2008-01-01

A Comparison Of The Profiles And Career Pathways

Terri Kaylene Jordan
University of Texas at El Paso, rtcaj@aol.com

A COMPARISON OF THE PROFILES AND CAREER PATHWAYS
OF PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS AND
CORPORATE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

TERRI K. JORDAN

Educational Leadership Administration

APPROVED:

Gary D. Brooks, Ed.D., Chair

Herbert K. Heger, Ph.D.

Richard M. Rhodes, Ph.D.

Don P. Schulte, Ed.D.

Patricia D. Witherspoon, Ph.D.
Dean of the Graduate School

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to the people who mean the most to me in my life: my husband, my children, my parents, and my grandparents.

To my husband, Robert, thank you for all of your love. I could never have completed this project without your support and encouragement. From the first class to the completion of the dissertation, you have been with me every step of the way; often having more faith in me than I did in myself. Thank you for all of the sacrifices you made on my behalf – and for always ensuring our children never wanted for anything, especially when I could not be there. You make my life complete, and you will forever be my "True Companion''. I love you 24/7.

To my children, Connor and Abbie, thank you for being the best son and daughter a mother could ever have. You both are the true lights of my life – and everything I do is for you. You have been so understanding throughout my journey in writing this paper. For every weekend and holiday I spent away from you, I am eternally grateful for your tolerance. As you both continue to grow, I hope you understand how important your education is – and I hope this work serves as a small example of what you can accomplish. The future is yours – and I am looking forward to sharing in your successes – I know there will be many! My "Punkin" and my "Princess" – I love you.

To my parents, Leon and Karen Fails, there truly are no words for me to express what I feel in my heart. All of my accomplishments are a result of your high expectations, your unyielding support, and your unwavering love. Thank you for providing a loving home, lessons of faith and hope, and every possible opportunity to be all I could be. I am truly blessed to be able to continue to share my life with you. My children are so fortunate to be able to know and love their grandparents – thank you for the love you provide to them each and every day. I know I don't express my thoughts or feelings enough – but I hope you know how very appreciative and grateful I am for all you have done, and continue to do, for me. I am truly the luckiest daughter in the world to have the best parents in the world. Thank you for making me all that I am. I love you both more than words can say.

To my grandparents, my only wish is that you were here to share this very special moment. I do know that you are always with me – you never leave my thoughts. I know what "family" is because of what you taught me – and the lessons I learned continue to be shared with my own husband and children. Nanny, Papa, and Gran – you are my angels. I miss you terribly, and I love you forever.

"For the vision is yet for the appointed time;

It hastens toward the goal, and it will not fail.

Though it tarries, wait for it;

For it will certainly come, it will not delay".

Habakkuk 2:3

A COMPARISON OF THE PROFILES AND CAREER PATHWAYS OF PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS AND CORPORATE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

By

TERRI K. JORDAN, B.S., M. Ed.

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at El Paso

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Educational Leadership and Administration

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO

December 2008

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work could only have been accomplished with the support and love of the many people whom I am honored to have in my life. As with any project of this magnitude, there are many individuals who are responsible for the successful completion of this dissertation.

Thank you to Drs. Gary and Irma Brooks. I have known Dr. Gary Brooks since 1987, when I began my work on my Master's Degree at the University of Texas at El Paso. He served as my advisor then and continues to serve as my guide and counselor as the Chair of my Dissertation Committee. Like the 36 doctoral students before me, I will be eternally grateful for his encouragement and assistance in my attainment of this milestone. As he begins his retirement, I wish him only the very best life has to offer. He has looked after so many of us for so long, it is time he looked after himself and enjoyed the opportunity to rest and relax.

Dr. Irma Brooks has been the encouragement and support I needed to complete this work. There were many times I thought I could not complete the research or write the final chapter; but she never allowed me to doubt myself. I thank her for her emails, phone calls, reviews, and edits. I truly appreciate all she has done, not only as a reviewer, but also as a fellow educator.

Dr. Herbert Heger is an integral member of my Dissertation Committee. I want to thank him for his reviews and comments as he read and we discussed my research.

His insight on this project was critical to the successful completion of the work. His willingness to come to El Paso to assist me in this effort was truly appreciated; I am grateful for his guidance.

Dr. Don Schulte has shared his expertise with many educators and students in public school districts and at the University. I thank him for assisting so many of us as we continue our careers. His experiences, at every level of education, are wonderful lessons to us all. I thank him for being willing to be a member of my Committee; his perspective was critical to its completion.

Dr. Richard Rhodes served as the external member of my Committee. I met Dr. Rhodes many years ago when his youngest son attended the high school where I served as Principal. His support at that time was invaluable; and continues to the present. I thank him for being so willing to work with me on this project – he never even hesitated when I asked if he would assist me in this process. I look forward to our continued efforts to provide every opportunity for students in El Paso to become productive and successful members of our community.

I am very grateful that each and every member of my Committee was able to participate in this process. Without their expertise, guidance, and support, this project could not have been completed. I, along with the community of El Paso, are truly blessed to have these fine individuals serve as ambassadors for students and what can be accomplished through the educational process.

There are numerous individuals who were always willing to assist me in researching and organizing my findings. I am so appreciative to Art Jordan, Carlos Perales, Dr. Nidelia Montoya, and Sharon Carr who were always willing to spend time on weekends to assist me on this project. They provided valuable assistance to me in all aspects of the writing process.

I would also like to extend my sincere appreciation to Dr. Gilbert Castro and Dr. Robert Nachtmann. At the time I did not seem to have a clear direction, they both provided insight into this study. They provided focused questions and a guided course for me to follow as I moved forward. Although they were not directly involved on my Committee, they stepped in to assist at just the right time.

I cannot thank Dr. Edward Gabaldon enough for all that he did to help me complete this process. His encouragement and constant support were critical in the final stages of this project. We have worked together for just a short time, but we have already established a strong team approach to the varied responsibilities we carry. I could not have envisioned or realized the "last chapter" were it not for his friendship.

I must also thank Miriam Salvador for all of her help. This acknowledgement page is not long enough to mention all she has done for me, in all aspects of my professional career and educational endeavors. In the simplest of terms, she has unselfishly given of her time and talents to assist me, with never a hesitation. She is one of the most giving persons I have ever met and I will be eternally grateful.

ABSTRACT

Overview

The purpose of this descriptive study was to compare the personal characteristics and career pathways of the superintendents of the fifty largest public school districts in the United States and the chief executive officers (CEO's) of the top fifty Fortune 500 companies in the United States. The research questions that guided this study were: (1) What are the similarities and dissimilarities in the profiles of public school superintendents and CEO's of Fortune 500 companies? and, (2) What are the similarities and dissimilarities in the career pathways of public school superintendents and CEO's of Fortune 500 companies? Demographic information was researched regarding gender, age, ethnicity, educational background, and compensation; and professional preparation information was researched regarding traditional career pathways and succession of the identified executives.

The target populations of this study were the 50 largest school districts and the 50 largest Fortune 500 corporations in the United States. The 50 largest school districts ranged in size from 986,967 students to 68,783 students. The 2007 Fortune 500 included the largest United States incorporated companies who filed financial statements with a government agency. The largest company of the Fortune 500 list was WalMart with revenues (in millions) of $351,139. The smallest of the top 50 companies was Freddie Mac with revenues (in millions) of $44,002.

The web sites for each of the 50 largest school districts and the 50 largest corporations were examined to search for the names and demographic information of the superintendents and CEO's. In some cases, additional information was retrieved through various media publications posted on the internet when the resumes/curriculum vitaes on the school district web sites or company web sites were incomplete. Additionally, a request under the federal Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552 was made to each of the school districts in order to retrieve the required information.

Of the 50 districts, the demographic and career pathway information was either entirely or partially available for all but nine of the superintendents. Therefore, the total number of superintendent subjects reviewed was 41. Of the 50 Fortune 500 companies, the demographic and career pathway information was either entirely or partially available for all 50 of the CEO's.

Conclusions: Profiles of Superintendents and CEO's

Based on the demographic data obtained by the researcher, the typical public school superintendent is a White/non-Hispanic male, age 55 or over, holds a doctoral degree, and earns a base salary of $190,000 or more. Fortune 500 CEO's, typically, are White/non-Hispanic males, age 55 or over, hold a bachelor's or master's degree, and earn a base salary of a $1,000,000 or more.

School district superintendents typically attended a public institution for their bachelor's degree and majored in education, science, or liberal arts; and typically attended a public institution for their highest earned degree and majored in education. Corporate CEO's typically attended a private institution for their bachelor's degree and majored in liberal arts, science, or business; and typically attended a private institution for their highest earned degree and majored in business or law.

The similarities between superintendents and corporate CEO's included gender, ethnicity, age. The dissimilarities between superintendents and corporate CEO's included undergraduate major, major for the highest earned degree, types of institutions attended, and base salary.

Conclusions: Career Pathways

The typical career pathway to the superintendency was teacher/high school principal/central office. The typical career pathways to the CEO position were vice-president/chief financial officer or chief operating officer/president.

Prior to their appointment, the typical superintendent under study was an external applicant, whereas the subject CEO's were internal applicants.

The dissimilarities between superintendents and corporate CEO's included career pathways and applicant status (internal v external).

Recommendations

Recommendations were made for further research in the areas of demographic information and career pathways of top educational leaders and CEO's. It was recommended that national databases be developed of superintendents, presidents of colleges and universities, and CEO's. These databases should include basic demographic data such as gender, ethnicity, age, educational background, and base compensation in order to facilitate the research on the superintendency and corporate CEO's. Comparative research should be conducted to identify the leadership skills required of public school superintendents, corporate CEO's, and college/university presidents; to include information regarding leadership styles, conflict resolution strategies, and leadership challenges. Finally, it was recommended that research be conducted to compare the oversight and accountability exercised by school boards, corporate boards, and boards of regents over their chief executive officers; with particular attention to the effectiveness of corporate CEO's who have been appointed to serve as a public school superintendent or college/university president.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

Background

For many years there has been discussion, especially among educators, about the similarities of the leadership role in public school districts and in corporate offices. "Regardless of district size, there is little doubt that the old, less visible role of school superintendent has changed to that of highly visible chief executive" (Hoyle, Bjork, Collier, & Glass, 2005, p. x).

In 2002, the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA) of 1965 was reauthorized as the *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001 (NCLB). NCLB requires public school superintendents across the nation to focus their attention on statewide accountability systems, parent participation and choice regarding school improvement, flexibility in the use federal education funds, hiring highly qualified teachers, and providing safe and drug free schools, among the myriad of duties and responsibilities already assumed by these leaders in education. In the business world, chief executive officers of multi- million/billion dollar companies spend a significant amount of time making decisions concerning stockholders' expectations, consumer needs, revenues and profits, highly skilled employees, and safe working environments.

The responsibilities of a superintendent are similar to the challenges faced by CEO's of major corporations (Konnert & Augenstein, 1990). Additionally, in some

districts the superintendent also acts as the Chief Financial Officer (CFO), the Chief Operating Officer (COO), and the Chief Academic Officer (CAO). Even when duties are delegated, the responsibilities lie with the person at the helm (Doyle, 1998).

Statement of the Problem

The role of the superintendent has changed dramatically in the last twenty-five years. In an effort to reform public schools, national commissions and task forces were created beginning as early as 1982. *A Nation At Risk* was one of the first reports released with a focus on increased accountability. This report, and others like it, generated a focus on reforms to the educational system. "They called for improving student performance on standardized tests, assessing school-level performance and progress, increasing graduation requirements, lengthening the school day and year, and tightening teacher licensure requirements" (Hoyle, et al., 2005, p. 1). This first wave of accountability was directed to the state level of government and reinforced centralized control of the schools (Bjork, 1996).

During the mid- to late- 1980s reports "broke new ground by calling attention to national increases in numbers of Hispanic and Asian students, students from lower-income families, and students with special needs; making a compelling argument for addressing the needs of all children; and recommending that teaching and learning processes be radically redesigned to address diversity in students' cultures and learning styles" (Hoyle, et al., 2005, p. 2). Additionally, these reports endorsed a decentralized

form of decision making – Site Based Decision Making (SBDM). Decentralized decision making encouraged teacher professionalism by encouraging their participation in school governance and decision making (Bjork, 1996).

From 1989 – 2003, reports have focused on two characteristics: "Reforms must ensure children's well-being, and no child should be academically left behind" (Hoyle, et al., 2005, p. 2). The most recent reform initiative, the *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB, 2002), focuses on the redesign of teaching and pedagogy to improve and increase student learning, especially for students who have been identified as at-risk.

While these reports focus on student learning, one cannot ignore the importance of the principal and the superintendent in leading schools and school districts in implementing these reform initiatives. School and district management are no longer positions needing the simple management and executive skills of budget, personnel, and building or district oversight. The reforms demand "a different set of management and leadership attributes than during previous decades, and required changes in the nature of schooling that in turn required more inclusive discourse and more democratic decision-making processes in schools" (Hoyle, et al., 2005, p. 3).

The role of the chief executive officer has changed dramatically in the last three decades. "American businesses have been forced to try to adapt to powerful economic, technological, and societal changes" (Forbes & Piercy, 1991, p. 2).

In the 1980s, the rate of inflation declined, government regulations affecting businesses were eased, and foreign competition increased markedly. During this period of deregulation many companies faced charges of fraud and money laundering. The most notable was the Enron scandal. Also, many companies closed their doors due to foreign competition or were acquired by their competitors.

In our own country, the weakened economic status of many companies gave rise to mergers and acquisitions. Corporate takeovers were big business in the 1980s (Jarrell, Brickley, & Netter, 1988). The takeovers, mergers, and acquisitions occurred for a number of reasons. First, in the competitive international marketplace, domestic mergers became more acceptable. Second, deregulation of businesses in the transportation and broadcasting industries induced new merger and acquisition activity. These takeover activities called for new skills and strategies from the management teams that oversaw the companies. Other factors included innovations in takeover financing, less stringent anti-takeover regulations, and the retreat of the courts from protecting the targeted firms (Jarrell, et al., 1988) The power once held by corporate officers hung in the balance as many companies faced restructuring.

In early 2000, the government passed new legislation, the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, to establish standards for company executives and public accounting firms. Sarbanes-Oxley seeks to promote responsibility for the corporation, increase public disclosure, improve the transparency of financial reporting and auditing, and strengthen the

penalties for violations (Alkhafaji, 2007). The main purpose of the Act is to make sure the information given by a corporation is reliable, truthful, honest, and defensible by the company. The Act requires ethics, accounting accuracy, and accountability from corporations in America (Alkhafaji, 2007).

Powerful personal computers and work stations caused technological changes in the 1980s that businesses had not experienced before that time. Corporate officers continue to address the application of technology to increase productivity and efficiency in the 21st century. Additionally, "patterns of energy usage will be altered as applications of super-conductivity and cold fusion are developed" (Forbes & Piercy, 1991, p. 3). The changes implemented in 2002 by the Sarbanes-Oxley Act also require new attention to technology. Applications such as product accounting, general ledger, asset and inventory management, billing and accounts receivables and payables, payroll, budgeting, tracking systems, and other reporting systems require a stronger and well established relationship between Chief Executive Officers (CEO's) and Chief Information Officers (CIO's) (Braganza & Franken, 2007).

As members of the baby boom continue to age, businesses have had an increased number of candidates qualified for middle and upper level management positions. However, due to the economic and technological changes outlined above, organizations have had fewer openings for management personnel. Seniority-based promotion systems have been disrupted; and underrepresented classes, such as women, minorities,

and handicapped people have had more opportunities in the field of management than they did in the past (Forbes & Piercy, 1991).

Chief executive officers of corporations, military generals, and school district superintendents are all responsible for the oversight of bureaucratic organizations. They share similar skills and leadership qualities. These outward similarities have led to the perception that skills of top executives are mobile and can be transported from private and public sector businesses or from military ranks to schools. Based on this perception "school boards around the country have been hiring a new breed of superintendent—military generals, a federal prosecutor, a health care executive, investment banker and former corporate executives" (Geiger, 2002, p. 1) to be the top administrator and manager of school districts. The goal of this dissertation is to objectively address this perception of leadership transferability, but limit the topic and further discussion to businesses and school districts.

Teaching and learning in informal and formal settings are ongoing and critical activities within private and public corporations. Clearly, these secondary activities are good for the business. In public schools, teaching and learning, collectively, is the primary business. Both corporations and school districts are concerned with setting goals to achieve the organization's mission; developing a long term vision of what success will bring; knowing stakeholders' (or stockholders') expectations; marketing and communicating; managing large budgets; building, operating and maintaining a

physical plant; creating a personnel office to acquire skilled employees and developing personal and professional enhancement opportunities to retain them; creating a safe "work" environment; and assembling a legal and paralegal staff to address burgeoning compliance measures. Therefore, the assumption that business CEOs and superintendents are transposable positions "sounds plausible. After all, how difficult could it be to mange a school district?" (Geiger, 2002, p. 1).

The aim in business is to create special processes and environments to yield products, or ways to transport, market, sell or service products. The end result is something that brings in revenue and is profitable. School districts are different. Despite having the characteristic infrastructure of a corporation, the unique business of a school district is scholarship. Important elements of scholarship are imparting knowledge by applying the best ways to teach and disseminate it so that it can be applied for useful purposes. The business of schools is to measure the quality of their products in highly complex ways ultimately using measurements of success that are not immediate. The primary products of school districts are different from those of corporations. The district's products are graduates that have acquired knowledge and skills that will allow them to become successful members of the business work force and community. While immediate profit is not realized, future profit-making potential for businesses, the graduates themselves, and the community is the promise.

The business of education requires highly skilled and knowledgeable individuals with considerable leadership skills and qualities and appropriate backgrounds. District school boards are responsible for deciding the best place to search for their leaders and the qualities and characteristics that they should possess. The long-term welfare of districts depends on correct decisions.

Theoretical Basis for the Study

The theoretical basis for this study is Classical Organizational Theory. This is a traditional conceptual view of bureaucratic organizations, in which school district superintendents and chief executive officers have been delegated oversight responsibility by their operating boards. There are six key elements identified in Classical Organizational Theory:

1. "A hierarchical organizational structure that systematically orders communication and authority among formally established positions.
2. Division of labor based on functional specialization.
3. A system of procedures, rules, and regulations covering the rights and duties of employees in work situations.
4. Impersonality of interpersonal relations.
5. Promotion and selection based on technical competence.
6. Rational, systemic, goal-oriented organizational processes" (McKibbin, 1981, p. 10).

In the classic organizational chart, relationships between chief executive officers or school district superintendents and their subordinates are established on a hierarchical chart. These relationships "assign status, regulate formal activity, provide a structure for performance evaluation, and legitimize the authority of one person over another" (McKibbin, 1981, p. 11).

All tasks performed in the organization are delegated to departments and units specializing in the assigned function. Centralized control and approval from the school district superintendents or the chief executive officers is maintained in order to ensure that the objectives of the organization are met through established operating guidelines and procedures.

Interests of the individual and of the organization should be similar and are developed through organizational vision, mission, and goal statements. The goals must be clearly defined, measurable, and attainable. Individuals in the organization are recruited and retained through formalized personnel policies, contracts defining job expectations, and financial incentives linked to performance (McKibbin, 1981).

School district superintendents and chief executive officers are responsible for the oversight of bureaucratic organizations. The preparedness to accept the challenge of authority and responsibility required of these leadership positions should be defined by similarities in their personal profiles and career pathways.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to compare the personal characteristics and career pathways of the superintendents of the fifty largest public school districts in the United States and the chief executive officers (CEO's) of the top fifty Fortune 500 companies in the United States.

Significance of the Study

The study added to the body of knowledge in educational administration.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1.) What are the similarities and dissimilarities in the profiles (e.g. gender, age, ethnicity, educational background, compensation) of public school superintendents and CEO's of Fortune 500 companies?

2.) What are the similarities and dissimilarities in the career pathways of public school superintendents and CEO's of Fortune 500 companies?

Definition of Terms

Career Pathway. A career pathway is the sequence of job titles held by an individual leading to his/her appointment as superintendent or chief executive officer (CEO). A career pathway for a superintendent may include teacher, building vice-principal or principal, central office administrator, and superintendent (Hayes, 2001). A career pathway for a CEO may include Vice-President, Senior Vice-President, Executive Vice-President, President, and CEO (Forbes and Piercy, 1991).

Chief Executive Officer. A Chief Executive Officer (**CEO)** is the highest-ranking corporate officer in charge of the total management of a corporation or company.

***Elementary and Secondary Education Act* of 1965**. *The Elementary and Secondary Education Act* of 1965 (Public Law 89-10) authorized grants for elementary and secondary school programs for children of low income families; school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials for school children; supplementary educational centers and services; strengthening state education agencies; and educational research and research training ("Digest of Education Statistics", 2008).

Enrollment. Enrollment is receiving instruction by attendance in a public school, as opposed to being registered prior to receiving instruction ("Student Attendance Accounting Handbook", 2007).

Fortune 500 Company. This term includes U.S. incorporated companies that file financial statements with a government agency. This includes private companies and cooperatives that file a 10-K and mutual insurance companies that file with state regulators. Excluded are private companies not filing with a government agency; companies incorporated outside the U.S.; companies owned or controlled by other U.S. companies that file with a government agency; and U.S. companies owned or controlled by foreign companies ("FAQ Definitions and Explanations", 2007).

***No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001**. The *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB), which reauthorized ESEA, incorporated the principles and strategies of "increased accountability for States, school districts, and schools; greater choice for parents and students, particularly those attending low-performing schools; more flexibility for States and local education agencies (LEAs) in the use of Federal education dollars; and a stronger emphasis on reading, especially for our youngest children" (http://www.ed.gov/print/nclb/oveerview/intro/execsumm.html).

School district size. School district size is the total number of students served by the school district in pre-kindergarten through grade 12.

Superintendent. The superintendent is the educational leader and the chief executive officer of the school district (TEC, 2007).

Urban school district. An urban school district is a geographic area in a state where a public school system operates as a governmental entity. Districts located in large cities with populations exceeding 10,000 residents and with more than 3,000 students are classified as urban districts (Glass & Franceschini, 2007).

Delimitations

This study was delimited to the superintendents of the 50 school districts in the U.S. with the largest enrollment and the CEO's of the top 50 corporations on the Fortune 500 list for 2007.

Limitations

The primary limitation of this study is the accuracy and completeness of the resumes/curriculum vitaes provided by the participants.

Organization of the Remaining Chapters

Chapter 2 presents a review of the related literature and research divided into six sections: 1) history of the position of public school superintendent; 2) history of the position of the corporate CEO; 3) job responsibilities of the superintendent; 4) job responsibilities of the corporate CEO; 5) accountability systems applied to the superintendent; and 6) accountability systems applied to the corporate CEO. Chapter 3 describes the research design and methodology of the study. Chapter 4 presents the results of the study based on the research questions posed above. Chapter 5 includes a summary of the study, conclusions, links to the extant literature, recommendations for further research, and implications for practice.

CHAPTER 2 – REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature focused on the following topics: the history of the position of the public school superintendent and the corporate Chief Executive Officer (CEO), the job responsibilities of the public school superintendent and of the corporate CEO, and the accountability systems applied to the public school superintendent and the corporate CEO.

Historical Background of the Public School Superintendent

In order to understand the current expectations of a public school superintendent, it is important to understand the history and development of the position. Many of the past influences on the position are still affecting the superintendency today. The word "superintendent" is derived from the Latin words *super*, which translated means "over," and *intendo*, which translated means "direct" (Konnert & Augenstein, 1995, p. 6). The direct oversight and management of school operations were the initial responsibilities of early superintendents. The functions of leadership, change process, and accountability were not identified as job-related skills until much later in the history of the development of the superintendent. This occurred as a result of a multitude of political and social factors affecting the public school system (Konnert & Augenstein, 1990).

Public school education began in the United States in 1642 in Massachusetts. Oversight of these schools was primarily done by volunteer community committees

who were responsible for the oversight of the fiscal resources, the instructional program, the materials, and the facilities. Committee members were charged with visiting the schools to ensure compliance with the committee's decisions. These committees would later take the form of the present day school boards, and the committee members charged with the school visitations would be the very earliest form of the school superintendent. The committee member was to oversee the daily operations, but had limited or no responsibilities regarding curriculum, teaching, or learning. Later, as the availability of state funding increased, state superintendents were selected to oversee the accounting of the state funds, but the job duties of the state superintendent was primarily data collecting and oversight functions. The position of the state superintendents would develop into what we now know as state departments of education (Konnert & Augenstein, 1990; Norton,Webb, Dlugosh, & Sybouts, 1996).

The earliest superintendents were often chosen and evaluated on their moral character and their church membership. Formal education and professional training were not required of the 19th century superintendent. In early biographical studies, words used to describe a superintendent include "earnest," "Christian character," "pure," and "true scholar" (Tyack & Hansot, 1982, p. 16). "Leadership in public education was often seen as a *calling* similar to that of church missionary, and in teachers' institutes superintendents were sometimes as interested in converting to religion as in evangelizing for schooling" (Tyack & Hansot, 1982, p. 16). The schools

systems in place were largely unbureaucratic and did not implement codes of professionalism for their leaders or their teachers. The schools, for the most part, were one room school houses in rural areas that were run by lay people with a Protestant-republican background (Tyack & Hansot, 1982).

The first school superintendents were appointed in 1837 in Buffalo, New York and in Louisville, Kentucky. By 1860, superintendents existed in 27 districts (Glass, 1992). The number of general superintendents continued to grow throughout the late 1800s due to growing school populations caused by rapid growth and westward movement. Superintendents served in their positions for little or no pay. Local committees, or boards, served as the authority over appointed superintendents, lacking any standards or policies from which to operate (Jackson, 1995; Konnert & Augenstein, 1990; Norton, et al., 1996).

Superintendents in the late 19th century were proponents and supporters of education and were required to fight the political and economic battles required to develop a free and public education for all children (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). These early superintendents faced the challenge of the survival of the public school movements (Glass, 1992). Opponents of the position of superintendent began to emerge at the state and local level. Harold Steward Young cited possible reasons for opposition to this position in his doctoral dissertation entitled: <u>In Pursuit of a Profession: A Historical Analysis of the Concept of "Personalization" for American</u>

Public School Superintendency 1865-1973. These reasons include: a) teachers and principals feared a loss of control; b) the board feared a loss of power (and the opportunity to dispense favors); c) the public's and board's fear of "one-man control;" d) a lack of trained men for the position; e) the absence of legal authority for the position; f) the belief the position (and expense) was unnecessary; g) satisfaction with the schools as they were; and h) a general resistance to change (Norton, et al., 1996, p. 4).

The first professional organization developed to support school superintendents, the Department of School Superintendents, was founded in 1865 at a National Teachers Association meeting. In 1870, this group was finally recognized as a part of the National Education Association. In 1937, this organization became the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) (Konnert & Augenstein, 1990).

By the end of the century, the superintendent as a religious lay person had been replaced by administrators who had made education their career. Until that time, the superintendent's responsibility was to be the instructional leader, and local board members handled the budget and local finances. It was not until the beginning of the twentieth century that superintendents began to study and oversee the fiscal responsibilities of school districts, such as the construction and maintenance of school buildings (Sharp & Walter, 2004). Two movements were identified in this era. First, in the early 1900s, scientific management principals, developed by Frederick Taylor, were

the managerial and organizational concepts under which superintendents operated. Cost effectiveness and efficiency, already implemented in big businesses in the corporate sector, were infused into the operations of the public school. The principals of scientific management included the identification of duties, procedures and time lines required to complete identified duties, incentives to encourage completion of the identified duties, and supervision and oversight of workers. Schools became a business-like bureaucracy, where superintendents were the supervisors with control over a number of schools, teachers were the workers, and the curriculum was strictly mandated. Standardized tests, created by a central office, were given to evaluate teacher compliance with the stated curriculum in order to produce the most efficient product: the student (Glass & Franceschini, 2007; Jackson, 1995; Norton, et al., 1996). "The tenants of scientific management, and the resulting bureaucracy, still guide the practices of some local schools today, despite the fact that many researchers and reformers believe highly centralized, hierarchical structures are a chief obstacle to school restructuring" (Glass, 1992, p. 2).

Second, superintendents focused on the government reform movement. Their priority was to rid schools of corruption and political influences. Local and state governments, including schools, were often influenced and run under the auspices of self-serving politicians lacking good judgment or values. Superintendents were expected to make their decisions outside of the political arena, based on the best

interests of the student. The scientific management movement and the good government movement were interrelated until the early twentieth century, when attention to social issues began to influence community and political leaders (Jackson, 1995).

In the 1930s, the focus of the school superintendent was fiscal resources, personnel management, facilities, and curriculum organization systems. There were very loosely defined educational goals and schools and districts often operated independently of each other. These superintendents were often known as social, political, and religious conservatives (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). Superintendents, at this time, acted as a spokesperson for education, but tried to ignore any other conflict or issue that may have been generating. Schools continued to run in an assembly-like fashion, where the majority of students were preparing for work in factories, and only the elite, wealthy families were educated in private schools. Social division and racial segregation were not concerns of the school leadership (Jackson, 1995).

The focus of the superintendent, and of education, was the preservation and strengthening of democracy in the early 1950s. However, in 1954, the historic case of *Brown v Board of Education,* forced superintendents to consider desegregation and other social issues. The civil rights movement had begun and black Americans demanded a change in the current state of segregation. Schools became a focal point of controversy and superintendents were no longer educational experts, but rather targets of criticism

in the area of social policy. School boards, communities, and even teachers demanded a more active role in the creation of policy as it affected the schools. Teacher unions were formed, and now began to put superintendents in a new and unknown defensive position (Jackson, 1995; Norton et al., 1996).

The superintendent of the 1960s was required to deal with additional federal laws maintaining equity. These laws included the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which gave minority populations a more active and visible role in public education. Additionally, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 authorized funds to outside agencies to provide educational opportunities for the physical, developmental and educational needs of children. In 1965, Congress also passed an immigration act that eliminated the quotas required for European immigrants. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 identified federal monies that were to be spent in local schools to address the needs of the economically and educationally disadvantaged student. Due to the turbulent times in the 1960s, there continued to be strained relationships between superintendents and their students, teachers and communities (Jackson, 1995; Tucker & Ziegler, 1980; Cuban, 1988).

Superintendents' roles changed dramatically in the 1970s due to the growth of school populations, urbanization, and the focus on minority rights and access to higher education. Many viewed superintendents as behavioral social scientists and

community leaders (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). Equity in financing became a focus in this time period. Reliance on local property taxes created a great discrepancy in the amount of funding school districts had at their disposal. Wealthy school districts were able to collect higher amounts of tax dollars than were low-income urban and rural districts. The California Supreme Court case of *Serrano v Priest* in 1971 and the U.S. Supreme court case of *Rodriguez v San Antonio ISD* in 1973 began this movement. These school finance cases were focused on alleged violations of the equal protection clause of the U.S. Constitution. These issues continue to be debated even today.

Due to issues of equity, school districts began hiring racial and ethnic populations to serve as administrators in their schools, including superintendents. As populations of minority students grew, communities began to search for superintendents who represented the minority populations. Prior to this time superintendents were white and male and were often criticized for not understanding the issues facing their schools. This required a new breed of superintendent; a superintendent with specialized training who would be prepared for racial, ethnic, and economic issues and who would be able to deal with urban population shifts (Jackson, 1995).

Also occurring during the 1960s and the 1970s was the change in the composition of the school board. Up until this time, school boards represented a legal interest group. Board members were usually members of the Chamber of Commerce or the

Rotary Club (Reeves, 1954). Now, board members were more representative of the total community, with blue-collar workers, homemakers, and others with a desire to change the system being elected (Getzels, Liphan, & Campbell, 1968).

Beginning in the early 1980s, superintendents' characteristics focused on personal traits, professional experiences, job context, preparation, school board relations, evaluations, and opinions (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). Efforts were now focused on improving college administrator programs, headed by organizations such as the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP). There was room for improvement in the preparation programs. They generally had minimal entrance requirements, which varied from state to state, and most superintendents did not hold doctoral degrees even though many colleges and universities offered such programs (Hayes, 2001).

The National Commission on Educational Excellence published the report, *A Nation at Risk,* in 1983. This report blamed local schools and their leaders for the inability of the United States to compete globally with other nations. This report, and subsequent reports from groups of business, civic, and other interest groups, called for reforms in teacher certification, curriculum and superintendent preparation (Jackson, 1995).

A second wave of school reform began in 1986. These reforms were directed at local school districts and focused on site-based decision making. Parental involvement, school choice, and teacher empowerment became topics of importance. The policies implemented were a change from the top-down decision making model that was practiced in almost all school districts. “Centralized school governance and control was seen as a source of inefficiency and as an impediment to the creativity needed to bring about change at the local school level” (Norton, et al., 1996, p. 19).

The position of the superintendent, in the 1990s, required individuals who were knowledgeable in the political arena, in the complex area of accountability, and the requirements that leadership demands (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). Traditional superintendent models have faded; however, the influences of the past continue to shape and develop the position of today. In order to maintain a working knowledge of curriculum trends; federal, state, and local expectations; and fiscal responsibilities; preparation programs for superintendents are much more common today than ever before.

In 1993, the AASE Commission on Standards developed Professional Standards for the superintendency. These standards were benchmarks for the profession. Professionals in and out of education were asked to give their input about the requirements of such an important leadership position in the schools, and indeed, in the community. These foundations for superintendent preparation and evaluation were

meant to be a work in progress that could be modified as the role of the superintendent changed. The identified standards include: leadership and culture, policy and governance, communications and community relations, organizational management, curriculum planning and development, instructional management, human resource management, and values and ethics of leadership (Hoyle, 1993).

As we enter the 21st century, superintendent preparation is a priority. The development and implementation of standards-based preparation and licensing has become a nationwide movement (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). Even though the superintendent has never been apolitical, the role of the superintendent has become more political than ever. The superintendent is elected by a board of trustees and the district is supported by taxes levied on the community. The expectations have never been higher. Superintendents must be familiar with politics at the local, state, and national level; they must have a heightened awareness of the programs and the influential players in their communities, and they must understand how to manage conflict rather than simply eliminate it (Jackson, 1995).

The position of superintendent has never been easy and continues to evolve and change. Today it can still be said, as the National Education Association's Educational Policies Commission wrote in 1965, that,

> "the superintendency of schools is one of the most crucial and perhaps most difficult public positions in American life today. The occupant of this

position, more than any other single person in the community, influences the shape of public education. Thus he has a basic role in determining what will become of the young people of his community, and through them what his community and the nation will become" (Jackson, 1995, p. 1).

The study of the history of the superintendency helps us to understand the many factors that were critical in the development of the current position, even as it continues to change and evolve (Konnert & Augenstein, 1990).

Historical Background of the Corporate Chief Executive Officer

In order to understand the background of the corporate CEO, it is important to understand the history of the American corporation, much like the superintendent's history is connected to the development of the public school system.

Prior to the 17th century, corporations were created in Europe as not-for-profit entities. Their function was to build institutions for the public good, such as hospitals and universities. The established corporations operated under a constitution that outlined their specific duties. The constitution was approved and overseen by the government ("A short history of corporations", 2002).

The corporate charter dates back to medieval Europe, where incorporation legitimized public institutions and semiprivate enterprises. During the 17th century, corporations shifted their focus to making money. The wealth realized by the corporations was used to finance European colonial expansion. The corporations

maintained control of trade, resources, and territory in Asia, Africa, and the Americas. In 1602, the Dutch East India Company became the first true stock corporation with a permanent fund of capital. Partners combined their personal stock in order to create the world's first commercial corporation. At the height of its rule, the East India Company ruled over 20% of the world's population and had a private army of over 250,000 (Korten, 1995).

The corporate charter made its way to the American colonies where it became a widely accessible instrument of economic growth. The American colonies were products of the Virginia Company of London and the Massachusetts Bay Company (formerly the Virginia Company of Plymouth). The two societies secured settlement grants governed by local councils and answered directly to the sovereign, England.

In 1776, the outside-director notion gave way when the colonies gave way to on-the-scene authority. Prior to this time, the British rule over the American colonies required that raw materials be shipped from the colonies to Britain for manufacture, and then the colonies, in turn, had to purchase the finished product (Kaplan, 1999). The American Revolutionary War signaled the end of the British control of the American colonies. In 1752, one of the first independent colonial corporations was founded by Benjamin Franklin, The Philadelphia Contributionship for the Insurance of Houses from Loss of Fire (Vance, 1983).

In 1819, Chief Justice John Marshall rendered the Dartmouth College decision, saying “the corporation is an artificial being, invisible, intangible, and existing only in the contemplation of the law” (Vance, 1983, p. 2). This decision challenged the English common law that gave a corporation authority to do whatever it wanted to do except that which was explicitly forbidden by law. The Dartmouth decision granted the corporation authority only through its charter, which was approved by the state legislature. This was a natural fit to the new thought and principles of limited and representative government. Almost 200 years after Chief Justice Marshall’s decision, we still question whether the American corporation is indeed “invisible and intangible.” Most Americans see corporations as real beings with form and substance (Vance, 1968).

This new view of a corporation attracted the large and unaffiliated American public because it provided limited liability which reduced investor risk, provided a structure which made it easier to bring in professional management, and established commercial enterprises within the framework of the American government. This was a stark contrast to the interconnected world of business and capital in England.

Also in 1776, Adam Smith, the father of free trade theories, published the *Wealth of Nations*. In London, he argued that large business limits competition: “The pretence that corporations are necessary to the better government of the trade is without foundation” (Smith, 1776). Economists, such as Adam Smith, distrusted public

corporations. They contended that entrepreneurial firms managed by owners would be more profitable than public corporations that were managed by executives who had been hired to fill the leadership positions. The hired executives were thought to make decisions about other people's money without having to bear the full consequences of their decisions (Cannella & Monroe, 1997).

The idea that executives in leadership positions had their own agendas and interests and only acted as agents of the stockholders came to be known as agency theory. Investors would turn over their wealth to managers while retaining the risks associated with the decisions of those managers (Berle & Means, 1932).

After America had won its independence, more American corporations began to be established. Like the British companies, these corporations were to complete specific public functions, like digging canals or building bridges. The corporations were governed by charters, which were issued for periods of 10-40 years. The expectation was that the corporations would be dissolved once the task had been completed. The purpose of this arrangement was to limit commercial interests and prohibit corporate participation in the political process (Kaplan, 1999).

In 1844, England passed an Act allowing corporations to define their own purpose. This was the birth of corporations as we know them today. With this decision, the power to control corporations passed from the government to the courts (Kaplan, 1999).

In 1886, a landmark decision by the United States courts recognized the corporation as a "natural person" under the law in *Santa Clara County v. Southern Pacific Railroad Co.* The 14th Amendment to the Constitution, which states "no state shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property," was used to defend corporations and strike down regulations. The Amendment, interestingly enough, was written to protect emancipated slaves in the South (Kaplan, 1999).

By the end of the 19th century, railroad tycoons and robber barons were in charge of the large monopolies that had formed due to the lack of control on companies. The health of capitalism was in danger. In an attempt to bring the corporations under control, the courts established antitrust laws to break monopolies, taxation and tariffs were raised, and state regulation began to creep in ("A short history of corporations", 2002).

At the turn of the century, J.P. Morgan established the country's first billion-dollar corporation, United States Steel Corporation. Morgan brought together 300 iron and steel makers, merchants, and financiers to establish this corporation. This corporation was an example of outside-director control and Morgan was heavy handed, to the point of having a directorate dictatorship. While some believe this was the reason for U.S. Steel's decline, it provided the structural and functional design for boardroom emulators who followed (Vance, 1983).

At the same time, Henry Ford established the Ford Motor Company. This proved to be an example of the owner-founder inside board corporation. In this type of organization, titles were virtually non-existent, including one for Henry Ford, himself. There were no vice-presidents and the organization's administration was lean. Under this type of leadership, there was no complex chain of command and decisions could be made quickly (Vance, 1983).

The labor movement of the early 1900s, the depression of the 1930s, and World War II established an environment for stronger state intervention. By this time, however, U.S. corporations controlled land, military forces, ports, and railroads in poorer countries. This began a new wave of placing greater restrictions on foreign investments (Kaplan, 1999).

In the 1950s, the office of the chief executive was actually a sharing of responsibilities between two or more executives in the Office of the President (OP). Ideally there were four prime functions that were divided among the executives: chief executive officer (CEO), chief operating officer (COO), chief financial officer (CFO), and chief administrative officer (CAO). The division of duties allows for individuals to optimally perform their duties and maximize their expertise. Today, the COO, CFO, and/or CAO are members of an executive team that can be a training ground for chief executive officer (Vance, 1983).

Beginning in 1950, the Gross National Product (GNP) began falling, productivity began dropping, and unemployment began rising. Compensation rose 53% from 1977 to 1983. Productivity increases were seen in Italy, Germany, France, the Netherlands, and Japan. The line of profit was down and many companies were actually running in the red. This caused businesses to file for bankruptcy. These bankruptcies were either liquidations or company assets were auctioned off and, in either case, many jobs were lost. Unionization caused increased labor costs for many industries. Unions fought to maintain cost-of-living compensation and benefit plans, causing increased adversarial relationships between management and labor. Business leaders who were in the CEO positions had no experience in dealing with a downside economy. They had flourished in environments where anyone could make money, and had little or no preparation or training on what to do when economics turn against them (Ruch & Goodman, 1983).

In the mid 1960s the United States experienced a time of heightened social activism. This activity resulted in the demand for environmental and labor standards. The break-up of some of the larger monopolies also occurred during this time (Kaplan, 1999).

In the 1970s, positive agency theory developed as an off-shoot of agency theory. Instead of focusing on the executives hired to manage other people's money with little or no consequence for the decisions they made, the focus now was on the ability of investors to diversify their wealth because of the separation of ownership and control.

Rather than investing in an entrepreneur's firm in which they could lose their wealth if the firm failed; diversified investors did not have all of their wealth in one investment and therefore all of their wealth was not at stake (Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Fama, 1980). Studies showed a decrease in conglomerate mergers, reductions in take over resistance, decreases in the payment of greenmail, increases in managerial risk-taking and debt financing of acquisitions, and decreases in the cost of corporate equity (Amihud & Lev, 1981; Walking & Long, 1984).

Top managers, however, still acted in their own self-interests. They focused on growth rather than profitability since their compensation was determined by the size of their firm (Jensen, 1988). Corporate boards of directors lacked both incentive and time to monitor the executives who were running the company (Walsh & Seward, 1990). Due to the lack of oversight, executives often set their own salaries or attempted to grow their own firms to justify their increases in salary because the governance oversight with respect to salaries was weak (Crystal, 1991).

During the 1970s and the 1980s, Milton Friedman and other economists established the "Chicago School" model of economics. This was similar to the *laissez-faire* capitalism of the 19th century. These economists developed ultra free-market ideas based on deregulation and privatization. The political resources of corporate America came together to regain control of the political agenda and the court systems. American President Ronald Reagan and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher encouraged

corporations to thrive using Chicago School principles. Utilizing tax cuts, ignoring unemployment, rolling back social welfare and increasing privatization, the social contract was dismantled (“A short history of corporations”, 2002)

During this time period, only a few independent directors served on boards; CEO’s dominated the corporations. CEO’s received excessive compensation. Shareholders, and the public in general, were concerned about lavish spending (Steckmest, 1982). Financial manipulators, corporate raiders, lawyers, and investment bankers profited. Stakeholders, employees, management, consumers, creditors, communities, and the economy suffered during this time (Alkhafaji, 2001).

In 1984, Hambrick and Mason established the upper echelons theory. They argued that the outcomes of the organization are a result of the values and cognitions of the executive rather than a reflection of corporate board control or environmental forces. This theory evolved into strategic leadership theory. This theory of management maintained that the executive is in a position to make the most impact on the organization. Further, the executive’s psychological make-up explained the executive’s strategic choices. Executives’ values, cognitions, and personalities affected their field of vision, their selective perception of information, and their interpretation of the information to be used in the decision-making process (Finkelstein & Hambrick, 1996). Studies in the area of strategic leadership theory found that increased executive tenure inhibited strategic change and affected organization performance (Gabarro, 1987;

Finkelstein & Hambrick, 1990; Norburn & Birley, 1988; Miller 1991) and demographic characteristics such as functional background and education affected organizational outcomes (Miles & Snow, 1978).

The 1990s brought transformational leadership. This leadership theory dated back to Max Weber in 1924. Weber identified the charismatic as the person endowed with extraordinary gifts of divine grace that attracted followers who believed they were linked to leaders through transcendent powers. Transformational leaders made followers more aware of the importance and value of task outcomes, by activating their higher order needs, and by encouraging them to go beyond self-interest for the sake of the organization. These leaders motivated followers to perform in excess of the expectations (Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992). Transformational leaders exuded confidence, dominance, a sense of purpose, and had the ability to articulate goals and ideas that they had psychologically already prepared their followers for (Fromm, 1941).

A six-factor Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was developed by Bass in 1985. This questionnaire has been revised over time and is now considered to be a valid and reliable instrument. The questionnaire is used to select top managers with both desirable risk-taking capabilities and an increased capacity for transforming followers.

Early in the 21st century, a number of major corporate and accounting scandals rocked the financial world. These events affected corporations such as Enron, Tyco

International, Adelphia, Peregrine Systems, and WorldCom. Problems with conflicts of interest and executive compensation practices triggered the events that led to these scandals. Investors lost billions of dollars when the share prices of these large corporations collapsed. The issues that came to light as a result of these events were 1) boards of directors did not properly oversee the financial reporting of their corporations; 2) auditing firms, who were charged with oversight of the accounting practices of firms, were also being hired as consultants, which created the appearance of conflicts of interest; 3) securities analysts and investment bankers who provided buy and sell recommendations, and who also oversaw loans and mergers and acquisitions, also created a sense of conflict of interest; 4) banks were lending large sums of money to corporations without understanding the potential risks involved; which also created a false sense of a company's health and integrity; 5) mutual fund managers were found to have been advocating the purchase of technology stocks, while at the same time selling them; all of this occurring during the sharp decline of technology stocks and in the overall market in general in 2000; and 6) stock options were not being treated as compensation (Farrell, 2005).

In response, American President George W. Bush signed into law the Public Accounting Reform and Investor Protection Act of 2002 or the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002. The Act was named after Senator Paul Sarbanes and Representative Michael G. Oxley. President Bush said the Act included "the most far-reaching reforms of

American business practices since the time of Franklin D. Roosevelt" (Bumiller, 2002, p. A1). The Sarbanes-Oxley Act, or SOX, established new standards for U.S. public company boards, management, and public accounting firms. SOX contained language regarding corporate board responsibilities, criminal penalties, and a requirement of the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) to implement rulings directing compliance with the law. Under this law, senior executives were required to take individual responsibility for the accuracy and completeness of corporate financial reports. It required the CEO and /or CFO to certify and approve the integrity of the firm's financial statements on a quarterly basis in order to maintain accountability (Montana, 2007).

Much like the position of the school superintendent, the position of the Chief Executive Officer continues to change and evolve. A study of the history of the position of the CEO helps us to understand the complex set of issues that surround this leadership position (Zhang & Rajagopalan, 2003).

Job Responsibilities of the Public School Superintendent

Superintendents hold one of the most important and challenging jobs in our education system. There are approximately 17,000 school districts in our country serving over 48 million K-12 students (Council of the Great City Schools, 2006). Increased public availability of achievement data has put superintendents under more scrutiny than ever before (Fuller, Campbell, Celio, Harvey, & Immerwahr, 2003). The

areas of expertise the superintendent must possess are numerous. In reviewing the responsibilities of the superintendent, it is evident that the learning process can never be over for the superintendent. Superintendents must have a working knowledge of many areas: personnel, facilities, public relations, and curriculum and instruction, to name a few. As the chief education officer and chief executive officer, the superintendent is required to oversee the daily operations of the entire district (Sharp & Walter, 2004).

In 1993, the American Association of School Administrators published the *Professional Standards for the Superintendency*. These standards were based on research, input from past and present superintendents and those who develop preparation programs for the superintendency. While these standards were not considered to be a static description of the standards to which a superintendent was to aspire, they are considered the framework to which today's superintendent must strive in order to ensure excellence within schools. "The superintendency requires bold, creative, energetic, and visionary school leaders who can respond quickly to a myriad of issues ranging from dealing with social changes, a diverse student population, and demands for equity, to improving school quality for every child and making effective use of new technologies" (Hoyle, 1993 p. 3). In order to accomplish this, superintendents must be skilled collaborators, who are able to utilize all resources in a shared decision making environment to support the education of all children.

The first standard is Strategic Leadership and District Culture. The superintendent must be able to create a school mission and vision that meets the requirements of federal, state, and local policies and addresses the issues and concerns faced in the current communal environment. "Primary responsibilities of the superintendent are to provide leadership in establishing a vision for the educational organization and then converting this vision into a set of goals and priorities for the organization" (Konnert & Augenstein, 1995, p. 13). The reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, known as *No Child Left Behind* (USDE, 2002), focused on the redesign of teaching and pedagogy to improve and increase student learning. Knowledge of the requirements in this legislation is imperative to superintendents writing goals for their districts. Additionally, it is critical to be aware of the trends and opinions regarding community demographic profiles, medical and health issues, consumer based education, and war and terrorism. Each of these areas has potential fiscal and societal implications within the educational environment. An understanding of the multiple factors that influence today's schools is needed in order to make sound decisions.

The mission and vision must promote rigor and excellence in the instructional setting for all students and staff. The *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) Legislation enacted in 2002 also outlined the requirements and guidelines of "increased accountability for states, school districts, and schools; greater choice for parents and students, particularly

those attending low-performing schools; more flexibility for states and local education agencies (LEAs) in the use of federal education dollars; and a stronger emphasis on reading, especially for our youngest children" (USDE, 2002, p. 9). Effective vision and mission statements are a means to set the goals for school improvement and educational excellence.

Superintendents must always keep their thoughts focused on what is best for children when making district decisions. Whether the issue involves curriculum, food service, health care, or the allocation of scarce resources, the superintendent must be resolved in carrying out the mission of the district: serve the educational needs of the students. The superintendent of a public school district has the responsibility and duty of leading and managing the learning community. This position offers challenges to the intellect and a vast array of opportunities to make a difference in many lives (Hoyle, et al., 2005).

While the development of the mission and vision statements is a function of the leadership role of the superintendent, a process of strategic input from stakeholders is valuable in defining the shared vision and mission for the organization. Stakeholders within the learning community include district employees, students, parents, community and business representatives, and members of the board of trustees. The mission and vision should inspire and energize all involved to work toward school excellence and character development for students and staff. "Education CEO's can

lead others to embrace difference and engage them in solving problems to build stronger social capital and more caring communities" (Hoyle, et al., 2005, p. 222). This process defines the district's organizational health and establishes the guidelines from which the action steps to achieve the mission and vision must be developed (Hoyle, 1993; Hoyle, et al. 2005).

The second standard is Policy and Governance. The ability to merge federal, state, and local laws and policies within district policies and guidelines is fundamental to the knowledge and skills required of a superintendent (Hoyle, 1993). The federal government has turned its attention to funding for targeted programs and related mandates and regulations. The courts have directed schools in desegregation, funding, and special education. States have increased their control over curriculum, graduation requirements, teacher certification, and evaluation. All of this puts schools, and their leaders, in the center of the political arena.

The Constitution of the United States gives implied authority for the federal government's involvement in education in the General Welfare Clause which is in the preamble of the Constitution in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1. The General Welfare Clause states, "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excise, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States" ("The United States Constitution", 1997). In 1936, the United States Supreme Court ruled, in *United States v Butler,* that Congress could interpret the General

Welfare Clause in a way that would allow the enactment of legislation that would protect national interests. Subsequently, Congress enacted several pieces of legislation that have had a great influence on education. In 1958, Congress enacted the National Defense Education Act (NDEA). This legislation was in direct response to the Soviet Union's launch of Sputnik and an effort to assist the United States in regaining technology supremacy by investing in math, science, and foreign language education. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), authorized in 1965, was one of the largest investments made for public education. ESEA targeted funding for low-income, at-risk students; teacher recruitment, professional development; educational technology, and after school programs ("ESEA", 2007). In 1976, Public Law 94-142, targeted funding for educational services to provide equal protection under the law for children with disabilities. *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB), signed in 2003 and the reauthorization of ESEA, was a commitment to ensure that all children would learn and contribute to the economic strength of the country.

Knowledge of these federal programs is critical to the superintendent. While the federal government cannot control or oversee the daily operations of the district, the regulations attached to each of the pieces of legislation require detailed reporting and accounting for expenditures spent within the program, and restrict commingling of program and local funding. These programs expand school services and ensure that the

constitutional rights of all children are met, but they also expand the bureaucratic systems and personnel needs of school districts.

Additionally, the courts have made other decisions that protect the constitutional rights of individuals, while at the same time have changed the way schools are led and managed. For example, superintendents must be aware of the implications of the First Amendment and how that relates to public education and religion, freedom of speech and the press, and the right to assembly. The Fourth Amendment is important as it defines the expectations to be protected from unreasonable search and seizures. The Fourteenth Amendment and the Equal Protection Clause are critical to the understanding of searches and seizures and discrimination based on race or gender, respectively (Hoyle, et al., 2005).

The Constitution's Tenth Amendment, through the Reserve Powers Clause, gives responsibility for education to state governments. The Amendment states, "[t]he powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited to the states are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people" ("The United States Constitution, 1997). State legislative statutes and policies provide for an organizational structure to oversee education, mechanisms for funding through taxes and revenues, licensure for teachers and administrators, the establishment of salary scales, oversight for special education, and data collection for school improvement. State school systems are governed by state boards of education, led by a chief officer, and administered

through a state department of education. Superintendents work closely with the state governmental bodies to ensure compliance with rules, regulations, and state mandates. (Hoyle, et al., 2005).

Local school districts were established as the organizational unit implementing the state system of public education. School districts are subject to the will of state legislatures and must act within the federal constitutional provisions. Autonomy for local school districts is conditional and is limited to the powers granted by state legislatures and are related to improving education (Kowalski, 1999). Local school districts are overseen by local school boards who, along with the superintendent, make educational decisions regarding property taxes, school property, staffing, and instructional programs. All decisions must fall within the guidelines and framework established by federal and state statutes, regulations, and policies. The superintendent is hired by the school board. The local school board develops the job description and performance expectations for the superintendent, and delegates day-to-day job responsibilities to the superintendent. These responsibilities include advising the board on all educational matters within the district; which include policy options, academic programs and progress, personnel matters, and strategic planning (Kowalski, 1999). The increased scrutiny of public education has increased the need for superintendents to work closely with board members and provide political leadership skills in

implementing laws and regulations from every level of government (Bjork & Lindle, 2001).

The Center on Reinventing Public Education found that many superintendents feel political pressures from the federal, state, and local governments which takes a significant amount of time away from their attention to teaching and learning. Political pressures and internal conflicts can be difficult to manage and detract from the focus on student achievement (Fuller, et al., 2003).

The third standard is Communications and Community Relations. Every school district must implement a communications program designed to inform both the external and internal stakeholders, which addresses consensus building and conflict mediation. Superintendents must have knowledge and a passion for working closely on both internal and external communications in order to maintain and strengthen support for schools and school personnel (Hoyle, 1993).

The superintendent must be able to communicate and articulate the district goals to the community and to the mass media. The community includes parents, special interest groups, and local policy makers. They must have information about the purpose and function of the district and how the educational mission is performed. The ability to align stakeholder support and garner financial and community support for district priorities is essential to the successful superintendent. Superintendents spend a large part of their day communicating with various organizations within the

community. The visibility of the superintendent at community activities and the participation of the superintendent in service organizations and civic groups in key in establishing effective communication with the community at large and keeping them informed about the culture surrounding the school district (Norton, et al., 1996).

Teachers and staff must be well informed about the mission and vision of the district because they form the foundation of the communication to the larger community. Superintendents must be aware of the communication efforts of each of their school and central office administrators within the system. The development of a district-wide image is internally driven. Administrators are increasingly expected to shape school improvement initiatives and enlist the support of the public (Kowalski, 2003). Visibility at school and district events is critical and it provides opportunities for the superintendent to build coalitions and to tell the school story (Hoyle, 1993).

Problems with communication will become the responsibility of the superintendent. Any incomplete or misleading information that is provided by the superintendent can bring about a larger amount of reaction and chaos than any information provided by other individuals within the district (Konnert & Augenstein, 1995). As decisions of the superintendent and the Board of Trustees regarding public education continue to garner public exposure, it is imperative that the superintendent have a plan to emphasize public relations (Sharp & Walter, 2004).

The fourth standard is Organizational Management. The superintendent is required to develop and implement operational plans and processes that will result in the district meeting its identified goals. Strategic direction and strategic alignment are the two components of strategic design. "Strategic direction is identifying what you want to get, and strategic alignment is structuring to get what you want" (Schwahn & Spady, 1998, p.122). Organizational management is the focus on the plan that makes the goal a reality, or the strategic alignment. This is achieved through data driven decision making. Once the goals have been identified, all relevant data must be reviewed and disaggregated. The superintendent must implement problem solving methodologies by developing priorities and identifying the accompanying resources needed for the related solutions. The superintendent must monitor and evaluate all operational plans and processes and be able to make adjustments as needed (Stufflebeam, 1971).

The superintendent is also responsible for securing the needed and appropriate fiscal resources to reach district goals. This responsibility requires oversight of the district budget and all fiscal records (Hoyle, 1993). Superintendents must be knowledgeable in the area of finance. School budget reductions often require the superintendent to seek other forms of financing, such as grants and community agency awards. While most districts employ chief financial business officers, the superintendent is expected to be knowledgeable of the very complex school finance

system. The superintendent must understand the budget, the budget process, and the financial condition of the district (Sharp & Walter, 2004). The three areas that constitute a district budget are: 1) the description of the educational program of the district; 2) the expenditures that will be needed to execute the program; and 3) the revenues that will be available to fund the identified expenditures. Inadequate financing has been a primary concern for superintendents in each of the studies performed by the American Association of School Administrators. Therefore, additional areas of expertise include federal funding, grant funding, facilities and operations costs, the approval of bond issues, and compensation packages (Konnert & Augenstein, 1995). The mismanagement of the fiscal resources of a district can result in negative repercussions regardless of the successful academic achievements the superintendent and staff may put into place (Hoyle, et al., 2005).

Decreased budgets often call for cost-cutting measures. Superintendents are often faced with the challenges of determining how to effectively make these cuts without adversely affecting the educational programs. The continuum of cost-cutting measures ranges from obtaining reduced prices for same or like services, to making across-the-board cuts, to the most drastic of decisions to reduce instructional positions and personnel. Gaining staff and community support for these type of reductions is challenging and requires effective communication from the superintendent in developing and implementing the plan. The superintendent must communicate this

information, not only to the staff, but also to the board for approval, and to the community in order to maintain a positive image of the school system. The budget becomes a key managerial tool in ensuring that the primary mission of educating students is accomplished in the most effective, cost-efficient manner possible.

The fifth standard is Curriculum Planning and Development. The superintendent must be able to develop a strategic teaching and learning plan. Superintendents "who have the intellect, knowledge, and passion for both the "why" and "how" of pedagogy and the vision and ability to communicate that passion to the staff and community are cherished leaders" (Hoyle, et al., 2005, p 223). The developed curriculum must be aligned to national and state standards with an appropriate sequence for cognitive development. The curriculum must include performance indicators and integrate the most appropriate technologies (Hoyle, 1993). The leadership role of the superintendent is critical to the success of the curriculum and instruction program in a school district. Superintendents must make the curriculum a priority and be knowledgeable in this area.

Policy makers, in an attempt to ensure a quality education for all children, mandate curricula that focus on social proficiency and quantitative measures of student performance on state and national exams. A superintendent must focus on the stated requirements, but also must be able to create a shared mission and vision to educate children in a manner which reflects the skills, knowledge, and moral development all

students should have in order to become life-long learners and productive citizens (Hoyle, et al., 2005). In order to develop life-long learners, the superintendent must be able to anticipate occupational trends and identify the related educational implications.

Staff members, school boards, and the community will require a clear and concise message regarding the vision and mission for curriculum development from the superintendent. The teaching and learning goals can then be developed in congruence with the views of the superintendent. This plan is best developed in an environment where the superintendent encourages others to share their ideas and values the expertise of other professionals in developing the district curriculum goals.

The superintendent is also responsible for identifying the organizational framework for determining how the goals will be carried out. Depending on the size of the district, curriculum matters can be carried out by associate superintendents, directors, or principals. The superintendent must identify the personnel responsible and develop their appropriate job descriptions. In order to reach the established curriculum goals, the superintendent must be able to provide time, resources, facilities, and information to the organization regarding how to reach these goals. In order for curriculum planning and development to occur, time must be allocated for curriculum writing, high quality human resources must be made available to develop the curriculum, space for staff development must be available, and information in the form

of “best practices” should be provided to personnel delegated the authority to develop the teaching and learning goals.

The sixth standard is Instructional Management. The role the superintendent plays as an instructional leader is critical to the success of the mission and vision of the district, especially in the area of school reform. Superintendents with high levels of involvement in instructional matters and who use their management skills to lead and direct principals and teachers are very effective (Boyle, 1993; Cuban, 1984).

Many times, the management skills of a superintendent do not encompass instructional management; however, these skills are essential to the implementation of the teaching and learning plan. Superintendents who are directly involved in the hiring processes of the district are able to ensure that excellent educators are hired who will be able to effect a high quality instructional program. Principals who are indirectly, or directly, supervised by the superintendent are more likely to set their instructional goals in line with those of the district and achieve the needed results on standardized test scores. The superintendent must be able to articulate clear, instructional goals, and also be able to monitor the district’s efforts to achieve those goals. Sound financial planning is also an important managerial responsibility related to instructional leadership. A strong district budget is imperative in ensuring that the needed fiscal allocations are provided to implement the instructional goals. As always, communication is key to these efforts. The superintendent must be able to articulate the

instructional and curricular objectives of the district, describe how resources are being distributed to achieve those objectives, and encourage participation and shared decision making in order to develop a common district vision for all stakeholders (Murphy & Hallinger, 1986).

The superintendent must be familiar with research on instructional strategies. This research includes methodologies and best practices in the educational environment. The current educational reform movement focuses on the understanding of superintendents to implement change processes that will enhance staff and student learning (Fullan, 1998). These processes include a focus on continuous learning and development for the individual in the organization. Additionally, developing communities of learners among staff, parents, and the community will assist in creating a climate of learning. The communities of learners must study and utilize data to drive their decision making and establish their goals. Under the *No Child Left Behind Act*, districts must collect and publish annual reports regarding their progress in meeting state and federal mandates. Staff members must be able to analyze, interpret, and strategically use the data for planning and goal setting.

The superintendent must also be familiar with strategies to help students learn at high levels; and be knowledgeable about the development of the whole child, to include physical, social, emotional, cognitive and linguistic needs (Hoyle, 1993). The development stages of children range from preschool age (2-5 years), to

elementary/intermediate/middle school age (6-12 years), and to high school or adolescence (13-18 years). The culture and support provided in each stage is critical to the child's overall development and superintendents must be able to make instructional leadership decisions that are guided by knowledge of these principles. Additionally, superintendents must be cognizant of the change from "traditional" families to single-parent families, step families, foster and adoptive families, and teenage parents; which can be crucial to understanding a child's development and success. Families living in poverty and children with special needs due to handicaps are also trends that require superintendents to review and revise their programs to better serve their populations. "The school superintendent is responsible for communicating the needs of children and youth to the community and organizing the resources of the school to meet the needs of all students" (Norton, et al., 1996, p. 198).

Superintendents are required to be demographers. They must understand population shifts, specifically as many communities become majority-minority and multicultural education becomes a necessity. The superintendent's position requires an understanding of multicultural education and an understanding that while cultural backgrounds and social experiences are related to student learning, they are not the only predictors of success (Hoyle, et al., 2005). Computer technology and other alternate methods of evaluating students are areas superintendents must continue to investigate and apply within the instructional setting of their district. Factors such as

changing demographics and increased attention to student achievement and accountability have played a major role in focusing superintendents on the instructional management of their districts.

The seventh standard is Human Resources Development. Due to the nationwide shortage of teachers in the last ten years, it has been critical for the superintendent to become aggressive in the areas of recruiting and retaining teachers. “If educational leaders are not consistently competent in recruiting and selecting qualified and motivated individuals, efforts to improve the quality of education are bound to fail” (Winter, 1997, p. 133). Conner stated “the success of a school administrator will depend more upon this skill in selecting, improving, and dealing with the human element than upon any other factor…There is no more important administrative responsibility than effective personnel administration” (1964, p. iii).

While many superintendents delegate authority to a human resource central administrator, the superintendent has the overall leadership responsibility in five areas. First, the superintendent works closely with staff, the board, and the community in recognizing the importance of the human resource factor and establishes policies and procedures that outline this vision. Second, the superintendent must factor in human resources in each decision made to assist the district in meeting its goals and objectives. Third, the superintendent must staff a qualified human resources department to oversee the policies and procedures previously mentioned. Fourth, effective

communication must be demonstrated between the department and the district stakeholders relative to human resource research, problems, and activities. Finally, the superintendent must always set the example in demonstrating the importance of this function (Norton, et al., 1996).

Knowledge of the legal requirements that guide employee selection, development, retention, and dismissal is required (Hoyle, 1993). In addition to state and local policies, attention must be given to the federal laws and policies that guide recruitment and selection processes. These include, but are not limited to, the Equal Pay Act of 1963, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, and the Vietnam Era Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act.

A superintendent's success is related to providing and retaining a competent, well-placed, well-trained, and committed staff (Hoyle, et al., 2005). Staff retention is as critical to the human resources process as is recruitment. Superintendents must prioritize factors such as professional development and compensation packages in order to ensure that established and qualified teachers and staff are employed by the district. Professional development should provide a continuous process for employees to help shape the organization by providing time for thoughtful planning and an opportunity to develop action statements designed to reach the stated goals. The superintendent is also responsible for understanding and selecting benefits packages

that are in the best interests of all employees. The human element is critical to the success of a school district achieving their goals; therefore, human resources is a primary job requirement for superintendents.

The eighth standard is Values and Ethics of Leadership. The superintendent must model a strong value system and establish a clear sense of moral leadership. The superintendent must be able to respond and advocate for multicultural understanding in an ethical and skillful manner. Also of great importance, is the ability to coordinate social agencies and human services in order to help every student grow and develop as a valuable member of the society (Hoyle, 1993). A superintendent holds a position of responsibility and trust. The learning community expects the superintendent to be a moral and ethical leader. As the chief academic and administrative officer, the superintendent holds the most visible position in the district and the expectations are high regarding professional behavior (Hoyle, et al., 2005) The superintendent is expected to "promote social justice, democracy, and respect for and tolerance of religious groups and to model moral and ethical practices" (Hoyle, et al, 2005, p. 223).

A superintendent must also have a good working relationship with the board of trustees. Although the responsibilities of the board are beyond the scope of this paper, it is important to note the general expectations of this governing entity. In general, the board should establish and regularly review all policies; hire, support, and evaluate the superintendent; refer all administrative communications to the superintendent; adopt

and oversee a school budget; determine hiring policies with clear board and superintendent responsibilities; and communicate and interpret the district's mission (Larson, 2006).

Throughout the history of the development of the role of the public school superintendent, one thing has remained constant: the superintendent is the guardian of the community's most valuable possession – the children. The superintendent is expected to provide the mission and the vision to supervise the education of the next generation. Superintendents are required to be both executives and educational leaders. Their role requires knowledge to work in a political environment, where there exists a multitude of conflicting interests and forces that may often interfere with the school system being able to accomplish its goal. The ability of a superintendent to maintain a notion of stability, while the environment is in constant change, is a responsibility that is critical to the success of this educational leader.

Job Responsibilities of the Corporate Chief Executive Officer

The 1992 AASA Study of the American School Superintendency found that superintendents in large school districts considered their job to be very similar to the job responsibilities held by Corporate Chief Executive Officers (CEOs). Both require management and executive skills needed for overseeing large budgets, personnel, accountability for the product that is produced and competition (Hoyle, 1993).

Complexity, ambiguity, and information overload are descriptors for the position of CEO (Kotter, 1982; Mintzberg, 1973).

Research on strategic leadership has shown that organizations are reflections of the top managers and the decisions they make (Hambrick & Mason, 1984; Chaganti & Sambharya, 1987; Miller, Kets De Vries & Toulouse, 1982). The CEO is the person ultimately responsible and accountable for the corporation's strategy, design, performance, and environment (Dalton & Kesner, 1983). The individual who has the ultimate legal authority and responsibility in the hierarchy of the organization is the CEO (Vancil, 1987). The CEO determines the central concept of the business and controls and directs the efforts of the corporation toward its goals (Lauenstein, 1980; Brady & Helmich, 1984). Beatty and Zajac (1987) found that shareholders, suppliers, customers, the public, and the government see the CEO as the symbol of the corporation, the ultimate decision maker, and the person with absolute authority. Many times, the success or failure of the CEO is translated into the respective success or failure of the organization.

In 1977, a study was conducted by Hay Associates, a worldwide consulting firm specializing in the development and management of human resources, to evaluate data available regarding the position of the chief executive officer. Hay Associates collected 104 job descriptions prepared by personnel departments, legal staffs, outside consultants, and presiding CEO's. While the job descriptions may not be representative

of all companies, the 104 studied were approved by the incumbents and were used as a basis for determining their salaries; therefore, the job responsibilities outlined were actually being performed by the CEO (Rock, 1977).

Chief Executive Officers (CEO's) have been given tremendous authority and power. Principal functions and duties of the position of the CEO for large, diversified, industrial companies include:

1. Goal setting and prioritizing corporate objectives;
2. Review, control, and evaluate short- and long-term strategies;
3. Communication of corporate guidelines and long-range plans;
4. Develop and maintain key internal and external communications regarding the political influences, the public image, and corporate performance of the organization;
5. Develop the allocation of resources;
6. Ensure the soundness of the organization's financial structure;
7. Develop strategic framework for acquisitions, mergers, and consolidations;
8. Oversee human resources to ensure managerial productivity, utilization of group and individual capabilities, and management continuity;
9. Develop corporate structure and management functions;
10. Participate in the selection of board members and ensures their understanding and support of corporate objectives (Rock, 1977).

In reviewing the eight standards established for public school superintendents, these duties reflect many of the same responsibilities, such as strategic leadership, policy and governance, communications, organizational management, and human resources management.

Goal setting sets the fundamental goals of the company and establishes priorities in terms of basic corporate objectives, with the board of directors (Rock, 1977). The chief executive officer (CEO) holds the position of leadership in an organization. The CEO has the responsibility for ensuring that the goals and vision of the Board of Directors are followed and realized. The CEO is the advocate for organizational programs and operations to the Board and stakeholders.

Goal setting requires decision making and the CEO must know what he/she is deciding. The CEO must be equipped with all related facts, be able to apply applicable theories and techniques, and be able to discern alternatives and then select the best course of action (Vance, 1968). The CEO must be able to apply hierarchical leadership techniques when needed. These are effective skills in setting goals, making decisions, assigning tasks, allocating resources, managing people, and holding people accountable. Collaboration is also an important technique needed by today's CEO. Employees must feel a sense of mutual self-interest, and talented, ambitious employees must be held accountable for meeting the company's objectives not just for their own

work, but also for their performance in helping others within the organization (Bryan & Joyce, 2007).

The CEO reviews and approves long and short term strategies. The CEO monitors performance, makes adjustments as needed, and evaluates progress toward company objectives (Rock, 1997). Decision making skills are critical for any individual holding the position of CEO. As plans are formulated and developed, the CEO is charged with monitoring the plans and for evaluating the effectiveness with which they are achieved. During the monitoring stage, CEO's are required to be flexible and take corrective action to monitor and adjust as needed. Corrective actions may include "dismissing personnel or adding or eliminating development thrusts, to building new plans, making corporate consolidations, or totally reorganizing all or part of the corporation" (Pelton, Sackmann & Boguslaw, 1990, p. 93).

CEO's must be able to structure their corporations to meet the conditions of the 21st century. In the past, capital was the scarce resource, interaction costs were high and hierarchical authority and vertically integrated structures were keys to success. Today, leaders must think holistically about their businesses and begin to nurture talent and knowledge, implement governance structures that undo unproductive complexity, and establish new performance metrics (Bryan & Joyce, 2007).

The CEO formulates, interprets, and communicates the direction, guidelines, and long-range plans of the organization (Rock, 1977). In 1972, General Motors Corporation

conducted a study under the auspices of its Organizational Research and Development Department (ORD) called the "GM Employee Survey." This study found, "the employees' view of top management, from the plant manager right up through GM Central Office executives and the chairman himself, had the greatest single impact on worker job attitudes of all the factors studied" (Ruch & Goodman, 1983). This finding was reconfirmed in a study conducted at AT&T and at Kansas State University. CEO's must learn how to use their position of influence to improve worker attitudes and to boost overall corporate effectiveness.

The CEO must be knowledgeable of the products, programs, or services delivered by the organization. As the person identified in the singular leadership role, "it comes down to one person who is responsible for the plan" (Pelton, et al., 1990, p.4). However, it is important to note, that the CEO also holds the title of communicator, not only within the organization, but to all external stakeholders as well. The successful leader should make all internal and external stakeholders feel they are part of the development and implementation of the plan.

The CEO maintains positive external relations in the social, economic, and political environment in which the company competes for resources. The CEO maintains a favorable public image for the corporation through effective representation to customers, local communities, government, stockholders, and the financial community (Rock, 1977).

Communication must be honest and truthful and show a belief in the importance of the American worker. An example of this is Lee A. Iacocca. He rescued Chrysler from near bankruptcy. Using media skills, political power, and even some acting techniques, he saved Chrysler from being taken apart. He received a historical financial rescue package to save the third largest U.S. auto maker due to the communication skill needed of the present day executive/communicator. "Public relations is the management function that evaluates public attitudes, identifies the policies and procedures of an individual or an organization with the public interest, and executes a program of action to earn public understanding and acceptance" (Ruch & Goodman, 1983, p. 23).

The CEO monitors the company's financial health (Rock, 1977). Generations ago it was enough for a businessman to know how to make his own product and then how to sell it. Today, the economics that a businessman must know far transcend what was required of our ancestors. Financial responsibilities include oversight of annual budgets, management of company resources, and daily adherence to all regulatory guidelines. Also included under the umbrella of financial responsibility is the oversight of all fundraising activities of the organization. This includes "identifying resource requirements, researching funding sources, establishing strategies to approach funders, submitting proposals and administrating fundraising records and documentation" (McNamara, 1997). Technology, organized labor, governmental controls, imports from

abroad, and many other variables make it impossible for a businessman to remain on the outer fringes of economic knowledge and its application (Vance, 1968).

The CEO establishes the strategic framework of the essential resources of the corporation (Rock, 1977). In establishing the resources of the corporation, CEO's often consider mergers as a vehicle to build their company. Vance identified four reasons for the consideration of a merger. The first is the desire to help the "underdog," or the desire of a large successful corporation to help a chronic poor performer. Second, and probably more logical, is the recognition of an investment opportunity. Third is money manipulation which is related to the second reason. Money manipulation, however, also involves the consideration of the control of stocks and the profit yield paid directly to stockholders. The fourth reason is managerial megalomania. This is one area that is difficult to illustrate. The consideration is that CEO's involved in mergers are strong-willed, are trying to prove themselves, and are compulsive in trying to establish themselves as successful businessmen.

The CEO develops the grand design of corporate structure and assigns accountabilities and functions within the structure (Rock, 1977). The CEO assesses, selects, develops, motivates, evaluates, and rewards top executives in order to assure managerial productivity, optimal utilization of individual and group capabilities, and management continuity (Rock, 1977). CEO's are tasked with the duties of human resource management. The leader of the organization must be able to manage

personnel policies and procedures, according to all laws and regulations. Personnel employed by the organization should understand the vision and goals of the organization and should be enthusiastic in working to that end.

The CEO participates in the selection of board members and ensures their full understanding and approval of management policies (Rock, 1977). CEO's are most often the leaders of the boardroom. CEO's have direct access to the current comprehensive information about their companies. Most boards of directors see their primary role as serving the CEO and their secondary role as providing oversight. As a result, the CEO typically determines meeting agendas and controls the information received by the directors. Also the CEO plays an influential role in who sits on the board and is typically a member of some of the board's committees. The board assumes leadership in those instances when the company ownership is changing or when the CEO's leadership is in question. In some companies, the CEO is the chair of the board as well. In this case, accountability can be held to one person, there is no dysfunctionality between the CEO and the board chair, it avoids having two public spokespersons addressing stakeholders, and some efficiency can be realized by not having to update the board chair at every turn. Additionally, recruiting a CEO may be far easier if the position of the board chair is part of the appointment (Conger, 2005).

There are four types of boards a CEO will work with, and each one defines the type of control given to the CEO. First is a constitutional board which meets only to fill

statutory requirements. The directors on the board are unobtrusive and tend to let all authority fall to the CEO. Second, consultive boards develop as the corporation grows in scale and complexity. The CEO turns to the board for technical assistance or legal, financial, or political advice. Most American boards are consultive in their function. Third, the collegial board is characterized by broadly diffused public ownership. The collegial board meets often (10 to 12 times per year) and their meetings are often characterized by discussion, debate, and disagreement. Differences of opinion are decided by a vote, with the majority vote prevailing. The CEO is considered to be a member of the board and one of the voting members. This process can be very slow and issues such as petty jealousies, preconceptions, and vested positions can cause great obstacles for the directors. Finally, communal boards are public boards. These boards are bureaucratic in nature. In lieu of a CEO, the communal board utilizes a central planning agency as the decision maker. Decisions are typically automatic, predictable, and compliant. Directors on a board are charged with selecting the chief executive officer, sanctioning the CEO's team, providing the CEO with a forum, assuring managerial competency, evaluating management performance, setting salary levels, guaranteeing managerial integrity, charting the corporate course, and overseeing policies to be implemented by management.

There has been much discussion about whether boards select CEO's or if CEO's select the boards. The reality is that probably both occur. Ideally, incumbent CEO's

should act objectively and unselfishly to arrange for boards to be exposed to the available talent of potential successors. Boards are knowledgeable about the magnitude of their decisions and may resist any interference from an incumbent in making this decision. Whether members of the board of directors are chosen by the CEO or by other board members, the following considerations may be reasons to why they were chosen: 1) a desire of management to form alliances with other organizations; 2) financial reasons; 3) social reasons; 4) to receive optimal benefit from the previous three reasons; and 5) a choice as an interaction of the firm, the director, and society (Brady & Helmich, 1984).

Kesner and Sebora stated that the CEO's job is very different from other organizational positions. They identified the job as being idiosyncratic, non routine, and unstructured (1994). Job descriptions and lists of activities for the CEO are rare, because it would be very difficult to list all that is required of a CEO on a routine basis. The task of picking new CEO's is always tricky, because there is nothing typical about the typical CEO (Rowan, 1993).

Accountability Systems Applied to the Public School Superintendent

Public school superintendents, like private sector CEO's, demand the management and executive skills to oversee budgets, technology, accountability, and competition. The chief executive of an educational organization must have a vision and the required skills to lead the learning community in a new, high-stakes, digital age

(Hoyle, et al., 2005). Superintendents' evaluations are driven by politics, personality, and high stakes test scores. In the past, superintendents have been able to count on the relationships built with school board members and community leaders in order to receive positive evaluations. Accountability has increased over the years, and today, school boards, state and federal education departments, and taxpayers demand that evaluations of superintendents be based on budgets, cost-effectiveness, and the strategic plan for school operations.

The superintendent-board relationship is similar to other executive leadership positions in the private or public sector. As of 1992, approximately 87% of superintendents had formal job descriptions, compared to 75.9% in 1982. Superintendents in large school districts are more likely to have job descriptions than are superintendents in small districts. Of those with formal job descriptions, only 56.9% felt they were actually evaluated against the criteria in their job description. Superintendents are held to high standards in the public arena. The standards used to evaluate superintendents are somewhat vague and subject to interpretation in each district. Superintendents are often evaluated on whether or not they are doing a good job and whether or not they have a good relationship with the board of trustees and community leaders; rather than being evaluated against the criteria in their job description (Carter & Cunningham, 1997).

A study of annual superintendent evaluations conducted by the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) found that evaluations are typically reported as *excellent* or *good*. While the percentage of superintendents receiving *good* on their evaluations has remained consistent between 1992 and 2000 (89.3%), the percentage of superintendents receiving *excellent* on their evaluations has decreased from 69.1% in 1997 to 59.4% in 2006. This decrease has been attributed to the increased political pressures placed on superintendents by *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB). The ability to work with community relations, budget, finance, and operations may be overshadowed by a focus on high stakes testing. Additionally, because the average board member serves between four and five years, many superintendents find themselves being evaluated by boards who were not part of the hiring process when they were selected. Board members may be more critical of an individual in the leadership position who was placed there without their participation in the process.

The AASA has established eight performance standards that can be used in the evaluation process to assist boards in determining the rating for the superintendent. The eight performance standards are: 1) lead and manage personnel effectively; 2) manage fiscal activities effectively; 3) manage administrative and facilities functions effectively; 4) foster effective school-community relations, 5) relate effectively with the school board; 6) foster a positive district/school climate; 7) stimulate, focus, and support

improvement of classroom instruction; and 8) respect diversity and promote equality of opportunity.

The quality of the relationship between the board members and the superintendent is critical in the evaluation process. Superintendents are evaluated to ensure accountability and establish performance goals. Most superintendents are evaluated using an instrument with numerical points in conjunction with an appraisal of non-quantifiable skills, such as communication. The criteria most often used to evaluate superintendents were general effectiveness, management functions, board/superintendent relationships, budget development, and educational leadership (Glass, 1992).

School boards have the responsibility for evaluating the superintendent. Evaluations, however, are based on the competence of the evaluator, biased assumptions and judgments that may affect the outcome, and the current weak link between the job description of the superintendent and the job-related performance analysis required of this position. Annual superintendent evaluations are required by most states. School boards evaluate their superintendents informally which are inconsistent observations of personnel and financial standards and abilities or formally; that is an assessment of observable and non-observable leadership and management functions. Formal assessments are often based on the AASA Performance Standards. Most superintendents are evaluated annually; however, some superintendents have

mid-year, or formative evaluations to ensure their progress toward the goals that were determined by the board to be measured in completing their final evaluation. The purpose of the superintendent evaluation is to determine superintendent performance in accordance with standards set by the board of trustees, to clarify the perceived role of the superintendent, to determine future compensation, to establish performance goals, to identify areas in need of improvement, and to determine contract renewal.

A 1984 national study revealed that only 32% of school districts examined their superintendents with a formal evaluation (Sonedecker, 1984). More recent studies show these numbers are increasing; however, there are still approximately 25% of the superintendents not receiving a formal evaluation (Koryl, 1996; Simpson, 1994). Ideally, evaluations should serve both a formative and summative purpose. Not only do evaluations assess the job performance and possible areas of improvement for the superintendent, but they also provide a vehicle of communication for the board and the superintendent. Evaluations typically occur at the same time a board is discussing the reemployment of a superintendent. During an evaluation, board members may be more likely to focus on behaviors and achieved goals, rather than personal biases, dislikes, or conflicts that may occur due to the political nature of the relationship between a board and a superintendent (Kowalski, 1999).

An annual evaluation of the superintendent should include the following four steps: 1) the board of trustees sets goals and priorities and defines expectations; 2) the

board of trustees and the superintendent collaboratively develop an evaluation process to determine if expectations have been met; 3) the board of trustees conducts a formative conference to provide ongoing monitoring of the performance of the superintendent; and 4) the board of trustees conducts a final summative evaluation (Hoyle, et al., 2005).

Most superintendents are assigned a minimum of a three-year contract. Currently, very few superintendents are hired under a performance-based contract; although, many states utilize performance based criteria when evaluating the superintendent such as test scores, financial audits, and budget management. Educational Research Services (ERS) conducted a study for the 2005-2006 school year and found the national mean superintendent salary to be $134,436, with superintendents in large urban districts averaging $187,924. For the 2003-2004 school year, the mean salary was $125,609. The averages do not include fringe benefits, such as health insurance. (Glass & Franceschini, 2007).

In his dissertation, <u>Performance Based Evaluation of the CEO</u>, David Carl Thomas quoted the following statement from the AASA and the National School Board Association regarding the foundation for an evaluation of a superintendent:

> Though individual school board members have many opportunities to observe and evaluate a superintendent's performance, it is clear that such informal evaluations cannot provide the board with a complete

picture of the superintendent's effectiveness in carrying out her (his) complex job. Regular, formal evaluations offer boards the best means of assessing their chief administrator's total performance.

Conducted properly they benefit the instructional program of the school district by:

> enhancing the chief administrator effectiveness;
>
> assuring the board that its policies are being carried out;
>
> clarifying for the superintendent and individual board members the responsibilities the board relies on the superintendent to fulfill; and
>
> strengthening the working relationship between the board and the superintendent.

To gain these benefits, boards must commit themselves to the belief that all individuals can improve if given the opportunity to do so.

This commitment should take the form of a written policy which:

> makes explicit the board's belief that evaluations should be constructive experiences to enhance performance;
>
> assures the superintendent that he (she) will know the standards against which he(she) will be evaluated, and will be involved in their development;

asks before the board as a whole evaluates the superintendent, that individual board members and the superintendent measure the chief administrator's performance against the agreed upon standards;

schedules the board as a whole to review all evaluations of the superintendent's performance at regular intervals – at least once a year before discussing renewal of the superintendent's contract, and preferably half-way through the school year as well, so the superintendent can receive guidance in areas where need is seen for improvement;

specifies that the board's evaluation will occur at a scheduled time and place, with no other items on the agenda, at a study or executive session with all board members and the superintendent present;

requires the board's evaluation to include discussions of both strengths and weaknesses, but stipulates that each judgment be supported by as much rational and objective evidence as possible; and

states that evaluation results will be used by the board and superintendent as they cooperatively set job targets by

> which the superintendent's performance will be measured
> in the ensuing year; results also may be used as the basis
> for planning a program of professional development.

The policy also may invite the superintendent to request an evaluation of the board's own performance if the executive believes such a session would help clarify his (her) role (Thomas, 1989).

Accountability Systems Applied to the Corporate Chief Executive Officer

Chief Executive Officers are held accountable for financial measures and corporate performance. Performance objectives include profitability, cost-effectivenss, quality of earnings, growth, market penetration, positioning, and sustained achievement (Rock, 1977). Corporate CEO evaluations are determined by quarterly or annual profit margins (Hoyle, et al., 2005).

There are three basic purposes for leadership assessment: prediction, performance review, and development. Prediction assessments evaluate potential and leadership emergence. These assessments are used to place executive members in key roles in the organization and to determine their compensation and possible bonuses. These assessments can also be used to help potential investors determine whether the company is a sound investment.

Performance reviews can be used for strategic planning to align organizational, team, and individual goals. Additionally, performance reviews consist of appraisal and

feedback used to hold executives accountable to the parent company, the board, and the stockholders. Performance measures for the executive must be aligned with the strategy, be measurable, capture all aspects of performance, be able to be influenced by the leader, and linked to long-term value (London, Smither, & Diamante, 2005).

Development assessments are used to communicate an executive's strengths and weaknesses. Ideally, these types of assessments should occur as a part of routine daily practices, rather than annual feedback with possibly threatening consequences.

Financial metrics play a large role in assessing the performance of executives, because these measures are often linked to the executive's compensation. It is difficult to measure the leader's contribution to the financial performance or those areas that were out of the executive's control. Also of concern are the leaders that sacrifice long-term value for short-term profits in order to gain a more desirable evaluation. The balanced scorecard has been developed to address this issue. The balanced scorecard selects a small number of measures that are directly linked to the firm's strategy and vision and asks the question, "If the vision succeeds, how will we be different to our shareholders and customers with respect to internal business processes and innovation and learning?" (London, et al., 2005, p. 54). If the CEO is a member of the board of directors, then the question arises as to who does the evaluation.

In a study of boards of directors from industrial, financial, utility, and service companies, heads of boards were found to be sensitive to the criticism focused on

executive compensation, but were confident in their ability to link pay to performance. While quantitative measures carried the most weight in executive evaluations, qualitative measures were also preferred in the overall assessment of the CEO (Brossey, 1986).

Boards of directors should consider and establish the standard of performance of a company's management. Evaluations should be determined not by what the company earned last year, but by what the company should have earned (Green, 1984).

Although, collectively, a board of directors guides the direction of the corporation, the CEO, and other appropriate officers as deemed necessary, are appointed to oversee the business of the company. These appointments can generally be removed by the board of directors if necessary. Historically, CEO selection was once considered one of the only responsibilities of the board of directors. Today, boards take on much more responsibility, to include evaluating and firing a CEO (Vance, 1983).

In 1987, Vancil found the average tenure of a CEO to be more than 14 years. The board of directors of the corporation is the group responsible for making the succession decision. Because of the infrequency of such an appointment and the gap of time between the time of a decision to remove a CEO and the eventual outcome of this decision, the degree of the impact of the board of directors is somewhat limited (Hogarth, 1987). Most boards consist of outside directors (non-employees) who meet fewer than ten times per year (Heidrick & Struggles, 1987). Therefore, the decision of

CEO succession often rests in the hands of directors who could be somewhat unfamiliar with the corporation and its internal processes.

In the early 1960s, two studies were conducted to investigate the variable of successor origin to a position of leadership. Carlson (1961) studied 200 school superintendents and found that successors promoted from within made fewer changes, were compensated less, and had less inter-organizational status than those successors brought in from the outside. However, in 1964, Grusky studied baseball team managers. He found that inside successors had improved team performance, while outside successors did not realize any change in team performance. Therefore, conclusions were not able to be drawn on the variable of the origin of the successor.

Another variable of consideration regarding CEO succession is that of the size of the organization. First, larger organizations were found to have more instances of succession than were smaller firms (Grusky, 1961; 1964; Kriesberg, 1962; Trow, 1961), often because they were more bureaucratic and this was a way to adapt to changing environments within the organization.

A third variable of succession that was studied was post-succession performance. These studies established the "three theories of succession." The first theory became known as the "common sense" theory. It basically stated that when determining a successor, directors would choose someone who would make the firm stronger (Kesner & Sebora, 1994). The second theory is the "vicious cycle" theory. This theory states that

frequent successions result in poor performance for the organization. This theory was supported by Grusky's (1963) study of baseball team managers. The third theory is "ritual scapegoating." This theory states that a manager has little to do with the poor performance of the organization, but the dismissal is a signal that change is occurring within the firm (Gamson & Scotch, 1964).

In the 1970s, additional studies were conducted on successor origin and succession frequency. Also, studies were conducted on successor characteristics and the role of the board in succession. In the area of successor origin, Birnbaum (1971) challenged the definition of "inside" and "outside" successor. He studied university and college presidents and found that successors who had been trained in organizations with similar characteristics to the organization in which they would now serve as leader, experienced less conflict and greater stability. Pfeffer and Leblebici (1973) and Helmich and Brown (1972) also found that an inside successor included not only the successor familiar with the values of the firm, but also one familiar with the social and political process of the office of the CEO.

In studying succession frequency, studies were very clear in establishing that frequent successions were detrimental to firm performance. In a study of basketball coaches, it was found that the greater the tenure of the coach, the greater the team success. However, after a certain period of time, 13 years on the average, team performance tended to decline steadily (Eitzen & Yetman, 1972; McEachern, 1975).

When considering successor characteristics, March and March (1977) studied school superintendents and found that when examining the skills required of managers to move to the top echelons of the organization, the individuals in the pool of chief executive candidates were often indistinguishable from each other. However, Hall (1976) found that education level and type and career pathways were associated with different types of organizations.

A new area of study during the 1970s was the relationship of the board of directors and the succession of the CEO. While boards were identified as being responsible for the succession of the CEO, it was not clear that all boards were committed to this task. Many times, boards served at the request of the CEO and it would be unlikely they would call for the dismissal of the CEO. Also, the CEO often controlled the board's agenda, so many boards were left powerless (Mace, 1971). Gephart (1978) introduced the idea that successor process and outcome was influenced by the predecessor's exit, which could occur because of 1) retirement, 2) voluntary resignation, 3) firing, 4) intra-organizational movement, or 5) death.

The third era of the study of CEO succession was the 1980s and the 1990s. The notion of successor origin continued to be studied, but within the framework of firm performance. The studies conducted yielded mixed results. Studies concluded that insiders were associated with greater profitability than outsiders (Zajac, 1990), positive market effects for inside promotions and no effect for outside promotions (Furtado &

Rozeff, 1987), and both inside and outside successors were attributed to negative market effects (Beatty & Zajac, 1987). Studies were also conducted to further define the intra-industry successor versus the outside-industry successor. Intra-industry candidates had industry-specific skills that could be transferred to different firms, and outside-industry candidates had generic management skills that may or may not transfer across industries (Castanias & Helfat, 1991).

Of great interest to researchers was the rate of succession. Researchers found that succession rates were higher in low performing corporations than in higher performing ones (Benston, 1985; Coughlan & Schmidt, 1985). The increased succession rates were found to be related to takeover bids, bankruptcy, block trades, greenmail payments, acquisitions, and proxy contests (Kesner & Sebora, 2001).

A new area of study in this era was succession consequences. Succession was found to be related to organizational changes and breaks in momentum of the company (Miller 1993). The likelihood of organizational failure was greater following a succession of founders of the company (Carroll, 1984). In a survey of 118 CEO's, succession was not linked to post-succession performance (Pfeffer & Davis-Blake, 1986). These and other studies concluded that the nature of the change that occurred after succession was dependent on the successor's characteristics and the contextual factors of the environment.

Another new area of study was that of succession planning. As of 1982, fewer than 50% of corporate firms engage in any type of successor planning (Brady & Helmich, 1982). The planning that was in place was directed and planned by the current CEO (Vancil, 1987). Succession is a dramatic event that will shape the future of the organization, but little work has been done in this area. Succession is most likely to occur when a CEO is not meeting the board's expectations (Puffer & Weintrope, 1991), but there was a clear understanding or contingency plan in place for a majority of the corporations.

The evaluation of a CEO, in many instances, determines the future of the executive with the firm. The evaluations focus on executive behaviors, organizational strategies, and performance (Gupta & Govindarajan, 1984; Hambrick & Mason, 1984, Kotter, 1982). Discussions concerning evaluations also lead to discussions regarding the tenure of the CEO and the eventual succession to the leadership position. A study of these areas is critical to understanding the dynamics of the CEO's tenure in office.

CHAPTER 3 - METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to compare the personal characteristics and career pathways of the superintendents of the fifty largest public school districts in the United States and the chief executive officers (CEO's) of the top fifty Fortune 500 companies in the United States. Specifics of the design and methodology are explained in the following sections: participants and selection of the participants, research design, procedures, data analysis and ethical considerations.

Participation and Selection of the Participants

In April, 2008, the United States Department of Education published the statistical analysis report *Characteristics of the 100 Largest Public Elementary and Secondary School Districts in the Untied States: 2004-2005.* The most recent data regarding school district size was for the school year 2004-2005. These data were published by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) through the Department of Education.

The target populations of this study were the largest 50 school districts and the 50 largest Fortune 500 corporations in the United States. In 2004-2005, there were 17,662 public school districts, 98,579 public schools, and over 49.5 million students attending these schools. The 50 largest school districts ranged in size from 986,967 students to 68,783 students. Twenty seven of the 50 school districts served populations

of over 100,000 students. The largest district was New York City Public Schools with 986,967 students enrolled in 1,205 schools. The smallest district of the top 50 was Granite School District in Salt Lake City, Utah with 68,783 students enrolled in 115 schools (Garofano, Sable, & Hoffman).

The web sites for each of the 50 largest school districts were examined to search for the names and demographic information of the superintendents of each district. In some cases, additional information was retrieved through various media publications posted on the internet when the resumes/curriculum vitaes on the district web site were incomplete.

Each year, *Fortune Magazine* publishes the Fortune 500. The 2007 Fortune 500 included the largest United States incorporated companies who filed financial statements with a government agency. This included private companies and cooperatives that filed a 10-K and mutual insurance companies that filed with state regulators. Private companies that did not file as a private company, companies incorporated outside of the United States, companies owned or controlled by other United States companies that filed with a government agency, and United States companies owned or controlled by foreign companies were not included in the Fortune 500. The data used to identify the companies on the Fortune 500 were for the fiscal year ended on or before January 31, 2007 (*Fortune*, 2007).

The largest company of the Fortune 500 list was WalMart with revenues of $351,139 billion. The smallest of the top 50 companies was Freddie Mac with revenues of $44,002 billion.

The web sites for each of the 50 largest corporations were retrieved to search for the names and demographic information of the Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) of each company. In some cases, additional information was retrieved through various media publications posted on the internet when the resumes/curriculum vitaes on the company web site were incomplete.

The Research Design

This study was conducted using a descriptive research design and document analysis. CEO/Superintendent profiles and career pathways were identified by examining resumes/curriculum vitaes provided by participants or available on corporate/school district websites utilizing a rubric developed by the researcher.

"Descriptive research is a type of quantitative research that involves making careful descriptions of educational phenomena (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). The descriptive research design used in this study was the cross-sectional design. A cross-sectional design study examines data obtained at one point in time from different groups; in this study, the two groups are public school district superintendents and public sector CEO's.

The disadvantage of a cross-sectional design study is the effect of change in the population over time. In the populations studied in this work, the enrollment in school districts could change, thus affecting the list of schools on the top 50 largest school districts. However, while there has been change in rank in the largest school districts in the United States since 1994-1995, only 12 of the largest 100 districts in 1994-1995 are not on the list in 2004-2005 (Garofano, et al., 2008). Likewise, *Fortune Magazine* identifies the Fortune 500 each year. In each publication, there are companies that fall off of the list and there are companies who rise enough spots to move into the top 50. Only thirty six companies who were on the Fortune 500 list in 2006 are not on the list in 2007 (*Fortune*, 2007).

School district and corporate web sites, and other media publications, were reviewed to seek the most current data regarding profiles and career pathways for the respective superintendents and chief executive officers. Under "Profiles", this researcher compiled information regarding gender, age, ethnicity, educational background, and compensation. Highest degree earned, major field of study, and type of institution were noted in the "Educational Background" section. Compensation included only the base pay and did not include any additional stipends, incentives, or stock options. The "Career Pathway" information section identified current and previous administrative assignments, length of service in the administrative positions, and career patterns.

Procedures

The school districts in the United States with the largest enrollment were identified through the United States Department of Education (USDE) report developed by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). The largest corporations were identified through the *Fortune Magazine* annual publication of the Fortune 500, which included the largest United States incorporated companies who filed financial statements with a government agency. Once identified, the web sites of the identified school districts and corporations were searched to seek superintendent and chief executive officer demographics, resumes/vitaes, and compensation information. When not available through the district or corporate web site, professional media web sites provided additional information. Personal phone calls to school district superintendent offices were made to complete the data set required for this study.

Data Analysis

Data from an *Excel Spreadsheet* were analyzed to identify the similarities and dissimilarities in the profiles of public school superintendents and CEO's of Fortune 500 companies. The profiles included the following demographic information: gender, age, and ethnicity. Professional information from resumes and curriculum vitas was also identified including: educational background and compensation. Data were further analyzed to identify the similarities and dissimilarities in the career pathways of public school superintendents and CEO's of Fortune 500 companies.

Ethical Considerations

Prior to conducting this study, approval was sought from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the University of Texas at El Paso. All university policies and procedures were followed. As per IRB guidelines, approval was requested for exempt status. This study involved the study of existing data, documents, and records from sources that were publicly available. Additionally, all data existed prior to the beginning of the research (see Appendix A).

Summary

This chapter included participation and selection of the participants, research design, procedures, data analysis techniques, and ethical considerations.

CHAPTER 4 - RESULTS

This chapter includes a review of the purpose of the study, a description of the subjects of the study, and the results for each research question posed in Chapter 1 that provided the focus of the study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to compare the personal characteristics and career pathways of the superintendents of the fifty largest public school districts in the United States and the chief executive officers (CEO's) of the top fifty Fortune 500 companies in the United States.

Subjects

There were 17,662 public school districts in the United States and its jurisdictions in the 2004-2005 school year, according to the 2008 report by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (Garofano, Sable, & Hoffman, 2008). The 50 school districts with the largest number of students enrolled ranged in size from 986,967 students in the New York City Public Schools to 68,783 students in the Granite County School District in Salt Lake City, Utah.

The web sites for each of the 50 largest school districts were examined to search for the names and demographic information of the superintendents of each district. In some cases, additional information was retrieved through various media publications posted on the internet when the resumes/curriculum vitaes on the district web site were

incomplete. Additionally, a request under the federal Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552 was made to each of the school districts in order to retrieve the required information. Of the 50 school districts, demographic and career pathway information was either entirely or partially available for all but nine of the superintendents, therefore, information was available or provided by 82% of the districts under study.

Each year, *Fortune* magazine publishes the Fortune 500. The 2007 Fortune 500 included the largest United States incorporated companies who filed financial statements with a government agency. This included private companies and cooperatives that filed a 10-K and mutual insurance companies that filed with state regulators. Private companies who did not file as a private company, companies incorporated outside of the United States, companies owned or controlled by other United States companies that filed with a government agency, and United States companies owned or controlled by foreign companies are not included in the Fortune 500. The data used to identify the companies on the Fortune 500 are for the fiscal year ended on or before January 31, 2007 (*Fortune*, 2007).

The web sites for each of the 50 largest incorporated companies were examined to search for the names and demographic information of the CEO's of each company. In some cases, additional information was retrieved through various media publications posted on the internet when the resumes/curriculum vitaes on the company web site were incomplete. Of the 50 Fortune 500 companies, the

demographic and career pathway information was either entirely or partially available for all of the CEO's, for a response rate of 100%. Data, therefore, were available for 91 of the 100 individuals who were the subject of this study (91.0%).

Results

Research Question #1: *What are the similarities and dissimilarities in the gender of public school superintendents and CEO's of Fortune 500 companies?*

Table 1 presents the gender of the public school superintendents and corporate CEO's.

Table 1. Gender of Public School Superintendents and Corporate CEO's

	Superintendents		CEO's	
Gender	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Male	36	85.7	49	98.0
Female	6	14.3	1	2.0
Total	42		50	

Table 1 shows that data regarding gender were available on 42 of the 50 superintendents and on all 50 of the corporate CEO's. The positions of superintendent and Fortune 500 CEO's are dominated by males. When comparing the two positions, there is great similarity in the high percentage of males and the low percentage of females. Of the top 50 Fortune 500 CEO's, only one female is a chief executive officer. She is the CEO for the company ranked number 35 on the list.

Research Question #2: *What are the similarities and dissimilarities in the age of public school superintendents and CEO's of Fortune 500 companies?*

Table 2 presents the age of the public school superintendents and corporate CEO's who were the focus of this study.

Table 2. <u>Age of Public School Superintendents and Corporate CEO's by Age Group</u>

	Superintendents		CEO's	
Age Group	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
30 to 34	0	0.0	0	0.0
35 to 39	0	0.0	0	0.0
40 to 44	2	6.7	2	4.0
45 to 49	3	10.0	2	4.0
50 to 54	3	10.0	11	22.0
55 to 59	13	43.3	17	34.0
60+	9	30.0	18	36.0
Total	30		50	

Table 2 shows that 70% or more of the superintendents and corporate CEO's are 55 years or older, none were under 40. The youngest superintendent was 43 years old, while the oldest was 66 years of age. The youngest CEO was 42 years old and the oldest was 77.

Research Question #3: *What are the similarities and dissimilarities in the ethnicity of public school superintendents and CEO's of Fortune 500 companies?*

Table 3 presents the ethnicity of the public school superintendents and corporate CEO's.

Table 3. Ethnicity of Public School Superintendents and Corporate CEO's

	Superintendents		CEO's	
Category	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
White, non-Hispanic	31	75.6	47	94.0
Hispanic	2	4.9	0	0.0
African American	7	17.1	3	6.0
Asian	1	2.4	0	0.0
Total	41		50	

Table 3 shows that there was more minority representation (24.4%) among the superintendents of the largest public school districts than among the top 50 Fortune 500 corporate CEO's (6.0%). There were no Hispanic or Asian CEO's.

Research Question #4: *What are the similarities and dissimilarities in the educational background of public school superintendents and CEO's of Fortune 500 companies?*

Table 4 presents the educational background, in terms of highest earned degree, of the public school superintendents and corporate CEO's who were the focus of this study.

Table 4. Highest Earned Degree of Public School Superintendents and Corporate CEO's

	Superintendents		CEO's	
Degree	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
High School	0	0.0	1	2.0
Associate's	0	0.0	1	2.0
Bachelor's	1	2.4	17	34.7
Master's	10	24.4	19	38.8
Doctorate	30	73.2	11	22.4
Total	41		49	

Table 4 shows that public school superintendents of the largest school districts in the U.S. are more highly educated, in terms of graduate degrees, than are the CEO's of Fortune 500 companies. Almost all of the superintendents (97.6%) held graduate degrees compared to slightly more than 61% (61.2%) of the corporate CEO's.

Table 5 presents a breakdown of the major fields of study of the public school superintendents and corporate CEO's for their bachelor's degrees.

Table 5. Major Fields of Study of Public School Superintendents and Corporate CEO's

(Bachelor's Degree)

	Superintendents		CEO's	
Major	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Business	2	5.9	11	25.6
Liberal Arts	9	26.5	18	42.8
Education	13	38.2	0	0.0
Science	10	29.4	14	32.6
Law	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	34		43	

Table 5 shows that the three most common undergraduate major fields of study for public school superintendents were education, science, and liberal arts. For corporate CEO's they were liberal arts, science, and business.

Table 6 presents the major fields of study of public school superintendents and corporate CEO's for their highest earned degree.

Table 6. <u>Major Fields of Study of Public School Superintendents and Corporate CEO's (Highest Earned Degree)</u>

	Superintendents		CEO's	
Major	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Business	0	0.0	17	58.6
Liberal Arts	7	18.4	3	10.3
Education	28	73.7	0	0.0
Science	1	2.6	2	6.9
Law	2	5.3	7	24.1
Total	38		29	

Table 6 shows that almost three of four (73.7%) of the superintendents majored in education for their highest earned degree. By contrast, the preferred major for corporate CEO's was business (58.6%). Almost one of four (24.1%) of the CEO's majored in law for their highest earned degree.

Table 7 presents the type of university (public or private) attended by public school superintendents and corporate CEO's for their bachelor's degree.

Table 7. <u>Type of University Attended by Public School Superintendents and Corporate CEO's (Bachelor's Degree).</u>

	Superintendents		CEO's	
Type of School	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Public	22	64.7	19	43.2
Private	12	35.3	25	56.8
Total	34		44	

Table 7 shows that almost two thirds (64.7%) of the school district superintendents attended a public university for their bachelor's degree, whereas approximately half (43.2%) of the corporate CEO's attended a public university.

Table 8 shows the type of university (public or private) attended by public school superintendents and corporate CEO's for their highest earned degree.

Table 8. Type of University Attended by Public School Superintendents and Corporate CEO's (Highest Earned Degree)

	Superintendents		CEO's	
Type of School	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Public	22	57.9	4	14.3
Private	16	42.1	24	85.7
Total	38		28	

Table 8 shows the same pattern of attendance as in Table 7, but the distribution is different. A larger percentage of superintendents (42.1% v 35.3%) and corporate CEO's (85.7% v 56.8%) attended a private institution for their highest earned degree than for their bachelor's degree.

Table 9 presents a breakdown of the schools, by conference, attended by public school superintendents and corporate CEO's for their bachelor's degree.

Table 9. Division I Conference Representation of Universities Attended by Public School Superintendents and Corporate CEO's (Bachelor's Degree).

	Superintendents		CEO's	
Conference	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
ACC	1	4.0	4	12.1
Atlantic Ten	0	0.0	3	9.1
Big 12	2	8.0	8	24.2
Big East	3	12.0	1	3.0
Big Ten	3	12.0	3	9.1
Big West	0	0.0	0	0.0
Col. Athletic	1	4.0	1	3.0
Conf. USA	3	12.0	1	3.0
Ivy League	2	8.0	6	18.2
MAAC	0	0.0	0	0.0
MAC	1	4.0	0	0.0
MEAC	1	4.0	0	0.0
Mount. West	1	4.0	1	3.0
Miss. Valley	1	4.0	0	0.0
Northeast	0	0.0	1	3.0
Pacific 10	2	8.0	2	6.1
SEC	3	12.0	1	3.0
Southland	0	0.0	0	0.0
WAC	0	0.0	1	3.0
West Coast	1	4.0	0	0.0
Total	25		33	

Table 9 shows that almost half (48.0%) of the school district superintendents attended Big East, Big Ten, Conference USA, or SEC schools. More than half of the corporate CEO's (54.5%) attended Big 12, Ivy League, or ACC schools.

Table 10 presents a breakdown of the schools, by conference, attended by public school superintendents and corporate CEO's for their highest earned degree.

Table 10. Division I Conference Representation of Universities Attended by Public School Superintendents and Corporate CEO's (Highest Earned Degree)

	Superintendents		CEO's	
Conference	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
ACC	1	3.3	1	5.0
America East	1	3.3	0	0.0
Atlantic Ten	2	6.7	1	5.0
Big 12	5	16.7	1	5.0
Big East	1	3.3	0	0.0
Big Ten	3	10.0	0	0.0
Big West	1	3.3	0	0.0
Col. Athletic	1	3.3	0	0.0
Conf. USA	1	3.3	3	15.0
Ivy League	4	13.3	10	50.0
MAAC	2	6.7	0	0.0
MAC	1	3.3	0	0.0
Mount. West	2	6.7	0	0.0
Pacific 10	1	3.3	4	20.0
SEC	3	10.0	0	0.0
Southland	0	0.0	0	0.0
West Coast	1	3.3	0	0.0
Total	30		20	

Table 10 shows that 30% of the school district superintendents received their highest earned degree from a Big 12 or Ivy League institution. Half of the corporate

CEO's for which data were available received their highest earned degree from an Ivy League school.

Research Question #5: *What are the similarities and dissimilarities in the compensation of public school superintendents and CEO's of Fortune 500 companies?*

Table 11 presents the base salary of the public school superintendents and corporate CEO's who were the subject of this study.

Table 11. Annual Base Salary of Public School Superintendents and Corporate CEO's

Superintendents			CEO's		
Base Salary	#	%	Base Salary	#	%
Below $100,000	0	0.0	Below $500,000	2	6.3
$100,000 to $114,999	0	0.0	$500,000 to $749,999	4	12.5
$115,000 to $129,999	0	0.0	$750,000 to $999,999	6	18.7
$130,000 to $144,999	0	0.0	$1,000,000 to $1,249,999	8	25.0
$145,000 to $159,999	1	2.5	$1,250,000 to $1,499,999	2	6.3
$160,000 to $174,999	2	5.0	$1,500,000 to $1,749,999	6	18.7
$175,000 to $189,999	1	2.5	$1,750,000 to $1,999,999	1	3.1
$190,000 to $204,999	5	12.5	$2,000,000 to $2,249,999	2	6.3
$205,000 to $219,999	1	2.5	$2,250,000 to $2,499,999	0	0.0
$220,000 to $234,999	2	5.0	$2,500,000 to $2,749,999	0	0.0
$235,000 to $249,999	2	5.0	$2,750,000 to $2,999,999	0	0.0
$250,000 to $264,999	8	20.0	$3,000,000+	1	3.1
$265,000 to $279,999	9	22.5			
$280,000 to $294,999	4	10.0			
$295,000 to $309,999	2	5.0			
$310,000 to $324,999	2	5.0			
$325,000 to $339,999	0	0.0			
$340,000+	1	2.5			
Total	40			32	

Table 11 shows that there is a great disparity between the base salaries of the superintendents of the largest public school districts in the U.S. and the base salaries of Fortune 500 corporate CEO's. Nine of ten public school superintendents earn a base salary of $190,000 or more, whereas almost all (94%) of the corporate CEO's earn a base

salary of $500,000 or more. These salary figures do not include fringe benefits such as housing, entertainment, or car allowances; stock options; insurance and retirement packages; corporate bonuses; etc. The difference in base salaries would be more pronounced if fringe benefits were included.

Research Question #6: *What are the similarities and dissimilarities in the career pathways of public school superintendents and CEO's of Fortune 500 companies?*

Table 12 presents the career pathways of the public school superintendents and corporate CEO's who were the focus of this study.

Table 12. Career Pathways of Public School Superintendents and Corporate CEO's

Superintendents			CEO's		
Pathway	#	%	Pathway	#	%
Teacher/Elem. Prin./Central Office	6	17.1	Director, Pres.	2	4.2
Teacher/M.S. Prin./Central Office	3	8.5	VP/CFO or COO/Pres.	15	31.3
Teacher/H.S. Prin./Central Office	11	31.4	VP/CFO or COO	6	12.5
Teacher/Prin.	1	2.9	VP/Pres.	13	27.1
Teacher/Central Office	6	17.1	VP	4	8.3
Prin./Central Office	2	5.7	COO or CFO/Pres.	3	6.3
Teacher only	1	2.9	COO or CFO	2	4.2
Prin. only	0	0.0	President	2	4.2
Central Office only	1	2.9	Founder	1	2.1
Other	2	5.7			
Teacher/other	1	2.9			
Other/Central Office	1	2.9			
Total	35			48	

Table 12 shows that the most common career pathway to the superintendency is teacher/high school principal/central office administrator (31%). The career pathway followed by most Fortune 500 CEO's was vice-president/chief financial officer or chief operating officer/president (31%). The pathway taken by public school district superintendents and Fortune 500 CEO's were similar in that the executives held professional positions in management prior to being promoted to the position of highest ranking executive.

Boards of trustees of public school districts and boards of corporations, when faced with the challenge of recruiting and appointing a superintendent/chief executive officer, have a choice of selecting an internal candidate or a candidate external to the organization.

Table 13 presents data regarding the status (internal or external applicant) of the superintendents and corporate CEO's who were the subjects of this study.

Table 13. Public School Superintendent and Corporate CEO Succession

	Superintendents		CEO's	
Status	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Internal applicant	16	45.7	34	69.4
External applicant	19	54.3	15	30.6
Total	35		49	

Table 13 shows that public school boards of trustees select external applicants to serve as superintendents by a small margin (54% v 46%); whereas, Fortune 500 corporate boards tend to select internal applicants by a large margin (69% v 31%). Therefore, CEO's are more likely to have earned their position through internal succession than are superintendents.

CHAPTER 5 - DISCUSSION

Chapter 5 contains a summary of the study, including the purpose of the study, research questions, and a description of the methodology; conclusions based on the results of the study presented in Chapter 4; links to the extant literature presented in Chapter 2; recommendations for further research; and implications for practice.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to compare the personal characteristics and career pathways of the superintendents of the fifty largest public school districts in the United States and the chief executive officers (CEO's) of the top fifty Fortune 500 companies in the United States. The following research questions guided this study:

1.) What are the similarities and dissimilarities in the profiles (e.g. gender, age, ethnicity, educational background, compensation) of public school superintendents and CEO's of Fortune 500 companies?

2.) What are the similarities and dissimilarities in the career pathways of public school superintendents and CEO's of Fortune 500 companies?

The target populations of this study were the 50 largest school districts and the 50 largest Fortune 500 corporations in the United States. The 50 largest school districts ranged in size from 986,967 students to 68,783 students. Twenty-seven of the 50 school districts served populations of over 100,000 students. The largest district was New York City Public Schools with 986,967 students enrolled in 1,205 schools. The smallest

district of the top 50 was Granite School District in Salt Lake City, Utah with 68,783 students enrolled in 115 schools (Garofano, Sable, & Hoffman, 2007).

The web sites for each of the 50 largest school districts were examined to search for the names and demographic information of the superintendents of each district. In some cases, additional information was retrieved through various media publications posted on the internet when the resumes/curriculum vitaes on the school district web sites were incomplete. Additionally, a request under the federal Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552 was made to each of the school districts in order to retrieve the required information (See Appendix B). Of the 50 districts, the demographic and career pathway information was either entirely or partially available for all but nine of the superintendents. Therefore, the total number of superintendent subjects reviewed was 41.

Each year, *Fortune* magazine publishes the Fortune 500. The 2007 Fortune 500 included the largest United States incorporated companies who filed financial statements with a government agency. This included private companies and cooperatives that filed a 10-K and mutual insurance companies that filed with state regulators. Private companies who did not file as a private company, companies incorporated outside of the United States, companies owned or controlled by other United States companies that filed with a government agency, and United States companies owned or controlled by foreign companies are not included in the Fortune

500. The data used to identify the companies on the Fortune 500 are for the fiscal year that ended on or before January 31, 2007 (*Fortune*, 2007).

The largest company of the Fortune 500 list was WalMart with revenues (in millions) of $351,139. The smallest of the top 50 companies was Freddie Mac with revenues (in millions) of $44,002.

The web sites for each of the 50 largest corporations were retrieved to search for the names and demographic information of the Chief Executive Officers (CEO's) of each company. In some cases, additional information was retrieved through various media publications posted on the internet when the resumes/curriculum vitaes on the company web sites were incomplete. Of the 50 Fortune 500 companies, the demographic and career pathway information was either entirely or partially available for all 50 of the CEO's.

Prior to conducting this study, approval was sought from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the University of Texas at El Paso (See Appendix A). All university policies and procedures were followed. As per IRB guidelines, approval was requested for exempt status. This study involved the review of existing data, documents, and records from sources that were publicly available. Additionally, all data existed prior to the beginning of the research.

This study was conducted using a descriptive research design and document analysis. CEO/Superintendent profiles and career pathways were identified by

examining resumes/curriculum vitaes provided by participants or available on corporate/school district web sites utilizing a rubric developed by the researcher.

"Descriptive research is a type of quantitative research that involves making careful descriptions of educational phenomena" (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). The descriptive research design used in this study was the cross-sectional design. A cross-sectional design study examines data obtained at one point in time from different groups; in this study, the two groups were public school district superintendents and public sector CEO's.

Conclusions

The following conclusions can be drawn from the results of the study presented in Chapter 4.

1. Based on the demographic data obtained by the researcher, the typical public school superintendent is a White/non-Hispanic male, age 55 or over, holds a doctoral degree, and earns a base salary of $190,000 or more.
2. Fortune 500 CEO's, typically, are White/non-Hispanic males, age 55 or over, hold a bachelor's or master's degree, and earn a base salary of a $1,000,000 or more.
3. School district superintendents typically attended a public institution for their bachelor's degree and majored in education, science, or liberal arts.

4. Corporate CEO's typically attended a private institution for their bachelor's degree and majored in liberal arts, science, or business.
5. School district superintendents typically attended a public institution for their highest earned degree and majored in education.
6. Corporate CEO's typically attended a private institution for their highest earned degree and majored in business or law.
7. The typical career pathway to the superintendency was teacher/high school principal/central office.
8. The typical career pathways to the CEO position were vice-president/chief financial officer or chief operating officer/president.
9. Prior to their appointment, the typical superintendent under study was an external applicant, whereas the subject CEO's were internal applicants.
10. The similarities between superintendents and corporate CEO's included gender, ethnicity, and age.
11. The dissimilarities between superintendents and corporate CEO's included undergraduate major, major for the highest earned degree, types of institutions attended, base salary, career pathways, and applicant status (internal v external).

Links to the Extant Literature

This researcher found that within the 50 largest school districts, approximately 86% of the public school superintendents were male and 14% of those superintendents were female. Studies performed by the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) in 2006 showed that 78.9% of superintendents were males and 21.1% were women, in districts with 25,000 students and above (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). In a study conducted by Bjork, Keedy, and Gurley (2003), the majority of women superintendents (68%) were in rural or suburban districts with 2,999 or fewer students; however, there had been great gains in the percent of women serving as superintendent in suburban and urban districts, serving over 25,000 students (5% to 14%). Based on data reviewed in 1999, the likelihood of a male teacher becoming a superintendent was 1 in 43; the likelihood of a female teacher becoming a superintendent was 1 in 825 (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005).

This researcher found that of the top 50 Fortune 500 companies, 49 of the CEO's were male and 1 CEO was a female. Although there have been efforts to ensure that gender is not a factor in determining an employee's evaluation and advancement, women executives continue to report gender-based stereotypes as significant barriers to their advancement, although they note there has been some advancement in recent years (Lyons & McArthur, 2007). Approximately 50% of the firms in the Fortune 1000

had no women as top executives as recently as 2000; those with women executives had only one or two per firm (Helfat, Harris, & Wolfson, 2006).

Regarding age, this researcher found that 83% of the superintendents were 50 years old or older. The 2006 study performed by AASA showed that 91.2% of the superintendents were 50 years old or older in districts with enrollments of 25,000 students or more (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). Hoyle (1993) found that most superintendents were in their forties or fifties.

A study of the top 50 Fortune 500 CEO's revealed that 92% were age 50 or older. In a study conducted in 2006, the CEO's in Business Week's 1992 report on "The Corporate Elite – the Chief Executives of the 1000 Most Valuable Publically Held U.S. Companies," the mean age of the CEO was 51.66 years of age. The most common age decade was the 50s and 131 executives were age 50-59 at the time of succession (Davidson, Nemec, & Worrell, 2006).

This researcher found that the ethnicity of superintendents in the 50 largest school districts was 76% White/non-Hispanic, with 17% identified as African American. These finding compare with the 2006 AASA study which reported that 87.7% of the superintendents of districts with enrollments of 25,000 and above were White/non-Hispanic and 12.3% were African American (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). This research is consistent with other studies which reported on the under-representation of

minorities in the profession including Mertz & McNeely, 1994; Shakeshaft, 1994; Hill & Ragland, 1995; Tallerico & Burnstyn, 1996; Keller, 1999; and Vail, 1999.

The ethnicity of the top 50 CEO's was 94% White/non-Hispanic, with 6% identified as African American. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 opened the door for a handful of black men to serve as executives; black women were not represented in the corporate positions until the 1980s (Daniels, 2005). The current top African American executives in the country have very high academic credentials. Of the 50 most influential African Americans in the investment industry, six are women. Forty of these executives hold graduate degrees, with nine holding law school diplomas. Ten of these top 50 executives graduated from Harvard and eight have more than one graduate degree ("African Americans on Wall Street", 2003).

This researcher found that 73% of the superintendents in the 50 largest school districts had earned a doctoral degree. This compares to 84% of superintendents holding doctoral degrees in districts with 25,000 or more students as found in the study performed by the AASA in 2006 (Glass & Franceschini). William Hayes noted that a majority of superintendents do not complete a doctoral program (2001); the percentage of superintendents who do earn their doctorate are typically those who serve in larger districts (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). The doctoral degrees earned by superintendents are rigorous and place a high priority on research, budgeting, planning, and instructional development (Hayes, 2001; Glass & Franceschini, 2007).

The highest degrees earned by the top 50 Fortune 500 CEO's were closely split between master's degrees at 39% and bachelor's degrees at 35%. In the previous four decades, the number of CEO's without at least an undergraduate degree has declined 37.5%. Those CEO's with graduate degrees increased 30.6% (Forbes & Piercy, 1991). The study conducted by Forbes and Piercy identified the most popular graduate degree to be an MBA (1991).

This researcher found that 75% of the public school superintendents had a base salary of $220,000 or more. The study performed by AASA in 2006 showed the average salary for a superintendent in a large urban district to be $187,924 (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). In a study conducted by the Educational Research Center (ERS), the national mean salary for a superintendent was $134,436 for the 2005-2006 school year (2006). The base salaries do not include fringe benefits; however, dollar values for benefits, such as health insurance, are expected to have increased (Glass & Franceschini, 2007).

The base salaries of 94% of the top 50 Fortune 500 CEO's was $500,000 or more. The CEO's base salary is paid for occupying the most action-oriented, the highest risk taking, and the greatest freedom to act position in the company (Rock, 1977). With an economic slow-down; the poor performance of major companies such as Countrywide Financial, Citigroup, and Merrill Lynch; and a presidential election; it is anticipated that a major reform of CEO pay is on the horizon. However, the reality is that, regardless of

the reforms enacted, corporate boards will find a way to pay their top executive whatever they like (Colvin, 2008). Corporate CEO's are able to accommodate for a drop in their base salaries by including stock ownership and bonuses in their contracts. Implementation of such ideas as docking the bonus or stock return based on actual value and paying out bonuses based on the company's cash earnings relative to its cost of capital would benefit the company and the shareholders; and perhaps begin to strengthen America in a global economy (Colvin, 2008).

This researcher found that the most common career pathway taken by a superintendent was that of teacher, high school principal, and central office administrator. "Historically, most chief school officers began as teachers, went on to become building principals, and moved on to the superintendency. Some also served along the way in a central office position such as assistant superintendent" (Hayes, 2001, p. 23). More recently, studies have shown that the career pathway of teacher, principal, central office administrator was most prevalent for superintendents in districts serving more that 25,000 students and in districts serving 3,000 to 24,000 students. The pathway of teacher, principal was most common for superintendents in school districts serving less than 2,999 students (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). According to the results this study, 12% of the superintendents had experience outside of the educational environment. "Still, the fact cannot be ignored that is recent years, a number of major districts have hired their superintendent from other fields" (Hayes, 2001, p.23).

This researcher found that the most common pathway taken by the Fortune 500 CEO was vice-president, chief financial officer or chief operating officer, president. Previous studies have shown that after the first management position, the next positions held were vice-president, executive vice-president, or top management position other than CEO (CFO or COO), and then promotion to CEO (Forbes & Piercy, 1991). In following the pathway listed above, the move to CEO within the organization is dependent on the existence of an "heir apparent" within the organization. The heir apparent is defined as "any officer who was the only person in the firm holding the title of president or of COO or both" (Zhang & Rajagopalan, 2003, p. 332). Findings indicated that the likelihood of promotion within the organization was significantly increased by the existence of an heir apparent, who fell within the same career pathway identified by CEO's in this report (Zhang & Rajagopalan, 2003).

This researcher found that 46% of the subjects studied were internal candidates who were promoted to the position of superintendent in their district. In 2000, a study showed that only 9% of superintendents spent their entire career, including their principalship, in one district (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). Glass, Bjork, and Brunner found that after being named superintendent, only 56% served in only one district (2000). Additionally, Glass, et al. (2000), found that while 88% of superintendents spend their careers in one state, 68% of those surveyed were external candidates to their present position. These data continue the perception of the impermanence and

transitory nature of the position of superintendent. "In our society where professional recognition is based on salary and the size of the organization being managed, it is not surprising that ambitious superintendents seek to move to larger districts" (Hayes, 2001).

This researcher found that 69% of the corporate subjects studied were internal candidates who were promoted to the position of CEO for their company. Previous studies have shown that internal CEO succession is positively associated with the size and performance of the firm (Dalton & Kesner, 1983; Guthrie & Datta, 1998). Internal succession is also most likely to occur when inside constituencies are powerful (Boeker & Goodstein, 1993; Cannella & Lubatkin, 1993). In recent years, more and more firms are recruiting and hiring CEO's from outside of their firms. Bernthal, Rioux, and Williams found that 37 percent of the firms in their study filled their top executive positions from outside of their firms (1999). Internal candidates typically generate loyalty and boost morale, have knowledge of established social networks, have skills and abilities that are already known, and ensure the continuity and stability of the firm (Howard, 2001; Harris & Helfat, 1997; Ocasio, 1999). External candidates provide new perspectives, skills, and knowledge; provide information from competing firms; and are a way that a firm can signal to the market that the hiring firm is aligning itself with the rest of the industry (Howard, 2001; Boeker, 1997; Powell, 1988).

Recommendations for Future Research

The following recommendations are made for further research.

1. It is recommended that the U.S. Office of Education and/or the National School Board Association develop a national database of superintendents by district size. The database should include basic demographic data such as gender, ethnicity, age, educational background, and base compensation. This will facilitate the research on the superintendency.

2. It is further recommended that the American Council on Education develop a national data base to include demographic information on presidents of colleges and universities to facilitate research about chief executive officers.

3. It is recommended that the editors of *Fortune* magazine develop a Fortune 500 database that includes basic demographic data such as gender, ethnicity, age, educational background, and base compensation for CEO's of all public, private, and not-for-profit organizations.

4. Further research should be conducted to compare these findings to superintendents in rural, small town, and suburban districts; presidents at colleges and universities; and CEO's of smaller companies and not-for-profit organizations.

The databases suggested in recommendations 1 – 3 would facilitate comparative research on public school superintendents, college presidents, and corporate CEO's.

5. Further research should be conducted to include comparative information on public school superintendents, corporate CEO's, *and* college/university presidents.

6. Comparative research should be conducted to identify the leadership skills required of public school superintendents, corporate CEO's, and college/university presidents.

7. Qualitative comparative studies should be conducted to solicit in-depth information about the leadership styles, conflict resolution strategies, and leadership challenges faced by public school superintendents, corporate CEO's, and college/university presidents.

8. Research should be conducted to assess the effectiveness of corporate CEO's who have been appointed to serve as a public school superintendent or college/university president.

9. Research should be conducted to identify the effects of the world-wide financial crisis on the selection of public school superintendents, corporate CEO's, and college/university presidents.

10. Comparative research should be conducted to assess the accountability measures applied to public school superintendents, corporate CEO's, and college/university presidents.

11. Research should be conducted to compare the oversight exercised by school boards, corporate boards, and boards of regents over their chief executive officers.

Implications for Educational Practice

Public school district superintendents and Fortune 500 CEO's are responsible for the oversight of bureaucratic organizations. They share similar skills and leadership qualities. These outward similarities have led to the perception that skills of top executives are mobile and can be transported from private and public sector businesses to school districts. Based on this perception "school boards around the country have been hiring a new breed of superintendent—military generals, a federal prosecutor, a health care executive, investment banker and former corporate executives" (Geiger, 2002, p.1) to be the top administrator and manager of school districts.

Teaching and learning in informal and formal settings are ongoing and critical activities within private and public corporations. Clearly, these secondary activities are good for the business. In public schools, teaching and learning, collectively, is the primary business. Both corporations and school districts are concerned with setting goals to achieve the organization's mission; developing a long term vision of what success will bring; knowing stakeholders' (or stockholders') expectations; marketing and communicating; managing large budgets; building, operating and maintaining a physical plant; creating a personnel office to acquire skilled employees and developing personal and professional enhancement opportunities to retain them; creating a safe work environment; and assembling a legal and paralegal staff to address burgeoning compliance measures. Therefore, the assumption that business CEO's and superintendents are transposable positions "sounds plausible. After all, how difficult

could it be to mange a school district?" (Geiger, 2002, p. 1).

The aim in business is to create special processes and environments to yield products, or ways to transport, market, sell, or service products. The end result is something that brings in revenue and is profitable. School districts are different. Despite having the characteristic infrastructure of a corporation, the unique business of a school district is scholarship. Important elements of scholarship are imparting knowledge by applying the best ways to teach and disseminate it so that it can be applied for useful purposes. The business of schools is to measure the quality of their products in highly complex ways ultimately using measurements of success that are not immediate. The primary products of school districts are different from those of corporations. The district's products are graduates who have acquired knowledge and skills that will allow them to become successful members of the business work force and community. While immediate profit is not realized, future profit-making potential for businesses, the graduates themselves, and the community is the promise.

The business of education requires highly skilled and knowledgeable individuals with considerable leadership skills and qualities and appropriate backgrounds. The boards of trustees of school districts are responsible for deciding the best place to search for their leaders and the qualities and characteristics that they should possess. The long term welfare of school districts depends upon the ability of their boards of trustees to make correct decisions. School boards should not assume, in the absence of

substantive research, that the skills required to run a public or private corporation are the same skills that will result in the effective administration of a school district.

LIST OF REFERENCES

African Americans on Wall Street have first-class academic credentials (2003). *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 39*, 33.

Alkhafaji, A.F. (2001). *Corporate transformation and restructuring*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Alkhafaji, A.F. (2007). Corporate governance: The evolution of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act and its impact on corporate America. *Competitive Review: An International Business Journal 17(3)*, 193-202.

Amihud, Y. & Lev, B. (1981). Risk reduction as a managerial motive for conglomerate Mergers. *Bell Journal of Economics, 12*, 605-617.

A short history of corporations (2002). Retrieved March 28, 2008 from http://www.newint.org/features/2002/07/01/history-of-corporations.

Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Beatty, R.P. & Zajac, E.J. (1987). CEO change and firm performance in large corporations: Succession effects and manager shifts. *Strategic Management Journal, 8*, 305-317.

Benston, G. (1985). The self-serving management hypothesis: Some evidence. *Journal of Accounting and Economics, 7*, 67-84.

Berle, A.A. & Means, G.C. (1932). *The modern corporation and private property*. New York, NY: MacMillan.

Bernthal, P.R., Rioux, S.M., & Willins, R.S. (1999). *The leadership forecast: A benchmarking study*. Pittsburgh, PA: Development Dimensions International.

Birnbaum, R. (1971). Presidential succession: An inter-institutional analysis. *Educational Record, (Spring)*, 133-145.

Bjork, L. (1996). Impact and response: *The implications of school restructuring on university-based professional preparation programs*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.

Björk, L., Keedy, J. & Gurley, D. K. (2003). Career paths of superintendents: Results from the study of the American superintendency. *Journal of School Leadership*, 13(4), pp. 406-42.

Bjork, L. & Kowalski, T.J. (Eds.) (2005). *The contemporary superintendent: Preparation, practice, and development.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Bjork, L. & Lindle, J.C. (2001). Superintendents and interest groups. *Educational Policy, 15(1)*, 76-91.

Boeker, W. (1997). Executive migration and strategic change: The effect of top manager movement on product-market entry. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 42*, 213-236.

Boeker, W. & Goodstein, J. (1993). Performance and successor choice: The moderating effects of governance and ownership. *Academy of Management Journal, 36,* 172-186.

Brady, G. F. & Helmich, D. L. (1982). The hospital administrator and organizational change: Do we recruit from the outside? *Hospital and Health Services Administration, 27*, 53-62.

Brady, G. F. & Helmich, D. L. (1984). *Executive succession: Toward excellence in corporate leadership*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Braganza, A. & Franken, A. (2007). SOX, compliance, and power relationships. *Communications of the ACM, 50 (9)*, 97-102.

Brossey, R. (1986). What directors say about their role in managing executive pay. *Directors and Boards 10(4)*, 38-40.

Bryan, L.L. & Joyce, C. I. (2007). Better strategy through organizational design. *McKinsey Quarterly*, *2*, 20-29.

Bumiller, E. "Bush signs bill aimed at fraud in corporations". *The New York Times*, July 31, 2002, pg. A1.

Canella, A.A. & Lubatkin, M. (1993). Succession as a sociopolitical process: Internal impediments to outsider selection. *Academy of Management Journal, 36,* 763-793.

Canella, A.A. & Monroe, M.J. (1997). Contrasting perspectives on strategic leaders: Toward a more realistic view of top managers. *Journal of Management 23(3),* 213-237.

Carlson, R. (1961). Succession and performance among school superintendents. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 6*, 210-227.

Carroll, G.R. (1984). Dynamics of publisher succession in newspaper organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 29*, 93-113.

Carter, G.R. & Cunningham, W.G. (1997). *The American school superintendent: Leading in an age of pressure*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Castanias, R.P. & Helfat, C.E. (1991). Managerial resources and rents. *Journal of Management*, *17*, 155-171.

Chaganti, R. & Sambharya, R. (1987). Strategic orientation and characteristics of upper management. *Strategic Management Journal, 8*, 393-401.

Clark, D.L., McKibbin, S. & Malkas, M. (Eds.), *Alternative perspectives for viewing educational organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory.

Colvin, G. (2008). Rewarding failure. *Fortune.* Retrieved October 27, 2008 from http://money.cnn.com/2008/04/14/magazines/fortune/colvin_rewarding_failure/index.htm.

Conger, J.A. (2005). Best Practices in Corporate Boardroom Leadership in *The Practice of leadership: Developing the next generation of leaders*, Jay A. Conger and Ronald E. Riggio (Eds.) 2007. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Conner, F. (1964). Foreward, in James Van Zwoll, *School Personnel Administration* (p.iii). New York, NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Coughlin, A.T. & Schmidt, R.M. (1985). Executive compensation, management turnover, and performance: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Accounting and Economics, 7*, 43-66.

Council of the Great City Schools (2006). Urban school superintendents: Characteristics, tenure, and salary fifth survey report. *Urban Indicator. 8(1),* 1-12. Retrieved March 28, 2008, from http://www.cgcs.org/images/Publications/Indicator_06.pdf .

Crystal, G.S. (1991). *In search of excess*. New York, NY: Norton.

Cuban, L. (1984). Transforming the frog into a prince: Effective schools research and Practice at the district level. *Harvard Educational Review, 54(2),* 120-151.

Cuban, L. (1988). *The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Dalton, D. & Kesner, I. (1983). Inside/outside succession and organizational size: The pragmatics of executive succession. *Academy of Management Journal, 26*, 736-742.

Daniels, C. (2005). Pioneers. *Fortune*. Retrieved October 27, 2008 from http://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/fortune_archive/2005/08/22/8218034/index.htm.

Davidson, W., Nemec, C. & Worrell, D. (2006). Determinants of CEO age at succession. *Journal of Management & Governance, 10(1),* 32-57.

Dickins, D. & Houmes, R. (2007). Executive compensation: Much ado about nothing? *Financial Analysts Journal*, *63(3),* 28-31.

Digest of Education Statistics: 2007 (2008). Retrieved February 20, 2008 from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/ch_4.asp.

Doyle, D.P. (1988). The main thing – Academic learning. In R.R. Spillane & P. Regnier (Eds.). *The superintendent of the future: Strategy and action for achieving academic excellence* (p. 15-30). Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen.

Eagly, A.H. & Johnson, B.T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 108(2)*, 233-256.

ERS (2006). *Salaries and wages paid professional and support personnel in public schools, 2005-2006.* Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Eitzen, D.S. & Yetman, N.R (1972). Managerial change, longevity, and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 17*, 110-116.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act. (2007). Retrieved September 29, 2008 from http://www2.edtrust.org/edtrust/ESEA.

Evaluating the Superintendent. (1981) Superintendent Career Development, Series Number 6, *American Association of School Administrators and the National School Board Association,* 4-5.

Fama, E.F. (1980). Agency problems and the theory of the firm. *Journal of Political Economy*, *88*, 288-307.

FAQ definitions and explanations (2007). Retrieved September 28, 2007 from http://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/fortune500/2007/faq/.

Farrell, G. (2005). *America Robbed Blind*. Austin, TX: Wizard Academy Press.

Finkelstein, S. & Hambrick, D.C. (1990). Top management team tenure and organizational outcomes: The moderating role of managerial discretion. *Administrative Quarterly*, *35*, 484-503.

Finkelstein, S. & Hambrick D.C. (1996). *Strategic leadership: Top executives and their effects on organizations*. St. Paul, MN: West.

Forbes, J.B. & Piercy, J.E. (1991). *Corporate mobility and paths to the top: Studies for human resource and management development specialists*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Fortune 500 Magazine for 2007.

Fromm, E. (1941). *Escape from freedom*. New York, NY: Farrar & Reinhart.

Fullan, M. (1998). The meaning of educational change: A quarter century of learning. In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan, & D. Hopkins (Eds.), *International handbook of educational change, Part I* (p. 199-213). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Fuller, H.L., Campbell, C., Celio, M., Harvey, J., & Immerwahr, J. (2003). *An impossible job? The view from the urban superintendent's chair.* Seattle, WA: Center On Reinventing Public Education.Retrieved March 28, 2008, from http://www.ncsrp.org/cs/csr/view/csr_pubs/23.

Furtado, E. & Rozeff, M. (1987). The wealth effects of company initiated management changes. *Journal of Financial Economics, 18*, 147-160.

Gabarro, J.J. (1987). *The dynamics of taking charge*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

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

Gamson, W.A. & Scotch, N.A. (1964). Scapegoating in baseball. *American Journal of Sociology, 70*, 69-72.

Garofano, A., Sable, J. & Hoffman, L. (2008). Characteristics of the 100 largest public elementary and secondary schools in the United States: 2004-2005. National Center for Education Statistics.

Geiger, P.E. (2002). When superintendents become the generals. *American Association of School Administrators*. Retrieved March 3, 2008 from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_mOJSD/is_59_2/ai_82492239.

Gephart, R. (1978). Status degradation and organizational succession: An ethnomethodological approach. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 23*, 553-581.

Getzels, J.W., Liphan, James, M. & Campbell, R.F. (1968). *Educational administration as a social process: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Glass, T.E. (1992). *The 1992 study of the American school superintendency: America's education leaders in a time of reform*. Arlington, VA: American Association of Secondary Administrators.

Glass, T.E., Bjork, L. & Brunner, C.C. (2000). *The study of the American school superintendency 2000: A look at the superintendent in the new millennium.* Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Glass, T.E. & Franceschini, L.A. (2007). *The state of the American school superintendency: A mid-decade study*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Green, H. (1984). *Managing*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Grusky, O. (1961). Corporate size, bureaucratization, and managerial succession. *American Journal of Sociology, 67*, 263-269.

Grusky, O. (1963). Managerial succession and organizational effectiveness. *American Journal of Sociology, 69*, 21-31.

Grusky, O. (1964). The effects of succession: A comparative study of military and business organizations. In M. Janowitz (Ed.), *The new military*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Gupta, A.K. & Govindarajan, V. (1984). Business unit strategy, managerial characteristics, and business unit effectiveness at strategy implementation. *Academy of Management Review, 27*, 25-41.

Guthrie, J.P. & Datta, D.K. (1998). Corporate strategy, executive selection and firm performance. *Human Resource Management, 37 (2),* 101-115.

Hall, R.I. (1976). A system pathology of an organization: The rise and fall of the old Saturday Evening Post. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21*, 185-211.

Hambrick, D.C. & Fukutomi, G.D.S. (1991). The seasons of a CEO's tenure. *Academy of Management Review 16 (4)*, 719-742.

Hambrick, D.C. & Mason, P. (1984). Upper echelons: The organization as a reflection of its managers. *Academy of Management Review, 9,* 193-206.

Harris, D. & Helfat, C. (1997). Specificity of CEO human capital and compensation. *Strategic Management Journal, 18*, 895-920.

Hayes, W. (2001). *So you want to be a superintendent?* Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Heidrick & Struggles, Inc. (1987). *The changing board*. Chicago, IL: Heidrick & Struggles.

Helfat, C.E., Harris, D. & Wolfson, P.J. (2006). The pipeline to the top: Women and men in the top executive ranks of U.S. corporations. *Academy of Management Perspectives,* 42-64.

Helmich, D.L. & Brown, W.B. (1972). Successor type and organizational change in the corporate enterprise. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 17*, 371-381.

Hill, M.S. & Ragland, J.C. (1995). *Women as educational leaders: Opening windows, pushing ceilings.* Thousand Oakes, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Hogarth, R. (1987). *Judgment and choice*, (2nd ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley.

Hoyle, J. (1993). *Professional standards for the superintendency*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Howard, A. (2001). Identifying, assessing and selecting senior leaders. In S.J. Zaccaro & R.J. Klimoski (Eds.), *The nature of organizational leadership-Understanding the performance imperatives confronting today's leaders*: 305-346. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Howard, A. (2005). Best practices in leader selection in the practice of leadership: *Developing the next generation of leaders,* Jay A. Conger and Ronald E. Riggio (Eds.) 2007. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hoyle, J. R., Bjork, L.G., Collier, V. & Glass, T. (2005). *The superintendent as CEO: Standards based performance.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hoyle, J., Bjork, L., Collier, V., & Glass, T. (2005). *The superintendent as CEO: Standards-based performance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hoyle, J.R. & The AASA Commission on Standards for the Superintendency (1993). *Professional standards for the superintendency*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Jackson, B. L. (1995). *Balancing Act: The political role of the urban school superintendent*. Washington, D.C.: Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies.

Jarrell, G.A., Brickley, J.A., and Netter, J.M. (1988). The market for corporate control: The empirical evidence since 1980. *Journal of Economic Perspectives 2(1)*:, 49-68.

Jensen, M.C. (1988). The takeover controversy: Analysis and evidence. In J.C. Coffee, L. Lowenstein & S. Rose-Ackerman (Eds.), 314-354, *Knights raiders & targets.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Jensen, M.C. & Meckling, W.H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3, 305-360.

Kaplan, J. (1999). *The short history of corporations*. Terrain.

Keller, B.K. (1999). Report calls for more minority superintendents. *Education Week, 18 (24),* 3.

Kesner, I.F. & Sebora,T. C. (1994). Executive succession: Past, present, & future. *Journal Of Management, 20 (2)*, 327-272.

Konnert, M.W. & Augenstein, J.J. (1995). *The school superintendency: Leading education into the 21st century*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Company.

Konnert, M.W. & Augenstein, J.J. (1990). *The superintendent in the nineties: What superintendents and board members need to know*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing.

Koryl, M. (1996). *Formal evaluation of Indiana school superintendents: Practices and superintendent perceptions.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana.

Kotter, J.P. (1982). *The general manager*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Kowalski, T. J. (1999). *The school superintendent: Theory, practice, and cases*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kowalski, T.J. (2003). *Contemporary school administration: An introduction*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Kriesberg, L. (1962). Careers, organization, size, and success. *American Journal of Sociology, 68*, 355-359.

Larson, D. (2006). Roles and responsibilities. *American School Board Journal, 193 (5)*, 32-33.

Lauenstein, M. (1980). Boards of directors: The need for a strategic concept. *Journal of Business Strategy, 1*, 66-68.

London, M., Smither, J.W., & Diamante, T. (2005). Best practices in leader assesment in *The Practice of Leadership: Developing the next generation of leaders*, Jay A. Conger and Ronald E. Riggio (Eds.) 2007. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lyons, D. & McArthur, C. (2007). Gender's unspoken role in leadership evaluations. *Human Resource Planning, 30 (3),* 24-32.

Mace, M. L. (1971). *Director: Myth and reality*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration.

March, J.C. & March J.G. (1977). Almost random careers: The Wisconsin school superintendency, 1940-1972. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 22*, 377-409.

McEachern, W.A. (1975). *Managerial control and performance*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

McKibbin, S. (1981). In D.L. Clark, S. McKibbon, & M. Malkas (Eds.), *Alternative Perspectives for Viewing Educational Organizations* (3-13). San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory.

McNamara, C. (1997). Basic overview of role of chief executive. Retrieved March 29, 2008 from http://www.managementhelp.org/chf_exec/ed_rspon.htm.

Mertz, N.T., & McNeely, S.R. (1994). How are we doing? Women in urban school administration. *Urban Education, 28* (4), 361-372.

Miles, R.E. & Snow,C.C. (1978). *Organization strategy, structure and process*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Miller, D. (1991). Stale in the saddle: CEO tenure and the match between organization and environment. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 37*, 34-52.

Miller, D. (1993). Some organizational consequences of CEO succession. *Academy of Management Journal, 36*, 644-659.

Miller, D., Kets de Vries, M.F.R., & Toulouse, J-M. (1982). Top executive locus of control and its relationship to strategy-making, structure, and environment. *Academy of Management Journal, 25*, 237-253.

Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The nature of managerial work*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Montana, J, J.D. (2007). The Sarbanes-Oxley Act: Five years later. *The Information Management Journal November/December*, 48-53.

Murphy, J. (1991). The 'maytag' man of school reform. *School Administration*, *2 (48),* 32-33. Abstract obtained from *Managers of virtue: public school leadership in America, 1820-1980*.

Murphy, J. & Hallinger, P. (1986). The superintendent as instructional leader: Findings from effective school districts. *Journal of Educational Administraion, 24(2),* 213-236.

Norburn, D. & Birley, S. (1988). The top management team and corporate performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 9*, 225-237.

Norton, M.S., Webb, L.D., Dlugosh, L.L. & Sybouts, W. (1996). *The school superintendency: New responsibilities, new leadership*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Ocasio, W. (1999). Institutionalized action and corporate governance: The reliance on rules of CEO succession. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44*, 384-416.

Pelton, W., Sackmann, S. & Boguslaw, R (1990). *Tough choices: The decision-making Styles of America's top CEO's*. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.

Pfeffer, J. & Davis-Blake A. (1986). Administrative succession and organizational performance: How administrator experience mediates the succession effect. *Academy of Management Journal, 29*, 72-83.

Pfeffer, J. & Leblebici, H. (1973). Executive recruitment and the development of interfirm organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 18*, 449-461.

Porac, J., Wade, J., & Pollock, T. (1999). Industry categories and the politics of the comparable firm in CEO compensation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *44*, 112-144.

Powell, W.W. (1988). Institutional effects on organizational structure and performance. In L. Zucker (Eds.), *Institutional patterns and organizations*: 115-136. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Puffer, S. & Weintrop, J. (1991). Corporate performance and the CEO turnover: The role of performance expectations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36*, 1-19.

Reeves, C. (1954). *School boards*. Westwood, CT: Greenwood Press.

Rock, R.H. (1977). *The chief executive officer: Managing the human resources of the large, diversified, industrial company*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Rowan, R. (1993). The tricky task of picking an heir apparent. *Fortune*.

Ruch, R.S. & Goodman, R. (1983). *Image at the top: Crisis and renaissance in corporate leadership*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Schwahn, C. & Spady, W. (1998). *Total leaders: Applying the best future-focused change strategies to education*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Shakeshaft, C. (1994). Women in urban administration. *Urban Education, 28* (4), 357-360.

Sharp, W. L. & Walter, J.K. (2004). *The school superintendent: The profession and the person*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Education.

Simpson, E.H. (1994). *Practices and procedures used in the evaluation of public school superintendents in South Carolina as perceived by superintendents and school board chairpersons.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus.

Smith, A. (1776). *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations*. London: Methuen.

Sonedecker, J.W. (1984). *Evaluation of the American public school superintendent.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus.

Steckmest, F.W. (1982). *Corporate performance: The key to pubic trust*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Student attendance accounting handbook (2007). Retrieved September 29, 2007 from http://www.tea.state.tx.us/school.finance/handbook/index.html.

Stufflebeam, D. (1971). The relevance of the CIPP evaluation model for educational accountability. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, *5*, 19-25.

Tallerico, M. & Burstyn, J.N. (1996). Retaining women in the superintendency: The location matters. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *32*, 642-664.

TEC, Chapter 11, Subchapter E, Section 22.201(a) (2007). Retrieved February 17, 2007 from http://tlo2.tlc.state.tx.us/statutes/ed/toc.htm.

The United States Constitution. (1997). Retrieved September 29, 2007 from http://www.usconstitution.net/const.html.

Thomas, D.C.(1989). Dissertation: Performance Based Evaluation of the Chief Executive Officer. University of Missouri-Columbia

Trow, D. (1961). Executive succession in small companies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *6*, 228-239.

Tucker, H.J. & Zeigler, H.L. (1980). *Professionals versus the public: Attitudes, communication, and response in school districts*. New York, NY: Longman.

Tyack, D. & Hansot, E. (1982). *Managers of virtue: Public school leadership in America, 1820 – 1980*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

U.S. Department of Education. (2002). *No Child Left Behind: A desktop reference*. Retrieved July 17, 2003 from www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/reference.

Vail, D. (1999). Women at the top. *American School Board Journal, 186 (12),* 20-24.

Vance, S.C. (1968). *The corporate director: A critical evaluation*. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin, Inc.

Vance, S.C. (1971). *Managers in the conglomerate era*. New York, NY: Wiley-Interscience.

Vance, S.C. (1983). *Corporate leadership: Boards, directors, and strategy*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Vancil, R. (1987). *Passing the baton*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walking, R.A. & Long R.S. (1984). Agency theory, managerial welfare, and takeover bid resistance. *Rand Journal of Economics, 15*, 54-68.

Walsh, J.P. & Seward, J.K. (1990). On the efficiency of internal and external corporate control mechanisms. *Academy of Management Review, 15*, 421-458.

Winter, P. (1997). Educational recruitment and selection: A review of recent studies and recommendations for best practice. In L. Wildman (Ed.), *Fifth NCPEA Yearbook* (p. 133-140). Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing.

Young, H. S. (1976). In pursuit of a profession: A historical analysis of the concept of "personalization" for American public school superintendency 1865-1973. (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1976). *ProQuest,* AAT 8015392.

Yukl, G. & Van Fleet, D.D. (1992). Theory and research on leadership organizations. In M.D. Dunnette & L.M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, Vol. 3 p. 147-197. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Zajac, E.J. (1990). CEO selection, succession, compensation, and firm performance: A theoretical integration and empirical evidence. *Strategic Management Journal, 11*, 217-230.

Zhang, Y. & Rajagopalan, N. (2003). Explaining new CEO origin: Firm versus industry antecedents. *Academy of Management Journal*, *46(3)*, 327-338.

APPENDIX A

Institutional Review Board Information

UTEP INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB)

Investigator checklist for requesting exempt status

Does the protocol include?

[ ] Yes [X] No Children*
[ ] Yes [X] No Prisoners, fetuses, pregnant women, or human in vitro fertilization
[ ] Yes [X] No More than minimal risk
[ ] Yes [X] No Deception of subjects
[ ] Yes [X] No Cognitively impaired subjects

<u>**If ANY answers are YES, the protocol is not exempt**</u> [*see exception for children in 45 CFR 46.101 (b) (2), below]

The protocol must qualify under <u>one</u> of the following categories:

❑ **Activities Being Conducted Are Not Research. 45 CFR 46.102 (d)**

The information collected will not be used to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge. For example, the project is an evaluation for a specific department, agency, company or institution and the results will not be published or otherwise disseminated.

❑ **Research Does Not Involve Human Subjects. 45 CFR 46.102 (f)**

The study does not involve living individuals or data collected from living individuals; or the study involves the use of tissue or other data which have been collected for some other purpose by someone other than the investigator, and are not linked to the individual by personal identifiers. [Examples include lab studies conducted with samples from a third party if the samples are anonymous (no one has personal identifying information); human plasma, commercial cell lines, etc. obtained from publicly available commercial sources; material obtained at autopsy.]

❑ **Surveys/Interviews/Standardized Educational Tests/Observation of Public Behavior.** 45 CFR 46.101 (b) (2)

Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior if: (1) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; or (2) and disclosure of human subjects' responses outside research would not reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability or reputation. *Observation of public behavior in children may be exempt if the investigator does not participate in the activities being observed.

✓ **Secondary Use of Pre-Existing Data**. 45 CFR 46.101 (b) (4)

Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens (1) if these sources are publicly available, or (2) if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly, or through identifiers linked to subjects. "Existing data" means that the information or materials must already exist at the time of the research proposal, i.e. no on-going collection. [This category can be used only if the data set accessed by the investigator contains **no identifiers**; chart reviews do not qualify]

❑ **Taste and Food Quality Evaluation.** 45 CFR 46.101 (b) (6)

Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies: (1) if wholesome foods without additives are consumed; or (2) if food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or agricultural chemical or environment contaminant at or below the level found to be safe, by the FDA or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

In addition to checking the appropriate category, include a brief description of the proposed activity. Please submit **one** copy of this form and supporting documents using the appropriate template via IRBNet.

The signature of the Department Chair or Department Research Review Committee is not required. The Chair or Vice-Chair of the IRB will review requests for exempted research and determine if the study qualifies for an exemption. If granted, continuing reviews are not required, and no further IRB action is needed. If the exemption request is not granted, a protocol must be submitted to the IRB. The investigator is responsible for submitting for subsequent review any changes in the protocol approved for exemption.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO
Office of the Vice President for Research and Sponsored Projects
Institutional Review Board
El Paso, Texas 79968-0587
phone: 915 747-8841 fax: 915 747-5931

DATE:	July 8, 2008
TO:	Terri Jordan
FROM:	University of Texas at El Paso IRB
STUDY TITLE:	[90432-1] -A Comparison of the Profiles and Career Pathways of Public School Superintendents and Corporate Chief Executive Officers
IRB REFERENCE #:	
SUBMISSION TYPE:	New Study
ACTION:	APPROVED
APPROVAL DATE:	July 7, 2008
EXPIRATION DATE:	July 6, 2009
REVIEW TYPE:	Expedited Review

Thank you for your submission of New Study materials for this research study. University of Texas at El Paso IRB has APPROVED your submission. This approval is based on an appropriate risk/benefit ratio and a study design wherein the risks have been minimized. All research must be conducted in accordance with this approved submission.

This study has received Expedited Review based on the applicable federal regulation.

Please remember that informed consent is a process beginning with a description of the study and insurance of participant understanding followed by a signed consent form. Informed consent must continue throughout the study via a dialogue between the researcher and research participant. Federal regulations require each participant receive a copy of the signed consent document.

Please note that any revision to previously approved materials must be approved by this office prior to initiation. Please use the appropriate revision forms for this procedure.

All SERIOUS and UNEXPECTED adverse events must be reported to this office. Please use the appropriate adverse event forms for this procedure. All FDA and sponsor reporting requirements should also be followed.

Please report all NON-COMPLIANCE issues or COMPLAINTS regarding this study to this office.

Please note that all research records must be retained for a minimum of three years after termination of the project.

Based on the risks, this project requires Continuing Review by this office on an annual basis. Please use the appropriate renewal forms for this procedure.

If you have any questions, please contact Lola Norton at 915-747-8841 or irb.orsp@utep.edu. Please include your study title and reference number in all correspondence with this office.

APPENDIX B

Federal Freedom of Information Act Request

July 9, 2008

To Whom It May Concern:

This request is made under the federal Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552 for the following documents:

1. Curriculum vitae or resume for the current superintendent;

2. Demographic information regarding the current superintendent; to include age, ethnicity, gender, and educational background; and

3. Superintendent base salary for 2007-2008.

The Freedom of Information Act, as you are aware, provides that if portions of a document are exempt, the remainder must be segregated and released. Therefore, I would appreciate you sending me all non-exempt portions of those records I have requested. Should you elect to withhold or delete any information, please justify your decision by referencing specific exemptions of the Act. Under provisions of the Freedom of Information Act, I reserve the right to appeal should you determine to withhold any information sought in my request.

The information should be sent via email to Terri Jordan at tkjordan@episd.org.
Thank you in advance for your assistance in providing me with this information. Please do not hesitate to call me if you should have any questions. I can be reached at (915) 881-2315.

Sincerely,

Terri Jordan

CURRICULUM VITAE

Terri Jordan was born on September 4, 1964 in Lubbock, Texas. She graduated from Hanks High School, El Paso, Texas, in the spring of 1982 and entered Texas Tech University in Lubbock, Texas, in the fall of that year. In 1985, she earned her bachelor's degree in education with teaching fields in mathematics and Spanish. She taught high school mathematics in the El Paso Independent School District in El Paso, Texas, while pursuing a master's degree in educational administration, which she earned from the University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP) in 1990: She was an assistant principal at the high school level before becoming a high school principal in the El Paso Independent School District at Franklin High School. She later became Executive Director for Technology and Information Systems; Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum and Instruction; and Assistant Superintendent, College Readiness. She is currently serving as the Associate Superintendent for Secondary Schools in the El Paso Independent School District.

Permanent Address: 6734 Heritage Ridge

El Paso, Texas 79912