

Principal Preparation Project

Questions from discussion arising during May 8, 2017 Presentation to the Regents

At the May Board of Regents meeting the Department provided an update on the work of the Principal Preparation Project and the Advisory Committee. During the presentation, members of the Board of Regents raised several topics/issues, and we would like to have the Advisory Team provide their thoughts on these topics and issues.

1. If NYS adopts *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders*, what will it mean for those who supervise principals?
2. What is the reaction of the Advisory Team to the reality that unfortunately occurs in some schools; that is, when it comes to arranging a clinical experience, too many programs leave it to the school building leader candidate to find the match with a site for an internship and/or to find an individual who agrees to serve as a mentor?
3. What thought has the Advisory Team given to the prerequisites that NYS now requires for those seeking School Building Leader certification; in particular, while the State requires three years of classroom teaching experience or pupil personnel services, is that viewed as sufficient or adequate?
4. As the Advisory Team considers revisions to standards for principal preparation, has there been any conversation about the role of love and care for students? More specifically, where and how does love enter the discussion about standards for principal preparation?
5. With respect to the belief titled "Valuing Diversity", do members of the Advisory Team understand and appreciate that there is a difference between tolerating diversity and seeing diversity as an asset?

Note: The question raises an important point. Within PSEL standard 3 it states that effective school building leaders "ensure equity and cultural responsiveness for each student by encouraging the perception that student diversity is an asset for teaching and learning."

6. With regard to "Valuing Diversity", how could/should local board members play a role in setting tone and expectation?
7. Does the Advisory Team plan to suggest that university programs to prepare school building leaders should set out to recruit more diverse leader candidates?
8. How has the Advisory Team come to grips with the reality that school building leader candidates earn the SBL certificate but then head off to become leaders in school settings that are widely different? For instance, some go on to serve in urban high schools and others find themselves in rural elementary schools. Some work in turnaround schools and others in school districts specializing in special education or in schools focused on early childhood. Some work with students who are mostly English language learners.

Note: This question generated an ongoing discussion about the need for specialized preparation. The High Concept Paper that was submitted to the ESSA Think Tank on behalf of the Advisory Team does address this point. It states, "Adapt preparation to account for varied setting (rural vs urban), level (elementary vs secondary), age (early childhood), school type (Title I vs non-Title I), student need (those with disabilities, English learners, gifted & talented), or school focus (STEM, Career Tech, etc.)." The P12-Higher Education Partnership breakout group has formulated a recommendation that states, "Consider an annotation to the SBL certificate for the principalship." How would the Advisory Team members recommend that an annotation system be developed? What would be required to obtain the annotation?

9. When we talk about "competency-based", do we fully appreciate that the competencies required of different types of school leaders vary considerably? I ask because as anesthesiologist, I recognize that what is required for brain surgery differs from what is required for foot surgery. Shouldn't competency based approaches in terms of school building leadership take account of this too?
10. Often consensus decisions leave behind important points that ought to be part of the conversation but because they didn't gain support from everyone, they are swept away and don't move forward. We would like to know from the Advisory Team what they believe are the issues that have not gained consensus support but we need to be aware of nonetheless?
11. What timeline does the Advisory Team suggest concerning implementation of recommendations the Regents adopt?