

## November 30, 2016 Meeting of the Principal Project Advisory Team

### Agreements Reached and Transcription of Small-Group Notes from Chart Paper

Advisory Team members responded to a 2-part homework assignment. The first part involved completing an online survey. For the second part, members drafted a reply to a question pertaining to the work of their respective breakout group.

#### SUMMARY OF AGREEMENTS AND UNDERSTANDING REACHED DURING THE FIRST HALF OF THE MEETING:

##### Homework Assignment Related to Belief Statements and a Theory of Action

Overall, 27 of 38 members (70% of team) responded to a SurveyMonkey asking if they agree/disagree with 12 beliefs.

- 96 percent (21 of 22 respondents) said they agreed or strongly agreed with 8 belief statements:
  - Purpose
  - Equity
  - Instruction
  - Partnership
  - Student Centeredness
  - Continuous Improvement and Change Management
  - Reflective Practice
  - Innovation and Calculated Risk-Taking
- 85 percent of respondents (18 of 21) said they agreed or strongly with 3 belief statements
  - Value Diversity
  - Skillful Practice under Authentic Conditions
  - Shared Responsibility for Feedback that Promotes Improvement (of Candidates and Programs)
- 78 percent of those who responded (17 of 22) said they agreed or strongly with 1 belief statement
  - Program Admissions

Overall, 21 of 38 members (55% of team) responded to a SurveyMonkey asking if they agree with a theory of action.

- 85 percent of those who responded (18 of 21) said they agreed/strongly agreed with a “Straw Man” theory of action

Working in small groups, members considered and discussed results of the survey (above). Following discussion, the co-chairs and facilitator polled members on each individual belief statement. Using the consensus-building approach (“Fist to five”), each member indicated the level of support for each belief statement. A summary of results follows:

The Advisory Team achieved full agreement on two cornerstone beliefs:

- Continuous Improvement and Change Management: Well prepared school building leader candidates display the emotional intelligence, skill, and grace needed to manage the tension and conflict that can arise when schools engage in continuous improvement efforts.
- Value Diversity: Effective principal preparation programs recruit and produce aspiring leaders from varied backgrounds and historically-under-represented populations who are committed to the success of every student, who value different learning styles, who promote instructional practices that capitalize on a range of cultural traditions, and who strive to eliminate prejudice, stereotype, bias, and favoritism

The Advisory Team identified suggested improvements to eight other belief statements:

- Purpose: Well prepared school building leader candidates make it their mission to equip every student for success in the next level of schooling, career, and life and have demonstrated they have the ability to translate aspirational goals into plans, action, and desired results.

NOTE: Suggestion made to also say that aspiring principals make it their mission to support the success of staff in the school

- Equity: Well prepared school building leader candidates are committed to meeting the learning needs of all students and create a school culture where all students are valued and experience success, regardless of their differences (socio-economic status, religion, race, sexual orientation, disability, or native language).  
NOTE: Suggestion made to say that aspiring principals create conditions that promote student well-fare and success the focus of the work and to add gender, age, ethnicity, and national origin to the items in parentheses
- Instruction: Well prepared school building leader candidates the knowledge and skill to improve teacher instruction and student learning the day they step into the job.  
NOTE: Suggestion made to delete the last seven words (“The day they step into the job”)
- Partnership: Well prepared school building leader candidates have the willingness and ability to share decision-making and distribute leadership so collaboration thrives, students and parents feel they belong, and community members are valued and appreciated as respected partners.  
NOTE: We agreed to parse this and create two belief statements (one related to “shared decision-making and leadership” and another related to “collaboration and partnering”).
- Student-Centeredness: Well prepared school building leader candidates cultivate a climate of compassion and care for the well-being of every child in the school.  
NOTE: Suggestion made to leave the wording “as is” but to merge it with the belief on “Equity”.
- Innovation and Calculated Risk-Taking: Well prepared school building leader candidates embrace innovation when a credible case can be made that a novel approach could lead to improvement.  
NOTE: Suggestion made to delete last 15 words so the statement is simply, “well-prepared school building leader candidates embrace innovation.”)
- Skillful Practice under Authentic Conditions: Effective principal preparation programs produce aspiring principals who demonstrate their readiness for school leadership by successfully applying the skills and knowledge they acquired in the university setting during the course of a full-time, year-long, school-based internship.  
NOTE: Suggestion made to delete six of the last seven words so the statement is simply “. . . during the course of an internship.”
- Shared Responsibility for Feedback Cycles that Promote Improvement (of Candidates and Programs): Effective principal preparation programs work with Districts to pair each aspiring principal candidate with a practiced administrator who provides mentoring advice to the leader candidate (on how to improve) and feedback to university faculty (on how to refine the prep program).  
NOTE: Suggestion made to replace “practiced administrator” with the term “trained mentor who is a successful administrator”.

The Advisory Team agreed to set aside two other proposed belief statements for future consideration. Time did not permit the Team to learn about the source of concern from Advisory Team members who were unable to support these belief statements “as is.”

- Reflective Practice: Well prepared school building leader candidates rely on collegial feedback, student evidence, and current research to guide practice and inform decisions.  
NOTE: During “Fist to Five” consensus-building process, four Advisory Team members indicated with a “2”.
- Program Admissions: Effective principal preparation programs enhance the quality of aspiring building leaders by raising the expectations used to admit candidates and through the use of a richer array of evidence that provides a better picture of candidate fitness for the position and readiness for admission.  
NOTE: During “Fist to Five” consensus-building process, two Advisory Team members indicated a fist and two indicated a “2”.

The Advisory Team agreed to set aside discussion of a theory of action for future consideration.

Due to inclement weather, the expected presenter for a topic on the agenda (Michelle Young from University of Virginia) was unable to attend but she did participate via WebEx. So the Advisory Team agreed to postpone until January a discussion of the topic. The topic of Michelle's presentation is "national efforts to develop program standards that reflect professional standards for educational leaders and CAEP standards."

#### SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS FROM THE SECOND HALF OF THE MEETING:

During the second half of the meeting, members met in small breakout groups. Each of the five breakout groups had its own leader. One of the five breakout groups involved all those remotely participating (led by Erika Hunt).

#### Breakout Groups

##### Standards

- Larry Woodbridge (leader)
- Cecelia Golden
- Marie Guillaume
- Maria Pacheco
- Note: Senior Counsel Kelly Grace sat in with this group on behalf of John D'Agati

##### Diversity

- Carron Staple (leader)
- Cheryl Atkinson
- Bill Clark
- Kathleen Feeley
- Edwin Quezada
- Ken Turner
- Allen Williams

##### Authentic Experiences and the Internship

- Nell Scharff-Panero (leader)
- Marc Baiocco
- Shireen Fasciglione
- Lynn Lisy-Macan
- Kevin McDonald
- John McKenna
- Greg Mott

##### P12-Higher Education Partnership

- David Flatley (leader)
- David Babician
- Joh Blowers
- David Cantaffa
- Hazel Carter

##### Professional Learning and Support

- Erika Hunt (leader)
- Grace Barrett
- Bergre Escobores
- Sister Remigia Kushner

- Moses Ojeda
- Howard Schoor
- Colleen Taggerty
- Michelle Young
- Stephen Todd

Homework Assignment Related to Loftiest Aspiration and Minimal Expectation (with respect to recommendations)

Overall, 23 members responded to an invitation asking them to respond to this two-part question.

- o When it comes to changes we might recommend:
  - What is the loftiest aspiration you have with respect to a recommendation we could produce?
  - What is your minimal expectation with respect to a recommendation we could produce?

A table was created and distributed that shows the responses how Advisory Team members responded.

What follows are the notes generated by each breakout group

**Notes from Discussion with the Breakout Group on Authentic Experiences and the Internship**

What's at the heart of our charge? (tentative thoughts of the group):

- Clinically rich experiences where candidates practice and do the work of the principal-ship

Considerations:

1. Perhaps revisit/consider the word "improve" in the above
2. Perhaps suggest categories/areas within which the practicing/doing happens, as in:

- o Instruction
- o Situational/relationships/relational trust
- o Management
- o Systems / change management

OR

- o Instruction
- o Management
- o Politics

- Brainstorm: What might we imagine, including out of the box, without worrying about constraints at this point?
  - o Medical model; authentic experiences embedded in each course (or some set number of courses) within university programs / micro-experiences
  - o Partnership agreements with districts that allow this to happen
  - o Making the coursework more relevant
  - o Perhaps a capstone that comes out of this
  - o Perhaps with demonstrations of ability to authentic (field-based) audiences
  - o Multiple pathways (full year internship is one pathway; clinically rich experiences embedded in all/many courses another pathway)
  - o Competency based model - allows gaining credit for teacher leadership experiences
  - o Come up with criteria about what it looks like to demonstrate mastery in standards - a rubric (what would this look like)
  - o Perhaps a pilot - voluntary across institutions/districts in the state and capturing representative populations and settings - to explore & learn the above (what a competency based model would look like etc)

## Notes from Discussion with the Breakout Group on Standards

- As a group, we began with brief introductions and setting norms for our group.
- Next, we briefly reviewed each of the professional standards for educational leaders (2015 standards). For each standard, we had a short discussion.
- Depending on the standard, we addressed some of the following ideas:
  - o What makes this standard different from the 2008 standards?
  - o Why is this standard important?
  - o What are potential issues with this standard?
  - o Is there anything we would revise/suggest to improve the standard?
- Standard 1
  - o Cecelia pointed out that is a very important standard, we must have it, and the group as a whole was in consensus.
- Standard 2
  - o Larry explained that this standard is “new” to the 2015 standards.
  - o As a group, the consensus was that this was an important addition to the new standards.
  - o It can be related to APPR (ethics involved in score reporting and implementation of APPR plans), as well as anything that involves money (for example, student activities).
- Standard 3
  - o Larry explained that this standard was not as detailed in the older standards.
  - o Again, the group was in agreement that elaborating on the diversity standard is very important.
  - o Related to the federal standards (ESSA) and increasing diversity in all school districts—to different degrees depending on the location, but equally important.
- Standard 4
  - o The group did not like the use of the word “rigorous”—replacing this with “challenging” or “high quality” would be more effective.
  - o As a group, the importance of this standard is ensuring that there is a “real world application” component to the coursework and curriculum.
  - o Larry mentioned situations where he has seen conflicting coursework and curriculum—which again highlights the importance of this standard.
- Standard 5
  - o Group was in agreement with this standard.
- Standard 6
  - o The group discussed that the focus of this standard is the “entire building”—and while it sounds similar to standard 7, standard 7 focuses on the teachers, assistant principals, staff.
- Standard 7
- Standard 8
  - o The group likes this standard because it promotes a sense of teamwork and common goals.
- Standard 9
  - o Larry explained that a lot of principals do not know what they’re doing when it comes to operations and management—so that makes this standard important for programs.
- Standard 10
  - o The group pointed out that this standard is similar to the “innovations” standard in the old set of standards.
  - o Celia pointed out that its important for a principal to act as an agent for social change
  - o Marie pointed out it is important for a principal to be a risk taker

### Next steps:

- The group decided that before the next meeting we would review the detailed set of 2015 standards.
- At the next meeting we will be drafting our longer group proposal and reviewing any regulations that relate to the standards.

## Notes from Discussion with the Breakout Group on Diversity

### Three Big Ideas Emerged from Discussion

1. Multiple pathways to School Leader certification may improve access of historically under-represented populations
2. The challenge in this area has two parts:
  - One is forward-looking (changes in the certification process could affect new entrants to the principal ranks)
  - One considers addressing and providing a remedy for the bias that now exists within schools
3. As concerns leadership, how can we better address the learning needs of an increasingly-diverse student population?

### Members of the breakout group identified a series of questions:

- Do the School Building Leader exams “gate keep” in the desired way (if not, what needs to change in that regard)?
- How do School Building Leader exams affect access, opportunity, and supply?
- How much of the decline in non-white principals is due to fewer non-white candidates enrolled in SBL programs?
- If we are concerned about the access of candidates from historically under-represented populations (and we are), how early should we begin working on the talent pipeline (is High School too early)?
- How do we create urgency about the declining numbers of principals from historically under-represented populations?
- Is the possibility of suggesting or recommending multiple pathways to earning SBL certification within our charge?
- A year-long (unpaid) internship could pose a challenge for those from historically under-represented populations
- If multiple certification pathways exist for teachers/superintendents (& students seeking HS diploma) why not principals?
- Could we address remedying the bias in current school leadership using the CTLE requirements (responsibility to register every five years)?
- Won't every recommendation fall into one of four categories:
  - Expectations
  - Capacities
  - Opportunities
  - Incentives

## Notes from Discussion with the Breakout Group on P12-Higher Education Partnership

### Goals of work product for team members

- Generate ideas/recommendations
- Formalize the construct of what should be present in a P12/IHE partnership
- Understand cultures of P12 & IHE to identify common motivations
- Distinguish between partner and partnership...and understand partnership is not simply a contractual relationship...more about common goals, teaming, shared vision/resources, etc
- Advance “one profession” approach...education as a seamless continuum from preschool to elementary to secondary to post-second
- What are the characteristics/attributes of a successful partnership and how can we make it sustainable?
- Identify barriers, develop solutions, propose recommendations (with framework of a business case)
- Consider variable partnership management strategies to recognize differences between local/regional, statewide, national and international P12/IHE partnerships.
- Incorporate thoughts around levels of participation and corresponding roles in a successful partnership (leadership, governance, middle, individual contributors, etc)

### What are some successful partnerships we could model our work after?

- Niagara U/Niagara School District...robust curriculum mapping, demonstrated gains in diversity and student achievement
- An example of a partnership between a district and local community college where credits earned during HS are automatically accepted at this specific college...with assumption student will attend that college or potentially forfeit the credit (student gets credits, parents save tuition %, college gets placement...win/win/win)

- An example of a HS embedded at a college campus...integrated structure, resources...could earn associate's degree at HS graduation...improved graduate rate and better college preparation
- UHS – University in the HS widely accepted as successful...some questions about applicability at the building leader level

Brainstorm some thematic ideas:

- Consider teaching hospitals concept for education. Could we develop “teaching districts”? Would this model benefit from a vernacular shift? (residencies v internships) How can we learn from this the medical profession to elevate the role of professional educators and create destinations for professional development?
- Need ideas that foster mutual collaboration
- Explore P-12/IHE partnership implications to certification delivery process. For example, current variations of brick and mortar locations and online options may complicate acceptance/implementation/consistency of execution.
- The role of the building leader v district leader v board of education in partnership exploration/expansion/management was also discussed.

### **Notes from Discussion with the Breakout Group on Professional Learning and Support**

Key notes

- Describe the central concept, the underlying elements that are at the heart of the proposed change.
- Job embedded, authentic experiences, support that is “just in time” and related to the real need.
- Continuum of support
- Connect Universities and districts in a continuous improvement process
- In context in terms of community
- With a continuum, mentioning can occur as a group of people working together; a cohort arrangement.
- Balance work with personal/helping people realizes they need a healthy balance for a socio-emotional component to prevent burn-out.
- Shared leadership

Topic-Specific Questions

- What obstacles impede sitting principals from acquiring the needed knowledge and skill in these areas? There are a lot of obstacles depending of building you're in, region you're in, district level support. Sometimes the obstacles are within the person themselves. Sometimes it is financial. High need districts and time.
- How do we assess the needs in these areas? Look local, to see authentic assessments. How do you reach individuals to be just in time? Evaluation tool can either support or be a negative impact- look at how the district looks at building level authentic experiences and performance based. APPR was not entirely aligned across state, but there was some alignment.

Wrap up

- What are the central concepts/underlying elements of support?
- Job embedded, authentic experiences, just in time training tied to local context, continuum of support that spans from prep to in position, connecting universities and districts in continuous improvement; one way would be a cohort arrangement. Help principals realize a healthy balance between managing their responsibilities and their social and emotional needs-shared leadership.
- Obstacles: the availability and professional motivation and financial. Availability is more about equity- equity varies by district and region. Board and district level providing support-often more difficult in high need districts to do these.
- Innovation: Models to look into; brought in to a larger conversation. Cohort model-innovation lab (zones); each zone has a cohort of like-minded people or positions. Creating a network of support-safe colleagues
- One member brought up the 360 degree assessments inspire UCEA. How it would be helpful to collect feedback of the candidates once they are in the job and data can go back to the university so that universities can have continuing improvement.

- Missouri model: Continuum of support for new principals; looks at state standards and makes suggestions for what new principals will need for support.
- Micro-credential model: Job embedded, authentic professional development tied to performance requirements. So it is a longer duration of PD often offered online but can be face-to-face. Tied to an actual activity that is tied to their training in which they measure the impact- can choose how they want to measure outside of student learning. Tie learning and training to an actual practice but can give real results.

Co-chairs adjourned the meeting (at 3:00 pm).