standard of excellence is nonexistent (Hoy and Miskel, 2005).

With limited resources and unlimited demands on state budgets, investments in higher education represent opportunity costs to K-12 education, healthcare, roads, prisons, etc. (The Institute for Higher Education Policy and Scholarship America, 2002). At a time when higher education challenges are great (shrinking budgets, increasing public expectations of accountability, legal disputes, etc.), the expectation for urban university presidents and chancellors to lead the way in urban school reform can be

perceived simply as an additional burden (Zimpher & Howey, 2004; see also The Institute for Higher Education Policy and Scholarship America).

Urban universities' fates are tied inextricably to the communities where they are located (AASCU, 2002; Gilderbloom, 2002). In an era of diminishing resources, the historical practice in which urban universities could ignore the poverty, crime and squalor on its fringes, while focusing internally on its academic reputation have become more unacceptable (AASCU; DePaola, 1998). These "outside" factors, if not addressed, will find their ways into the "ivory towers" of academia through reality and perception (Gilderbloom). DePaola (1998) concurred, noting the public perception is that ". . . these institutions fail to serve the public need and the professionals who lead them may be placing career interests above public interests . . . . The Public also is concerned about an apparent inadequate devotion to teaching . . ." (p. 3). A growing expectation exists among the public that urban universities take the lead in convening general public and political support to address better everyday community issues such as elementary and secondary education, crime and poverty (Stukel, as cited in Gilderbloom). Provosts, deans, faculty and students are key elements to successful collaborations with urban schools; however, fully engaged institutions are led by active and visible presidents (AASCU; Gilderbloom; Mickelson et al., 1988).

Summary of Methodology

This study sought to measure faculty perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in their institutions' urban school reform initiatives. The researcher used a correlation design for the study, and the instrument was a scaled, web-based questionnaire designed by the researcher. The independent variables were the faculty members' academic college, academic rank, highest academic degree earned, years of service at the current institution, gender and ethnicity. The dependent variables for the study were faculty perceptions of presidential leadership. A pre-notice e-mail was sent to faculty members, followed one day later by the questionnaire. Two reminder notices were sent only to non-respondents during the course of the one-week response period.

Sample

The sample for this study consisted of faculty in the colleges of education and the colleges of arts and sciences for whom valid e-mail addresses could be obtained at five public urban research universities. The study entailed a purposive sample with universities chosen on the basis of their membership in the Great Cities' University coalition, an alliance of 19 public urban research universities that are collaborating to address educational challenges in their communities.

Instrumentation

The instrument used to assess perceptions of presidential leadership in urban school reform was a questionnaire developed by the investigator. The questionnaire consisted of 30 questions comprised of a seven-point Likert-type scale which included a range from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." Additionally, five questions designed to gather general perceptions of urban school reform were comprised of dichotomous questions which included options of "disagree" and "agree." The questions corresponded to seven internal scales of analysis. The seven scales were (1) Perceptions of Urban School Reform, (2) University Structure and Culture, (3) Presidential Awareness, (4) Internal Relationships, (5) External Relationships, (6) Resources and Support and (7) Accountability and Recognition. The questionnaire was disseminated as a confidential, web-based instrument.

Conclusions

Conclusions Related to the Theoretical Background

The conclusions for this study are based on the findings related to the purposes of the study and the theoretical base established in the review of the literature.

Gilderbloom (2002) pointed to institutions' mission statements as a starting place for fundamental change to occur in partnerships among urban universities and the cities in which they are located. In this study, faculty know their universities have strategic plans, and they believe their universities' strategic plans are current. However, they are unaware of whether urban school reform is addressed explicitly in their universities'

mission statements. They also are unaware of whether urban school reform is addressed explicitly in their universities' strategic plans. While a general belief that colleges of education are responsible exclusively for the universities' urban school reform initiatives does not exist, a general belief exists that colleges of education are responsible primarily for their universities' urban school reform initiatives.

The data show faculty feel urban schools need reform. Faculty also believe universities located in urban communities should be involved actively in urban school reform. However, faculty generally do not take personal responsibility for urban school reform initiatives at their universities. This result may stem from negative perceptions within universities that sometimes are barriers to university-school collaborations. As Birnbaum (1992a), Gilderbloom (2002) and Zimpher and Howey (2005) noted, faculty may think issues such as urban school reform are important but may not engage personally in urban school reform efforts because they perceive past and current administrations as non-consultative, non-responsive to faculty needs, opposed to shared governance and unfair in rewarding faculty for community-related service in the promotion and tenure process.

Mickelson et al. (1988) and Gilderbloom (2002) acknowledged the importance of provosts, deans, faculty and students in successful university-school collaborations; however, they emphasized that fully engaged institutions are led by active visible presidents. In this study, faculty agree somewhat with their presidents' awareness of urban school reform issues but neither agree nor disagree that their presidents choose opportune times to promote urban school reform initiatives. When asked about their

presidents' internal roles with urban school reform, faculty tend to neither agree nor disagree about their presidents' personal involvement in urban school reform. Although faculty somewhat agree that their presidents listen to campus stakeholders who are involved actively in urban school reform initiatives, they are neutral on whether their presidents appoint and support the right people to lead urban school reform initiatives; whether their presidents are effective in creating a shared vision of the universities' role in urban school reform; whether their presidents provide appropriate resources and support for urban school reform initiatives; and, whether their presidents recognize and hold accountable those involved in urban school reform initiatives.

Faculty seem more aware of their presidents' external relationships than their internal relationships in urban school reform. They tend to agree that their presidents build strong relationships with the local business community and with the local political community. Although faculty are more aware of their presidents' relationships with local business and political entities than in their perceptions of their presidents' internal relationships on urban school reform, they seem less sure of whether their presidents build strong relationships with local public school representatives and local families and citizens, who arguably are less visible. As the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU, 2002) emphasized, ". . . It is the CEO who, by wit and will works to align the complex array of internal and external stakeholders to support the public engagement mission . . ." (p. 37).

Conclusions Related to Null Hypothesis One

Fail to reject H_{01} = No statistically significant difference exists in faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives based on the faculty members' academic college.

The objective of this null hypothesis was to examine whether a statistically significant difference exists in faculty perceptions of their presidents' leadership roles in urban school reform based on faculty members' academic colleges. Raines (2004) spoke of a contentious relationship between faculty in the college of education and the college of arts and sciences due to respective perceptions that the university shows favor to the other college. In this study, statistical analysis of the participants' responses about their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform reveal no statistically significant difference between perceptions of faculty in the colleges of education and the colleges of arts and sciences.

Conclusions Related to Null Hypothesis Two

Fail to reject H_{02} = No statistically significant difference exists in faculty members perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives based on the faculty members' rank.

The objective of this null hypothesis was to examine whether a statistically significant difference exists in faculty perceptions of their presidents' leadership roles in urban school reform based on faculty members' academic rank. P. B. Kenen and R. H. Kenen (1978) found that faculty perceptions of influence and power may differ and shift

with the standing of the observer, including rank. In this study, statistical analysis of the participants' responses about their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform reveal no statistically significant difference in faculty perceptions by academic rank.

Conclusions Related to Null Hypothesis Three

Fail to reject H_{03} = No statistically significant difference exists in faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives based on the faculty members' years of service at their current institutions.

The objective of this null hypothesis was to examine whether a statistically significant difference exists in faculty perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform based on faculty members' years of service at their current institutions. Birnbaum (1992b) noted university presidents and their faculties' relationships often are contentious. Further, he asserted there seems to be an inverse relationship between presidential effectiveness and their terms in office. Birnbaum's observation is related to the presidents' length of time in office. However, one could argue that faculty with longer tenure at the university would be more likely than more junior faculty to observe presidents' complete tenure and therefore be more critical of the presidents' leadership than more junior faculty. In this study, however, statistical analysis of the participants' responses about their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform reveal no statistically significant difference among faculty perceptions by their years of service at their current institutions.

Conclusions Related to Null Hypothesis Four

Fail to reject H_{04} = No statistically significant difference exists in faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives based on the faculty members' highest academic degree earned.

The objective of this null hypothesis was to examine whether a statistically significant difference exists in faculty perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform based on faculty members' highest academic degree earned. The literature virtually is silent on whether faculty members' perceptions of presidential effectiveness—both generally and in urban school reform—is influenced by faculty members' highest degree earned. In this study, statistical analysis of the participants' responses about their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform reveal no statistically significant difference among faculty perceptions by their highest academic degree earned.

Conclusions Related to Null Hypothesis Five

Fail to reject H_{05} = No statistically significant difference exists in faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives based on the faculty members' gender.

The objective of this null hypothesis was to examine whether a statistically significant difference exists in faculty perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform based on faculty members' gender. P. B. Kenen and R. H. Kenen (1978) found that faculty perceptions of influence and power may differ and shift with

the standing of the observer, including gender. In this study, statistical analysis of the participants' responses about their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform reveal no statistically significant difference in faculty perceptions by gender.

Conclusions Related to Null Hypothesis Six

Fail to reject H_{06} = No statistically significant difference exists in faculty members' perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform initiatives based on the faculty members' ethnicity.

The objective of this null hypothesis was to examine whether a statistically significant difference exists in faculty perceptions of their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform based on faculty members' ethnicity. P. B. Kenen and R. H. Kenen (1978) found that faculty perceptions of influence and power may differ and shift with the standing of the observer. Their study looked at faculty members' academic rank, gender and experience in governance; however, the study did not consider ethnicity. The investigator's review of the literature did not reveal any studies that specifically looked at faculty perceptions of university leadership in urban school reform by ethnicity. In this study, statistical analysis of the participants' responses about their presidents' leadership role in urban school reform reveals no statistically significant difference in faculty perceptions by ethnicity. Overall, Black/African American and White/Non-Hispanic respondents tend to agree somewhat in their perceptions of presidential leadership in urban school reform in all scales. Hispanic/Latino/Latina respondents

represent the only ethnic group to disagree somewhat on any scale: internal relationships, resources and support and accountability and recognition.

Recommendations for Future Actions

The following recommendations for action are based on the findings and conclusions in this study:

1. The mere existence of universities' mission statements and strategic plans is insufficient to communicate an institutional commitment to urban school reform (Gilderbloom, 2002). Presidents more often and more effectively should communicate to faculty the institutional commitment to urban school reform as reflected in its current mission statement, strategic plan and accountability and rewards structures.

2. Faculty members believe urban schools need reform, and they feel that universities located in urban communities should be involved in urban school reform. However, faculty generally do not accept personal responsibility for urban school reform initiatives at their universities. As noted by one faculty member in the open comments section of the questionnaire for this study, ". . . I don't think it's fair to hold the Provost or the Deans of most of the College responsible for Urban School Reform. I'll raise hell if she tries to hold me responsible for Urban School, Rural School, or any school reform. That's not my job and not what I was hired to do. I'm not in the Teacher's College." Presidents should communicate more effectively that urban school reform is everyone's job. Additionally, they should develop a plan to involve faculty across academic

disciplines and throughout the university in urban school reform initiatives. Further, they should recognize and reward faculty members' efforts in the promotion and tenure process.

3. Faculty believe their presidents generally are aware of urban school reform initiatives. Additionally, they appear more aware of their presidents' personal role in urban school reform as related to the local business community and the local political community. Presidents should develop a plan to develop stronger and more visible relationships with local public school representatives and local families and citizens.

Recommendations for Additional Research

The results of this study left several questions unanswered and raised some additional questions. Therefore, additional research on the topic of leadership in urban school reform should consider the following:

1. To what extent is the delegation of responsibility for urban school reform initiatives to provosts and deans attributable to presidential leadership?

2. To what extent do presidents' self-perceptions of their leadership in urban school reform differ from their faculties' perceptions?

3. The researcher in this study believes some faculty may not have participated in the study because of concerns that negative comments about their presidents could damage

their institutions or their own careers. The researcher recommends that this study be replicated with written presidential endorsement of the study, written encouragement from the president to the faculty to participate in the study and university-granted access for the researcher to the universities' faculty listservs.

REFERENCES

Akbar, N. (1984). *Chains and images of psychological slavery.* Jersey City, NJ: New Mind Productions.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU). (2002). *Stepping forward as stewards of place.* Washington, DC: Author.

American Council on Education (ACE). (2002). *Touching the future: Final report-Presidents' task force on teacher education.* Washington, DC: Author.

Bauman, G., Bustillos, L., Bensimon, E., Brown, III, M., & Bartee, R. (2005). *Achieving equitable educational outcomes with all students: The institution's roles and responsibilities.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Birnbaum, R. (1992a). *How academic leadership works: Understanding success and failure in the college presidency.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Birnbaum, R. (1992b). Will you love me in December as you do in May? Why experienced college presidents lose faculty support. *Journal of Higher Education, 63(1),* 1-25.

Cooper, E. J. (1989). Addressing urban school reform: Issues and alliances. *Journal of Negro Education, 58(3).* Retrieved August 5, 2006, from http://www.newhorizons.org/trans/cooper1.htm

Council of the Great City Schools (2004). *Demand greatest for math, science and special education teachers.* Retrieved March 23, 2007, from http://www.cgcs.org/adaview.aspx?pageid=3776

Croasmun, J., Hampton, D., & Herrmann, S. (1999). *Teacher attrition: Is time running out?* Retrieved September 11, 2005, from The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Educational Leadership Program School of Education Web site: http://horizon.unc.edu/projects/issues/papers/Hampton.asp

DePaola, D. P. (1998, October). *Beyond the university: Leadership for the common good.* Paper presented at the 75th Anniversary Summit Conference of the American Association of Dental Schools, San Diego, CA.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1917). The migration of Negroes. In H. Aptheker (Ed.), *A documentary history of the Negro people in the United States 1910-1932* (Vol. 3, pp. 185-190). Secaucus, NJ: The Citadel Press.

Franklin, J. H. (1980). *From slavery to freedom.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

Flawn, P. T. (1990). *A primer for university presidents: Managing the modern university.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2007). *Education research: An introduction* (8th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

Gilderbloom, J. I. (2002). The urban university in the community: The roles of boards and presidents. *Metropolitan Universities, 13(2),* 10-28.

Gilliland, M. W. (2004). Many voices, one future: Creating new standards—the gold line future at UMKC. In N. L. Zimpher & K. R. Howey (Eds.), *University leadership in urban school renewal* (pp. 143-168). Westport, CT: American Council on Education & Praeger Publishers.

Gladieux, L. E. (2000). *The rising cost of college tuition and the effectiveness*

    of government financial aid. Hearing conducted by the U.S. Senate, Washington,

    DC.

Hess, F. (1999). *Spinning wheels: The politics of urban school reform.* Washington,

    DC: The Brookings Institution Press.

Hooijberg, R., & Choi, J. (2000). Which leadership roles matter to whom? An

    examination of rater effects on perceptions of effectiveness. *Leadership*

    quarterly, 11(3), 341-364.

Horatio Alger Association of Distinguished Americans, Inc. (2001). *The state of our*

    nation's youth. Retrieved February 22, 2004, from

    http://www.ericfacility.net/ericdigests/ed455952.html

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (Eds.). (2005). *Educational administration: Theory,*

    research, and practice. Boston: McGraw Hill Book Company.

The Institute for Higher Education Policy and Scholarship America. (2004).

    Investing in America's future: Why student aid pays off for society and

    individuals. Retrieved February 22, 2004, from http://www.ihep.org

Karenga, M. (1982). *Introduction to black studies.* Los Angeles: The University of

    Sankore Press.

Kenen, P. B., & Kenen, R. H. (1978). Who thinks who's in charge here: Faculty

    perceptions of influence and power in the university. *Sociology of Education,*

    51(April), 113-123.

Lee, C. C. (1995). Successful African American male youth: A psychosocial profile. *Journal of African American Men*, *1(3)*, 63-71.

Michael, S. O., Schwartz, M., & Balraj, L. (2001). Indicators of presidential effectiveness: A study of trustees of higher education institutions. *The International Journal of Educational Management, 15(7),* 332-346.

Mickelson, D., Kritek, W., Hedlund, R., & Kaufmann, A. (1988, February). *Urban school-university collaborations. A final report to the Ford Foundation.* New York: Ford Foundation.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2005). *The condition of education: Special analysis - Mobility in the teacher workforce*. Retrieved July 25, 2006, from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.sap?pubid=2005-094

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF). (2003). *No dream denied: A pledge to America's children.* Washington, DC: Author.

Patton, C. V. (2004). Partnerships, accountability, and results in educational reform in Georgia. In N. L. Zimpher & K. R. Howey (Eds.), *University leadership in urban school renewal* (pp. 193-211). Westport, CT: American Council on Education & Praeger Publishers.

Peel, H. A., Peel, B. B., & Baker, M. E. (2002). School/university partnerships: A viable model. *The International Journal of Educational Management, 16(7),* 319-325.

Raines, S. C. (2004). Passionate connections, informed decisions, executive leadership. In N. L. Zimpher & K. R. Howey (Eds.), *University leadership in urban school renewal* (pp. 193-211). Westport, CT: American Council on Education & Praeger

Publishers.

Reid, I. D. (2004). You can't teach without teachers: The Wayne State University and
Detroit Public Schools partnership. In N. L. Zimpher & K. R. Howey (Eds.),
University leadership in urban school renewal (pp. 131-142). Westport, CT:
American Council on Education & Praeger Publishers.

Swanson, C. B. (2004a). *Who graduates? Who doesn't? A statistical portrait of public
high school graduation, Class of 2001.* Urban Institute. Retrieved August 6,
2006, from http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410934

Swanson, C. B. (2004b). *Projections of 2003-04 high school graduates: Supplemental
analyses based on findings from Who graduates? Who doesn't?* Urban Institute.
Retrieved June 12, 2007, from
http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411019_2003_04_HS_graduates.pdf

Tompkins, R., & Deloney, P. (2006). *Rural students at risk in Arkansas, Louisiana, New
Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas.* Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development
Laboratory. Retrieved August 6, 2006, from http://www.sedl.org/rural/atrisk.html

U.S. Census Bureau. (n.d.) *United States Census 2000.* Retrieved August 26, 2006, from
http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html

U.S. Department of Education. (1999). *President's summit on teacher quality.* Retrieved
August 5, 2006, from http://www.ed.gov/inits/teachers/conferences/summit.html

Williams, J. (1987). *Eyes on the prize: America's civil rights years 1954-1965.* New
York: Penguin Books.

Zimpher, N. L., & Howey, K. R. (2005). The politics of partnerships for teacher

education redesign and school renewal. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56(3),* 266-271.

Zimpher, N. L., & Howey, K. R. (Eds.). (2004). *University leadership in urban school renewal*. Westport, CT: American Council on Education & Praeger Publishers.

APPENDIX A

URBAN FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

Perceptions of University Presidential Leadership in Pre-college Urban School Reform

Questionnaire

SECTION I: PERCEPTIONS OF PRE-COLLEGE URBAN SCHOOL REFORM

Please read each statement below and indicate whether you tend to agree or disagree by clicking the corresponding circle.

	Disagree	Agree
1. Urban schools are in need of reform.	○	○
2. Universities located in urban communities should be actively involved in Urban School Reform.	○	○
3. I personally am involved actively in my university's Urban School Reform initiatives.	○	○
4. National Urban School Reform initiatives are making a positive impact.	○	○
5. My university is making a positive impact on Urban School Reform initiatives in my community.	○	○

SECTION II: PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP IN PRE-COLLEGE URBAN SCHOOL REFORM

Please read each statement below and indicate to what extent you agree or disagree by clicking the corresponding circle.

Part 1: University Structure and Culture

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Urban School Reform is an institutional priority.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
2. The College of Education at my university is primarily responsible for Urban School Reform initiatives.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
3. The College of Education at my university is responsible exclusively for Urban School Reform initiatives.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
4. Urban School Reform is effectively linked to my university's mission.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
5. My university has a strategic plan that is current.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
6. My university's strategic plan is effectively utilized to guide the operation of the university.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
7. Urban School Reform is addressed explicitly in my university's strategic plan.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
8. My president is a vocal supporter of effective teacher education programs.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Part 2: Presidential Awareness

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree
9. My president seizes opportunities to promote university, school and community collaborations.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
10. My president understands historical relationships between the university and the local community.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
11. My president effectively addresses historical barriers to university and community partnerships.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
12. My president understands the university culture as it relates to Urban School Reform.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
13. My president is effective at choosing the most opportune times to promote Urban School Reform initiatives.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
14. My president is receptive to new ideas regarding Urban School Reform.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
15. My president has a working knowledge of issues associated with Urban School Reform.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Part 3: Internal Relationships

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree
16. My president listens attentively to faculty and other campus stakeholders who are involved actively in Urban School Reform initiatives.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
17. My president effectively creates a shared vision of the university's role in Urban School Reform.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
18. My president appoints the right people to lead Urban School Reform initiatives.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
19. My president supports the right people to lead Urban School Reform initiatives.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
20. My president meets regularly with campus stakeholders in Urban School Reform initiatives.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Part 4: External Relationships

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree
21. My president builds strong partnerships with local public school representatives.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
22. My president builds strong partnerships with the local business community.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
23. My president builds strong relationships with the local political community.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
24. My president builds strong relationships with local families and citizens.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
25. My president effectively cultivates Urban School Reform support from the university's Board of Trustees/Regents.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Part 5: Resources and Support

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree
26. My institution provides adequate financial resources to support Urban School Reform initiatives.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
27. My institution ensures necessary administrative resources to support Urban School Reform initiatives.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
28. My president understands the financial costs of Urban School Reform initiatives.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
29. My president is involved personally in raising money for Urban School Reform initiatives.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
30. My president is involved personally in reallocating internal funds to support Urban School Reform initiatives.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Part 6: Accountability and Recognition

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree
31. My president fairly holds the Chief Academic Officer accountable for measurable progress in Urban School Reform.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
32. My president fairly holds academic deans accountable for measurable progress in Urban School Reform.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
33. My president recognizes campus efforts in Urban School Reform which pre-date his/her presidency.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
34. My university regularly assesses its progress in Urban School Reform.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
35. My president expects regular progress reports on the university's Urban School Reform initiatives.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

SECTION III: PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Please indicate your responses to the following questions:

What is your gender?

- ○ Male
- ○ Female

What is your highest degree earned?

- ○ Bachelors Degree
- ○ Masters Degree
- ○ Doctoral Degree
- ○ Terminal Degree other than Doctoral

What is your academic rank?

- ○ Assistant Professor
- ○ Associate Professor
- ○ Professor
- ○ Other (please specify) [_____]

What is your field of study or discipline?

How many years have you taught at the university level?

How many years have you taught at your current university?

What is your race/ethnicity?

○ American Indian or Alaska Native
○ Asian/Asian American
○ Black/African American
○ Hispanic/Latino/Latina
○ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
○ White/Non-Hispanic

Please check here if you would like to receive a copy of this study when it is complete.

○ Yes, I would like a copy.
○ No, thank you.

Please provide any additional comments you wish to share:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND CONTRIBUTION!

Submit Survey

VITA

Name: Rodney Prescott McClendon

Address: 10th Floor Rudder Tower
                   1246 TAMU
                   College Station, TX 77843-1246

Major Subject: Agricultural Education (Leadership, Education, and
                   Communications)

Education: B.A., Banking and Finance, Morehouse College, 1990

                   J.D., Emory University, 1994

                   Ph.D., Agricultural Education, Texas A&M University, 2007

Professional   Chief of Staff to the President,
Experience: Texas A&M University, 2002-current

                   Assistant Provost, Office of the Executive Vice President and
                   Provost, Texas A&M University, 1999-2002

                   Assistant Director (1998-1999) and Coordinator of Student
                   Retention and Development, Department of Multicultural
                   Services, Texas A&M University, 1995-1999