

PRINCIPAL PROJECT ADVISORY TEAM MEETING IN A BOX

Breakout Group Title: P12-Higher Education Partnership

Leader: David Flatley

Members: David Babician, Hazel Carter, David Cantaffa, Annette Roman, John Blowers, John D'Agati

Purpose: Enhance the productivity of and healthy interdependency of the P12-Higher Education Partnership.

Resources: Below are items that may be helpful to your group. Each appears with a short description.

1. *Improving University Principal Preparation Programs: Five Themes from the Field*
P. Mendels, ed., with AACTE, AASA, UCEA
<http://www.nysed.gov/common/nysed/files/file-2-improving-university-principal-preparaion-2016.pdf>

Documents pervasive view that principal preparation programming can and should be improved nationwide. Describes how demands on principals are changing and preparation programs must stay abreast of these changes. Expectations of principals (required for certification) must take environmental changes into account and need to keep pace so program graduates are actually prepared for the demands of the job. States play a key role in creating the ecosystem within which these changes take place. The partnership between universities and school districts is a necessary and important link in the certification chain. This is especially true as interest rises nationally in competency-based approaches to principal preparation.

2. *The Principal Internship: How Do We Get it Right? 2005*
(Southern Regional Education Board (SREB))
http://publications.sreb.org/2005/05V02_Principal_Internship.pdf

This study of educational leadership degree programs in the southern region of Illinois describes the need for (but a paucity of) purposeful “hands on” experiences. This document was assembled by Illinois for the purpose of providing guidance with respect to internships for aspiring school building leaders. The authors outline an approach that is designed to prepare aspiring principals to lead the essential work of school improvement and higher student achievement prior to being placed at the helm of a school. Leadership is learned through studying the key concepts and skills used by effective leaders, observing good models, as well as by one’s own trial and error in the workplace. Graduates of principal preparation programs consistently report that their most significant learning occurred during their internship experience. At the same time, many of these graduates say the internship experience was the component of their preparation program most in need of expansion and improvement. Although it is somewhat dated, it does provide a helpful way for Advisory Team members to think about how field experiences should reflect and be linked to standards-based instruction that takes place within university classrooms during principal preparation

3. *High-Concept Paper on "State Support for Development of School Building Leadership"*
New York State Education Department

NYSED may elect to include this in its plan to respond to ESSA requirements:

- Repurpose fed funds (2% of state Title IIA allocation) SED now uses for overhead
- To deploy leadership academies like in NYC (LEAP/Baruch) & Buffalo (LIFTS/UBuff)
- And tie in expertise of regional BOCES so NYS has way to scale this throughout NYS
- So teacher leaders who are aspiring principals tap resources/mentors/programming
- And more candidates apply learning in full-time, year-long, job-embedded internship
- And more exit programs having shown they can improve teaching/learning in schools

Note. In this context, the term LEAP means for "Leaders in Education Apprenticeship Program" and LIFTS means "Leadership Initiative for Tomorrow's Schools"

4. *Seeking Mutual Benefit: University and Districts as Partners in Preparation, 2013*
(Portland State University; Amy Daggett Petti)
http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1082&context=edu_fac

This reports findings from a qualitative study that employed case study research methods to examine a newly-formed university-district-teacher union partnership and document how the partnerships benefit students. Findings show perceived mutual benefits. These included benefits for the school partner. Somewhat unexpectedly, benefits affected tenured teachers, their principals, as well as university-district liaisons.

5. *Planning University-Urban Partnerships: Implications for Principal Prep Programs 2011*
(Journal on Educational Planning v20 no. 2; Mark A Gooden, Christian M. Bell, Richard M. Gonzales and Amy P. Lipka)
http://isep.info/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/20_2_1PlanningUniversity.pdf

Recent research supports creating university/district partnerships as part of a solution to address rising demands to improve the effectiveness of principal preparation programs. This study suggests partnership can beneficially increase the number of effective leaders prepared to work in urban schools. Findings from this work describe success as well as some potential pitfalls for those seeking to establish university-urban partnerships. Recommendations are offered for those interested in exploring university/district partnerships.

6. *A School-University Partnership in Administrator Preparation 2014*
(Journal of Educational Leadership and Administration, v16 p47-59; Margaret R. Basom & Diane M. Yerkes)
<http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ794959.pdf>

School-University partnerships have become an important aspect of reform efforts dedicated to developing the next generation of school leaders. This study examines one university's approach to working with school districts as partners in the development of school leaders. Findings include benefits and concerns from the perspective of students, faculty and adjunct instructors.

7. *PowerPoint of Illinois Partners Advancing Rigorous Training: Delivering High-Quality Principal Preparation and Development Through Deep University/District Partnerships 2016*
(Illinois State University, Guy Banicki, Kathy Black, Kathleen King)

This presentation was assembled by the Center for the Study of Education Policy. It is meant to provide information on how to develop district/university partnerships. Funded by a grant to the center (by the American Institute for Research) this presentation includes a theory of action. This presentation offers examples showing how to stage a deep district/university connection. It offers timelines, results, and impact reports.

I. Generic Questions – Suitable for All Breakout Groups

A. Context

1. Do we agree with the topic description for our breakout group and its associated belief statement?
2. To spark creativity, do we agree to refrain from evaluating ideas as they surface (and evaluate later)?

B. Possibilities

1. What is the universe of possible ideas that might form the basis of a recommendation in our area?
2. When it comes to possible changes that we might recommend in the area of our topic:
 - What is the loftiest aspiration we have with respect to a recommendation in this area?
 - What is our minimal expectation with respect to a recommendation in this area?

C. Challenges

1. As we think about improvements in this area, what factors could potentially become obstacles?

D. Narrowing

1. How do we evaluate the viability of recommendations we produce? (see notebook section 2)
2. Of the recommendation possibilities we identify, which 3 have the best potential for positive impact?

E. Implications

1. Of all the recommendation possibilities we generate, which will require a change in regulation/policy?
2. What guidance can/should we offer with respect to implementation of recommendations we make?
3. When we make a recommendation in this area, what questions will then arise (examples follow)?
 - As implementation occurs, what are good ways to monitor and assure consistency and quality?
 - What “stakes” are involved for individuals and organizations that are affected?
 - How much latitude exists (or should) when time comes to implement recommended changes?
 - Will a recommendation in our area need to connect with recommendations in other areas (how)?

II. Topic-Specific Questions

A. Breakout Group Topic: P12/University Partnerships (facilitator, David Flatley)

1. When it comes to principal prep, what is now lacking in the partnership between P12 and universities?
2. When it comes to principal prep, what obstacles impede a healthier P12/University partnership?
3. After all the relevant factors are considered, if there is a root-cause (for the shortfall), what is it?
4. When it comes to principal prep, how do universities & districts benefit from a healthier partnership?
5. How would a tighter/better partnership between P12 & HE improve the principal certification process?
6. How might districts and universities better share decision making that leads to certification?
7. How important is it for mentors/superintendents/IHEs to hold candidates to the same expectation?
8. How do mentors and superintendents decide if a candidate has demonstrated the abilities to lead?
9. What happens when a candidate does not have the abilities?
10. What are the criteria/characteristics/"look fors" when it comes to a high-quality P12-HE partnership?
11. What standards and criteria define a high-quality P12-HE partnership; could we create SREB-type list?
12. How would P12/HE partnership equip candidates to meet the learning needs of a diverse population?
 - Students with individualized education plans
 - Multi-lingual students
 - Homeless children and/or children in foster care and/or children of incarcerated parents
 - Children living in poverty
 - LGBTQ