



STATEWIDE DATA ON SUPPLY AND DEMAND OF PRINCIPALS AFTER POLICY CHANGES TO PRINCIPAL PREPARATION IN ILLINOIS

ALICIA HALLER AND ERIKA HUNT

MARCH 2016

INTRODUCTION

Research has demonstrated that principals have a powerful impact on school improvement and student learning.¹ Principals play a vital role in recruiting, developing, and retaining effective teachers; creating a school-wide culture of learning; and implementing a continuous improvement plan aimed at increasing student achievement². Leithwood, Louis, Anderson & Wahlstrom (2004) established that school leadership is second only to classroom instruction in terms of school-level influences on student outcomes. However, that sequential description overlooks the role of the principal to scale effective practices school wide. Manna (2015) argues that it is the principal that acts as a “powerful multiplier of effective teaching and leadership practices in schools.”³

Recognizing the importance of school leadership and the growing complexity of the principalship, Illinois has worked at the forefront of innovation with improvements to principal preparation, and has been recognized as a national leader in this area.⁴ For over a decade, stakeholders throughout Illinois have engaged in efforts to improve principal preparation and development that began with the Illinois Commission on School Leader Preparation (2006), which led to recommendations made by the Illinois School Leader Taskforce (2008), and culminated into Illinois Public Act 096-0903.

IL P.A. 096-0903 was enacted in 2010 and reformed the way principals were recruited, prepared and credentialed throughout the state. The new Act mandated that all programs seeking to prepare principals apply for state approval under the new requirements. It also eliminated Type 75 General Administrative programs that had largely been shown to be ineffective in preparing

¹ Bryk, Sebring, Allensworth, Luppescu, & Easton, 2010; Grissom, Kalogrides, & Loeb, 2015; Leithwood, Seashore Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Lewis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010; Moore 1995; Spillane, 2006; Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003.

² Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2013; Clifford, Behrstock-Sherrat & Feters, 2012; Darling-Hammond, Meyerson, Orr & Cohen, 2007; Marzano, Waters & McNulty, 2005; Murphy, Elliott, Goldring & Porter, 2006; Seashore-Lewis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom & Anderson, 2010

³ Manna, 2015, p. 7

⁴ Recognized for bold policy initiatives involving principal preparation and development, Illinois was nominated by the National Conference of State Legislators and selected by the Education Commission of the States as the recipient of the 2014 Newman Award for State Policy Innovation.

principals for today's schools⁵. That change was crucial in setting the stage for programs to redesign their new programs with a targeted focus on the specific knowledge, skills and abilities necessary for candidates to become effective principals and assistant principals.

CHALLENGES TO DETERMING THE IMPACT OF IL P.A. 096-0903

In 2012, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) began accepting applications for approval from principal preparation programs under the new regulations. Since then, education officials from around the state have been eager to understand how the changes brought on by IL P.A. 096-0903 have affected the supply of qualified school leaders in Illinois. Unfortunately, no statewide repository exists that provides all data necessary to accurately describe or predict supply and demand figures for school leaders. The reliability and validity of data available from a variety of sources are questionable due to a number of reasons. For example, because the Type 75 certificate qualified candidates for a wide variety of roles, it cannot accurately be used to define a pool of candidates for principal positions. Therefore it is virtually impossible to determine a baseline of the supply of potential principals available prior to the policy change.

Because data are unclear in terms of the impact on the pipeline of principals and assistant principals in Illinois, it would be premature to make any revisions to the new regulations. The state should consider implementing three key strategies prior to making any further changes to the regulations governing principal preparation: 1) develop a longitudinal data system that collects and stores a wide variety of metrics that can more accurately inform supply and demand studies and support the development of a strong pipeline of effective principals; 2) identify regional differences in supply and demand and ensure equitable distribution of resources to support an adequate pipeline of school leaders for every district in the state; and 3) support district level implementation of effective talent management practices, such as developing a clear leadership vacancy strategy and improving recruitment, selection, training, and retention of principals and assistant principals. These three key strategies are essential for the state to determine a clear picture of supply and demand, but more importantly, to ensure our schools are led by effective principals capable of improving student outcomes.

EMERGING DATA INDICATING IMPACT OF NEW REGULATIONS ON PRINCIPAL SUPPLY AND DEMAND

While there are a number of concerns about the reliability and validity of data available to inform a supply and demand study of principals and assistant principals, that does not mean data currently available can or should be ignored entirely. A number of organizations have stepped forward to collect and distribute data involving enrollment, principal vacancies, licenses, etc. What follows is an attempt to weave disparate measures and data from various sources into a coherent picture of the current supply and demand for principals and assistant principals in Illinois. To be clear, data included in tables below are incomplete and as such limit the ability to

⁵ Illinois Commission on School Leader Preparation, 2006. The intentionally broad design of the old programs was not specific to training principals and assistant principals, but rather a wide variety of administrative positions. IL P.A. 096-0903 intentionally narrowed the focus from preparation that led to a Type 75 General Administrative certificate to a narrow focus on the specific skills, knowledge and competencies required of a school principal. This was a significant change as the Type 75 certificate was previously used to qualify educators for other positions such as department chair, athletic director, special education director, etc.

establish clear findings. However, the tables and descriptions included below drive home the need for improvements to the state’s data system in order for it to more accurately define changes over time to supply and demand.

FY15 SUPPLY AND DEMAND DATA

While the new state regulations governing principal preparation terminated all Type 75 General Administrative programs, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) preserved the rights of those holding Type 75 certificates to serve as school principals, or other administrative positions determined by the districts. Therefore, the total pool of qualified applicants for a current principalship in Illinois includes all educators that hold current and valid Type 75 certificates and those with a Principal Endorsement.

Listed in Table 1 are supply and demand data from FY15. The total number of principal positions and the average number of principal vacancies between 2012-2015 were reported to the Illinois School Leader Advisory Council (ISLAC) by Regional Offices of Education (ROE), Intermediate Service Centers (ISC), and the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) in January 2015.⁶ Additionally, the total number of Type 75 certificate holders was provided by ISBE as of January 30, 2015, and the total number of educators with Principal Endorsements was collected by the Illinois Association of School Boards (IASB) in collaboration with the Illinois Council of Professors of Educational Administration (ICPEA), as of December 2015. The reliability of data included in Table 1 is uncertain.

Table 1. Supply and Demand for Principals in Illinois

Illinois Data on School Administrators for FY15	
Total Number of Principal Position in Illinois	2,961
Average Number of Principal Vacancies in Illinois FY12-FY14	412
Total Number of Registered Type 75-Gen. Administrative Certificates	43,728
Total Number of Educators with Principal Endorsements	479
<i>Current Supply (including sitting principals)</i>	<i>44,207</i>
<i>Average Annual Demand</i>	<i>412</i>

Data outlined in Table 1 suggest that from a statewide perspective, there appears to be a more than adequate supply of qualified candidates to fill annual principal vacancies. However, because the Type 75 prepared candidates for a wide variety of roles, it is unclear how many of those educators have any desire to serve as a principal. Additionally, regional differences could cause some districts to experience shortages. In an effort to identify regional differences, Table 2 below includes the distribution of Type 75 holders as reported to ISLAC by the ROEs, ISCs, and CPS in January 2015.⁷

⁶ The DuPage ROE collected data in Table 2 for ISLAC. While the response rate was quite high at 94%, a number of ROEs indicated their data were incomplete. Additionally, the total number of principal positions in Chicago does not include charter, contract, or alternative learning opportunity programs (ALOP).

⁷ For a small number of ROEs with incomplete data, it was unclear whether they were reporting that they had no Type 75 licenses registered in their region, or if the data were incomplete. Therefore, in those instances --- was reported to reflect an uncertainty about those data. Additionally, no data on Type 75 holders in Table 2 below were included for the Chicago Public Schools, due to concerns that their system may not have reliability isolated some that should not have been included (e.g. displaced employees, recent retirees, temporary workers, licenses that were not current, etc.)

Table 2. Number of Registered Type 75 Holders vs. Principal Positions in Illinois

ROE/ISC/ CPS	Region	Registered Type 75s	Principal Positions	Net
ROE	1	75	35	+40
ROE	3	---	41	n/a
ROE	8	275	38	+237
ROE	9	303	---	n/a
ROE	10	114	26	+88
ROE	11	---	66	n/a
ROE	12	147	34	+113
ROE	13	---	49	n/a
ROE	17	19	---	n/a
ROE	19	1488	214	+1274
ROE	21	320	39	+281
ROE	22	37	18	+19
ROE	24	65	23	+42
ROE	24	378	38	+340
ROE	25	250	14	+236
ROE	26	45	27	+18
ROE	27	---	17	n/a
ROE	28	---	38	n/a
ROE	30	127	---	n/a
ROE	31	---	162	n/a
ROE	32	---	---	n/a
ROE	34	1859	217	+1642
ROE	35	---	46	n/a
ROE/ISC/ CPS	Region	Registered Type 75s	Principal Positions	Net
ROE	38	---	26	n/a
ROE	39	440	54	+386
ROE	40	180	---	n/a
ROE	41	513	81	+432
ROE	43	49	35	+14
ROE	44	619	79	+540
ROE	45	284	24	+260
ROE	46	70	31	+39
ROE	47	68	36	+32
ROE	48	342	67	+275
ROE	49	---	55	n/a
ROE	50	543	79	+464
ROE	51	378	57	+321
ROE	53	166	43	+123
ROE	54	173	39	+134
ROE	55	70	26	+44
ROE	56	3617	165	+3452
ISC	N Cook	781	125	+656
ROE	Kids	7	---	n/a
ISC	S Cook	---	130	n/a
ISC	W Sub	124	146	-22
Chicago	Dist. 299	---	521	n/a
TOTAL:		13,926	2,961	+10,965

Data in Table 2 above demonstrate that some ROE regions may have an abundance of Type 75 holders relative to principal positions while others do not. Data from Table 2 provide a reference for policymakers, preparation programs, and districts in terms of targeted capacity building efforts.

PRINCIPAL PREPARATION PROGRAMS APPROVED UNDER NEW REGULATIONS

In addition to the number of current and valid Type 75 holders, the principal pipeline is also affected by enrollment in new Principal Endorsement programs. Table 3 includes a list of the programs that have been approved to provide preparation for a Principal Endorsement.

Table 3. Illinois Approved Principal Preparation Programs⁸

Program	Approval	Program	Approval Date
Aurora University	10/5/12	New Leaders – Chicago	6/19/12
Benedictine University	9/15	Northern Illinois University	8/2/13
Bradley University	5/3/13	North Central College	5/31/12
Chicago State University	5/3/13	North Park University	4/5/13
Concordia University	5/10/12	Northeastern Illinois	9/7/12
DePaul University	9/7/12	Roosevelt University	6/15
Dominican University	4/5/13	Saint Xavier	12/7/12
Eastern Illinois University	6/25/12	Southern Illinois University - Carbondale	6/7/13
Governor's State University	10/5/12	Southern Illinois University -	4/13/12
Illinois State University	9/7/12	University of Illinois - Chicago	12/7/12
Lewis University	9/7/12	University of Illinois - Springfield	9/7/12
Loyola University	9/7/12	University of Illinois - Urbana-	10/5/12
McKendree University	4/13/12	University of St. Francis	5/31/12
National Louis University	6/26/12	Western Illinois University	9/7/12

Prior to the enactment of the 2010 revised statute and rules, there were 31 programs providing preparation leading to the Type 75 – General Administrative certificate. According to ISBE, as of February 2016, 28 principal preparation programs have been approved by the state.

CURRENT ENROLLMENT IN ILLINOIS PRINCIPAL PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Table 4 below provides enrollment and graduation data collected by IASB and ICPEA. Data included in Table 4 were self-reported by the preparation programs in December of 2015. While the response rate was high, data are incomplete for four of the approved programs, which support the need for a single longitudinal data system that collects and stores timely and accurate data on principal supply and demand.

Table 4. Enrollment and Graduation from Programs Since Policy Changes Were Enacted

Principal Endorsement Program	Enrollment as of 12/2015	Principal Endorsements Produced as of 12/2015	Principal Endorsement Program	Enrollment as of 12/2015	Principal Endorsements Produced as of 2/2015
Aurora University	78	7	North Central College	50	11
Benedictine University	n/a	n/a	North Park University	9	0
Bradley University	20	4	Northeastern Illinois University	140	29
Chicago State University	30	6	Northern Illinois University	51	10
Concordia University Chicago	200	80	Roosevelt University	20	0
DePaul University	51	3	Saint Xavier University	8	4
Dominican University	23	10	SIU – Carbondale	12	0
Eastern Illinois University	n/a	n/a	SIU - Edwardsville	92	13
Governors State University	n/a	n/a	University of Illinois	53	2
Illinois State University	29	0	University of Illinois-Chicago	17	29
Lewis University	16	0	University of Illinois-Springfield	55	0
Loyola University	13	n/a	University of St. Francis	71	9
McKendree University	71	6	Western Illinois University	91	10
National Louis University	76	0	TOTAL	1,293	310
New Leaders - Chicago	17	77			

⁸ Data provided by ISBE January 2015, and updated according to ISBE Directory of Programs, February 2016.

IASB and ICPEA collect data annually from principal preparation programs to monitor enrollments. The total enrollment the previous year (December 2014) was 694. That number nearly doubled by December 2015, to 1,293. The increase was likely due to natural progression as programs moved from the initial implementation phase to a continuous improvement phase that included an increased focus on recruitment by university preparation faculty in partnership with districts. Data in Tables 3 and 4 indicate that while many programs have only completed two full years of implementation, they are producing what appears to be a sufficient number of graduates for the statewide pipeline, which averages just over 400 principal vacancies each year. Yet, as Table 2 illustrated an uneven geographic distribution of Type 75 holders, the same pattern may hold for Principal Endorsement holders that could create challenges in some areas of the state.

DEVELOPING A LEADERSHIP PIPELINE FOR SUCCESSION PLANNING

Different than the old Type 75 General Administrative programs, which attracted candidates who may or may not have been interested in pursuing a principalship, the rigorous selection process for new Principal Endorsement programs results in the admission of candidates interested in pursuing a principal or assistant principal positions. This allows districts to better predict the real leadership pool that they can access from preparation programs. Also, the new regulations mandated that principal preparation programs formally partner with at least one district in the design, delivery, and improvement of the program. Thus, the new regulations have created conditions that encourage districts to work in partnership with their local principal preparation program to develop a leadership pipeline that meets their specific needs.

The new Principal Endorsement, targeted specifically at preparing principals and assistant principals, affords districts the opportunity collaborate with preparation programs on their leadership vacancy strategy by developing a principal and assistant principal pipeline aligned to the district's projected needs. This is especially relevant for rural school districts that may struggle to recruit veteran out of area educators to fill leadership positions, and often rely on recruiting principal candidates from their current teaching staff. Targeted recruitment strategies can also prove to be a crucial element of the district's efforts in recruiting and retaining a more diverse leadership pool that reflects the changing demographics of students in Illinois schools.

District officials and current school leaders play an important role in encouraging teachers with leadership potential to apply to Principal Endorsement programs. That is a role that they may not have played with the old Type 75 programs when enrollments were larger due to the more general and less selective nature of the programs. Since the old Type 75 certificate was tied to a degree program, it also qualified educators to move up the salary schedule, regardless of whether or not they ever sought an administrative role. As a result, Type 75 programs typically had younger and much larger enrollments than just those aspiring to principal or assistant principal positions.

Correspondingly, principal preparation programs must increase their efforts toward working with districts, school administrators, and local teacher unions to identify high potential teachers that show the desire and capability to be strong instructional leaders. Efforts by principal preparation programs and those in the field must also include targeted recruitment of a pool of diverse educators that more closely reflect the changing demographics of students throughout Illinois.

Being proactive in this effort, districts such as Chicago District 299, Naperville District 203, and Springfield District 186 have implemented tracking systems that project upcoming vacancies and assure there is a qualified pool of principal and assistant principal candidates to meet anticipated needs. Districts also have gone so far as to implement policies that require teachers and administrators to report projected vacancies a number of years out in advance to allow the district to anticipate and plan for a specific number of vacancies during that time period. With the average principal endorsement program spanning 2-2 ½ years in duration; strategies such as those employed by Chicago, Naperville, and Springfield afford districts the time to plan for upcoming vacancies by encouraging high potential teachers to enter principal preparation programs in anticipation of specific job openings. These types of strategies could benefit all districts, but particularly rural districts that would benefit from growing their own principals.

Lastly, legislation passed in 2011 (P.A. 097-0607) created a new Teacher Leadership Endorsement. New Teacher Leadership programs have been designed by a number of universities throughout the state. These new programs are designed for teachers who want to pursue additional leadership training and responsibilities, but still want to remain in an instructional role. While their goal at the onset may not be to pursue a principalship, districts and principal preparation programs should not disregard the growing pool of teacher leaders that may be future candidates for principal endorsement programs. Districts would also benefit from exploring best practices for grooming teacher leaders and assistant principals for principal positions. In anticipation of this, some universities articulate their teacher leadership courses into the principal endorsement program. This design element results in expediting the amount of time it takes a candidate with a Teacher Leadership Endorsement to complete a Principal Endorsement program. In addition to monitoring the Principal Endorsement enrollment and completion rates, IASB and ICPEA have been collecting data on Teachers Leadership Endorsement programs.

MAJOR CHALLENGES TO UNDERSTANDING THE IMPACT OF POLICY CHANGES ON THE SUPPLY AND DEMAND OF PRINCIPALS IN ILLINOIS

While the responsibility for creating a sufficient supply of principal candidates to meet local demands lies primarily with universities and districts, there is also a responsibility at the state level to reliably collect state, regional, and local data that can inform research on the principal pipeline and program impact. As indicated in Tables 1 and 2 of this white paper, data sources and collection methods vary greatly among organizations reporting this information. **There currently exists no single repository for data necessary to adequately inform a report on the supply and demand of principals in Illinois.** Additionally, there are numerous other challenges in collecting the data necessary to accurately identify supply and demand. Table 5 below outlines some specific challenges faced by the state's current system.

Table 5. Challenges to Identifying Supply and Demand of Principals in Illinois

Challenges to Identifying the Supply	Challenges to Identifying the Demand
<p>Because the Type 75 was originally designed to qualify candidates for a wide variety of roles and many who hold the certificate claim they have no desire to seek a principalship, it is impossible to accurately determine a baseline for before and after comparison purposes between the old Type 75 and the new Principal Endorsement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is difficult to tell how many current Type 75 holders are actively seeking or plan to pursue a principalship. 	<p>The reliance on anecdotal evidence by districts and universities regarding the pipeline is problematic since ISBE does not have a reliable mechanism for recording or projecting principal vacancies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts vary in terms of what criteria, if any, they use to project future vacancies. • No data are systematically collected to determine the number of qualified applicants each principal opening produces. • No data are collected to explore efforts by districts to recruit, support, and retain school leaders
<p>The reliance on self-reported numbers from universities and districts, sometimes collected by a third party, increases threats to validity and reliability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISBE’s system is populated with self-reported data from districts and preparation programs. • The reliability of ISBE’s data is dependent upon data interpretation and input by districts or programs. • ISBE’s system does not always interface well with other systems, data are often incomplete or with errors. 	<p>The retirement systems (TRS and CTPF) calculate years of service in a significantly different manner than does ISBE, meaning any attempt by ISBE to project principal vacancies based on years of service, as calculated by ISBE’s data system, may be unreliable.</p>
<p>ISBE’s system does not currently interface with the Illinois Teachers’ Retirement System or the Chicago Teachers’ Pension Fund, therefore it is difficult to identify those with valid licenses who have retired.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The total number of Type 75s reported by ISBE includes an unknown number of valid/current licenses for retired persons or who are in process of retiring. Some administrators keep their license current to do consulting work, provide clinical supervision in university programs, etc. 	<p>Through the over-reliance on self-reported data from universities and districts, ISBE’s system is populated with self-reported data from districts and preparation programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reliability of ISBE’s data is dependent upon the reliability of the district or program data. ISBE’s system does not always interface well with other systems and therefore data are often incomplete and some districts and/or programs that routinely have errors.
<p>It is difficult to determine the degree of impact to the pipeline the current environment has had on it⁹ (e.g., the extent to which the job has become undesirable).</p>	
<p>ISBE’s system cannot reliably identify all those who possess a Type 75 and are currently working in a leadership position that requires that certification¹⁰</p>	

The challenges outlined above provide a clear case for the state to develop a well-designed multi-purpose longitudinal data system that not only tracks indicators of program impact, but also provides valid and reliable data that can be used to more clearly define school leadership supply and demand trends in Illinois.

⁹ e.g. The closing gap between teacher or assistant principal and principal salaries; the ever-increasing expectations place on the principal; the often conflicting policy mandates they are forced to juggle, the constant crisis mode brought on by ongoing fiscal instability at the state level, etc.

¹⁰ e.g. District Administrators, Athletic Directors, Department Chairs, Deans of Students, etc.

ISLAC RECOMMENDATIONS ON IMPROVEMENTS TO DATA COLLECTION

To address policy questions strategically and accurately, it is crucial that the state develop valid and reliable measures and systems of data collection. In September 2014, ISBE and IBHE convened a group of stakeholders from across the state for the express purpose of exploring the impact of the 2010 policy change to principal preparation and to gain a better understanding of the challenges and opportunities the new programs were facing. Through funding from The Wallace Foundation and McCormick Foundation, ISLAC was charged with developing a 5-year strategic plan to support and sustain a high-quality school leader pipeline throughout the entire state.¹¹ ISLAC hosted six statewide meetings between September 2014 and June 2015.

In their final report, ISLAC recommended that the state establish a data sharing system among state agencies (ISBE & IBHE), principal preparation programs, school districts and ROE. The Commission also recommended that districts be required to report annually to ISBE a limited set of data providing evidence of district partnerships with principal preparation providers, as well as provide the state with disaggregated data on their school leaders' performance evaluations covered under the Illinois Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA). In addition, ISLAC recommended that ISBE shall serve as a repository for data collected from preparation programs, districts and/or regional offices of education and will provide access to each on a range of metrics and will provide access to partners so that they can track outcomes beyond program completion. Recommended metrics to be collected by the state include:

1. Total number of candidates currently enrolled in the program (including percentage of racial and gender minorities)
2. Total number of graduates that year (July 1- June 30) (including percentage of racial and gender minorities)
3. Total number of candidates that year that attempted the principal endorsement exam (including percentage of racial and gender minorities)
4. Total number of candidates that year that passed the principal endorsement exam (including percentage of racial and gender minorities)
5. Total number of principal endorsement program graduates that year that earned Principal Endorsements (including percentage of racial and gender minorities)
6. Total number of principal endorsement program graduates that obtain principal positions in 1, 2, and 3 years beyond completion of principal prep program, since inception as a principal endorsement program (including percentage of racial and gender minorities)
7. Percentage of principal endorsement graduates in principal or assistant principal (AP) positions that have been rated in each of the 4 performance categories on evaluations that comply with PERA (including percentage of racial and gender minorities)
8. Percentage of principal endorsement program graduates in principal or AP positions who lead schools that demonstrate positive, flat, or negative student growth, as defined in PERA (including percentage of racial and gender minorities)
9. Percentage of principal endorsement graduates in principal or AP positions that demonstrate positive, neutral, or negative impact based on a state mandated school climate and culture survey (including percentage of racial and gender minorities)
10. Principals who completed principal endorsement programs and are promoted to district/regional leadership positions (including percentage of racial and gender minorities)

¹¹ ISLAC, 2016

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING TEACHER LEADERSHIP AS IT RELATES TO THE PRINCIPAL PIPELINE

By holding programs accountable for not only the enrollment of candidates, but also the number of candidates that are hired and how they are performing as principals and assistant principals, districts can be assured that preparation programs are recruiting and admitting candidates that want to serve as leaders and have the knowledge, skills, and abilities to be effective.

Additionally, the state might also consider tracking the number of Teacher Leaders across the state as a way of developing a better understanding of the bench for potential principal and assistant principal positions after they complete further training. Some data questions that might be considered regarding teacher leadership include:

1. How many teachers hold the Teacher Leadership Endorsement?
2. How many universities/programs have Teacher Leadership Endorsement programs or emerging leader programs¹²?
3. What are the incentives for teachers to receive the endorsement?
 - a. What are some of the most effective incentives?
4. How many teachers with the teacher leadership endorsement ultimately pursue the principal endorsement?
5. How many principals and assistant principals previously held Teacher Leader Endorsements?

RECOMMENDATION FOR FUNDING A NEW LONGITUDINAL DATA SYSTEM FOR IMPROVEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY PURPOSES

The passage of the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) has the potential to create new opportunities for innovation and improvement in the area of principal preparation and development. With the enactment of ESSA, ISBE is able to receive up to 5% of the total annual Title II allocation to Illinois.¹³ This represents a 2.5% increase compared to the funding formula established for Title II under No Child Left Behind (NCLB).

ISLAC recommendations outlined in the final report fortuitously align directly to the new requirements found in Title II of ESSA. Many of the regulations under Title II mirror the requirements found in the Illinois statute and rules governing principal preparation, so Illinois is well positioned to acquire Title II ESSA funding without having to make additional policy changes. ESSA also includes a provision that allows an additional 3% of the total amount reserved for sub-grants to be used by the state agency for allowable activities involving principals.¹⁴ These changes could result in a net increase in funding to support principal preparation and development. That means that if Illinois were to receive level funding under

¹² The Emerging Leader Program is offered by New Leaders, Chicago

¹³ ESSA – Title II - Section 2101 – c (1) and NCLB – Title II – Section 2113 – a (3)

¹⁴ ESSA – Title II - Section 2101 – c (3)

Title II in FY17¹⁵, up to **an additional \$8.56 million in Title II funds could be allocated by the state to support improvements to leadership preparation and development.**¹⁶ In addition to the recommendations from ISLAC, ISBE might also explore how ESSA funding could be used to support the recruitment of a more diverse principal pipeline as well as address any actual principal shortages in rural regions of the state.

Conclusion

Despite the large number of educators that hold Type 75 General Administration certificates and the growing number of candidates enrolling in and completing Principal Endorsement programs, there is still a concern that districts may experience shortages and struggle to fill critical school leadership positions due to the policy changes involving principal preparation and licensure. Yet, going back to the old way of preparing general administrators is not the solution, as the majority of Type 75 certificate holders did not and are not seeking out principal positions. Instead, a solution to combat potential shortages for principal positions must include a systemic approach that takes into consideration the roles and responsibilities that universities, districts, state and regional policymakers play.

In Illinois, where the groundwork has been laid to support on-going improvements to already strong principal preparation and development policies and programs, the timing of the enactment of ESSA appears to be ideal. The revisions to federal policy reflected in ESSA suggest that at last federal policy makers are beginning to create the conditions that will support the needs of school principals. It is crucial at this juncture that Illinois invest in robust data systems that inform policy formation and refinements. Given the numerous challenges to determining the impact of the policy change to principal preparation on the pipeline of school leaders in Illinois, it is essential that policymakers provide universities and districts with valid and reliable data to help them with making the best decisions for recruiting and retaining effective school leaders. The alignment between the Illinois policy on principal preparation and the new ESSA program regulations and funding formula make this the perfect time for the state to seize this window of opportunity to support the principal effectiveness work that stakeholders across Illinois have been engaged in for more than a decade.

¹⁵ The new regulations will gradually increase the poverty factor and decrease the population factor for state funding from the current 65/35 ratio to 80/20 beginning with FY20. ESSA phases in the new formula for Title II gradually, so there aren't any sudden or drastic shifts. While some have anticipated that the proportional share to Illinois will ultimately decrease over time with the new funding formula, that will be determined by population and poverty rates beginning after FY20. According to calculations to a report from the Congressional Research Service, downloaded from: <https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/2644885/ESEA-Title-II-a-State-Grants-Under-Pre.pdf>

¹⁶ ISBE FY16 budget downloaded from <http://www.isbe.net/budget/fy16/FY16-budget-book.pdf>. Additional funding calculations based on the following assumptions: FY16 Title II allocation to ISBE = \$160M. An increase of 2.5% of the total = \$4M and 3% set aside from the 95% of the total allocated to LEAs = \$4.56M. Assuming that both the additional 2.5% SEA allocation and the 3% set aside for leadership were both allocated to support leadership preparation and development efforts, the increase would \$8.56M.

REFERENCE LIST

- Branch, G., Hanushek, E. A., & Rivkin, S. G. (2013). School leaders matter. *Education Next*, 13(2), 62-69.
- Bryk, A., Sebring, P., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S. & Easton, J. (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Burkhauser, S., Gates, S. M., Hamilton, L. S., & Ikemoto, G. S. (2012). *First-year principals in urban school districts: How actions and working conditions relate to outcomes*. Technical Report. Rand Corporation.
- Clifford, M., Behrstock-Sherrat, E. & Fetters, J. (2012). *The ripple effect: A synthesis of research on principal influence to inform performance evaluation design*. Washington, D.C.: American Institutes for Research.
- Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., Meyerson, D., Orr, M. T., & Cohen, C. (2007). *Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Lessons from exemplary leadership development programs*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership.
- Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L. (2012) Innovative principal preparation programs: What works and how we know. *Planning and Changing* 43 (1/2), 25-45.
- Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015. 20 U.S.C.A. § 6301
- Grissom, J.A., Kalogrides, D., & Loeb, S. (2015). Using student test scores to measure principal performance.” *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 37 (1), 3-28.
- Illinois Public Act 096-0903. Administrative Certificates.
- Illinois School Leader Advisory Council (2016, March). *Final report and recommendations*. Presented to the Illinois State Board of Education and the Illinois Board of Higher Education.
- Illinois School Leader Task Force. (2008). *Report to the Illinois General Assembly*. Retrieved from <http://www.ibhe.org/SchoolLeadership/FinalReport.pdf>
- Illinois State Board of Education. (2015). *Budget Book FY16*. Springfield, IL.
- Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K, Anderson, S. & Wahlstrom, K. (2004) *How leadership influences student learning*. Toronto, Ontario: Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement and Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Lewis, K., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K. & Anderson, S. (2010). *Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings*. Minneapolis and Toronto: Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Manna, P. (2015). *Developing excellent school principals to advance teaching and learning: Considerations for state policy*. New York: The Wallace Foundation, 2015.
- Marzano, R., Waters, t., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Moore, M. (1995). *Creating public value: Strategic management in government*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Murphy, J, Elliott, S., Goldring, E. & Porter, A. (2006). *Learning-centered leadership: A conceptual foundation*. New York: The Wallace Foundation.
- No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. 20 U.S.C.A. § 6301
- Orr, M. T., King, C., & LaPointe, M. (2010). Districts developing leaders: Lessons on consumer actions and program approaches from eight urban districts. *Education Development Center*.
- Seashore Louis, K., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K., & Anderson, S. (2010). *Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement.
- Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Waters, T., Marzano, R.J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning.