

Principal Project Advisory Team (Phase 2)
Attendees Meeting 1
January 17, 2018

Absent (17)

Jackie Bennett
Bill Clark
David Cantaffa **
Paul Fanuele
Paul Fisher *
Soribel Genao
Richard Gonzales *
Albert Inserra
Kevin MacDonald
Colleen McDonald **
Andrea Fortin-Nossavage
Edwin Quezada
Lynda Quick
Stephen Todd
Elizabeth Waite
Xiao-lei Wang
Allen Williams **

Attendees (33)

Louise Verdemare Alfano
Greg Avellino
Zheadric Barbra
Peggy Boorady
Mark Brooks
Hazel Carter
Marina Cofield
Gladys Cruz
Yvette Malave Diaz
Susan Doyle
Sheila Durant
Clarence Ellis
Kathleen Feeley
Dave Flatley
Cecilia Golden
Marie Guillaume
Stephen Jambor
Tracey Johnson
Charles Khoury
James Kinnier
Mac Knight
Sister Remigia Kushner
Reginald Landeau, Jr.
Moses Ojeda
Carol Murphy
Reginal Richardson
Suzanne Rosenblith
Charles Russo
Deb Shanley
Kim Young Wilkins
Jennifer Wolfe
Larry Woodbridge
John Zampaglione

* Denotes non-resident external experts; their attendance, while welcomed, is not expected

** Denotes ex officio members who have schedule conflicts that make it impossible to attend more than two meetings

Principal Project Advisory Team Summary (minutes) of January 17, 2018 Meeting

A three-person team that chairs the Phase 2 Advisory Team opened the meeting at 10:45 am. The chairs include Gladys Cruz (District Superintendent), Reginald Landeau, Jr. (Principal), and Suzanne Rosenblith (School of Education Dean at a Higher Education Institution). Members introduced themselves.

Agreement was reached to conclude meetings at 3:00 pm to allow members travelling by rail to catch the 4:00 pm train.

Agreement was reached to provide members with a membership list that includes email addresses for every member (any member who is uncomfortable with that arrangement will notify one of the chairpersons).

A series of warm-up activities created context for the project. The central purpose of these activities was to highlight that members are a collection of people with varied views but that the success of this project depends on the ability of members to see beyond their differences to identify

Members reviewed contents of folders they received. These described project goals, deliverables, and timing.

Members agreed to an approach (called “fist to Five”) to gauge the level of support for a proposal.

During one activity, each member was invited to answer. Do you agree to subordinate your self-interest so we can achieve more together than any one of us can alone? Each participant responded affirmatively.

Members agreed to a set of operating agreements and to a set of steps to avoid “mission creep.”

Members reviewed documents that outlined the time and tasks.

- Four Phases of the Project
- Work-streams
- Goal, success criteria, charge, and deliverables
- Packet contents
- Web site access <http://www.nysed.gov/schools/principal-project-advisory-team>

Members were asked to imagine being elected to political office and then participating in an orientation for Congressional newcomers. They were invited to respond to a multiple choice question. When it comes to deciding any issue, to whom or what will you be loyal? Members engaged with their colleagues in small group discussion about their responses. Members were invited to try and reach consensus.

Members moved into five small work groups. Each group focused on one particular aspect of the Phase 2 charge:

- P20 Partnership
- Micro Credentials
- Standards for university-based principal preparation programs
- Standards for principal supervisors
- Competency-based assessment

Each group generated questions for which the group members need or want answers.

After 45 minutes, all members re-convened as a large group and, one by one, each small group reported out its findings.

The members adjourned at 2:55 pm (early due to snow and so members could make the 4:00 pm trains)

First Meeting on January 17, 2018 of the Principal Project Advisory Team (Phase 2) Agreements Reached and Transcription of Small-Group Notes from Chart Paper

At one point in the meeting, members were asked to take a Post-It and to consider their answer to a single question. That is, members were asked to write the single letter that best reflects your answer to the following scenario. You're elected to Congress. At the orientation session for newcomers, the facilitator asks you to respond to a single multiple-choice question. When it comes to deciding on any issue, to whom or what will you be loyal?

- a. Those from your district who voted for you
- b. All voters from your district, including those who voted for you and those who did not vote for you
- c. Not just those who voted but everyone from your district who has a pulse, including children
- d. Your own conscience
- e. All of humanity
- f. The planet
- g. Future generations
- h. Something else (name it)

These Post-its were collected and members were invited to compare notes with their neighbors. The Post-Its were collected and organized. The distribution follows:

<u>Count</u>	<u>Letter</u>	<u>Meaning</u>
0	a.	Those from your district who voted for you
0	b.	All voters from your district, including those who voted for you and those who did not vote for you
11	c.	Not just those who voted but everyone from your district who has a pulse, including children
11	d.	Your own conscience
3	e.	All of humanity
2	f.	The planet
1	g.	Future generations
5	h.	Something else (name it)
		School-aged children
		All of the community I am called upon to serve
		All of the above
		Current students and parents

Prior to meeting #1, a total of 33 Advisory Team members responded to a SurveyMonkey. The survey asked members to identify (for each component of the five-part charge for the team) the most important issue, concern, or question. The remarks from all respondents were assembled into a list and provided to all Phase 2 members (the remarks were not linked to any particular member but were in a simple list).

Prior to the first meeting of the Phase 2 team, the submissions to the SurveyMonkey that Phase 2 Team members provided were organized using a conceptual framework developed by Bob Terry. Former Director of the Hubert Humphrey Center for Policy Studies at the University of Minnesota, Bob Terry was the author of several books ([Authentic Leadership](#), among others). Though now deceased, Bob was the director of a week-long workshop that all newly-elected members of the U.S. Congress attended prior to the start of their first legislative session. Bob trained Congressional newcomers to use the framework as a way to sort through issues and organize information in a way that leads to healthy change. The framework has four tiers. Moving from lowest to highest tier, they are Resources, Structure, Power, and Mission. When discussing change, Bob observed that comments can be classified into one of four categories.

Mission: What business are we in?

Power: Who decides and how?

Structure: What roles, schedules, and rules guide action?

Resource: What are the requirements in terms of people, time, money, and tools?

Bob Terry described how the framework is used.

- Conversations on impending change tend to focus on lower levels (resources).
- To be effective in leading change, instead focus conversation on the top level (mission).
- Progress will be difficult until and unless agreement is gained about mission.
- Once consensus emerges on mission, other considerations are addressed more easily.

As well, members were asked to take a single Post-It and in 15 words or less, “describe what you perceive will be the single biggest hurdle to achieving results we desire.” These were collected and then organized using a framework from Bob Terry. The results were summarized for members. What follows is that summary.

Mission

- A lack of clarity about what is desired and yielding to perceived or actual barriers
- Recommending changes that will have the most impact across NYS (taking into account the various districts)
- Effectively collaborating to meet the needs of each constituent, e.g., school system, higher ed, community, State Ed
- Bringing varied and unique perspectives to consensus and insuring that our decisions are those that will have lasting impact on future leaders, teachers, students, and families
- Competing agendas – joining hands to accomplish a shared vision
- Getting desired outcomes (recommendations) accepted by the Regents for implementation
- Coming to grips with the diversity of need for an effective principal
- Creating a system, standard, service that applies universally to the diversity in rules (admin) and location (districts)
- The single biggest hurdle will be to think outside the box and not worry about the politics (small and big P) for developing the best leaders on behalf of our children
- Everyone agrees that principal preparation is important, but it is not the kind of URGENT issue that rises to the top of district leaders’ priority lists.
- I believe that the biggest hurdle is finding well-travelled administrators that are committed and have high expectations (my “own child” barometer). That means, treat every child as if it is my child

Power

- Resistance to change
- Agreement around a consistent commitment across many districts in the best interests of our kids
- Reaching agreement on outcomes and how to assess them validly
- Getting to yes from different points of view on what matters most
- Overcoming the “turf” challenge between P12 and Higher Ed and marrying theory with practice
- Unwillingness to hold higher ed to high standards without exception (not every institution of higher ed should be able to certify school leaders)
- To have all parties come to agreement and passed through State Ed
- Lack of the ability of members to compromise on which “big ideas” warrant the highest priority
- Not all principal preparation programs are created equal (therefore principal preparation is unequal)

Structure

- Lack of inclusion
- Conveying what is important to us, to the instructors, and to mentors in the field
- Getting everyone on the same page. Equality of preparation programs
- To identify the best candidates to accept into leadership programs
- That great ideas actually get implemented and then thoroughly carried out
- True accountability at (and for) all levels
- Universities aligning the practices with the district leadership programs that already exist
- Attracting seasoned master teachers to become educational leaders (principals, department chairs, etc.)
- Ensuring that all aspiring leaders participate in leadership development programs that reflect rigorous implementation of the new standards

Resources

- Time
- Time (not having enough of it to do all that we want to accomplish)
- Time (finding the time and \$s to train (a) quality mentors; (b) prospective school leaders; (c) do the business of mentoring; € finding the time at Institutions of higher education to revamp curricula
- Decision-makers unfamiliar with the needs of working professionals (principal-ship not an attractive career choice)
- Money (finances and funding); (b) equity; (c) access; (d) standardization; (e) massive comprehensive effort; (f) the single biggest hurdle is to develop a comprehensive standardizations of leadership development that is equitable and affords all access to exceptional opportunities
- The single biggest hurdle is funding for a full-year school-based internship residency

As well, the SurveyMonkey asked respondents to indicate their preference for working in a small group (the membership will be divided into five small work groups with each work group addressing a different aspect of the Phase 2 Team charge). Following lunch and for the final 90 minutes of the meeting, members met in small groups. Each group corresponded to a different part of the 5-part charge. The asterisk (*) denotes co-leaders of each small group.

P20 Partnerships

Hazel Carter *
Suzanne Rosenblith *
Larry Woodbridge
Louise Alfano
Kevin MacDonald
Elizabeth Waite
Paul Faneule
Bill Clark
Cecilia Golden

Prep Program Standards

Clarence Ellis *
Peggy Boorady *
Dave Flatley
Gladys Cruz
David Cantaffa
Xiao-lei Wang
Melissa Garafola
Mac Knight
Chuck Khoury
Greg Avellino

Micro Credentials

Sister Remegia Kushner *
Reginald Richardson *
Stephen Todd
Andrea Fortin-Nossavage
Kathleen Feeley
Yvette Malavé-Diaz
John Zampaglione

Allen Williams
Susan Doyle
Sheila Durant
Moses Ojeda

Supervisor Standards

Reginald Landeau, Jr. *
Lynn Lisy-Macan *
Jennifer Wolfe
Jackie Bennett
Lynda Quick
Kim Wilkins
Marie Guillaume
James Kinnear
Mark Brooks
Edwin Quezada

Competency Based

Deb Shanley *
Zheadric Barbra *
Stephen Jambor
Al Inserra
Soribel Genao
Colleen McDonald
Tracey Johnson
Chuck Russo
Marina Cofield
Carol Murphy

Each group addressed the same prompt. Their task was to identify the most obvious or important policy implications (in the form of questions) related to their topic area.

After each small group reported out to the whole group, the meeting was adjourned (at 2:55 pm due to snow).

What follows are the notes produced by each of the five small groups.

COMPETENCY-BASED ASSESSMENT

How do we know that change is working?
Possibly a survey (but need a baseline)
Possibly by looking at school performance

How will comparability be achieved?
Data triangulation (using multiple sources)
Calibrations done by peers

How do we keep it legal (through transition)?
Considerations here related to Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR)

How do we decide if change is uniformly implemented?

One piece concerns universality

Another involves alignment among and between state, university and colleges

STANDARDS FOR PRINCIPAL SUPERVISORS

Concerning Standard #1

Seems very broad. How do differing philosophies and contexts impact the principal supervisor's ability to help Principal's grow?

Concerning Standard #2

How is "effective" defined?

What does engagement look like?

Can the same person coach and evaluate?

Should the evaluation identify growth areas and then the growth be facilitate by a different individual?

How does a set of standards accomplish both specificity and freedom?

Where do the positive relationships and trust (the development of trust) "fit" with the principal evaluation/growth process facilitate by the Principal Supervisor?

How do we accomplish autonomy and alignment to a set of standards?

STANDARDS FOR UNIVERSITY –BASED PRINCIPAL PREPARATION PROGRAMS

How do the NELP standards align with the PSEL standards? (What's missing?)

How will the NEL standards be reflected in the academic content of the university preparation programs?

How will university programs be evaluated?

How should the comments and recommendations of the MCEAP team inform decision making?

How do we address the failure to address culturally responsive practice?

How do we ensure that preparation programs address perceived gaps?

How do we measure the success of preparation programs?

P20 PARTNERSHIPS

How do you develop an environment and structure to allow the principal-ship to take place?

How to engage/support higher ed faculty with respect to promotion and tenure?

Structurally, how do we create a formal partnership that meets the needs and mission of HE and P12?

How do we know that universities are preparing highly effective principals (what is the evidence)?

How do we keep the relationship and partnership going?

What are the indicators that predispose an individual for success?

What are the indicators of programmatic success?

How do we reach consensus on the top five (above)!

MICRO CREDENTIAL

What is the purpose of micro credentials?	Should encourage continuous learning, expand and enhance knowledge while engaged in a prep program (or having just completed one). They should help candidates demonstrate competencies in scheduling, budgeting, negotiations, etc.
Given our 5-part charge, what will define success?	This we answered as the mission of the micro-credential work group: To expand and enhance leadership knowledge and skill
What questions do we need to answer (for each portion of our charge)?	What are some experiences of micro-credentialing? Who should take advantage of micro-credentialing? How should micro-credentialing be assessed?
How open are we to a better way; are there boundaries on creativity?	We were enthusiastic about the value of micro-credentialing to augment the foundational preparation program. There are many areas where an aspiring principal needs exposure, and eventually, expertise.
When we consider all possible questions we could address, where do we start (and why)?	How does micro credentialing work? Who are some experts who can point out their work.
How do we achieve standards without standardization?	Those in preparation and in service should have options to choose. Colleges and Universities need to think about ways to augment institution required preparation programs.
What norms guide us, and what will thwart creep?	The group is guided by the need to know certain things before starting a principalship: finances, especially budget, HR issues including negotiations. How will the credential be evaluated? What will determine its acceptance to ????
What do we need to start and stop doing to become the system we dream of?	We will discuss this when we have the information from the readings and the conference call with some experts that Moses is arranging for us.
How can our proposals achieve both resonance and prominence?	We do need to think more about prominence. The idea of enhancing and expanding knowledge resonated with everyone in this work group.
Will we subordinate self-interest so we achieve together what no one of us can achieve alone?	Self-interest – the desire to know and be prepared for the job – was the impetus for micro credentials resonating with us. We talked about how to incorporate micro-credentialing into existing preparation programs.