

Principal Project Advisory Team Summary (minutes) of October 19, 2016 Meeting

Co-Chair David Flatley greeted members and opened the meeting at 9:00 am. Members introduced themselves. Members then reviewed the consensus-building process and reviewed what has transpired since the first meeting on Sept. 21, 2016.

- The USDOE released Title IIA guidance (Sept. 27, 2016)
- Decision was made to add meetings & extend meetings to 3 hours each (Sept. 30, 2016)
- An online survey was opened to local school board members, P12 educators, and school of education faculty (Oct 12, 2016)
- Advisory Team member Erika Hunt hosted webinar on year-long internships (Oct. 14, 2016)
- NYS Board of Regents heard a presentation on NYSED plan to comply with *Every Student Succeed Act* (Oct. 17, 2016)
- Wallace Foundation published video titled "A Bold Move to Better Prepare Principals" (Oct. 18, 2016)

Members agreed to shift future meeting times to noon – 3:00 pm. Dates follow:

- Nov. 30, 2016 Jan. 25, 2017 Feb. 22, 2017 Mar. 22, 2017 Apr. 12, 2017 May 31, 2017

Under "Old Business", members identified areas that may become a basis for recommendations. Nine possibilities follow:

1. Internship
Expand the time and improve the quality of the internship in ways that enable aspiring principals to apply knowledge and skill in authentic settings under the supervision of qualified mentors.
2. 2015 Standards *
Replace 2008 standards with new 2015 Principal Standards and with 2015 Principal Supervisor Standards **
3. Partnership
Improve P12 and IHE partnership (the term "IHE" refers to institute of higher education)
4. Professional Learning and Support
Improve ongoing professional learning and support (beyond appointment as principal)
5. Stakeholder Engagement
Improve comprehensive stakeholder engagement
6. Diverse Populations
[Strive to ensure] professional educators are prepared to work with culturally-diverse populations
7. Situational awareness
Promote situational awareness
8. Systems thinking and shared leadership
Promote systems thinking and shared leadership
9. Authentic experiences
Provide authentic experiences throughout a principal preparation program (not just as part of the internship experience)

* 2008 standards are *Educational Leadership Policy Standards* from Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium; New standards are *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders* from National Policy Board for Educ'l Administration.

** During the course of this discussion, another possibility was raised. However, the members who made the proposal offered to include it within the idea of "2015 Standards".

While the Advisory Team reached consensus on items 1-9 (above), members considered three other areas that could form the basis for a recommendation. However, consensus was not reached to add these three items to the list of areas for a recommendation. Nevertheless, the Advisory Team envisions that the topics may be re-visited in a future meeting.

1. What is the measure of higher education's impact on aspiring leaders, schools, or students?
2. How do we measure candidate readiness prior to SBL program graduation (i.e., student or school improvement)?
3. How can stakeholder input be part of the multiple measures used during the evaluation of an aspiring principal?

In the interest of time, co-chairs elected to forgo asking members to review a one-page narrative of focus group themes.

Members reviewed four graphs titled "Comparison of Pass Rates (current vs previous exam); impact varies by race/ethnicity. The Advisory Team reached consensus to add an additional area of recommendation (this became the 10th area).

10. Variability in SBL exam pass rates (by race/ethnicity)

What can we do given pass rates for current SBL exam and pass rates for the previous SBL exam vary by race/ethnicity?

Members shifted attention to a homework assignment. As a lead-in to this activity, members reviewed a table that listed the verbatim contributions of 20 individuals. Members then reviewed another table that showed how all of the responses from members had been organized thematically. Each member was then given an envelope containing 12 separate belief statements. Each individual member placed the belief statements in rank order (by importance). Members then formed small groups. Each small group produced a rank-ordered list of belief statements. To view the contributions of each small group, see attachment called "agreements and notes transcription". The Advisory Team elected not to try and reach whole-group consensus on a rank-ordered list of belief statements.

In the interest of time, co-chairs elected to forgo asking Advisory Team members to develop a Theory of Action. That topic will be shifted to the agenda for an upcoming meeting.

Members considered whether and how to organize to produce recommendations. While attempts were made to shorten the list of 10 possible areas for recommendations by combining and collapsing categories, membership agreed to leave all 10 areas intact. Advisory Team members agreed to respond to a survey monkey where each member would identify the area(s) of personal interest. This information will help the co-chairs and facilitator organize for the upcoming meeting. The Advisory Team understands that in the upcoming meeting, some portion of the meeting time will be spent with a few (perhaps three) subgroups working in parallel. Each subgroup would address a different area for possible recommendation. The understanding is that the Advisory Team would start with the ideas that surfaced early because they were big ideas. After recommendations are crafted for the big ideas attention will then shift to other areas.

Co-chairs adjourned the meeting at noon.