

National **Educational Leadership** Preparation (NELP) Program Recognition Standards - **Building Level**

The NELP – Building Level standards were designed for institutions undergoing CAEP Accreditation and NELP Program Review. The NELP Building Level standards are appropriate for Advanced Programs at the Master, Specialist, or Doctoral Level that Prepare Assistant Principals, Principals, Curriculum Directors, Supervisors, and other Education Leaders in a School Building Environment.

The NELP – Building Level Standards are provided by the National **Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) Specialized Professional Association (SPA)**, sponsored by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA).

Upon approval by the CAEP SPA Standards Committee, a full copy of the NELP – Building Level Standards can be obtained at the following url:
www.npbea.org

Contact Persons:

Michelle D. Young
NELP Standards Committee, Chair
405 Emmet St. S.
Charlottesville, VA 22904
434.243.1040 (office)
434.409.0065 (cell)
mdy&n@virginia.edu

Joan Auchter
NELP SPA Coordinator
1904 Association Drive
Reston, VA 20191
703-860-7280 (office)
703-508-5835 (cell)
auchterj@nassp.org

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Context.....	3
Development.....	5
What’s New?.....	7
Assumptions.....	8
Implementation	10
This Document	11
Standard One: Mission, Vision, and Improvement.....	13
Standard Two: Ethics and Professional Norms.....	15
Standard Three: Equity, Inclusiveness and Cultural Responsiveness.....	18
Standard Four: Learning and Instruction	21
Standard Five: Community and External Leadership.....	25
Standard Six: Operations and Management.....	28
Standard Seven: Building Professional Capacity.....	31
Standard Eight: Internship	34
APPENDIX 1: Using NELP Standards for Program Evaluation	35
NELP Standards: NELP Reviewer Evaluation Rubrics.....	37
Policy Regarding NELP Program Report Recognition Decisions	46
APPENDIX 2: Alignment of NELP Program Standards with CAEP Principles.....	50
APPENDIX 3: Research Support for Standards.....	57
References	72
Appendix 4: Glossary of Terms	82
Appendix 5: NELP Reviewer Selection and Training	92
Appendix 6: NELP Development Committees	96
Appendix 7: NELP Building-ELCC 2011-PSEL 2015 Crosswalk.....	97

Introduction

A historic shift is happening in the field of educational leadership. Policy makers, families and other constituents of PK-12 schools are increasingly holding education leaders accountable for the academic success and personal well-being of every student. No longer is it enough to manage school finances, maintain a spotless and safe building and keep the busses running on time. Education leaders must also provide clear evidence that the children in their care are being better prepared for college, careers and life. Importantly, no individual leader is able to accomplish these goals alone. Today, education leadership is a collaborative effort distributed among a number of professionals in schools and districts. School-level leaders include administrators, teacher leaders and department chairs. District leaders hold positions such as superintendents, curriculum supervisors, talent management specialists, assessment directors and professional development providers. Their titles may vary, but they are all charged with the same fundamental challenge: support every student's learning and development.

Clear and consistent leadership standards can assist all educational stakeholders in understanding these expectations (Canole & Young, 2013). Over the last three years the Council for Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA), with financial support from the Wallace Foundation, have led a significant effort to revise the national standards that guide preparation and practice for educational leaders in the United States. The NELP Building Level standards are appropriate for Advanced Programs at the Master, Specialist, or Doctoral Level that Prepare Assistant Principals, Principals, Curriculum Directors, Supervisors, and other Education Leaders in a School Building Environment. Rooted in both research and effective practice, these standards provide a framework for understanding how to best prepare, support and evaluate education leaders in their efforts to help every child reach his or her fullest potential.

Context

The Council of Chief State School Officers published the first set of national standards for educational leaders in 1996, followed by a modest update in 2008 based on the empirical research at the time. Both versions provided frameworks for policy on education leadership at the state level for almost 20 years. However, the context in which schools currently operate continues to shift. Globalization, for example, is transforming the economy and the 21st century workplace for which schools prepare students. Technology, too, is advancing quickly, changing the nature of communication and learning. The conditions and characteristics of children, in terms of demographics, family structures and more, are changing. On the education front, the politics and shifts of control make the headlines daily. Cuts in school funding loom everywhere, even as schools are being subjected to increasingly competitive market pressures and held to higher levels of accountability for student achievement.

Without question, such changes are creating myriad challenges for educational leaders. At the same time they present rich and exciting opportunities for educational leaders to innovate and

inspire staff to pursue new, creative approaches for improving schools and promoting student learning. Since the crafting of the first set of educational leadership standards in 1996, the profession of educational leadership has developed significantly. Educators have a better understanding of how and in what ways leadership contributes to student achievement. An expanding base of research demonstrates that educational leaders exert influence on student achievement by creating challenging and supportive conditions, conducive to each student's learning, and by supporting teachers, creating positive working conditions, allocating resources, constructing appropriate organizational policies and systems, and engaging in other deep and meaningful work outside of the classroom. Given such changes, it is clear that educational leaders need new standards to guide their practice in directions that will be the most productive and beneficial to students.

In November of 2015 the [Professional Standards for Educational Leaders \(PSEL\)](#) were approved by the NPBEA. These standards, formerly known as the ISLLC standards, are grounded in current research and leadership experience and articulate the knowledge and skills expected of educational leaders (Canole & Young, 2013, CCSSO, 1996; CCSSO, 2008). PSEL has “a stronger, clearer emphasis on students and student learning, outlining foundational principles of leadership to help ensure that each child is well-educated and prepared for the 21st century” (CCSSO, 2015, p. 2). “They are student-centric, outlining foundational principles of leadership to guide the practice of educational leaders so they can move the needle on student learning and achieve more equitable outcomes” (CCSSO, 2015, p. 1).

The 2015 PSEL standards reflect the following leadership domains:

1. Mission, Vision, and Improvement
2. Ethics and Professional Norms
3. Equity and Cultural Responsiveness
4. Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment
5. Community of Care and Support for Students
6. Professional Capacity of School Personnel
7. Professional Community for Teachers and Staff
8. Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community
9. Operations and Management
10. School Improvement

Significantly, each of the standards places emphasis on both academic success and well-being. The PSEL Standards will be adopted or adapted by many states to guide policies concerning the practice and improvement of educational leaders (e.g., licensure, evaluation and professional learning policies).

In December of 2015, a committee comprised of essential stakeholder communities from across the country began development on a set of leadership preparation standards congruent to the PSEL. As noted by CAEP (2017), consistency among standards “ensures a coherent continuum of expectations” (p. 10). The preparation standards, formerly known as the Educational Leadership Constituent Council or ELCC standards, have been renamed the

National Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) standards and will be used to guide program design, accreditation review, and state program approval.

While aligned to the PSEL standards, the NELP standards serve a different purpose and provide greater specificity around performance expectations for beginning level building and district leaders. Whereas the PSEL standards define educational leadership broadly, the NELP standards specify what novice leaders and preparation program graduates should know and be able to do as a result of their completion of a high quality educational leadership preparation program. Like the ELCC standards that preceded them, the NELP standards were developed specifically with building and district leaders in mind and will be used to review educational leadership programs by the NELP Specialty Professional Association (SPA) (formerly known as the ELCC SPA) of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). There is one set of NELP standards for candidates preparing to become building-level leaders and a second set of standards for candidates seeking to become district-level leaders.

Development

The NELP standards for building level leadership preparation address the most critical knowledge and skills areas for beginning building level educational leaders. These standards align to national leadership practice standards and research on effective leadership practice, input from key stakeholder communities, and the four CAEP principles—(A) The Learner and Learning, (B) Content, (C) Instructional Practice, and (D) Professional Responsibility (See Appendix 2 for Alignment between NELP and CAEP Principles). The NELP standards flow from a 17-month process fostered by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), and the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA).

Recognizing the changes that have occurred in education leadership practice since the release of the 2011 ELCC standards, the adoption of new standards and policies at the state level, and the need to align to the new Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL) standards, a committee of educational leadership stakeholders was developed to collaboratively revise the 2011 ELCC standards. The committee members, who represented practicing leaders, professional association representatives, state department personnel, educational leadership faculty scholars, educational leadership preparation program leaders and college leadership (See Appendix 6 for a list), were selected based on the stakeholders they represented as well as the expertise they brought to the committee.

The work of the NELP Standards Development Committee began as soon as the PSEL standards were released in November of 2015, and involved reviewing the CAEP Guidelines, gathering input from practitioners, state department of education representatives and higher education faculty on the 2011 ELCC standards (Young, 2016), followed by a rigorous review of empirical research supporting the PSEL standards and the preparation of building and district leaders for high performing schools and districts. This work also involved the development of several

crosswalks between sets of important national and state leadership and educator preparation standards, and the development, review, external vetting and editing of draft standards.

Early drafts were vetted with focus groups hosted by a variety of leadership professional associations, and included practitioners, higher education faculty, state department personnel and professional association representatives. In addition to sharing and discussing the standards during these focus groups, committee representatives also used the interactions to share key sections of the CAEP Guidelines, such as the limits on the number of standards and components, the necessity of developing standards that are based on empirical research and that are measurable through six to eight assessments, and the importance of aligning the standards to the four CAEP principles. Feedback from the focus groups was analyzed and reviewed by committee members and then used to further refine the standards. In May of 2016 the Standards were distributed widely, through CAEP and NPBEA member organizations (CCSSO, UCEA, NASSP, NAESP, AASA, AACTE, ICPEL), for public comment. Public comment revealed strong support, with 86% approving or strongly approving the NELP standards and between 94 and 100% noting that the focus of the eight standards was warranted. A summary of the survey data was shared with the field through NPBEA organizations and used by the committee to inform revisions. The revised draft was presented to and approved by the NPBEA in July of 2016 and then submitted to CAEP SPA Standards Committee for review and feedback.

Feedback from the CAEP SPA Standards Committee was received in October 2016 and shared with the NELP committee. Based on this feedback, the NELP committee further reviewed research on the preparation, evaluation and practice of educational leaders; consulted with NPBEA organizations, practicing school and district leaders, state education officials, researchers, higher-education leaders and faculty, and other policy-oriented constituents; and refined the draft standards to ensure that the standards included the most essential knowledge and skills as identified by research and input from the field and which can be achieved by candidates during the course of their preparation and assessed by programs. In May of 2017, feedback was sought on a final draft of the NELP standards from practicing leaders, higher education faculty and state officials. The feedback indicated overwhelmingly support for the standards regarding their focus, measurability, and ability to guide effective leadership preparation.

At two points during the process of developing the NELP standards, analyses were conducted to determine the existence of potential duplication and/or overlap in the standards, first after the initial draft of the standards was developed and, subsequently, when the final draft was complete. In conducting this analysis, standards and elements/components for each of the CAEP SPAs were thoroughly reviewed, and no duplication was identified. However, it is important to point out that educational leaders share a common goal of collaboration with varied school personnel, including special education professionals as described by CEC, school librarians as described by AASL, instructional technology specialists as described by ISTE, school psychologists as described by NASP, and classroom teachers. Furthermore, educational leaders share a common goal of supporting the education of diverse learners. How this is accomplished by these different educational professionals, however, is different. The NELP standards (see for

example, Standard Three: Equity, Inclusiveness and Cultural Responsiveness) articulate the specific knowledge and skills that educational leaders require to lead, facilitate and collaborate with others in a mutual effort to achieve enhanced and equitable student learning.

What's New?

The new NELP standards for building level leaders reflect all of the elements of the 2011 ELCC for building level leaders and the majority elements from the PSEL standards, as demonstrated in the crosswalk in Appendix 7. When compared to the 2011 ELCC standards for building level leaders there are several important additions. First, and perhaps most noticeable, is the number of standards. The six content standards found in the 2011 ELCC standards have been expanded to seven in the NELP standards. The expansion enabled the NELP committee to develop standards that more closely reflect current understandings of school leadership, to better align to the ten PSEL standards, and to more clearly delineate several core leadership functions. For example, the 2011 ELCC standards addressed core values, professional norms, ethics, and equity within one standard (i.e., ELCC Standard 6). The new NELP standards, like the 2015 PSEL standards, include one standard for ethics and professional norms (NELP Standard 2) and one for equity, inclusiveness and cultural responsiveness (NELP Standard 3). These changes delineate expectations for educational leaders not present in the previous ELCC standards, such as developing the knowledge and “capacity to evaluate, communicate about, and advocate for ethical and legal decisions (NELP Standard 2, Component 2) and the knowledge and “capacity to evaluate, cultivate, and advocate for equitable, inclusive and culturally responsive instruction and behavior support practices among teachers and staff” (NELP Standard 3, Component 3). Although CAEP includes the notion of ethical practice in its CAEP unit standards and a focus on diversity among its core principles, it is essential that educational leadership preparation standards address ethics and diversity in ways that attend to the specific professional responsibilities of educational leaders. As such, they are included within the NELP leadership standards and stated in terms of appropriate educational leadership candidate professional actions.

A second difference is represented within the stem statement of the NELP standards. The NELP standards expand ELCC’s concern for supporting “the success of every student” to promoting the “current and future success and well-being of **each** student and adult.” The focus on **each** student and **each** adult reflects the focus on individual needs within the PSEL standards, which assert that when a leader meets the needs of each individual, no subgroup will be missed.

A third difference in the 2018 NELP standards is the addition of the building level leaders’ responsibility for the well-being of students and staff as well as their role in working with others to create a supportive and inclusive school culture. In addition to being included in each of the standard stem statements, this focus is found within Components 2.1, 3.2, 4.3, and 7.2.

Fourth, the NELP standards articulate the building level leaders’ role in ensuring equitable access to educational resources and opportunities. Standard 3, which is a new standard with

three components, focuses on “applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to develop and maintain a supportive, equitable, culturally responsive and inclusive school culture.” In addition to standard three, equity is also addressed in: 4.2, 4.4 and 6.2.

A fifth difference between the two sets of standards is the NELPs stronger focus on assessment. For example Standard 4, Component 3 focuses on the leaders’ role in evaluating, developing and implementing formal and informal culturally responsive and accessible assessments that support instructional improvement and student learning and well-being. Additionally, Standard 4, Component 4 requires program completers to understand and demonstrate capacity to collaboratively evaluate, develop, and implement the school’s curriculum, instruction and assessment practices in a coherent, equitable, and systematic manner.

Sixth, in contrast to ELCC, the 2018 NELP standards (see Component 6.3), requires building level leaders to *“reflectively evaluate, communicate about, and implement laws, rights, policies, and regulations to promote student and adult success”* but does not expect building level leaders to act to influence those laws, rights, policies and regulations.

A seventh difference between the 2018 NELP standards and the 2011 ELCC standards is the expanded focus of Standard 7, Component 1. This component expects building level leaders to *“develop the school’s professional capacity through engagement in recruiting, selecting and hiring staff.”* This expectation greatly expands upon the 2011 ELCC element 6.2 that only expected leaders to *“understand and sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning...”*

Eighth, the NELP committee identified nine practices through which educational leaders achieve the expectations outlined in the standards. These nine key practices, and only these key practices, are included in the NELP standards and their components. They include: developing, implementing, evaluating, collaborating, communicating, modeling, reflecting, advocating and cultivating. Importantly, several of these key practices (i.e., developing, implementing, evaluating), are essential for school improvement (Bryk, Sebring, Allensworth, Easton and Luppescu, 2010). Definitions for each of these key practices are provided in the glossary, which can be found in Appendix 4.

Ninth and finally, the committee has developed a comprehensive crosswalk that compares the new NELP Building level standards to the 2011 ELCC standards and the 2015 PSEL standards. This crosswalk is available in Appendix 7.

Assumptions

There are several key assumptions embedded in the new NELP standards. Preparation programs are the heart of educational leaders’ pre-professional growth and professional advancement. “Programs provide the structured opportunities (e.g., course content and field

experiences) for individuals preparing to enter various education specialties to learn, practice, and be assessed on what they will need to know and be able to do when they enter their new professional responsibilities” (CAEP, 2017, p. 6). The following assumptions are embedded within the NELP building-level leadership preparation standards:

1. Improving student learning is the central responsibility of school leadership. Because a school leader must improve the learning of *all* students, the standards purposefully do not name specific sub-groups of students. Strong preparation of school leaders includes attention to learning and needs of all sub-groups of students as well as individual students.
2. The standards represent the fundamental knowledge, skills, and practices intrinsic to developing leadership that improves student learning and well-being.
3. The standards conceptually apply to a range of school-level leadership positions. They are intended to define what an entry-level building-level administrator should know and be able to do. While specific content and application details will vary depending upon the leadership role, the fundamental, enduring tenets are the same.
4. Each standard begins with the stem, **“Candidates who successfully complete a building-level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to...,”** in order to emphasize three things: 1) the importance of beginning level leaders gaining the knowledge, skills and commitments to both understand and have the capacity to undertake the leadership described in each of the standards; 2) the importance of leadership work to both the current and future experiences of the students and educational staff who leaders influence; and 3) the importance of attending to both the education and well-being of students and adults.
5. While there is a purposeful emphasis on leading for student learning and well-being, an understanding and acceptance of school leaders’ responsibility for managing the resources and operations of the school are also embedded.
6. The practice of school leadership is well-established as a research-based body of knowledge. This research base helps to inform the preparation of school leaders.
7. The preparation of school leaders requires overt connections and bridging experiences between research and practice.
8. The preparation of school leaders requires comprehensive practice in, and feedback from, the field over an extended period of time.
9. School leadership preparation programs must provide ongoing experiences for candidates to examine, refine and strengthen the leadership platform that guides their decisions –especially during difficult times.
10. While building-level leadership preparation programs are ultimately an institutional responsibility, the strength of the design, delivery and effectiveness of these programs will be significantly enhanced by P-12 participation and feedback.
11. Performance-based measures are most effective in evaluating candidate outcomes.

Implementation

Supporting the current and future success and well-being of students depends on the implementation of multiple and integrated effective leadership practices within a set of complex and nested contexts. Given the interdependency between the execution of specific school leadership skills and the overall educational environment, preparation programs are expected to provide candidates with intentionally developed school leadership development experiences that connect, embed and transcend explicit leadership skills within authentic contexts.

Candidates need multiple bridging experiences between course content and the realm of leadership practice. Life as a school leader requires the use of specialized skills within the context of often ambiguous, demanding, and interconnected events. Powerful connections to, and emphasis on, real or simulated school experiences will greatly facilitate program graduate's ultimate success as a school leader.

Leadership preparation programs must include three dimensions:

1. Awareness – acquiring concepts, information, definitions and procedures
2. Understanding – interpreting, integrating and using knowledge and skills
3. Application – apply knowledge and skills to new or specific opportunities or problems

The overall program should represent a synthesis of key content and field-based experiences extended over time that result in the school leader candidates' demonstration of the professional knowledge, skills, and commitments articulated in the NELP standards, and, most importantly, candidates' success in improving student achievement after taking a leadership position.

Standard 8: The Internship includes three components that address the internship under the supervision of knowledgeable, expert practitioners that engages candidates in multiple and diverse school settings, and provides candidates with coherent, authentic and sustained opportunities to synthesize and apply the knowledge and skills identified in NELP Standards 1-7 in ways that approximate the full range of responsibilities required of building level leaders and enable them to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult in their school. Evidence confirms the importance of a substantial and sustained educational leadership internship experience that has school-based field experiences and clinical internship practice within a school setting, monitored by a qualified onsite mentor. Many of the internship components and descriptors of practice in Standard 8 parallel the research findings regarding the critical components of the field experience (Milstein & Kruger, 1997). This research is provided in Appendix 3.

This Document

The purpose of this document is to provide background concerning the history, development and guidance for using the NELP standards for building level leadership preparation. The standards, their component areas and supporting explanations that provide guidance regarding the scope and focus of each standard component are presented in the following section. This section also includes criteria or rubric starters that clarify SPA expectations for appropriate candidate knowledge and skills. Subsequently, the document includes several appendices. Appendix 1, "Using NELP Standards for Program Evaluation," identifies the assessments types to be used for measuring candidate knowledge and skills and provides guidance for judging assessment evidence and for making program decisions. Appendix 2, "Research Support for Standards," provides a review of school leadership research supporting each of the NELP standards. Appendix 3, "Alignment of NELP Program Standards with CAEP Principles," provides an overview of how the NELP standards align with and reflect the four CAEP Principles. Appendix 4 provides a definition of terms used within the NELP standards and throughout this document. Appendix 5 overviews the process used to select and train reviewers for the NELP Specialized Professional Association (SPA). Appendix 6 lists the individuals who directly contributed to the development of the NELP standards. Appendix 7 provides a cross-walk demonstrating the similarities and differences between the NELP Building level standards, the 2011 ELCC standards and the 2015 PSEL standards.

**NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
PREPARATION (NELP) PROGRAM STANDARDS
Building Level**

Standard One: Mission, Vision, and Improvement

Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to collaboratively lead, design and implement a school mission, vision and process for continuous improvement that reflects a core set of values and priorities.

Component 1.1 Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to collaboratively evaluate, develop, and communicate a school mission and vision designed to reflect a core set of values and priorities.

Component 1.2 Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to lead improvement processes that include design, implementation, and evaluation.

RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR STANDARDS ONE:

Evidence presented in Appendix 3 in support of Standard 1 confirms that a building-level education leader must have the knowledge and skills to promote the success of every student through collaboratively leading, designing and implementing a school mission, vision and process for continuous improvement that reflects a core set of values and priorities. This includes knowledge of how to evaluate, design, and communicate a district mission and vision that reflects a core set of values and priorities and to lead improvement processes that include evaluation, design, and implementation. This research evidence was used to inform the development of standard one and components 1.1 and 1.2.

**Acceptable Candidate Performance for
NELP Building Level Leadership Standard 1**

NELP Standard Component 1.1

Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to collaboratively evaluate, develop, and communicate a school mission and vision designed to reflect a core set of values and priorities.

Content Knowledge

Program provides evidence of candidate knowledge of:

- Research on the role and importance of school mission and vision
- Processes for collaboratively developing a mission and vision
- Processes for developing an actionable mission and vision attentive to data, technology, values, equity, diversity, digital citizenship and community
- The characteristics of a well-written mission and vision statements

Educational Leadership Skills

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to:

- Evaluate existing mission and vision processes and statements
- Collaboratively design a school mission and vision attentive to data, technology, values, equity, diversity, digital citizenship, and community
- Develop a comprehensive plan for communicating the mission and vision

NELP Standard Component 1.2

Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to lead improvement processes that include design, implementation, and evaluation.

Content Knowledge

Program provides evidence of candidate knowledge of:

- Research on school improvement
- Formal processes of iterative, evidence-informed improvement
- Data collection, analysis and use
- Implementation theory and research

Educational Leadership Skills

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to:

- Evaluate existing improvement processes
 - Use research to develop an improvement process that includes the following components: diagnosis, design, implementation, and evaluation
 - Develop an implementation plan to support the improvement process
-

Standard Two: Ethics and Professional Norms

Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to understand and demonstrate the capacity to advocate for ethical decisions and cultivate and enact professional norms.

Component 2.1 Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to reflect on, communicate about, cultivate, and model professional dispositions and norms (e.g., fairness, integrity, transparency, trust, collaboration, perseverance, reflection, life-long learning, digital citizenship) that support the educational success and well-being of each student and adult.

Component 2.2 Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to evaluate, communicate about, and advocate for ethical and legal decisions.

Component 2.3 Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to model ethical behavior in their personal conduct and relationships and to cultivate ethical behavior in others.

RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR STANDARDS TWO:

Evidence presented in Appendix 3 in support of Standard 2 confirms that a building-level education leader must have the knowledge and skills to promote the success of every student through advocating for ethical decisions and cultivating and enacting professional norms. This includes the capacity to reflect on, communicate about, cultivate and enact professional norms and to evaluate and advocate for ethical and legal decisions. It also includes the capacity to model ethical behavior in their personal conduct and relationships and to cultivate ethical behavior in others. This research evidence was used to inform the development of standard two and components 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3.

**Acceptable Candidate Performance for
NELP Building Level Leadership Standard 2**

NELP Standard Component 2.1 Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to reflect on, communicate about, cultivate, and model professional dispositions and norms (e.g., fairness, integrity, transparency, trust, collaboration, perseverance, reflection, life-long learning) that support the educational success and well-being of each student and adult.

Content Knowledge

Program provides evidence of candidate knowledge of:

- Professional norms: (e.g., integrity, competency, fairness, transparency, trust, equity, democracy, digital citizenship, diversity, inclusiveness and the belief that each child can learn), which support student success and well-being
- Practices that reflect professional norms
- Approaches to cultivating professional norms in others
- Reflective practice

Educational Leadership Skills

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to:

- Engage in reflective practice as a professional norm
- Cultivate professional norms among school staff members
- Communicate professional norms to diverse constituencies
- Model professional norms (e.g., integrity, competency, fairness, transparency, trust, equity, democracy, digital citizenship, diversity, inclusiveness and the belief that each child can learn).

NELP Standard Component 2.2 Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to evaluate, communicate about and advocate for ethical and legal decisions.

Content Knowledge

Program provides evidence of candidate knowledge of:

- Research on decision making
- Decision making processes
- Guidelines for ethical and legal decision making

Educational Leadership Skills

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to:

- Evaluate ethical dimensions of issues
- Analyze decisions in terms of established ethical frameworks
- Develop a communication plan to advocate for ethical decisions

NELP Standard Component 2.3 Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to model ethical behavior in their personal conduct and relationships and to cultivate ethical behavior in others.

Content Knowledge

Program provides evidence of candidate knowledge of:

- Ethical practice

Educational Leadership Skills

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to:

- Formulate a school-level leadership

-
- Approaches to cultivating ethical behavior in others

- platform grounded in ethical standards
 - Model ethical practice
 - Cultivate ethical behavior in others
-

Standard Three: Equity, Inclusiveness and Cultural Responsiveness

Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to develop and maintain a supportive, equitable, culturally responsive and inclusive school culture.

Component 3.1 Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to evaluate, design, cultivate, and advocate for a supportive and inclusive school culture.

Component 3.2 Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to evaluate, cultivate, and advocate for equitable access to educational resources and opportunities that support the educational success and well-being of each student.

Component 3.3 Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to evaluate, cultivate, and advocate for equitable, inclusive and culturally responsive instruction and behavior support practices among teachers and staff.

RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR STANDARDS THREE:

Evidence presented in Appendix 3 in support of Standard 3 confirms that a building-level education leader must have the knowledge and skills to promote the success of every student through developing and maintaining a supportive, equitable, responsive and inclusive school culture. This includes the capacity to evaluate, cultivate, and advocate for a supportive and inclusive school culture; equitable access to educational resources, procedures and opportunities; and equitable instructional and behavior support practices among teachers and staff. This research evidence was used to inform the development of Standard 3 and components 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3.

**Acceptable Candidate Performance for
NELP Building Level Leadership Standard 3**

NELP Standard Component 3.1 Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to evaluate, design, cultivate, and advocate for a supportive and inclusive school culture.

Content Knowledge

Program provides evidence of candidate knowledge of:

- Dimensions of positive school culture (e.g., safe, healthy, caring, responsive, inclusive, and respectful)
- Research on inclusive school cultures
- Processes for evaluating school culture
- Processes for effecting changes to school culture
- Engaging in advocacy

Educational Leadership Skills

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to:

- Evaluate school culture
- Use research and data to design and cultivate a supportive, nurturing and inclusive school culture
- Develop strategies for improving school culture
- Advocate for a supportive and inclusive school culture

NELP Standard Component 3.2 Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to evaluate, cultivate, and advocate for equitable access to educational resources and opportunities that support the educational success and well-being of each student.

Content Knowledge

Program provides evidence of candidate knowledge of:

- Research on the consequences for students of equitable and inequitable use of educational resources and opportunities
- Equitable allocation of educational resources, procedures and opportunities (e.g., materials, technologies, media, teachers, social and behavioral supports, interventions, and adult relationships)
- Broader social and political concerns with equity and inequality in the use of educational resources, procedures and opportunities

Educational Leadership Skills

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to:

- Evaluate sources of inequality and bias in the allocation of educational resources and opportunities
- Cultivate the equitable use of educational resources and opportunities through procedures, guidelines, norms, and values.
- Advocate for the equitable use of educational resources, procedures and opportunities

NELP Standard Component 3.3 Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to evaluate, advocate, and cultivate equitable, inclusive and culturally responsive instruction and behavioral support practices among teachers and staff.

Content Knowledge

Educational Leadership Skills

Program provides evidence of candidate knowledge of:

- Culturally responsive instructional and behavior support practices
- Characteristics and foundations of equitable and inequitable educational practice especially among teachers and staff
- Research on implications for students of equitable, culturally responsive and inclusive practices
- Broader social and political concern with equity and inequality in schools

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to:

- Evaluate root causes of inequity and bias
 - Develop school policies or procedures that cultivate equitable, inclusive and culturally responsive practice among teachers and staff
 - Facilitate the use of differentiated, content-based instructional materials and strategies
 - Advocate for equitable practice among teachers and staff
-

Standard Four: Learning and Instruction

Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to evaluate, develop, and implement coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, supports and assessment.

Component 4.1 Program completers understand and can demonstrate the capacity to evaluate, develop, and implement high-quality, technology rich curricula programs and other supports for academic and non-academic student programs.

Component 4.2 Program completers understand and can demonstrate the capacity to evaluate, develop, and implement high-quality and equitable academic and non-academic instructional practices, resources and services that support student and adult learning.

Component 4.3 Program completers understand and can demonstrate the capacity to evaluate, develop, and implement formal and informal culturally responsive and accessible assessments that support instructional improvement and student learning and well-being.

Component 4.4 Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to collaboratively evaluate, develop, and implement the school's curriculum, instruction and assessment practices in a coherent, equitable, and systematic manner.

RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR STANDARDS FOUR:

Evidence presented in Appendix 3 in support of Standard 4 confirms that a building-level education leader must have the knowledge and skills to promote the success of every student through evaluating, developing, and implementing coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, supports and assessment. This includes the capacity to evaluate, develop, and implement academic and non-academic student programs and academic and non-academic instructional practices, resources and services that support the needs of each student. It also includes the capacity to evaluate, develop, and implement formal and informal assessments that support instructional improvement and student learning and well-being and to evaluate, develop, and implement the school's curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices in a coherent and systematic manner. This research evidence was used to inform the development of Standard 4 and components 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4.

**Acceptable Candidate Performance for
NELP Building Level Leadership Standard 4**

NELP Standard Component 4.1 Program completers understand and can demonstrate the capacity to evaluate, develop, and implement high-quality, technologically rich curricula, programs and other supports for academic and non-academic student programs.

Content Knowledge

Program provides evidence of candidate knowledge of:

- Research on the leadership of academic and non-academic programs
- Approaches to coordinating among (a) curricula, instructional technologies, and other supports and (b) academic and non-academic systems.
- Evidence-based curricula, use of technology, and other supports for academic and non-academic programs
- Infrastructures for the ongoing support of academic and non-academic programs

Educational Leadership Skills

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to:

- Evaluate (a) curricula, use of technology, and other supports and (b) academic and non-academic systems
- Propose designs and implementation strategies for improving coordination and coherence among academic and non-academic programs

NELP Standard Component 4.2 Program completers understand and can demonstrate the capacity to evaluate, develop, and implement high-quality and equitable academic and non-academic instructional practices, resources and services that support student and adult learning.

Content Knowledge

Program provides evidence of candidate knowledge of:

- Evidence-based instructional practices for different student populations
- Curricula, educational technologies and other educational resources that support digital literacy among students and adults
- Educational service providers
- Approaches to coordinating resources and services in support of the school's academic and non-academic services.

Educational Leadership Skills

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to:

- Evaluate coordination and coherence among the practices, resources and services that support, equity, digital literacy, and the school's academic and non-academic systems
 - Propose designs and implementation strategies for improving the impact of academic and non-academic practices, resources and services that support student learning.
-

NELP Standard Component 4.3 Program completers understand and can demonstrate the capacity to evaluate, develop, and implement formal and informal culturally responsive and accessible assessments that support instructional improvement and student learning and well-being.

Content Knowledge

Program provides evidence of candidate knowledge of:

- Research on the effective and ineffective assessment of student learning and well-being
- Research on assessment practices that are culturally responsive and accessible for each student
- Formative and summative measures of student learning and well-being
- Approaches to coordinating among assessments, instructional improvement and educational service delivery

Educational Leadership Skills

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to:

- Use research to evaluate the quality of formative and summative assessments of learning
 - Develop formal and informal culturally responsive and accessible assessments of student learning
 - Interpret data from formative and summative assessments for use in educational planning
 - Cultivate teachers' capacity to improve instruction based on analysis of assessment data
-

NELP Standard Component 4.4 Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to collaboratively evaluate, develop, and implement the school's curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices in a coherent, equitable, and systematic manner.

Content Knowledge

Program provides evidence of candidate knowledge of:

- Appropriate and ethical use of data to monitor and continuously improve the school's curriculum, instruction and assessment practices
- Research on the coordination (or lack thereof) within and among academic and non-academic services and its impact on student learning and well-being
- Approaches and strategies for building a coherent and equitable system of academic (curriculum, instruction and assessment) and non-academic services

Educational Leadership Skills

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to:

- Engage faculty in gathering, synthesizing and using data to evaluate the quality, coordination and coherence of the school's curriculum, instruction and assessment practices
 - Use research and evidence to propose designs and implementation strategies for improving coordination and coherence among the school's curriculum, instruction and assessment practices
 - Use technology and performance
-

-
- Approaches and strategies for supporting faculty collaboration

management systems to monitor, analyze, implement and evaluate school curriculum, instruction and assessment practices and results

Standard Five: Community and External Leadership

Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to engage families, community, and school personnel in order to strengthen student learning, support school improvement and advocate for the needs of their school and community.

Component 5.1 Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to understand and collaboratively engage diverse families in strengthening student learning in and out of school.

Component 5.2 Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to understand, collaboratively engage and cultivate relationships with diverse community members, partners, and other constituencies for the benefit of school improvement and student development.

Component 5.3 Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to collaboratively engage the larger organizational and policy context to advocate for the needs of their school and community.

RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR STANDARDS FIVE:

Evidence presented in Appendix 3 in support of Standard 5 confirms that a building-level education leader must have the knowledge and skills to promote the success of every student through engaging families, community, and school personnel in order to strengthen student learning, support school improvement and advocate for the needs of their school and community. This includes the capacity to engage families in strengthening student learning in and out of school, to engage community members, partners, and other constituencies for the benefit of school improvement and student development, and to engage the larger organizational and policy context to advocate for the needs of their school and community. This research evidence was used to inform the development of Standard 5 and components 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3.

**Acceptable Candidate Performance for
NELP Building Level Leadership Standard 5**

NELP Standard Component 5.1 Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to collaboratively understand and engage diverse families in strengthening student learning in and out of school.

Content Knowledge

Program provides evidence of candidate knowledge of:

- Research on the role of families in supporting student learning in and out school
- Research on student and family diversity
- Strategies for understanding, cultivating relationships with and engaging families in their children’s education

Educational Leadership Skills

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to:

- Gather information about family demographics and funds of knowledge available within students’ families that can be accessed to enhance student learning
- Collaborate with and cultivate collaborative partnerships among staff and families in support of student learning and success
- Foster two-way communication with families

NELP Standard Component 5.2 Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to understand, collaboratively engage and cultivate relationships with diverse community members, partners, and other constituencies for the benefit of school improvement and student development.

Content Knowledge

Program provides evidence of candidate knowledge of:

- School organizational cultures that promote community engagement
- Research on how community members, partners, and other constituencies can support school improvement and student success
- Collaboration methods to develop and sustain productive relationships with diverse community partners
- Practices for accessing and integrating external resources into the school

Educational Leadership Skills

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to:

- Collaboratively engage with diverse community members, partners, and other constituencies around shared goals
- Cultivate regular, two-way communication with community members, partners, and other constituencies
- Identify and use diverse community resources to benefit school programs and student learning

NELP Standard Component 5.3 Program completers understand and demonstrate the

capacity to collaboratively engage the larger organizational and policy context to advocate for the needs of their school and community.

Content Knowledge

Program provides evidence of candidate knowledge of:

- Research on the importance and implications of social, cultural, economic, legal and political contexts
- Strategies for effective oral, written and digital communication with members of the organization, community and policy communities
- Digital literacy
- Educational policy and advocacy

Educational Leadership Skills

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to:

- Gather information about the policy and district context
 - Conduct a needs assessment of the school and community
 - Develop a plan for accessing resources that addresses school and community needs
 - Develop communication for oral, written and digital distribution targeted to a diverse stakeholder community.
 - Advocate for school and community needs
-

Standard Six: Operations and Management

Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to improve management, communication, technology, school-level governance, and operation systems, to develop and improve data-informed and equitable school resource plans, and to apply laws, policies and regulations.

Component 6.1 Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to evaluate, develop and implement management, communication, technology, school-level governance, and operation systems that support each student’s learning needs and promote the mission and vision of the school.

Component 6.2 Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to evaluate, develop and advocate for a data-informed and equitable resourcing plan that supports school improvement and student development.

Component 6.3 Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to reflectively evaluate, communicate about, and implement laws, rights, policies, and regulations to promote student and adult success and well-being.

RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR STANDARDS SIX:

Evidence presented in Appendix 3 in support of Standard 6 confirms that a building-level education leader must have the knowledge and skills to promote the success of every student through improving management, communication, technology, school-level governance, and operation systems; developing and improving school resource plans; and applying laws, policies and regulations. This includes the capacity to improve management, communication, technology, school-level governance, and operation systems that support each student’s learning needs and promote the mission and vision of the school, to develop and improve a resourcing plan for the benefit of school improvement and student development, and to apply laws, rights, policies, and regulations to promote student and adult success. This research evidence was used to inform the development of Standard 6 and components 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3.

**Acceptable Candidate Performance for
NELP Building Level Leadership Standard 6**

NELP Standard Component 6.1 Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to evaluate, develop and implement management, communication, technology, school-level governance, and operation systems that support each student’s learning needs and promote the mission and vision of the school.

Content Knowledge

Program provides evidence of candidate knowledge of:

- Research on school management, operations, use of digital technologies, communication and governance systems
- Principles of systems management and continuous improvement
- Management theories on the effective use of school resources and structures (e.g., school time and schedules) to achieve equitable outcomes for diverse student populations.
- Processes for developing and implementing management, communication, technology, school-level governance and operation systems.
- Use of technology to enhance learning and the management of programs

Educational Leadership Skills

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to:

- Use a process for auditing the equity of school processes and operations as well as their impact on school processes, resource allocation, personnel decisions and students’ experiences and outcomes
- Use research and evidence to analyze school processes and operations to identify and prioritize strategic and tactical challenges for the school
- Use digital literacy to develop and implement management, communication, assessment, technology, school-level governance and operation systems
- Develop a school’s master schedule

NELP Standard Component 6.2 Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to evaluate, develop and advocate for a data-informed and equitable resourcing plan that supports school improvement and student development.

Content Knowledge

Program provides evidence of candidate knowledge of:

- School-based budgeting
- Strategies for acquiring resources
- Processes for gathering, synthesizing and evaluating data (e.g., data literacy) to develop and implement management, communication, technology, school-level governance and operation systems
- Strategies for aligning and allocating

Educational Leadership Skills

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to:

- Evaluate resource needs
- Use data ethically and equitably to develop and implement a school resourcing plan.
- Develop a multi-year resource plan aligned to the school’s goals and priorities
- Advocate for resources in support of

resources according to school priorities and student needs

needs

- Methods and procedures for managing school resources

NELP Standard Component 6.3 Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to reflectively evaluate, communicate about, and implement laws, rights, policies, and regulations to promote student and adult success and well-being.

Content Knowledge

Educational Leadership Skills

Program provides evidence of candidate knowledge of:

- Laws, rights, policies and regulations enacted by state, local and federal authorities that affect schools, students and adults
- Implications of laws, rights, policies and regulations for diverse student populations, subgroups and communities
- Research on emerging challenges such as privacy, social media (e.g., cyber-bullying) and safety.

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to:

- Reflectively evaluate situations and policies with regard to legal, ethical and equity issues
- Analyze how law and policy are applied consistently, fairly, equitably and ethically within a school
- Communicate policies, laws, regulations, and procedures to appropriate school stakeholders
- Monitor and ensure adherence to laws, rights, policies, and regulations

Standard Seven: Building Professional Capacity

Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to build the school's professional capacity, engage staff in the development of a collaborative professional culture, and improve systems of staff supervision, evaluation, support and professional learning.

Component 7.1 Program completers understand and have the capacity to collaboratively develop the school's professional capacity through engagement in recruiting, selecting and hiring staff.

Component 7.2 Program completers understand and have the capacity to develop and engage staff in a collaborative professional culture designed to promote school improvement, teacher retention, and the success and well-being of each student and adult in the school.

Component 7.3 Program completers understand and have the capacity to personally engage in, as well as collaboratively engage school staff in, professional learning designed to promote reflection, personal growth, cultural responsiveness, distributed leadership, digital literacy and citizenship, school improvement and student success.

Component 7.4 Program completers understand and have the capacity to evaluate, develop, and implement systems of supervision, support and evaluation designed to promote school improvement and student success.

RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR STANDARDS SEVEN:

Evidence presented in Appendix 3 in support of Standard 7 confirms that a building-level education leader must have the knowledge and skills to promote the success of every student through engaging staff in the development of a collaborative professional culture, building the school's professional capacity, and improving systems of staff supervision, evaluation, support and professional learning. This includes building professional capacity through engagement in recruitment, selection and hiring. It also includes the capacity to improve and engage staff in a collaborative professional culture, to engage staff in professional learning, and to improve systems of supervision, support and evaluation and that promote school improvement and student success. This research evidence was used to inform the development of Standard 7 and components 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4.

**Acceptable Candidate Performance for
NELP Building Level Leadership Standard 7**

NELP Standard Component 7.1 Program completers understand and have the capacity to collaboratively develop the school’s professional capacity through engagement in recruiting, selecting and hiring staff

Content Knowledge

Educational Leadership Skills

Program provides evidence of candidate knowledge of:

- Research on teacher recruitment, hiring and selection
- Practices for recruiting, selecting and hiring school staff
- Strategic staffing based on student, school and staff needs

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to:

- Evaluate school’s professional staff capacity needs
 - Evaluate candidate materials
 - Use research and data to plan and engage in candidate recruitment and selection that reflects the diversity of the student body
-

NELP Standard Component 7.2 Program completers understand and have the capacity to develop and engage staff in a collaborative professional culture designed to promote school improvement, teacher retention and the success and well-being of each student and adult in the school.

Content Knowledge

Educational Leadership Skills

Program provides evidence of candidate knowledge of:

- Research on and strategies for developing a collaborative professional culture designed to support improvement, retention, learning and well-being
- The role of relationships, trust and well-being in the development of a healthy and effective professional culture
- Research on and strategies for supporting safe and secure learning environments

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to:

- Use research to design and cultivate a collaborative professional culture
 - Model and foster effective communication
 - Develop a comprehensive plan for providing school community members with a safe and secure school building environment
-

NELP Standard Component 7.3 Program completers understand and have the capacity to

personally engage in, as well as engage school staff in, professional learning designed to promote reflection, personal growth, cultural responsiveness, distributed leadership, digital literacy and citizenship, school improvement and student success.

Content Knowledge

Educational Leadership Skills

Program provides evidence of candidate knowledge of:

- Research on teacher professional learning
- Practices for supporting and developing school staff
- Practices for cultivating and distributing leadership among staff
- Fostering reflective practice
- How to use information technology in ethical and appropriate ways to engage in personal and professional learning

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to:

- Evaluate professional staff capacity needs and management practices
- Identify leadership capabilities of staff
- Plan opportunities for professional growth that are aligned with performance results and meet school needs
- Engage staff in leadership roles
- Utilize information technology in ethical and appropriate ways to engage in personal and professional learning

NELP Standard Component 7.4 Program completers understand and have the capacity to evaluate, develop, and implement systems of supervision, support and evaluation designed to promote school improvement and student success.

Content Knowledge

Educational Leadership Skills

Program provides evidence of candidate knowledge of:

- Research based strategies for personnel supervision and evaluation.
- Importance of, and the ability to access, specific personnel evaluation procedures for a given context
- Multiple approaches for providing actionable feedback and support systems for teachers

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to:

- Observe teaching in a variety of classrooms
 - Gather and review district policies on instructional expectations
 - Provide teaching staff with actionable feedback to support improvement
 - Develop a system for monitoring whether supervision and evaluation strategies promote improvement
-

Standard Eight: Internship

Candidates successfully complete an internship under the supervision of knowledgeable, expert practitioners that engages candidates in multiple and diverse school settings, and provides candidates with coherent, authentic and sustained opportunities to synthesize and apply the knowledge and skills identified in NELP Standards 1-7 in ways that approximate the full range of responsibilities required of building level leaders and enable them to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult in their school.

Component 8.1

Candidates are provided a variety of coherent, authentic, field and or clinical internship experiences within multiple school environments that afford opportunities to interact with stakeholders and synthesize and apply the content knowledge and develop and refine the professional skills articulated in each of the components included in NELP Building-Level Program Standards one through seven.

Component 8.2

Candidates are provided a minimum of six-months of concentrated (10-15 hours per week) internship or clinical experiences that include authentic leadership activities within a school setting.

Component 8.3

Candidates are provided a mentor who has demonstrated effectiveness as an educational leader within a building setting; is present for a significant portion of the internship; is selected collaboratively by the intern, a representative of the school and/or district, and program faculty; and is provided with training by the supervising institution.

RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR STANDARDS EIGHT:

Evidence presented in Appendix 3 in support of Standard 8 confirms that effective internships include the use of expert practitioners as supervisors who engage candidates in multiple and diverse school settings and provide coherent, authentic and sustained opportunities to synthesize and apply the knowledge and skills identified in NELP Standards 1-7 in ways that approximate the full range of responsibilities required of building level leaders and enable them to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult in their school. This research evidence was used to inform the development of Standard 8 and components 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3.

APPENDIX 1: Using NELP Standards for Program Evaluation

Under CAEP policy, six assessments are required for Option A Program Reports. These six assessments must collectively measure NELP standards 1-7 and the 22 associated components. Assessments # 1 & #2 must measure content knowledge and assessments #3, 4, 5 and 6 must measure educational leadership skills. To demonstrate the effective measurement of all standard components in the program’s assessment system, preparation programs are required to develop a matrix that maps the specific leadership content knowledge and skills standard components to the specific assessments. Programs may, at their discretion, submit a seventh or eighth assessment if they believe it is necessary to strengthen their demonstration that the NELP standard components are met. These additional assessments will be evaluated and carry the same weight in the reviewer decision process.

The required NELP assessments focus on educational leadership content knowledge and educational leadership skills as indicated in the following table.

Educational Leadership Content Knowledge Assessments Include:	Educational Leadership Skill Assessments Include:
NELP Assessment 1: A state licensure assessment or other assessment of candidate content knowledge that aligns to the NELP building-level standards.	NELP Assessment 3: Demonstration of candidate’s instructional leadership skills.
NELP Assessment 2: An assessment of candidate content knowledge that aligns to the NELP building-level standards.	NELP Assessment 4: Demonstration of candidate’s leadership and management skills within in a field-based setting.
	NELP Assessment 5: Demonstration of candidate’s leadership skills in supporting an effective P-12 student learning environment.
	NELP Assessment 6: Demonstration of candidate’s leadership skills in the areas of family and community relations.

Please note, that while NELP Standard 8 is not measured in the 6 assessments, programs must provide evidence of this standard and its components through a one-page narrative document that describes the internship/clinical field experience.

NELP reviewers will use the NELP Standard Evaluation Rubrics to make qualitative judgments about whether a standard is “met,” “met with conditions,” or “not met.” Through application of

this rubric, the NELP SPA hopes to establish a viable and reliable evaluation system across education leadership program reviews while simultaneously creating standards that are also flexible and sensitive to a program's localized contexts.

With regard to NELP Assessment 1 (state licensure examinations), the NELP SPA does not require programs to meet a specific pass rate for its completers at the cohort level as a pre-condition for SPA National Recognition. However, as part of the program review reporting process, all programs are required to document candidates' performance on state licensure examinations as partial evidence for candidates' content knowledge. Programs are also expected to delineate how the licensure assessment is aligned with the NELP SPA Standards and Components. According to CAEP policy, "Alignment" may be attained if assessments that are comprised of content similar to the specialty standards demonstrate the same complexity as the standards; are congruent in the range of knowledge, skills, and dispositions that candidates are expected to exhibit; and call for an appropriate level of difficulty consistent with the standards.

Program Reports provided by institutions in any state that uses licensure tests should include the following data: 1) The average scores of completing candidates in the program, and 2) The range of scores for candidates completing the program.

NELP Standards 1-7: NELP Reviewer Evaluation Rubric

NELP SPA program reviewers and audit team members decide whether a program provides sufficient evidence to meet NELP standards and criteria for National Recognition. The following rubric should be used by NELP Building Level program reviewers in making qualitative judgments about the quality of assessment evidence presented in the Program Report for NELP standards 1-7. SPA program reviewer decisions on whether standards are met will be based on the preponderance of evidence at the standard level. CAEP (2017) defines preponderance of evidence as “an overall confirmation that candidates meet standards in the strength, weight, or quality of evidence,” rather than satisfactory performance for each component. A commonly accepted definition of preponderance of evidence is a requirement that a majority of the evidence favors a given outcome. NELP program review decisions are based on the preponderance of evidence at the standard level using this definition. Specifically, 75% of the components of each standard must be met at the acceptable or target level.

Programs will be required to provide evidence for all of the components of NELP Standards 1-7. However, programs are not required to meet all components of the standards as a criterion for National Recognition. The components are used by programs and reviewers to help determine how standards are met. This means that a standard could be met, even though evidence related to one or more components presented in the assessments is weak. Program reviewers will weigh the evidence presented in Program Reports, and when there is a greater weight of evidence in favor, they will conclude that a standard is met or that a program is recognized.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
Assessment Purpose		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purpose of each assessment for candidate monitoring or decision making concerning candidate progression is clear and aligned to specified standard components. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purpose of each assessment for candidate monitoring or decision making concerning candidate progression, while present, is unclear and/or inconsistently aligned to specified standard components. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purpose of each assessment for candidate monitoring or decision making concerning candidate progression is not provided and/or not aligned to specified standard components.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
-----	---------------------	---------

Assessment Instructions

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates are provided clear, complete instructions about what they are expected to do and how their performance will be evaluated (scoring rubric) that are aligned to the specified standard components. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates are provided with partial instructions about what they are expected to do and how their performance will be evaluated (scoring rubric) and/or instructions are inconsistently aligned to the specified standard components. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates are provided with instructions that are unclear, incomplete or missing, and have no alignment to the current standard components. |
|---|--|--|

Assessment Alignment to Standards

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collectively, the six required assessments are aligned to the seven standards inclusive of a preponderance of the 22 standard components (preponderance of evidence is defined as 75% of the components of <u>each</u> standard are met.) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collectively, the six required assessments have inconsistent alignment to the seven standards inclusive of the preponderance of the 22 standard components (preponderance of evidence is defined as 75% of the components of <u>each</u> standard are met). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collectively, the six required assessments have misalignment or no alignment to the seven standards inclusive of the preponderance of the 22 standard components (preponderance of evidence is defined as 75% of the components of each standard are met). |
|---|---|--|

Knowledge and Skills Assessed

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessments clearly define the content knowledge and professional skills to be evaluated (content knowledge: assessments 1 & 2; professional skills: assessments 3 – 6). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessments ambiguously define or inconsistently align the content knowledge and professional skills to be evaluated (content knowledge: assessments 1 & 2; professional skills: assessments 3 – 6). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessments do not align to the required content knowledge and professional skills to be evaluated (content knowledge: assessments 1 & 2; professional skills: assessments 3 – 6). |
|--|--|--|

Higher Level Skills

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessments require higher levels of intellectual behavior specified in standard components (e.g., develop, evaluate, analyze, & apply). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessments inconsistently require higher levels of intellectual behavior (e.g., develop, evaluate, analyze, & apply). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessments do not require higher levels of intellectual behavior (e.g., develop, evaluate, analyze, & apply). |
|--|--|--|

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
Evidence of Mastery		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The depth and breadth of the assessment tasks as outlined in the assessment descriptions elicit requisite evidence of candidates' level of mastery of essential content knowledge and professional skills (preponderance of evidence is defined as 75% of the components of each standard are met). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The limited depth and breadth of the assessment tasks as outlined in the assessment descriptions elicit partial evidence of candidate mastery of essential content knowledge and professional skills (preponderance of evidence is defined as 75% of the components of each standard are met). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The superficial and/or narrow assessment tasks as outlined in the assessment description(s) elicit minimal to no evidence of candidate mastery of essential content knowledge and professional skills (preponderance of evidence is defined as 75% of the components of each standard are met).
Scoring Rubric Alignment		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scoring rubric aligns to the specified standard components as identified in the assessment description and directions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scoring rubric alignment to the specified standard components as identified in the assessment description and directions is vague and/or incomplete. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scoring rubric is not provided or is not aligned to the specified standard components as identified in the assessment description and directions.
Scoring Rubric Focus		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within the body of the scoring rubric each standard component and related indicators must be measured separately. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within the body of the scoring rubric, some standard components and indicators are sometimes measured together making it impossible to accurately measure candidate performance at the individual component level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scoring rubric does not measure at the standard component level.
Judgment of Candidate Performance		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The basis for judging candidate performance (i.e., the criteria for success) is clearly defined and aligned to standard component indicators (content knowledge for assessments 1 & 2; professional skills for assessments 3 – 6). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The basis for judging candidate performance (i.e., the criteria for success) is partially defined and makes limited use of standard component indicators (content knowledge for assessments 1 & 2; professional skills for assessments 3 – 6.). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The basis for judging candidate performance (i.e., the criteria for success) is unclear in definition and/or unrelated to standard component indicators (content knowledge for assessments 1 & 2; professional skills for assessments 3 – 6).

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
-----	---------------------	---------

Levels of Candidate Performance

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proficiency level descriptions clearly distinguish differences among levels of performance using identifiers of what a candidate should demonstrate and a reviewer would expect to see at each performance level. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proficiency level descriptions provide subjective and/or vague qualifiers to distinguish differences among levels of performance thus limiting understanding of what a candidate should demonstrate and a reviewer would expect to see at each performance level. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scoring rubric does not measure at the standard component level. |
|---|---|--|
-

Data Chart Alignment

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data charts are aligned with standards as defined by the assessment directions and scoring rubrics. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data charts are inconsistently aligned with standards as defined by the assessment directions and/or scoring rubrics. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data charts lack alignment with standards as defined by the assessment directions and rubrics. |
|---|---|--|
-

Initial Program Report Data Chart Requirements

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial Program Report provides three applications of data for each assessment. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial Program Report provides fewer than three applications of data for one or two of the assessments but includes a valid justification for why the data is missing. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial Program Report does not provide three applications of data for all assessments and does not a valid justification for why the data is missing. |
|---|---|--|
-

Sufficiency of Data Representation

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data charts present data by semester/term/year, number of candidates and aggregates data at the standard level. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data charts do two of the following: report data by semester/term/year, number of candidates and/or aggregates data at the standard level. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data charts do not report the data by semester/term/year, number of candidates and aggregates data at the standard level. |
|---|--|---|

NELP Standard 8: NELP Reviewer Evaluation Rubric

The following rubric should be used by program reviewers in making qualitative judgments about the quality of NELP Standard 8. This standard outlines the components of a high-quality internship/clinical field experiences that are the signature for programs preparing entry-level candidates for school building leadership positions. Programs will be required to provide evidence for all of the components of Standard 8. However, programs are not required to meet all components of the standards as a criterion for National Recognition. This means that a standard could be met, even though evidence related to one or more components presented in the assessments is weak. Program reviewers will weigh the evidence presented in Program Reports, and when there is a greater weight of evidence in favor, they will conclude that a standard is met or that a program is recognized.

Program Reports should provide evidence of the components in Standard 8 through a one-page narrative document that describes the internship/clinical field experiences. Program reviewers should use the following rubric to evaluate the degree of alignment of the Program Report evidence.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
Description of Internship/Clinical Field Experience		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The internship/ clinical field experience is described in a comprehensive manner. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The internship/clinical field experience description is incomplete. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The internship/clinical field experience description is not provided.

NELP 8.1: Candidates are provided a variety of coherent, authentic, field and or clinical internship experiences within multiple school environments that afford opportunities to interact with stakeholders and synthesize and apply the content knowledge and develop and refine the professional skills articulated in each of the components included in NELP Building-Level Program Standards one through seven.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
Range of Experiences		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The internship/ clinical field experiences provide a range of diverse opportunities for candidates to engage in authentic school-based leadership work that requires them to synthesize and apply knowledge and skills gained through the program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The internship/ clinical field experiences provide limited opportunities for candidates to engage in authentic school-based leadership work that requires them to synthesize and apply knowledge and skills gained through the program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The internship/ clinical field experiences provide no opportunities for candidates to engage in authentic school-based leadership work that requires them to synthesize and apply knowledge and skills gained through the program.
Interactions with Stakeholders		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The internship/ clinical field experiences provide many opportunities for candidates to initiate and lead direct interactions with school staff, students, families, and school community leaders and organizations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The internship/ clinical field experiences involve candidates in a few direct interactions with school staff, students, families, and school community leaders and organizations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The internship/ clinical field experiences do not involve candidates in direct interactions with school staff, students, families, and school community leaders and organizations.
School Environments		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates are provided with opportunities to gain experiences in two or more school environments (e.g., elementary, middle, high, urban, suburban, rural, virtual, and alternative schools) to practice a wide range of relevant, school-based knowledge and leadership skills. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates are provided with an opportunity to gain experience in one type of school setting (e.g., elementary, middle, high, urban, suburban, rural, virtual, and alternative schools) to practice relevant, school-based knowledge and leadership skills. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates are not provided with an opportunity to gain experience in any school settings (e.g., elementary, middle, high, urban, suburban, rural, virtual, and alternative schools) to practice relevant, school-based knowledge and leadership skills.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
Alignment to Standard Component Areas		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description demonstrates alignment across all standard component areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description provides limited evidence of alignment across all standard component areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description provides insufficient or no evidence of alignment across standard component areas.

NELP 8.2: Candidates are provided a minimum of six-months of concentrated (10-15 hours per week) internship or clinical experiences that include authentic leadership activities within a school setting.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
Concentration of Experience		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program provides strong evidence that candidates participate in concentrated school internship/clinical field experiences over an extended period of time. The internship/clinical experiences cumulatively result in 6 months, 10–15 hours per week. <p>(Explanatory Note: The internship experience may be recurrent and it may include field experiences of different lengths. For example, experiences may include two noncontiguous clinical internships that together provide the equivalent of six months of clinical field experiences.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program provides evidence that candidates participate in limited school internship with field experiences over an extended period of time. The internship/clinical experiences cumulatively result in less than 6 months or less than 10 hours per week. <p>(Explanatory Note: The internship experience may be recurrent and it may include field experiences of different lengths. For example, experiences may include two noncontiguous clinical internships that together provide the equivalent of six months of clinical field experiences.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program fails to provide evidence that candidates participate in a sustained school internship with field experiences over an extended period of time or provides evidence that candidates do not participate in a sustained school internship with field experiences over an extended period of time.

NELP 8.3: Candidates are provided a mentor who has demonstrated effectiveness as an

educational leader within a building setting; is present for a significant portion of the internship; is selected collaboratively by the intern, a representative of the school and/or district, and program faculty; and is provided with training by the supervising institution.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
Mentor Qualifications		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program description includes comprehensive strategies for ensuring on-site mentors are qualified to serve as school-based educational leadership mentors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program description provides a vague explanation and limited information concerning how the program will ensure that on-site mentors are qualified to serve as school-based educational leadership mentors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program description fails to provide any explanation of qualifications for on-site mentors, or the evidence does not support how on-site mentors are qualified to serve as school-based educational leadership mentors.
Mentor Presence		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program description includes comprehensive strategies for ensuring that on-site mentors are present for a significant portion of the internship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program description provides a vague explanation of how they will ensure that on-site mentors are present for a significant portion of the internship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program description fails to provide any explanation of how they ensure that on-site mentors are present for a significant portion of the internship
Mentor Selection		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program description includes comprehensive strategies for how the on-site mentor is selected collaboratively by the intern, a representative of the school and/or district and a representative of the program faculty. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program description provides limited information regarding the selection of on-site mentors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program description fails to provide any explanation of how the on-site mentor is selected collaboratively by the intern, a representative of the school and/or district
Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met

Mentor Training

- Program description includes comprehensive strategies for how the supervising institution provides on-site mentors with training and guidance for their ongoing supervision and evaluation of intern candidates
- Program description provides limited information concerning the training of on-site mentors
- Program description fails to provide any explanation of how the supervising institution provides on-site mentors with training and guidance for their ongoing supervision and evaluation of intern candidates

Policy Regarding NELP Program Report Recognition Decisions

All Program Reports go through a three-step review process: 1) SPA program review, 2) SPA audit and 3) CAEP tech review. SPA review and audit team members must be professionals active in educational leadership organizations or institutions of higher education who are trained and qualified by the NELP SPA Coordinator. The CAEP tech review is conducted by CAEP headquarters staff.



NELP program reviewers and Audit Committee members will evaluate the “preponderance of evidence” presented in the program report to determine whether to grant “National Recognition,” “National Recognition with Conditions,” or “Further Development Required/Recognized with Probation.” “Preponderance of evidence’ means an overall confirmation that candidates meet standards in the strength, weight, or quality of evidence” (CAEP, 2017, p. 28). NELP program review decisions are based on the preponderance of evidence at the standard level using this definition. Specifically, 75% of the components of each standard must be met at the acceptable or target level.

Programs are required to submit two applications of data for each assessment in the initial report, and each standard must be represented in the two applications of data. That is, the assessment must be given and data collected at least two times. The data must be aggregated to the standard level. Programs may submit aggregate data by component to better make their case, but that is not required. This means that a standard could be met, even though evidence related to one or more components presented across the assessments is weak. Program reviewers will weigh the evidence presented in the NELP program reports, and when there is a greater weight of evidence (75% or more) in favor, they will conclude that a standard is met or that a program is recognized. “This will be based on the professional judgments of the SPA reviewer teams” (CAEP, 2017, p. 28).

Initial Program Report Decision Choices

Programs that are going through review for the first time have three opportunities to submit reports before a final recognition decision is applied. This allows programs the opportunity to receive feedback, collaborate with NELP and make changes in their programs without being penalized with a “not recognized” decision. A program that is being evaluated for the first time will receive one of the following three NELP program report decisions:

- a. National Recognition contingent upon unit accreditation
 - The program substantially meets all NELP standards 1-8;
 - No further submission required; program will receive full National Recognition when the unit receives accreditation;
 - Program will be listed on the CAEP website as Nationally Recognized if the unit is already accredited. If the unit is not accredited, then the program will be listed as Nationally Recognized pending unit accreditation.

- b. National Recognition with Conditions contingent upon unit accreditation
 - The program substantially meets some but not all NELP standards; therefore, a “Response to Conditions” report must be submitted within 24 months to remove the conditions. Conditions could include one or more of the following:
 - o Insufficient amount of data to determine if NELP standards are met;
 - o Insufficient alignment among NELP standards or assessments or scoring guides or data (see NELP Standard Evaluation Rubric);
 - o Lack of quality in some assessments or scoring guides;
 - The program has two opportunities within 24 months after the decision to remove the conditions. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, then the program status will be changed to Not Recognized.
 - The program is listed on the CAEP website as Nationally Recognized with Conditions until it achieves National Recognition. If its status is changed to Not Recognized, then the program will be removed from the list on the website.

- c. Further Development Required:
 - The program does not provide evidence that at least 75% of the components of each NELP standard are met and the NELP standards that are not met are critical to a high-quality program; therefore, recognition is not appropriate;
 - The program will have two opportunities within 12 to 14 months after the first decision to attain National Recognition or National Recognition with Conditions. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, then the program status will be changed to Not Recognized.

A program could receive a decision of Not Nationally Recognized only after two submissions within the 12 to 14-month period (from the first decision) were unsuccessful in achieving National Recognition or National Recognition with Conditions.

Program Report Decision Choices for a Currently Recognized Program

Program Reports that were previously approved by the NELP during a previous review cycle will not be in jeopardy of losing their recognition status immediately after their first review in a review cycle. These programs will receive one of the following NELP Program Report decisions:

- a. Continued National Recognition
 - The program substantially meets all NELP standards 1-8;
 - No further submission required;
 - Program is listed on the CAEP website as Nationally Recognized

- b. Continued National Recognition with Conditions
 - The program generally meets some but not all NELP standards; therefore, a “Response to Conditions” report must be submitted within 18 months to remove the conditions. Conditions could include one or more of the following:
 - o Insufficient amount of assessment data to determine if NELP standards are met;
 - o Insufficient alignment among NELP standards or assessments or scoring guides or data (see NELP Standard Evaluation Rubric);
 - o Lack of quality in some assessments or scoring guides;
 - The program will have two opportunities within 18 months after the first decision to attain National Recognition. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, then the program status will be changed to Not Recognized.
 - The program is listed on the CAEP website as Nationally Recognized (based on its prior review) until the Accreditation Council makes an accreditation decision for the unit. At that point, if the program has not achieved National Recognition with Conditions or National Recognition, its status is changed to Not Recognized and the program’s name will be removed from the website.

- c. Continued National Recognition with Probation
 - The program does not substantially meet all NELP standards and the NELP standards that are not met are critical to a high-quality program and more than a few in number, or are few in number but so fundamentally important that recognition is not appropriate. To remove probation, the unit may submit a revised Program Report addressing unmet standards within 12 to 14 months, or the unit may submit a new Program Report for national recognition within 12 to 14 months;
 - The program will have two opportunities within 12 to 14 months after the first decision to attain National Recognition or National Recognition with Conditions. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, then the program status will be changed to Not Recognized;
 - The program is listed on the CAEP website as Nationally Recognized (based on its prior review) until the Accreditation Council makes an accreditation decision for the unit. At that point, if the program is still Recognized with Probation, its status is changed to Not Recognized and the program’s name will be removed from the website.

A program could receive a decision of Not Nationally Recognized only after two submissions within the 12 to 14-month period (from the first decision) were unsuccessful in reaching either National Recognition or Continued National Recognition with Conditions.

APPENDIX 2: Alignment of NELP Program Standards with CAEP Principles

The four CAEP principles place student learning at the center of the educational enterprise (CAEP, 2017), and assert that “student learning must be the focus of standards and preparation for teachers and for other school professionals” (p. 11). The principles outline the knowledge and skills that beginning teachers must possess to fulfill their professional and ethical responsibilities to students in the classroom. Building level leaders also focus on student learning, though their influence on student learning is through their development of others, particularly teachers, as well as through their leadership of the school’s vision and learning environment. Thus, in addition to meeting their personal obligations to their profession, building-level school leaders have the added responsibility to ensure that all classroom teachers, as well as the other staff members who work with students are fluent in the CAEP principles. It is the building level leaders’ responsibility to ensure that educators know about learners and learning; that educators working with students know their content area and know how to instruct students and assess their progress. Finally, building level leaders play a major role in ensuring that educators meet their professional responsibilities.

The table below outlines how the National Educational Leadership Preparation Standards for Building Level Leaders align to the four CAEP Principles.

CAEP Principles	Advance Program Standards
Principle A: The Learner and Learning	<p>In addition to knowledge about students’ development and the school conditions that maximize student learning, building level leaders must also engage students’ families and ensure that students receive instruction in cultural responsive ways. Building leaders bear the primary responsibility for addressing equity issues and leading staff members and the families of students to ensure that the learning environments in which students are immersed value student differences and community values. The following four NELP Building Level Standards address Principle A:</p> <p>Standard One: Mission, Vision, and Improvement - Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to collaboratively lead, design and implement a school mission, vision and process for continuous improvement that reflects a core set of values and priorities.</p> <p>Standard Three: Equity, Inclusiveness and Cultural</p>

Responsiveness - Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to develop and maintain a supportive, equitable, culturally responsive and inclusive school culture.

Standard Four: Learning and Instruction - Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to evaluate, develop, and implement coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, supports and assessment.

Standard Five: Community and External Leadership - Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to engage families, community, and school personnel in order to strengthen student learning, support school improvement and advocate for the needs of their school and community.

Principle B: Content

As is pointed out in the CAEP document, Guidelines on Program Review with National Recognition using Specialized Professional Association (SPA) Standards, the term “content knowledge” has two meanings. “Content knowledge” refers to the subject matter of a discipline; it also refers to the professional field of study. As building level leaders, professionals must be able to address both of types of content. Building leaders must help others provide instructional in the subject matter disciplines that is accurate and to which students are given access through effective pedagogy. During their preparation, building level leaders must acquire the leadership knowledge outlined in the 7 standards outlined in the National Educational Leadership Preparation standards and accompanying components. The following seven NELP Building Level Standards address

Principle B:

Standard One: Mission, Vision, and Improvement -

Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to collaboratively lead, design and implement a school mission, vision and process for continuous improvement that reflects a core set of values and priorities.

Standard Two: Ethics and Professional Norms -

Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to *understand and demonstrate the capacity* to advocate for ethical decisions and cultivate and enact professional norms.

Standard Three: Equity, Inclusiveness and Cultural

Responsiveness - Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to develop and maintain a supportive, equitable, culturally responsive and inclusive school culture.

Standard Four: Learning and Instruction - Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to evaluate, develop, and implement coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, supports and assessment.

Standard Five: Community and External Leadership -

Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying

the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to engage families, community, and school personnel in order to strengthen student learning, support school improvement and advocate for the needs of their school and community.

Standard Six: Operations and Management - Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to improve management, communication, technology, school-level governance, and operation systems, to develop and improve school resource plans, and to apply laws, policies and regulations.

Standard Seven: Building Professional Capacity - Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to build the school's professional capacity, engage staff in the development of a collaborative professional culture, and improve systems of staff supervision, evaluation, support and professional learning.

Principle C: Instructional Practice

Candidates preparing for building level leadership positions must apply the knowledge outlined in the 7 NELP standards for building level leaders. Two of the most important aspects of building-level leaders' work are the abilities to monitor and improve the instruction and students receive and the ability to use assessment to benefit individual students as well as use assessments for charting improvements to curriculum and instruction. For Principle C, building level leaders have the dual responsibilities of knowing effective instructional and assessment practices as well as how to lead others in assessing and refining their expertise in these areas. The following four NELP Building Level Standards address Principle C:

Standard One: Mission, Vision, and Improvement - Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future

success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to collaboratively lead, design and implement a school mission, vision and process for continuous improvement that reflects a core set of values and priorities.

Standard Three: Equity, Inclusiveness and Cultural

Responsiveness - Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to develop and maintain a supportive, equitable, culturally responsive and inclusive school culture.

Standard Four: Learning and Instruction - Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to evaluate, develop, and implement coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, supports and assessment.

Standard Seven: Building Professional Capacity - Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to build the school's professional capacity, engage staff in the development of a collaborative professional culture, and improve systems of staff supervision, evaluation, support and professional learning.

Principle D: Professional Responsibility

Building level leaders must engage in their own professional learning, ethical practice, and collaboration while developing systems that ensure that others working with students also fulfil their professional responsibilities. The NELP Standards for Building Level Leaders provides candidates with a knowledge base that direction for personal professional responsibilities and for helping others fulfill their professional responsibilities. The Standards address the building level leaders' roles in collaboratively developing a school mission

that reflects the culture and values of the community. The standards also focus on assessing and continually improving curricula and the systems of instruction and assessment through which engage the curriculum. The following seven NELP Building Level Standards address Principle D:

Standard One: Mission, Vision, and Improvement -

Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to collaboratively lead, design and implement a school mission, vision and process for continuous improvement that reflects a core set of values and priorities.

Standard Two: Ethics and Professional Norms -

Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to *understand and demonstrate the capacity* to advocate for ethical decisions and cultivate and enact professional norms.

Standard Three: Equity, Inclusiveness and Cultural

Responsiveness - Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to develop and maintain a supportive, equitable, culturally responsive and inclusive school culture.

Standard Four: Learning and Instruction - Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to evaluate, develop, and implement coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, supports and assessment.

Standard Five: Community and External Leadership -

Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to engage families, community, and school personnel in order to strengthen student learning, support school improvement and advocate for the needs of their school and community.

Standard Six: Operations and Management - Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to improve management, communication, technology, school-level governance, and operation systems, to develop and improve school resource plans, and to apply laws, policies and regulations.

Standard Seven: Building Professional Capacity - Candidates who successfully complete a building level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to build the school's professional capacity, engage staff in the development of a collaborative professional culture, and improve systems of staff supervision, evaluation, support and professional learning.

APPENDIX 3: Research Support for Standards

The research shared in this Appendix to the NELP Building-Level Standards is based on a review of school leadership research supporting each of the NELP standards. This database represents an effort to be inclusive of a wide range of studies, with a focus on work published since 2000. These sources were culled by searching EBSCOhost academic education database, available through a public university, and Google Scholar for key search terms including overarching terms such as “school leadership” and “school effectiveness” as well as specific topics such as “cultural responsiveness” or “school vision.” In addition, the following publications were used to identify sources: (a) *The Research Base Supporting the ELCC Standards: Grounding Leadership Preparation Educational Leadership Constituent Council Standards in Empirical Research Educational Leadership Program Standards* (Eds. Young & Mawhinney et al., 2011) and (b) *Evidence Supporting the 2016 Revision of the Education Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) 2011* (Tucker, Anderson, Reynolds, & Mawhinney, 2016). The first source is a book that accompanied the 2011 version (ELCC) of the current leadership preparation program standards (NELP), providing the research background for the standards. The second study was commissioned as part of the standards revision process, published as a part of a special issue of the *Journal for Research in Educational Leadership (JRLE)*, and sought to update the research base with studies published between 2008 and 2013. This search yielded a total reference list of 261 sources.

Each source was coded by standard and component and the nature of the evidence, using NVivo 11.3 data analysis software. The complete database is available on line at the following url: http://www.ucea.org/resource_category/preparation/ The database includes a total of 521 references, with some studies addressing multiple aspects of school leadership or addressing the majority of the components within a standard. Whenever possible the abstract was coded for each source, but when the abstract included insufficient evidence of the methods or findings, the complete article was coded.

The nature of the evidence was determined by the connections made between the school conditions addressed in the standards and the knowledge, skills, and actions of the school leader. There were three different types of evidence: direct evidence of the need for the standard, indirect evidence of the need for the standard, and evidence related to the need for the standard. The definitions are as follows:

1. Direct evidence of the need for the standard:

- a. The study connected leadership behavior/s either directly or indirectly to a school or student level outcome (i.e. student achievement, professional engagement, student motivation, improvement, etc.)

2. Indirect evidence of the need for the standard:

- a. The study connected a school level variable that has been linked to leadership (i.e. teacher quality, school climate) to a school level outcome, or

- b. Provided specific detail about the relationship between leadership and a school or student level variable but does not make any claims directly or indirectly about a school or student level outcome.

3. Evidence related to the need for the standard:

- a. The study connected to the theme of a standard but does not necessarily make any claims about the relationship between the school leader and that theme, or
- b. Dealt with an intended school or student level outcome variable but does not explicitly mention the role of the school leader or a school level variable that has been linked to leadership.

Each type of support (direct, indirect and related) included quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods, and conceptual studies.

Table 1

Database sources by research methods and nature of the evidence

	Direct	Indirect	Related	Total
Standard 1	27	29	21	77
Standard 2	31	29	9	69
Standard 3	40	25	37	102
Standard 4	22	30	19	71
Standard 5	22	31	34	87
Standard 6	10	13	17	40
Standard 7	31	43	19	93
Standard 8	4	14	15	33
Total	187	214	171	572

Note. For more information on the evidence provided here, see the NELP Standards Building Level Database of Evidence.

Support for the Standards

The two standards with the most support, including the most direct evidence, were Standard 7 (Building Professional Capacity) and Standard 1 (Mission, Vision, and Improvement). The next most supported standard was Standard 3 (Equity, Inclusiveness and Cultural Responsiveness). These standards all had strong direct evidence. The next standard with somewhat strong evidence was Standard 5 (Community and External Leadership), followed by two standards with moderate support, Standard 4 (Learning and Instruction) and Standard 2 (Ethics and Professional Norms). The standard with the least amount of evidence, including limited direct evidence, was Standard 6 (Operations and Management).

In the following sections, there is a synthesis of a select sample of evidence, primarily evidence that directly links leaders to the area/s of school effectiveness or improvement found in each standard. At the end of each section is a table providing additional indirect and related citations.

Research Support for Standard One: Mission, Vision and Improvement

Standard 1 includes two components focused on a leader’s knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to collaboratively lead, design, and implement a school mission, vision and process for continuous improvement that reflects a core set of values and priorities. Many studies have explored the influence of transformative leadership on school effectiveness (Drago-Severson, 2012; Finnigan, 2012; Kose, 2009; Price, 2012; Supovitz, Sirinides, & May, 2009; Louis et al., 2010). An essential feature of transformational leadership is to demonstrate the capacity to lead, advocate for, and implement a mission, vision and strategic plan that supports school effectiveness and continuous school improvement (Geijsel, Slegers, Leithwood, & Jantzi, 2003; Kose, 2011; Kurland, Peretz, & Hertz-Lazarowitz, 2010; Mitchell & Sackney, 2006; Murphy & Torre, 2014; Penuel, Riel, Joshi, Pearlman, Kim, & Frank, 2010; Printy, & Marks, 2006; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008; Thoonen, Slegers, Oort, Peetsma, & Geijsel, 2011; Valentine & Prater, 2011).

Component 1.1 states, “Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to collaboratively evaluate, develop, and communicate a school mission and vision designed to reflect a core set of values and priorities.” This vision should be developed collaboratively with key stakeholders (Penuel et al., 2010; Finnigan & Daly, 2012) and should be informed by data (Eilers & Camancho, 2007; Halverson, 2010; Halverson, Pritchett, & Watson, 2007). It is important that the school leader ensures the school’s mission, vision, and goals are aligned with a set of core values, which emphasize important aspects of the school school’s culture such as equity, democracy, diversity, inclusiveness, community, commitment, and trust (Gurr, Drysdale, & Mulford, 2006; Hallinger, 2005; Kirby & DiPaola, 2011; Mitchell & Sackney, 2006; Printy & Marks, 2006; Scanlan & Lopez, 2012; Thoonen et al., 2011; Tschannen-Moran, 2009; Youngs & King, 2002). In pursuance of the mission and vision and aligned with core values, the school leader must collaborate with staff, families, and other members of the school community to design and monitor coherent and complementary systems of academic and social supports and services (Bruggencate, Luyten, Scheerens, & Slegers, 2012; Penuel et al., 2010; Printy & Marks, 2006; Tschannen-Moran, 2009).

Component 1.2 states, “Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to lead improvement processes that include design, implementation, and evaluation.” School leaders must be able to lead change by working with staff and school community to implement and evaluate a continuous, responsive, sustainable school improvement process focused on improving learning opportunities (Duke & Salmonowicz, 2010; Datnow & Castellano, 2001; Geijsel et al., 2003; Gerard, Bowyer, & Linn, 2008; Hallinger, 2005; Hallinger & Heck, 2011; Klar & Brewer, 2013; Silins & Mulford, 2002, 2004; Tschannen-Moran, 2009). This improvement

process should be done collaboratively (Goddard, Goddard, & Tschannen-Moran; Murphy & Meyers, 2009; Timar & Chyu, 2010) and should be constantly monitored (Halverson, 2010; Levin & Datnow, 2012; Marsh, 2012; Wayman & Stringfield, 2006; Wohlsetter, Datnow, & Park, 2008).

The following table shows the breakdown of support for this standard.

Table 2
Evidence for standard one by component and type of evidence

	Direct	Indirect	Related	Total
C1.1: Mission and vision that reflects a core set of values and priorities	23	12	9	44
C1.2: Lead improvement processes	4	17	12	33
Total	27	29	21	77

Note. For more information on the evidence provided here, see the NELP Standards Building Level Database of Evidence.

Research Support for Standard Two: Ethics and Professional Norms

Standard 2 includes three components focused on a leader’s knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to understand and demonstrate the capacity to advocate for ethical decisions and cultivate and enact professional dispositions and norms. School leaders must ensure that there are ethical values and norms that guide decision-making and other leadership behaviors to ensure the well-being of students (Begley, 2006; Frick, 2011; Frick, Faircloth, & Little, 2013; Kearney, Kelsey, & Herrington, 2013; Louis et al., 2010; Riehl, 2008; Shields 2004, 2010; Theoharis & Haddix, 2011; Walker & Shuangye, 2007).

Component 2.1 states, “Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to reflect on, communicate about, cultivate, and model professional dispositions and norms (e.g., fairness, integrity, transparency, trust, collaboration, perseverance, reflection, life-long learning, digital citizenship) that support the educational success and well-being of each student and adult.” An important aspect of ethical leadership is to develop the capacity to enact the professional norms of integrity, fairness, transparency, trust, collaboration, perseverance, self-awareness, reflection, life-long learning and continuous improvement in their actions, decision making, management of resources and relationships with others (Auerbach, 2009; Cooper, 2009; Goddard, Goddard, Kim, & Miller, 2015; Gurr et al., 2006; Price, 2012; Sanzo, Sherman, & Clayton, 2011; Scanlan & Lopez, 2012; Shelden, Angell, Stoner, & Roseland, 2010, Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Youngs, & King, 2002. In order to promote these cultural norms, leaders must engage in reflective practice and model those norms (Auerbach, 2009; Cooper, 2009; Gurr et al., 2006; Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Leaders must also be able to cultivate, communicate, and uphold these norms within and among diverse stakeholder groups,

addressing potential conflicts between individual and group rights in their decision-making processes (Cooper, 2009; Gurr et al., 2006; Shelden et al., 2010).

Component 2.2 states, “Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to evaluate, communicate about, and advocate for ethical and legal decisions.” They must also use professional judgment to consider ethical dilemmas, moral and legal consequences, and stewardship of the school’s resources (Cooper, 2009; Frick, 2011; Frick Faircloth, & Little, 2013). Leaders should also serve as advocates for the needs of all students (Good, 2008).

Component 2.3 states, “Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to model ethical behavior in their personal conduct and relationships and to cultivate ethical behavior in others.” School leaders must model ethical behavior in their personal conduct, relationships with others, and responses to unethical or unprofessional actions (Barnett & McCormick, 2004; Begley, 2006; Cooper, 2009; Gurr et al., 2006; Kerney, Kelsey, & Herrington, 2013; Price, 2012; Sanzo et al., 2011). The leader must also expect and support ethical behavior from staff and students (Cooper, 2009; Mitchell & Sackney, 2006; Price, 2012).

The following table shows the breakdown of support for this standard:

Table 3
Evidence for standard two by component and type of evidence

	Direct	Indirect	Related	Total
C2.1: Professional norms	13	16	5	34
C2.2: Ethical and legal decisions	6	4	1	11
C2.3: Ethical behavior	12	9	3	24
Total	31	29	9	69

Note. For more information on the evidence provided here, see the NELP Standards Building Level Database of Evidence.

Research Support for Standard Three: Equity, Inclusiveness and Cultural Responsiveness

Standard 3 includes three components focused a leader’s knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to develop and maintain a supportive, equitable, responsive and inclusive school culture. In order to ensure this supportive school culture exists, where every student is treated fairly and respectfully, there must be equitable guidelines, procedures, and decisions (Auerbach, 2009; Brooks, Adams, & Morita-Mullaney, 2010; Cooper, 2009; McKenzie et al., 2008; Scanlan, & Lopez, 2012; Theoharis & O’Toole, 2011),

Component 3.1 states, “Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to evaluate, design, cultivate, and advocate for a supportive and inclusive school culture.” School leaders are responsible for developing a safe, caring, healthy, inclusive and responsive school culture that embraces the belief that all students can learn at high levels, fosters supportive

relationships, and monitors and addresses individual and institutional biases to ensure each student and adult is treated fairly, respectfully, in a responsive manner (Auerbach, 2009; Barnett & McCormick, 2004; Gurr et al., 2006; Khalifa, 2010; Kirby & DiPaola, 2011; Lee & Smith, 1999; Louis et al., 2010; Price, 2012; Robinson et al., 2008; Sebastian & Allensworth, 2012).

Component 3.2 states, “Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to evaluate, cultivate, and advocate for equitable access to educational resources and opportunities that support the educational success and well-being of each student.” In order for all students to be successful, school leaders must ensure that school structures are established to ensure an equitable schooling experience (Cooper, 2009; Juettner, 2003; Louis et al., 2010; Marx, & Larson, 2012; McKenzie & Scheurich, 2004; Riehl, 2008; Theoharis, 2007; Theoharis & Haddix, 2011). Leaders must ensure equitable access to effective teachers, positive relationships with peers and adults, learning opportunities, social and behavioral support, accommodations and interventions, technology, and other resources necessary for success (Brooks et al., 2010; McKenzie et al., 2008; Price, 2012; Scanlan & Lopez, 2012; Theoharis & O’Toole, 2011; Youngs & King, 2002).

Component 3.3 states, “Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to evaluate, cultivate, and advocate for equitable, inclusive and culturally responsive instruction and behavior support practices among teachers and staff.” Furthermore in order for school leaders to ensure equity, they must support the development of teachers’ and staffs’ ability to recognize, respect and employ each student’s strengths, diversity and culture as assets for teaching and learning and to recognize and redress biases, marginalization, deficit-based schooling, and low expectations associated with race, class, culture and language, gender and sexual orientation, religion, and disability or special status (Auerbach, 2009; Brooks et al., 2010; Khalifa, 2010; McKenzie et al., 2008; Robinson et al., 2008; Scanlan & Lopez, 2012; Theoharis & O’Toole, 2011; Youngs & King, 2002).

The following table shows the breakdown of support for this standard:

Table 4

Evidence for standard three by component and type of evidence

	Direct	Indirect	Related	Total
C3.1: Supportive and inclusive school culture	18	13	18	49
C3.2: Equitable access	10	7	7	24
C3.3: Equitable instructional and behavior support practices	12	5	12	29
Total	40	25	37	102

Note. For more information on the evidence provided here, see the NELP Standards Building Level Database of Evidence.

Research Support for Standard Four: Learning and Instruction

Standard 4 includes four components focused a leader’s knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to diagnose, develop, implement and evaluate coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, supports and assessment. Learning and instruction is the technical core of schooling and must be a central priority for school leaders (Heck & Moriyama, 2010; Louis et al., 2010). School leaders create the programs and structures that support teaching and learning (Gerard, Bowyer, & Linn, 2008); Marks & Printy, 2003; Sebastian & Allensworth, 2012; Southworth, 2002).

Component 4.1 states, “Program completers understand and can demonstrate the capacity to evaluate, develop, and implement high-quality, technology rich curricula programs and other supports for academic and non-academic student programs.” With regard to well-developed curriculum and instruction, school leaders must be able to implement curricular resource and support systems that effectively and efficiently utilize time, technologies, instructional spaces, data, staffing, professional development, and communication to support equitable access to learning for each student, including linguistically diverse students and those with special needs (Flanagan & Jacobsen, 2003; Goddard et al., 2015; Libby, Bowyer, & Linn, 2008; Matsumura, Sartoris, Bickel, & Garnier, 2009; Printy & Marks, 2006; Robinson et al., 2008; Sanzo et al., 2011; Sebastian & Allensworth, 2012; Supovitz et al., 2009; Tschannen-Moran, 2009).

Component 4.2 states, “Program completers understand and can demonstrate the capacity to evaluate, develop, and implement high-quality and equitable academic and non-academic instructional practices, resources and services that support student and adult learning.” In addition to a coherent curriculum, school leader must address instructional practices by developing the capacity to promote challenging, engaging and equitable instructional practice and assessments informed by learning theory and research on special populations, child development, learning, and effective teaching (Crum & Sherman, 2008; Goddard et al., 2015; Hallinger, 2005; Lee & Smith, 1999; Louis et al., 2010; McKenzie et al., 2008; Riehl, 2008; Sanzo et al., 2011; Scanlan & Lopez, 2012).

Component 4.3 states, “Program completers understand and can demonstrate the capacity to evaluate, develop, and implement formal and informal culturally responsive and accessible assessments that support instructional improvement and student learning and well-being.” School leaders need to be able to support the collection of high-quality data from formative and summative assessments of student learning (Halverson, 2010; Halverson et al., 2007; Wayman & Stringfield, 2006) in order to examine how to improve instruction by proposing strategies to address trends in the assessment data (Levin & Datnow, 2012; Marsh, 2012; Murphy & Meyers, 2009)

Component 4.4 states, “Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to collaboratively evaluate, develop, and implement the school’s curriculum, instruction and assessment practices in a coherent, equitable, and systematic manner.” In order to promote learning, school leaders must ensure coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, and assessment that are responsive to student needs, embody high expectations for student learning, align with academic standards, and promote academic success, career readiness,

innovation and social emotional well-being for each student (Lee & Smith, 1999; Sebastian & Allensworth, 2012). These strategies should improve coordination and coherence among academic and non-academic systems and should be designed and implemented with collaboration from faculty (Halverson, 2010; Heck & Moriyama, 2010; Newmann, Smith, Allensworth, & Bryk, 2001; Robinson et al., 2008; Williams, Atkinson, Cate, & O’Hair, 2008; Youngs & King, 2002).

The following table shows the breakdown of support for this standard.

Table 5
Evidence for standard four by component and type of evidence

	Direct	Indirect	Related	Total
C4.1: Curricula, technologies, programs and other supports	8	12	4	24
C4.2: Academic and non-academic instructional practices and student services	9	3	5	17
C4.3: Formal and informal assessments	1	9	4	14
C4.4: Systems of curriculum, instruction, and assessment	4	6	6	16
Total	22	30	19	71

Note. For more information on the evidence provided here, see the NELP Standards Building Level Database of Evidence.

Research Support for Standard Five: Community and External Leadership.

Standard 5 includes three components focused on developing a leader’s knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to engage families, community, and school personnel in order to strengthen student learning, support school improvement and advocate for the needs of their school and community. In order for students to be successful, schools must put structures into place and nurture relationships that engage parents, families, and communities in authentic and meaningful ways (Auerbach, 2009; Bell, Bolam, Cubillo, 2003; Duke, Tucker, Salomonowicz, & Levy, 2007; Jeynes, 2005; Louis et al., 2010; Taylor & Pearson, 2004).

Component 5.1 states, “Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to understand and collaboratively engage diverse families in strengthening student learning in and out of school.” Research and practice have established the importance of school leaders developing the capacity to engage with families to strengthen student learning and the school environment (Adams, Forsyth, & Mitchell. 2009; Auerbach, 2009; Fan & Chen, 2001; Gordon & Louis, 2009; Jeynes, 2005; Kirby & DiPaola, 2011; Riehl, 2008; Sanders & Harvey, 2002). In the

interest of engagement, school leaders should ensure effective two-way communication with families and collaborate to support student success (Feuerstein, 2000; Gordon & Louis, 2009; Riehl, 2008; Shelden et al., 2010; Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Taylor & Pearson, 2004; Young, Rodriguez & Lee, 2008). Leaders must understand and recognize the assets inherent in the family culture and community demographics (Barnyak & McNelly, 2009; Ishimaru, 2013; Khalifa, 2012; Young, Rodriguez & Lee, 2008) and leverage those assets to ensure parent involvement by being welcoming and by entering into partnerships with families (Sheldon & Epstein, 2002; Sheldon & Van Voorhis, 2004; Sheldon, Epstein, & Galindo, 2010; Warren, Hong, Rubin, & Uy, 2009).

Component 5.2 states, “Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to understand, collaboratively engage and cultivate relationships with diverse community members, partners, and other constituencies for the benefit of school improvement and student development.” This focus on engagement and communication with communities should also result in partnerships that access the cultural, social, intellectual and political resources of diverse families, communities and public and private sectors for the benefit of school improvement and student development (Khalifa, 2010; Riehl, 2008; Sanders & Harvey, 2002; Shelden et al., 2010). Leaders must also openly communicate with community members (Gordon & Louis, 2009; Riehl, 2008; Shelden et al., 2010; Tschannen-Moran, 2001) and engage with the community (Khalifa, 2012).

Component 5.3 states, “Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to collaboratively engage the larger organizational and policy context to advocate for the needs of their school and community.” School leaders should also be aware of the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural changes and expectations and, in light of that understanding, advocate for the needs and priorities of the school, district, students, families, the community and the profession (Hoffman, 2009; Khalifa, 2012; Kirby & DiPaola, 2011; Sanders & Harvey, 2002; Shelden et al., 2010; Theoharis & Haddix, 2011). Leaders must also have open lines of communication with feeder and connecting schools, and the district central office (Gordon & Louis, 2009; Riehl, 2008; Shelden et al., 2010; Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Furthermore, they should advocate for school and community needs (Hoffman, 2009; Johnson & Fauske, 2000; Khalifa, 2012).

The following table shows the breakdown of support for this standard:

Table 6
Evidence for standard five by component and type of evidence

	Direct	Indirect	Related	Total
C5.1: Engage families	8	16	15	39
C5.2: Engage community members, partners, and other constituencies	8	8	12	28

C5.3: Engage the larger organizational and policy context	6	7	7	20
Total	22	31	34	87

Note. For more information on the evidence provided here, see the NELP Standards Building Level Database of Evidence.

Research Support for Standard Six: Operations and Management

Standard 6 includes three components focused on developing a leader’s knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to improve management, data-use, equity, communication, technology, school-level governance, and operation systems, to develop and improve school resource plans, and to apply laws, policies and regulations. Organizational management is a set of school leadership behaviors that have less grounding in research but that are known to be essential for running an effective school (Grissom & Loeb, 2011; Louis et al., 2010).

Component 6.1 states, “Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to evaluate, develop and implement management, communication, technology, school-level governance, and operation systems that support each student’s learning needs and promote the mission and vision of the school.” School leaders are responsible for developing and monitoring school management and operation systems that support each student’s learning needs and promote the mission and vision of the school (Guramatunhu-Mudiwa & Scherz, 2013; Halverson et al., 2007; Levin & Datnow, 2012; Marsh, 2012; Mitchell & Sackney, 2006; Robinson et al., 2008; Wayman & Stringfield, 2006; Youngs & King, 2002).

Component 6.2 states, “Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to evaluate, develop and advocate for a data-informed and equitable resourcing plan that supports school improvement and student development.” Managing and operating a school has a lot to do with diagnosing needs and developing a resource plan that meets those needs, including acquiring and managing fiscal resources, physical resources, technological resources, data, and other resources; developing and coordinating communication systems that gather and deliver actionable information for student learning, school improvement, and community engagement and enhance understanding to support student learning, collective professional capacity and community, and family engagement (Burch, Theorharis, & Rauscher, 2010; Heck & Hallinger, 2014; Grissom & Loeb, 2011; Ingle, Rutledge, & Bishop, 2011; Louis et al., 2010; Robinson et al., 2008; Youngs & King, 2002).

Component 6.3 states, “Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to reflectively evaluate, communicate about, and implement laws, rights, policies, and regulations to promote student and adult success and well-being.” School leaders must be able to interpret applicable laws, rights, policies, and regulations in order to adhere to them and benefit the

students (Grissom & Loeb, 2011; Louis et al., 2010; Mintrop, 2004; Singh & Al-Fadhli, 2011). They also serve as policymakers (Nance, 2003) and policy implementers (Conley & Glasman, 2008; Powell, Higgins, Aram, & Freed, 2009)

The following table shows the breakdown of support for this standard:

Table 7

Evidence for standard six by component and type of evidence

	Direct	Indirect	Related	Total
C6.1: School-level governance, and operation systems	5	6	5	16
C6.2: Resourcing plan	3	4	6	13
C6.3: Apply laws, rights, policies, and regulations	2	3	6	11
Total	10	13	17	40

Note. For more information on the evidence provided here, see the NELP Standards Building Level Database of Evidence.

Research Support for Standard Seven: Building Professional Capacity

Standard 7 includes four components focused on developing a leader’s knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to engage staff in the development of a collaborative professional culture, build the school’s professional capacity, and improve systems of staff supervision, evaluation, support and professional learning. An important function of a school leader is to develop the individual and collective professional capacity and community to support student learning (Camburn, Rowan, & Taylor, 2003; Crum & Sherman, 2008; Goddard, Neumerski, Goddard, Salloum, & Berebitsky, 2010; Hallinger, 2005; Kose, 2009; Louis et al., 2010; Price, 2012; Supovitz et al., 2009; Thoonen et al., 2011).

Component 7.1 states, “Program completers understand and have the capacity to collaboratively develop the school’s professional capacity through engagement in recruiting, selecting and hiring staff.” A managerial component of developing professional capacity is to ensure a system that recruits, hires, supports, and retains high-quality educational personnel and creates leadership pathways for effective succession (Cohen-Vogel, 2011; Copland, 2003; Engel, 2013; Fuller, Young & Baker, 2011; Heck & Hallinger, 2014; Ingle, Rutledge, & Bishop, 2011).

Component 7.2 states, “Program completers understand and have the capacity to develop and engage staff in a collaborative professional culture designed to promote school improvement, teacher retention, and the success and well-being of each student and adult in the school.” With regard to professional learning, school leaders must develop and sustain a positive professional culture of inquiry, collaboration, innovation and shared-leadership that empowers school staff with collective responsibility for enacting professional norms as they collaboratively work to achieve the school’s shared vision, continuous school improvement and objectives pertaining to the education of the whole child (Bruggencate et al., 2012; Goddard et al., 2015; Hoy, Sweetland, & Smith, 2002; Ishimaru, 2013; Mullen & Hutinger, 2008; Printy, 2008; Robinson et al., 2008; Sanzo et al., 2011; Tschannen-Moran, 2009; Walker & Slear, 2011).

Component 7.3 states, “Program completers understand and have the capacity to personally engage in, as well as collaboratively engage school staff in, professional learning designed to promote reflection, personal growth, cultural responsiveness, distributed leadership, digital literacy and citizenship, school improvement and student success.” In the interest of developing and retaining high quality teachers and staff, the school leader must develop workplace conditions that promote employee leadership, well-being, and professional learning and growth (Brezicha, Bergmark, & Mitra, 2014; Drago-Severson, 2012; Hoy et al., 2002; Ishimaru, 2013; Matsumura, Sartoris, Bickel, & Garnier, 2009; Mitchell & Sackney; Mullen & Hutinger, 2008; Printy, 2008; Sanzo et al., 2011; Sebastian & Allensworth, 2012; Tschannen-Moran, 2009; Walker & Slear, 2011; Youngs & King, 2002).

Component 7.4 states, “Program completers understand and have the capacity to evaluate, develop, and implement systems of supervision, support and evaluation that promote school improvement and student success.” To ensure the quality of the learning experience, school leaders must develop research-anchored systems of supervision, support, and evaluation that provide actionable feedback about instruction and other professional practices, promoting professional learning, leadership, and commitment to continuous school improvement (Hoy et al., 2002; Mitchell & Sackney, 2006; Printy, 2008; Robinson et al., 2008; Tschannen-Moran, 2009; Walker & Slear, 2011; Youngs & King, 2002).

The following table shows the breakdown of support for this standard.

Table 8

<i>Evidence for standard seven by component and type of evidence</i>				
	Direct	Indirect	Related	Total
C7.1: Collaborative professional culture	18	22	5	45
C7.2: Professional capacity	8	6	4	18
C7.3: Collaboratively engage staff in professional learning	1	9	4	14

C7.4: Supervision, support, and evaluation	4	6	6	16
Total	31	43	19	93

Note. For more information on the evidence provided here, see the NELP Standards Building Level Database of Evidence.

Research Support for NELP Standard 8: The Internship

Standard 8 includes three components that address the internship under the supervision of knowledgeable, expert practitioners that engages candidates in multiple and diverse school settings, and provides candidates with coherent, authentic and sustained opportunities to synthesize and apply the knowledge and skills identified in NELP Standards 1-7 in ways that approximate the full range of responsibilities required of building level leaders and enable them to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult in their school. Evidence confirms the importance of a substantial and sustained educational leadership internship experience that has school-based field experiences and clinical internship practice within a school setting, monitored by a qualified onsite mentor. Educator preparation program typically involve a field component, often referred to as the internship (Reyes-Guerra & Barnett, 2017). Principals demonstrate better leadership practices and more satisfaction with their preparation when they have had longer, more full-time internships (Cordeiro & Sloan, 1996; Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, & Orr, 2007; Hackmann, Russell, & Elliot, 1999; Orr, 2011; Orr & Barber, 2007; Orr & Orphanos, 2011; Young, Crow, Murphy, & Ogawa, 2009; Young & Crow, 2017).

Many of the internship components and descriptors of practice in Standard 8 parallel the research findings from Danforth Foundation-funded innovations in leadership preparation in the early 1990s. The critical components of the field experience identified were: (a) exposure to and engagement in relevant and realistic range of site responsibilities (8.1); (b) reflective seminars to support interns' analysis and integration of learning (8.1); (d) multiple and alternative internship experiences to support diverse clinical training (8.1); (e) sufficient time on task (frequency and regularity of work across school year and day (8.2); (f) support of effective mentor practitioners (8.3); (g) relationship with mentors who have demonstrated skills and have been trained as mentors: focus on appropriate modeling and reflection (8.3); and (h) field supervision, including program coordination by educators who can link district and university programs, model professional development and learning (8.3) (Milstein & Kruger, 1997).

Component 8.1 states, "Candidates are provided a variety of coherent, authentic, field and or clinical internship experiences within multiple school environments that afford opportunities to interact with stakeholders and synthesize and apply the content knowledge and develop and refine the professional skills articulated in each of the components included in NELP Building-Level Program Standards one through seven." Research has found that a high-quality internship should provide the necessary authentic learning experience for becoming a principal. They should give the candidate the responsibilities of leading, facilitating, and making decisions typical of an educational leader and should develop an educational leader's perspective on

school improvement (Darling-Hammond, Meyerson, LaPointe, & Orr, 2009; Darling-Hammond et al., 2007; Davis, Darling-Hammond, Meyerson, & LaPointe, 2005; Leithwood et al., 1996; Orr & Orphanos, 2011; Reyes-Guerra & Barnett, 2017; Young, et.al, 2009; Young & Crow, 2017). The role of the internship should be to socialize the candidate to the principalship (Browne-Ferrigno & Muth, 2004; Reyes-Guerra & Barnett, 2017).

Component 8.2 states, “Candidates are provided a minimum of six-months of concentrated (10-15 hours per week) building-level internship or clinical experiences that are authentic leadership activities within a building setting.” Although there is very little empirical research on the length and structure of internships, educational experts have argued that ideally the internship is full time and job embedded (Barnett, Copland, & Shoho, 2009; Carr, Chenoweth, & Ruhl, 2003; Reyes-Guerra & Barnett, 2017; Young, et.al, 2009; Young & Crow, 2017). Candidates with longer internships, averaging a full year, are better prepared for the position of school leader (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Hackman et al., 1999).

Component 8.3 states, “Candidates are provided a mentor who has demonstrated effectiveness as an educational leader within a building setting; understands the specific school context; is present for a significant portion of the internship; is selected collaboratively by the intern, a representative of the school and/or district, and program faculty; and is provided with training by the supervising institution.” A high-quality internship should closely supervise candidates, ideally in conjunction with highly-skilled school leaders, and should have program faculty regularly evaluate candidates. (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). Candidates should be matched with a trained mentor (Cordeiro & Sloan, 1996; Davis et al., 2005; Geismer, Morris, & Lieberman, 2014; Leithwood et al., 1996; Sosik, Lee & Bouquillon, 2005; Young, et.al, 2009; Young & Crow, 2017).

Table 9

Evidence for standard eight by component

Component	Direct	Indirect	Related	Total
C8.1: Coherent, authentic, experiences that provide opportunities to synthesize and apply the content knowledge, develop and refine the professional skills	2	4	5	11
C8.2: Minimum of six-months of concentrated (10-15 hours per week) building-level internship or clinical experiences that are authentic leadership activities	0	3	8	11
C8.3: Mentor who has demonstrated effectiveness as an educational leader within a building setting; understands the specific school context	2	7	2	11
Total	4	14	15	33

Note. For more information on the evidence provided here, visit the NELP Standards Building Level Database of Evidence.

References

- Adams, C. M., Forsyth, P. B., & Mitchell, R. M. (2009). The formation of parent-school trust: A multilevel analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(1), 4-33. doi: 10.1177/0013161X08327550.
- Auerbach, S. (2009). Walking the walk: Portraits in leadership for family engagement in urban schools. *School Community Journal*, 19(1), 9–32. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10211.2/2804>
- Barnyak, N. C., & McNelly, T. A. (2009). An urban school district's parent involvement: A study of teachers' and administrators' beliefs and practices. *School Community Journal*, 19(1), 33-58. Retrieved from ERIC.
- Barnett B. G., Copland M. A., Shoho A. R. (2009). The use of internships in preparing school leaders. In Young M. D., Crow G. M., Murphy J., Ogawa R. T. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on the education of school leaders* (pp. 371-394). New York, NY: Routledge
- Barnett, K., & McCormick, J. (2004). Leadership and individual principal-teacher relationships in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(3), 406-434. doi: 10.1177/0013161X03261742.
- Begley, P. T. (2006). Self-knowledge, capacity and sensitivity: Prerequisites to authentic leadership by school principals. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44(6), 570-589. doi: 10.1108/09578230610704792.
- Bell, L., Bolam, R., Cubillo, L. (2003). A systematic review of the impact of school leadership and management on student outcomes. London: EPPI Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education. Retrieved from https://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/Portals/0/PDF%20reviews%20and%20summaries/lea_rv1.pdf?ver=2006-03-02-124943-017
- Brezicha, K., Bergmark, U., & Mitra, D. L. (2014). One size does not fit all: Differentiating leadership to support teachers in school reform. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 51(1), 96-132. doi: 10.1177/0013161X14521632.
- Brooks, K., Adams, S. R., & Morita-Mullaney, T. (2010). Creating inclusive learning communities for ELL students: Transforming school principals' perspectives. *Theory Into Practice*, 49(2), 145-151. doi: 10.1080/00405841003641501.
- Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Muth, R. (2004). Leadership mentoring in clinical practice: Role socialization, professional development, and capacity building. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(4), 468-494. doi: 10.1177/0013161x04267113
- Bruggencate, G., Luyten, H., Scheerens, J., & Slegers, P. (2012). Modeling the influence of school leaders on student achievement: How can school leaders make a difference? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(4), 699-732. doi: 10.1177/0013161x11436272.
- Burch, P., Theoharis, G., & Rauscher, E. (2010). Class size reduction in practice investigating the influence of the elementary school principal. *Educational Policy*, 24(2), 330-358. doi: 10.1177/0895904808330168
- Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Easton, J. Q., & Luppescu, S. (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Camburn, E., Rowan, B., & Taylor, J. E. (2003). Distributed leadership in schools: The case of

- elementary schools adopting comprehensive school reform models. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25(4), 347-373. doi: 10.3102/01623737025004347.
- Canole, M. & Young, M. D. (2013). *Standards for Educational Leaders: An Analysis*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Carr C. S., Chenoweth T., Ruhl T. (2003). Best practice in educational leadership preparation programs. In Lunenburg F. C., Carr C. S. (Eds.), *Shaping the future: Policy, partnerships, and emerging perspectives: Vol. 11. Yearbook of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration* (pp. 204-222). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Cohen-Vogel, L. (2011). "Staffing to the test": Are today's school personnel practices evidence based? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 33(4), 483-505. doi: 10.3102/016237371141984.
- Conley, S., & Glasman, N. S. (2008). Fear, the school organization, and teacher evaluation. *Educational Policy*, 22(1), 63-85. doi: 10.1177/0895904807311297.
- Cooper, C. W. (2009). Performing cultural work in demographically changing schools: Implications for expanding transformative leadership frameworks. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. 45(5), 694-724. doi: 10.1177/0013161X09341639
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). (2017). *Guidelines on program review with national recognition using Specialized Professional Association (SPA) standards*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). (2015). *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL)*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). (2008). *Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). (1996). *The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: Standards for School Leaders*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Copland, M. A. (2003). Leadership of inquiry: Building and sustaining capacity for school improvement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25(4), 375-395. doi: 10.3102/01623737025004375.
- Cordeiro, P. A., & Smith Sloan, E. (1996). Administrative interns as legitimate participants in the community of practice. *Journal of School Leadership*, 6, 4-29. Retrieved from: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ519709>
- Crum, K. S., & Sherman, W. H. (2008). Facilitating high achievement: High school principals' reflections on their successful leadership practices. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(5), 562-580. doi: 10.1108/09578230810895492.
- Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., Meyerson, D., & Orr, M. T. (2007). *Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Lessons from exemplary leadership development programs*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Documents/Preparing-School-Leaders.pdf>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Meyerson, D., LaPointe, M., & Orr, M. T. (2009). *Preparing principals for a changing world: Lessons from effective school leadership programs*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Datnow, A., & Castellano, M. E. (2001). Managing and guiding school reform: Leadership in success for all schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(2), 219. doi: 10.1177/00131610121969307.

- Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., Meyerson, D., & LaPointe, M. (2005). *Review of research. School leadership study. Developing successful principals*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University, Educational Leadership Institute.
- Drago-Severson, E. (2012). New opportunities for principal leadership: Shaping school climates for enhanced teacher development. *Teachers College Record*, 114(3), 1-44. Retrieved from <http://www.tcrecord.org/>
- Duke, D. L., Tucker, P. D., Salmonowicz, M. J., & Levy, M. K. (2007). How comparable are the perceived challenges facing principals of low-performing schools. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 35(1), 3-21. doi: 10.7459/ept/28.2.02.
- Duke, D., & Salmonowicz, M. (2010). Key decisions of a first-year 'turnaround' principal. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 38(1), 33-58. doi: 10.1177/1741143209345450.
- Eilers, A. M., & Camacho, A. (2007). School culture change in the making: Leadership factors that matter. *Urban Education*, 42(6), 616-637. doi: 10.1177/0042085907304906.
- Engel, M. (2013). Problematic preferences? A mixed method examination of principals' preferences for teacher characteristics in Chicago. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49(1), 52-91. doi: 10.1177/0013161X12451025.
- Fan, X., & Chen, M. (2001). Parental involvement and students' academic achievement: a meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 13(1), 1-22. doi: 10.1177/0042085906293818.
- Feuerstein, A. (2000). School characteristics and parent involvement: influences on participation in children's schools. *Journal of Educational Research*, 94(1), 29. doi: 10.1080/00220670009598740.
- Finnigan, K. S. & Daly, A. J. (2012). Mind the gap: Organizational learning and improvement in an underperforming urban system. *American Journal of Education*, 119(1), 41-71. doi: 10.1086/667700.
- Finnigan, K. S. (2012). Principal leadership in low-performing schools: A closer look through the eyes of teachers. *Education and Urban Society*, 44(2), 183-202. doi: 10.1177/0013124511431570.
- Flanagan, L., & Jacobsen, M. (2003). Technology leadership for the twenty-first century principal. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41(2), 124-142. doi: 10.1108/09578230310464648.
- Frick, W. C. (2011). Practicing a professional ethic: Leading for students' best interests. *American Journal of Education*, 117(4), 527-562. doi: 10.1086/660757.
- Frick, W. C., Faircloth, S. C., & Little, K. S. (2013). Responding to the collective and individual "best interests of students": Revisiting the tension between administrative practice and ethical imperatives in special education leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49(2), 207-242. doi: 10.1177/0013161x12463230.
- Fuller, E., Young, M., & Baker, B. D. (2011). Do principal preparation programs influence student achievement through the building of teacher-team qualifications by the principal? An exploratory analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(1), 173-216. doi:10.1177/0011000010378613
- Geijsel, F., Slegers, P., Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2003). Transformational leadership effects on teachers' commitment and effort toward school reform. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41(3), 228-256. doi: 10.1108/09578230310474403.

- Geismar, T. J., Morris, J. D., & Lieberman, M. G. (2000). *Selecting mentors for principalship interns*. *Journal of School Leadership*, 10(3), 233-247. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ604883>
- Gerard, L. F., Bowyer, J. B., & Linn, M. C. (2008). Principal leadership for technology-enhanced learning in science. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 17(1), 1-18. doi: 10.1007/s10956-007-9070-6.
- Goddard, R., Goddard, Y., Kim, E. S., & Miller, R. (2015). A theoretical and empirical analysis of the roles of instructional leadership, teacher collaboration, and collective efficacy beliefs in support of student learning. *American Journal of Education*, 121(4), 501-530. doi: 10.1086/681925.
- Goddard, Y. L., Goddard, R. D., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2007). A theoretical and empirical investigation of teacher collaboration for school improvement and student achievement in public elementary schools. *Teachers College Record*, 109(4), 877-896. Retrieved from <http://www.tcrecord.org/>
- Goddard, Y. L., Neumerski, C. M., Goddard, R. D., Salloum, S. J., & Berebitsky, D. (2010). A multilevel exploratory study of the relationship between teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional support and group norms for instruction in elementary schools. *Elementary School Journal*, 111(2), 336-357. doi: 10.1086/656303.
- Good, T. L. (2008). In the midst of comprehensive school reform: Principals' perspectives. *Teachers College Record*, 110(11), 2341-2360. Retrieved from <http://www.tcrecord.org/>
- Gordon, M. F., & Louis, K. S. (2009). Linking parent and community involvement with student achievement: Comparing principal and teacher perceptions of stakeholder influence. *American Journal of Education*, 116(1), 1-31. doi: 10.1086/605098.
- Grissom, J. A., & Loeb, S. (2011). Triangulating principal effectiveness: How perspectives of parents, teachers, and assistant principals identify the central importance of managerial skills. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(5), 1091-1123. doi: 10.3102/0002831211402663.
- Guramatunhu-Mudiwa, P., & Scherz, S. D. (2013). Developing psychic income in school administration: The unique role school administrators can play. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 41(3), 303-315. doi: 10.1177/1741143212474803.
- Gurr, D., Drysdale, L., & Mulford, B. (2006). Models of successful principal leadership. *School Leadership and Management*, 26(4), 371-395. doi: 10.1007/1-4020-5516-1_3.
- Hackmann, D. G., Russell, F. S., & Elliott, R. J. (1999). *Making administrative internships meaningful*. *Planning and Changing*, 30, 2-14. Retrieved from: <http://courses.education.illinois.edu/eol464/fa2001/464web/MakingInternshipsMeaningful.pdf>
- Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4, 221-239. doi: 10.1080/15700760500244793
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2011b). Exploring the journey of school improvement: classifying and analyzing patterns of change in school improvement processes and learning outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 22(1), 1-27. doi: 10.1080/09243453.2010.536322.

- Halverson, R. (2010). School formative feedback systems. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 85(2), 130-146. doi: 10.1080/01619561003685270.
- Halverson, R., Prichett, R. B., Watson, J. G., & Wisconsin Center for Education Research, M. (2007). Formative feedback systems and the new instructional leadership. *Wisconsin Center For Education Research*, Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED497265.pdf>
- Heck, R. H., & Moriyama, K. (2010). Examining relationships among elementary schools' contexts, leadership, instructional practices, and added-year outcomes: a regression discontinuity approach. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 21(4), 377-408. doi: 10.1080/09243453.2010.500097.
- Heck, R., & Hallinger, P. (2014). Modeling the longitudinal effects of school leadership on teaching and learning. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 52(5), 653-681. doi: 10.1108/JEA-08-2013-0097.
- Hoffman, L. P. (2009). Educational leadership and social activism: a call for action. *Journal of Educational Administration & History*, 41(4), 391-410. doi: 10.1080/00220620903211596.
- Hoy, W. K., Sweetland, S. R., & Smith, P. A. (2002). Toward an organizational model of achievement in high schools: The significance of collective efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(1), 77-93. doi: 10.1177/0013161x02038001004.
- Ingle, K., Rutledge, S., & Bishop, J. (2011). Context matters: Principals' sensemaking of teacher hiring and on-the-job performance. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(5), 579-610. doi: 10.1108/09578231111159557.
- Ishimaru, A. (2013). From heroes to organizers: Principals and education organizing in urban school reform. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49(1), 3-51. doi: 10.1177/0013161x12448250.
- Jackson, B. L., & Kelley, C. (2002). Exceptional and innovative programs in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38, 192-212. doi: 10.1177/0013161X02382005.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relation of parental involvement to urban elementary school student academic achievement. *Urban Education*, 40(3), 237-269. doi: 10.1177/0042085905274540.
- Johnson Jr., B. L., & Fauske, J. R. (2000). Principals and the political economy of environmental enactment. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(2), 159. doi: 10.1177/00131610021968949.
- Juettner, V. (2003). Culturally responsive schools: Leadership, language, and literacy development. *Talking Points*, 14(2), 11-16. Retrieved from ERIC.
- Kearney, W. S., Kelsey, C., & Herrington, D. (2013). Mindful leaders in highly effective schools: A mixed-method application of Hoy's M-scale. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 41(3), 316-335. doi: 10.1177/1741143212474802.
- Khalifa, M. (2010). Validating social and cultural capital of hyperghettoized at-risk students. *Education and Urban Society*, 42(5), 620-646. doi: 10.1177/0013124510366225.
- Khalifa, M. (2012). A re-new-ed paradigm in successful urban school leadership principal as community leader. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(3), 424-467. doi:10.1177/0013161X11432922.

- Kirby, M. M., & DiPaola, M. F. (2011). Academic optimism and community engagement in urban schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 49*(5), 542-562. doi: 10.1108/09578231111159539.
- Klar, H. W., & Brewer, C. A. (2013). Successful leadership in high-needs schools an examination of core leadership practices enacted in challenging contexts. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 49*(5), 768-808. doi: 10.1177/0013161X13482577.
- Kose, B. W. (2009). The principal's role in professional development for social justice: An empirically based transformative framework. *Urban Education, 44*(6), 628-663. doi: 10.1177/0042085908322707.
- Kose, B. W. (2011). Developing a transformative school vision: Lessons from peer-nominated principals. *Education and Urban Society, 43*(2), 119-136. doi: 10.1177/0013124510380231.
- Kurland, H., Peretz, H., & Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (2010). Leadership style and organizational learning: The mediate effect of school vision. *Journal of Educational Administration, 48*(1), 7-30. doi: 10.1108/09578231011015395.
- Lee, V. E., & Smith, J. B. (1999). Social support and achievement for young adolescents in Chicago: The role of school academic press. *American Educational Research Journal, 36*(4), 907-945. doi: 10.3102/00028312036004907.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D. & Coffin, G. & Wilson, P. (1996). Preparing school leaders: What works? *Journal of School Leadership, 6*, 316–342. Retrieved from print copy.
- Levin, J. A., & Datnow, A. (2012). The principal role in data-driven decision making: using case-study data to develop multi-mediator models of educational reform. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 23*(2), 179-201. doi: 10.1080/09243453.2011.599394.
- Libby F. G., Bowyer, J. B., & Linn, M. C. (2008). Principal leadership for technology-enhanced learning in science. *Journal of Science Education and Technology, 17*(1), 1- 18. doi: 10.1007/s10956-007-9070-6.
- Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K. L., Anderson, S. E., Michlin, M., & Mascall, B. (2010). Learning from leadership: Investigating the links to improved student learning. *Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement/University of Minnesota and Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto, 42*, 50. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/Documents/Investigating-the-Links-to-Improved-Student-Learning.pdf>
- Marks, H. M., & Printy, S. M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 39*, 370-397. doi:10.1177/0013161X03253412
- Marsh, J. A. (2012). Interventions promoting educators' use of data: Research insights and gaps. *Teachers College Record, 114*(11), 1-48. Retrieved from <http://www.tcrecord.org/>
- Marx, S., & Larson, L. L. (2012). Taking off the color-blind glasses recognizing and supporting latina/o students in a predominantly white school. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 48*(2), 259-303. doi: 10.1177/0013161X11421923.
- Matsumura, L. C., Sartoris, M., Bickel, D. D., & Garnier, H. E. (2009). Leadership for literacy coaching: The principal's role in launching a new coaching program. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 45*(5), 655-693. doi: 10.1177/0013161x09347341.

- McKenzie, K. B., & Scheurich, J. J. (2004). Equity traps: A useful construct for preparing principals to lead schools that are successful with racially diverse students. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(5), 601-632. doi: 10.1177/0013161x04268839.
- McKenzie, K. B., Christman, D. E., Hernandez, F., Fierro, E., Capper, C. A., Dantley, M., ... & Scheurich, J. J. (2008). From the field: A proposal for educating leaders for social justice. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(1), 111-138. doi: 10.1177/0013161x07309470.
- Milstein, M. M., & Krueger, J. A. (1997). Improving educational administration preparation programs: What we have learned over the past decade. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 72(2), 100-116. doi: 10.1207/s15327930pje7202_6
- Mintrop, H. (2004). High-stakes accountability, state oversight, and educational equity. *The Teachers College Record*, 106(11), 2128-2145. Retrieved from <http://www.tcrecord.org/>
- Mitchell, C., & Sackney, L. (2006). Building schools, building people: The school principal's role in leading a learning community. *Journal of School Leadership*, 16(5), 627-640. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com/books>.
- Mullen, C. A., & Hutinger, J. L. (2008). The principal's role in fostering collaborative learning communities through faculty study group development. *Theory into Practice*, 47(4), 276-285. doi: 10.1080/00405840802329136.
- Murphy, J., & Meyers, C. V. (2009). Rebuilding organizational capacity in turnaround schools: Insights from the corporate, government, and non profit sectors. *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership*, 37(1), 9-29. doi: 10.1177/1741143208098162.
- Murphy, J., & Torre, D. (2014). Vision essential scaffolding. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 43(2), 177-197. doi: 10.1177/1741143214523017.
- Nance, J. P. (2003). Public school administrators and technology policy making. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(4), 434-467. doi: 10.1177/0013161x03255221.
- Newmann, F. M., Smith, B., Allensworth, E., & Bryk, A. S. (2001). Instructional program coherence: What it is and why it should guide school improvement policy. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 23(4), 297-321. doi: 10.3102/01623737023004297.
- Orr, M. T. (2011). Pipeline to preparation to advancement: Graduates' experiences in, through, and beyond leadership preparation. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(1), 114-172. doi: 10.1177/0011000010378612
- Orr, M. T., & Barber, M. E. (2007). Collaborative leadership preparation: A comparative study of innovative programs and practices. *Journal of School Leadership*, 16, 709-739. Retrieved from print copy.
- Orr, M. T., & Orphanos, S. (2011). How graduate-level preparation influences the effectiveness of school leaders: A comparison of the outcomes of exemplary and conventional leadership preparation programs for principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(1), 18-70. doi:10.1177/0011000010378610
- Penuel, W. R., Riel, M., Joshi, A., Pearlman, L., Kim, C. M., & Frank, K. A. (2010). The alignment the informal and formal organizational supports for reform: Implications for improving teaching in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(1), 57-95. doi: 10.1177/1094670509353180.
- Powell, D., Higgins, H. J., Aram, R., & Freed, A. (2009). Impact of No Child Left Behind on

- curriculum and instruction in rural schools. *Rural Educator*, 31(1), 19-28. Retrieved from ERIC.
- Price, H. E. (2012). Principal-teacher interactions: How affective relationships shape principal and teacher attitudes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(1), 39-85. doi: 10.1177/0013161x11417126.
- Printy, S. M. (2008). Leadership for teacher learning: A community of practice perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(2), 187-226. doi: 10.1177/0013161x07312958.
- Printy, S. M., & Marks, H. M. (2006). Shared leadership for teacher and student learning. *Theory into Practice*, 45(2), 125-132. doi: 10.1207/s15430421tip4502_4.
- Reyes-Guerra, D. & Barnett, B. (2017). Clinical practice in educational leadership. In M. D. Young and G. Crow. *Handbook of research on the education of school leaders 2nd Edition*. (Chapter 10.). New York, NY: Routledge
- Riehl, C. L. (2008). The principal's role in creating inclusive schools for diverse students: A review of normative, empirical, and critical literature on the practice of educational administration. *Journal of Education*, 189(1/2), 183-197. doi: 10.3102/00346543070001055.
- Robinson, V. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635-674. doi: 10.1177/0013161X08321509.
- Sanders, M., & Harvey, A. (2002). Beyond the school walls: A case study of principal leadership for school-community collaboration. *The Teachers College Record*, 104(7), 1345-1368. Retrieved from <http://tcrecord.org/>
- Sanzo, K.L., Sherman, W.H., & Clayton, J. (2011). Leadership practices of successful middle school principals. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(1), 31 - 45. doi: 10.1108/09578231111102045.
- Scanlan, M., & Lopez, F. (2012). Vamos! How school leaders promote equity and excellence for bilingual students. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(4), 583-625. doi: 10.1177/0013161x11436270.
- Sebastian, J., & Allensworth, E. (2012). The influence of principal leadership on classroom instruction and student learning: A study of mediated pathways to learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(4), 626-663. doi: 10.1177/0013161x11436273.
- Shelden, D. L., Angell, M. E., Stoner, J. B., & Roseland, B. D. (2010). School principals' influence on trust: Perspectives of mothers of children with disabilities. *Journal of Educational Research*, 103(3), 159-170. doi: 10.1080/00220670903382921.
- Sheldon, S. B., & Epstein, J. L. (2002). Improving student behavior and school discipline with family and community involvement. *Education and Urban Society*, 35(1), 4-26. doi: 10.1177/001312402237212.
- Sheldon, S. B., & Van Voorhis, F. L. (2004). Partnership programs in U.S. schools: Their development and relationship to family involvement outcomes. *School Effectiveness And School Improvement*, 15(2), 125-148. doi: 10.1076/sesi.15.2.125.30434.
- Sheldon, S. B., Epstein, J. L., & Galindo, C. L. (2010). Not just numbers: Creating a partnership climate to improve math proficiency in schools. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 9(1), 27-48. doi:10.1080/15700760802702548.
- Shields, C. M. (2004). Dialogic leadership for social justice: Overcoming pathologies of silence.

- Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(1), 109-132. doi: 10.1177/0013161x03258963.
- Shields, C. M. (2010). Transformative leadership: Working for equity in diverse contexts. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(4), 558-589. doi: 10.1177/0013161X10375609.
- Silins, H., & Mulford, B. (2004). Schools as learning organisations-Effects on teacher leadership and student outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 15(3-4), 43-466. doi: 10.1080/09243450512331383272.
- Singh, M., & Al-Fadhli, H. (2011). Does school leadership matter in the NCLB Era? *Journal of Black Studies*, 42(5), 751-767. doi: 10.1177/0021934710372895.
- Sosik, J. J., Lee, D., & Bouquillon, E. A. (2005). Context and mentoring: Examining formal and informal relationships in high tech firms and K-12 schools. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 12(2), 94-108. doi: 10.1177/107179190501200208
- Southworth, G. (2002). Instructional leadership in schools: Reflections and empirical evidence. *School Leadership & Management*, 22(1), 73-91. doi: 10.1080/13632430220143042.
- Supovitz, J., Sirinides, P., & May, H. (2009). How principals and peers influence teaching and learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(1), 31-56. doi: 10.1177/1094670509353043.
- Sweetland, S. R., & Hoy, W. R. (2000). School characteristics and educational outcomes: Toward an organizational model of student achievement in middle schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(5), 703-29. doi: 10.1177/00131610021969173.
- Taylor, B. M., & Pearson, P. D. (2004). Research on learning to read--at school, at home, and in the community. *Elementary School Journal*, 105(2), 167-181. doi:10.1086/428863.
- Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(2), 221 -258. doi: 10.1177/0013161x06293717.
- Theoharis, G., & Haddix, M. (2011). Undermining racism and a whiteness ideology: White principals living a commitment to equitable and excellent schools. *Urban Education*, 46(6), 1332-1351. doi: 10.1177/0042085911416012.
- Theoharis, G., & O'Toole, J. (2011). Leading inclusive ELL: Social justice leadership for English language learners. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(4), 646-688. doi: 10.1177/0013161x11401616.
- Thoonen, E. E., Slegers, P. J., Oort, F. J., Peetsma, T. T., & Geijsel, F. P. (2011). How to improve teaching practices the role of teacher motivation, organizational factors, and leadership practices. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(3), 496-536. doi: 10.1177/0013161X11400185.
- Timar, T. B., & Chyu, K. K. (2010). State strategies to improve low-performing schools: California's high priority schools grant program. *Teachers College Record*, 112(7), 1897-1936. Retrieved from <http://www.tcrecord.org/>
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(4), 308-331. doi: 10.1108/EUM0000000005493.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2009). Fostering teacher professionalism in schools: The role of leadership orientation and trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(2), 217-247. doi: 10.1177/0013161x08330501.
- Tucker, P. D., Anderson, E., Reynolds, A. L., & Mawhinney, H. (2016). Analysis of evidence

- supporting the Educational Leadership Constituent Council 2011 Educational Leadership Program Standards. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 11(1), 91-119. doi: 10.1177/1942775116641664
- Valentine, J. W., & Prater, M. (2011). Instructional, transformational, and managerial leadership and student achievement: High school principals make a difference. *NASSP Bulletin*, 95(1), 5 -30.
- Walker, A., & Shuangye, C. (2007). Leader authenticity in intercultural school contexts. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 35(2), 185-204. doi: 10.1177/1741143207075388.
- Walker, J., & Slear, S. (2011). The impact of principal leadership behaviors on the efficacy of new and experienced middle school teachers. *NASSP Bulletin*, 95(1), 46 -64. doi: 10.1177/0192636511406530
- Warren, M., Hong, S., Rubin, C., & Uy, P. (2009). Beyond the bake sale: A community-based relational approach to parent engagement in schools. *Teachers College Record*, 111(9), 2209-2254. Retrieved from <http://tcrecord.org/>
- Wayman, J., & Stringfield, S. (2006). Technology-supported involvement of entire faculties in examination of student data for instructional improvement. *American Journal of Education*, 112(4), 549-571. doi: 10.1086/505059.
- Williams, L. A., Atkinson, L. C., Cate, J. M., & O'Hair, M. J. (2008). Mutual support between learning community development and technology integration: Impact on school practices and student achievement. *Theory into Practice*, 47(4), 294-302. doi: 10.1080/00405840802329219.
- Wohlstetter, P., Datnow, A., & Park, V. (2008). Creating a system for data-driven decision-making: Applying the principal-agent framework. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 19(3), 239-259. doi:10.1080/09243450802246376.
- Young, M. D. (2016). Field Perceptions of the Educational Leadership Constituent Council Standards and the Accreditation Review Process: A Field Knowledge Survey Report for the National Educational Leadership Preparation Standards. An unpublished report submitted to the Council for Chief State School Officers.
- Young, M. D., Crow, G., Murphy, J., & Ogawa, R. (2009). *The Handbook of Research on the Education of School Leaders*. New York: Routledge.
- Young, M. D. & Crow, G. (2017). *The Handbook of Research on the Education of School Leaders, 2nd Edition*. New York: Routledge.
- Young, M. D., & Mawhinney, H. B. (2012). *The research base supporting the ELCC standards: Grounding leadership preparation & the educational leadership constituent council standards in empirical research*. Charlottesville, VA: UCEA.
- Young, M. D., Rodriguez, C., & Lee, P. (2008). The role of trust in strengthening relationships between schools and Latino parents. *Journal of School Public Relations*, 29 (2), 174-209. Retrieved from <https://rowman.com/page/JSPPR>
- Youngs, P., & King, M. B. (2002). Principal leadership for professional development to build school capacity. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(5), 643-670. doi: 10.1177/0013161x02239642.

Appendix 4: Glossary of Terms

Accreditation. (1) A process for assessing and enhancing academic and educational quality through voluntary peer review. CAEP accreditation informs the public that an institution has a professional education unit that has met state, professional, and institutional standards of educational quality. (2) The decision rendered by CAEP when an institution's professional education unit meets CAEP's standards and requirements.

Accreditation Council. Manages and conducts the accreditation functions of CAEP, including training, compliance, record keeping, recommending policy changes, and making decisions regarding the granting or withholding of pre-accreditation and accreditation.

Accuracy in Assessment. The assurance that key assessments are of the appropriate type and content such that they measure what they purport to measure. To this end, the assessments should be aligned with the standards and/or learning components that they are designed to measure.

Advanced Programs. Programs at post baccalaureate levels for (1) the continuing education of teachers who have previously completed initial preparation or (2) the preparation of other school.

Advocate. A school leader advocates when s/he publicly communicates a recommendation and/or provides support for a policy, resource, student, staff member or course of action.

Alignment. The term alignment is used in this document to reference the technical process of demonstrating the relationship between two or more things (e.g., standards and candidate assessments). The stronger the alignment between standards, goals and practices, the greater the level of coherence.

Building Leader. A school building leader is an educator employed by a school district and provided with the formal authority for working in a school to: collaboratively create a mission and vision for the school; attend to the ethical and professional norms of the school; ensuring equity of educational access among students; ensuring student learning and high-quality instruction, engaging family members and other community members as well as ensuring the efficient and effective operation and management of the school.

Certification. The process by which a non-governmental agency or association grants professional recognition to an individual who has met certain predetermined qualifications specified by that agency or association. (The National Board for Professional Teacher Standards grants advanced leadership certification.)

Clinical Practice. Field-based leadership practical experiences or internships that provide candidates with an intensive and extensive culminating activity. Candidates are immersed in

the learning community and are provided opportunities to develop and demonstrate competence in the professional roles for which they are preparing.

Collaborate. Leaders collaborate when they work jointly with others on activities with the intent of producing or creating something.

Commitments. The values, beliefs, dispositions, moral commitments and professional ethics that underlie an educational leader's professional performance. One's commitments influence a leader's behaviors and attitudes toward students, families, colleagues, and communities and affect student learning, motivation, and development as well as the leader's own professional growth. Commitments are guided by beliefs and attitudes related to values such as caring, fairness, honesty, responsibility, equity and social justice. For example, they might include a belief that all students can learn, a vision of high and challenging standards, or a dedication to providing a safe and supportive learning environment.

Communicate. Educational leaders communicate when they share and/or exchange information, news, or ideas with others including students, staff members, parents and guardians and other members of the wider community.

Components of Standards. Components elaborate on and further define different aspects of the standard. Components are used as evidence categories by Specialized Professional Associations (SPA). Program review teams will look for evidence that the Program Report addresses the components in order to arrive at a decision on the program's national recognition status.

Conceptual Framework. An underlying structure in a professional education unit that gives conceptual meaning to the unit's operations through an articulated rationale and provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, faculty scholarship and service, and unit accountability.

Consistency in Assessment. The assurance that key assessments produce dependable results or results that would remain constant on repeated trials. Institutions can document consistency through providing training for raters that promote similar scoring patterns, using multiple raters, conducting simple studies of inter-rater reliability, and/or comparing results to other internal or external assessments that measure comparable knowledge, skills, and/or professional dispositions.

Coordinate. Educational leaders coordinate when they assemble the many, varied facets of an activity or the processes of an organization into a relationship that will help to ensure efficiency and/or alignment among the facets.

Cultivate. Educational leaders cultivate when they promote, encourage and foster a belief or a commitment to one or more of the organization's goals, such as supporting the educational needs and well-being of every child.

Data. Information with a user and a use that may include individual facts, statistics, or items of information. For CAEP purposes, data include results of assessment or information from statistical or numerical descriptions of phenomena, status, achievement, or trends.

Data Literacy. An educator's ability to gather, synthesize and build knowledge from data, and to communicate that meaning to others.

Descriptors of Practice. A series of words, phrase, or sentence that describe, identify observable actions of a person demonstrating a specific knowledge, skill, or attitude.

Design. Educational leaders engage in design when alone, or in collaboration with others, they review and refine a system or program until it consistently achieves the intended purpose or outcome(s).

Digital Citizenship. Digital citizenship refers to a person utilizing information technology in ethical and appropriate ways to engage in communication, personal and professional learning, society, politics, and government.

Digital Literacy. Digital literacy includes the ability to utilize information and communication technologies to explore, identify, critically examine, evaluate and use online resources as well as to create content, communicate information, and collaborate online. Digital literacy requires both higher order thinking and technical skills.

Dispositions. The habits of professional action and moral commitments that underlie a leader's performance. A leader's dispositions reflect his or her values, beliefs, and professional attitudes and ethics and are demonstrated through both verbal and non-verbal behaviors toward students, families, colleagues, and communities. These behaviors affect student learning, motivation, and development as well as the leader's own professional growth. Like commitments, dispositions are guided by beliefs and attitudes related to values such as caring, fairness, honesty, responsibility, equity and social justice. CAEP expects institutions to assess the professional dispositions of candidates based on observable behaviors in educational settings. The two professional dispositions that CAEP expects institutions to assess are fairness (NELP Standards Two and Three) and the belief that all students can learn (NELP Standard Two). Professional education units can identify, define, and operationalize additional professional dispositions based on their mission and conceptual framework.

District Leader. A district leader is an educator employed by a school district and provided with the formal authority for working in a district to: collaboratively create a mission and vision for the district; attend to the ethical and professional norms of the district; ensuring equity of educational access among students; ensuring student learning and high-quality instruction, engaging family members and other community members and organization as well as ensuring the efficient and effective operation and management of the district as well as creating policies and governance structure that effectively meet the desired district and school outcomes.

Diversity. Diversity is inclusive of student and adult subgroups as well as individual differences. In education, individual differences include differences in personality, interests, learning modalities, learning abilities and life experiences. Furthermore, student and adult subgroups generally refers to any group of students or adults who share similar characteristics, such as gender identification or expression, sexual orientation, racial or ethnic identification, socioeconomic status, physical or learning abilities, nationality, language abilities, religion, or school-assigned classifications (e.g., English language proficiency, levels of literacy, special educational needs, etc.).

Equity. Educational equity refers to both processes and outcomes. Educational leaders support equity when they work to eliminate prejudice and barriers based on student individual and subgroup differences, and when they work to ensure that students achieve equitable outcomes. Educational leaders understand that equitable rarely means equal, particularly when working to meet individual student needs.

Evaluate. Educational leaders evaluate when they collect, synthesize, and assign value to data in order to aid in diagnosing problems, monitoring progress, and making decisions about the extent to which a project/policy/procedure meets identified goals/objectives or about the quality of performance and how it might be improved.

Field Experiences. A variety of early and ongoing field-based leadership opportunities (usually connected to a classroom assignment) in which candidates may observe, assist, tutor, instruct, and/or conduct research. Field experiences may occur in off-campus settings and include interactions with organizations such as community and business groups, community and social service agencies, parent groups, and school boards.

Governance. Governance refers to the building level and/or district-level structures and policies through which those persons with decision making authority secure and allocate resources, seek and respond to constituents' ideas and opinions, and are held accountable for decisions and the actions and expenses related to implementation

Indicators. In this document, the term indicator references the content knowledge and leadership skills that indicate acceptable candidate performances for the standards one through seven and their requisite components.

Institutions. Schools, colleges, or departments of education in a university, or non-university providers

Institutional Report. A report that provides the institutional and unit contexts, a description of the unit's conceptual framework, and evidence that the unit is meeting the CAEP unit standards. The report serves as primary documentation for Board of Examiners teams conducting on-site visits. (See the CAEP website for details.)

Internship. Generally, the post-licensure and/or graduate clinical practice under the supervision of clinical faculty; sometimes refers to the pre-service clinical experience.

Internship Length Equivalency: The six-month internship experience need not be consecutive, and may include experiences of different lengths. However, all programs must include an extended, capstone experience to maximize the candidate's leadership opportunities to practice and refine their leadership skills and knowledge. This culminating experience may be two noncontiguous internships of three months each, a four-month internship and two field practice opportunities of one month each, or another equivalent combination. Full-time experience is defined as 9-12 hours per week over a six-month period of time.

Institutional Standards. Standards set by the institution that reflect its mission and identify important expectations for candidate learning that may be unique to the institution's professional education unit.

INTASC. The Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, a project of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) that has developed model performance-based standards and assessments for the licensure of teachers.

Knowledge Base. Empirical research, disciplined inquiry, informed theory, and the wisdom of practice.

Leadership Platform. An educational leader's leadership platform consists of the leader's explicit or implicit statements and beliefs about education and educational leadership. The leadership platform serves as a type of personal compass by which an educational leader judges what is valuable, important to know, how to act and the criteria that are important to consider when making a decision.

Licensure. The official recognition by a state governmental agency that an individual has met certain qualifications specified by the state and is, therefore, approved to practice in an occupation as a professional. (Some state agencies call their licenses certificates or credentials.)

Nationally Recognized Program. A program that has met the standards of a specialized professional association (SPA) such as the NELP that is a member organization of CAEP. An institution's state-approved program also will be considered a nationally recognized program if the state program standards and the state's review process have been approved by the appropriate national association. (Nationally recognized programs are listed on CAEP's website.)

Other School Professionals. Educators who provide professional services other than teaching in schools. They include, but are not limited to, principals, reading specialists and supervisors, school library media specialists, school psychologists, school superintendents, and instructional technology specialists.

Performance Assessment. A comprehensive assessment through which candidates demonstrate their proficiencies in leadership content knowledge, professional leadership skills, and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, including their abilities to have positive effects on student learning.

Performance-Based Licensing. Licensing based on a system of multiple assessments that measure a leadership candidate's knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to determine whether he/she can perform effectively as a school or district leader.

Performance-Based Program. A professional preparation program that systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses data for self-improvement and candidate advisement, especially data that demonstrate candidate proficiencies, including positive effects on student learning.

Performance-Based Accreditation System. A practice in accreditation that makes use of assessment information describing candidate proficiencies or actions of professional education units as evidence for determining whether professional standards are met. It contrasts with accreditation decisions based solely on course offerings, program experiences, and other "inputs" as the evidence for judging attainment of professional standards.

Performance Criteria. Qualities or levels of candidate's leadership proficiency that are used to evaluate candidate performance, as specified in scoring guides such as descriptions or rubrics.

Performance Data. Information that describes the qualities and levels of proficiency of candidates, especially in application of their knowledge to classroom teaching and other professional situations. Sometimes the phrase is used to indicate the qualities and levels of institutional practice, for example, in making collaborative arrangements with clinical schools, setting faculty professional development policies, or providing leadership through technical assistance to community schools.

Portfolio. An accumulation of evidence about individual candidate proficiencies, especially in relation to explicit NELP standards and rubrics, used in evaluation of competency as a school or district leader. Contents might include end-of-course evaluations and tasks used for instructional or clinical experience purposes such as projects, journals, and observations by faculty, videos, comments by cooperating internship supervisors, and samples of candidate work.

Professional Development. Opportunities for professional education faculty to develop new knowledge and skills through activities such as inservice education, conference attendance, sabbatical leave, summer leave, intra- and inter-institutional visitations, fellowships, and work in P–12 schools.

Professional Knowledge. The historical, economic, sociological, philosophical, and psychological understandings of schooling and education. It also includes knowledge about learning, diversity, technology, professional ethics, legal and policy issues, pedagogy, and the

roles and responsibilities of the leadership profession.

Professional Standards. Standards set by the specialized professional associations (SPAs) and adopted by CAEP for use in its accreditation review. Professional standards also refer to standards set by other recognized national organizations/accrediting agencies that evaluate professional education programs (e.g., the National Association of Schools of Music).

Proficiencies. Required knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions identified in the professional, state, or institutional standards.

Program. A planned sequence of courses and experiences for the purpose of preparing teachers, school, and district leaders to work in pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade settings. Programs may lead to a degree, a recommendation for a state license, both, or neither.

Program Approval. Process by which a state governmental agency reviews a professional education program to determine if it meets the state's standards for the preparation of school personnel.

Program Completers. CAEP uses the Higher Education Act, Title II definition for program completers. Program completers are persons who have met all the requirements of a state approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program's requirements.

Program Review. See National Program Review.

Program Report. The report prepared by faculty responsible for a program (e.g., math education, elementary education) responding to specialized professional association (SPA) standards.

Reflect. Educational leaders reflect when they think carefully and deeply about a subject or topic. Reflection involves gathering, synthesizing and evaluation of data from a variety of sources to ensure a variety of viewpoints are included when thinking about a subject or topic.

Rubrics. Written and shared evaluative criteria for judging candidate performance that indicate the qualities by which levels of performance can be differentiated, and that anchor judgments about the degree of success on a candidate assessment. See Performance Criteria and Scoring Guide.

SASB. Specialty Area Studies Board

Scoring Guide. A tool such as a rubric, evaluation form, etc. used by faculty to evaluate an

assessment. Scoring guides should differentiate varying levels of candidate proficiency on performance criteria outlined in the SPA standards.

Skills. The ability to apply and use content, professional, and pedagogical leadership knowledge effectively and readily in diverse leadership settings in a manner that ensures that all students are learning.

SPAs. Specialized Professional Associations. The national organizations such as the NELP that represent teachers, professional education faculty, and other school professionals who teach a specific subject matter (e.g., mathematics or social studies), teach students at a specific developmental level (i.e., early childhood, elementary, middle level, or secondary), teach students with specific needs (e.g., bilingual education or special education), administer schools (e.g., principals or superintendents), or provide services to students (e.g., school counselors or school psychologists). Many of these associations are member organizations of CAEP and have standards for both students in schools and candidates preparing to work in schools.

SPA Program Review. The process by which the specialized professional associations assess the quality of teacher and leadership preparation programs offered by an institution. (Institutions are required to submit their programs for review by SPAs as part of the CAEP preconditions process, unless the state's program standards have been approved by CAEP's Specialty Area Studies Board for the review of the institution's education programs.)

SPA Program Standards. Standards developed by national professional associations that describe what professionals in the field should know and be able to do.

State Program Standards Review. The process by which specialized professional associations evaluate the degree to which a state's program standards are aligned with the CAEP and SPA aligned with SPA standards, the state standards will be approved by CAEP's Specialty Area Studies Board, and CAEP will defer to the state's review of institutions' teacher education programs.)

Standards. Written expectations for meeting a specified level of performance. Standards exist for the content that P-12 students should know at a certain age or grade level.
State Approval. Governmental activity requiring specific professional education programs within a State to meet standards of quality so that their graduates will be eligible for state licensure.

State Program Approval Standards. The standards adopted by state agencies responsible for the approval of programs that prepare teachers and other school personnel. In most states, college and university programs must meet state standards in order to admit candidates to those programs.

State Professional Standards Response. A state's written response to a specialized professional association's review of the state's program review standards.

State Standards. The standards adopted by state agencies responsible for the approval of programs that prepare teachers and other school personnel. In most state, college and university programs must meet state Standards in order to admit candidates to those programs.

Strategic Staffing. Strategic staffing is a process of assessing and discerning the staffing needs of a school/district in order to realize operational and strategic goals and then assigning staff in ways that are most likely to realize the school and/or district goals.

Structured Field Experiences. Activities designed to introduce candidates to increasingly greater levels of responsibility in the leadership roles for which they are preparing. These activities are specifically designed to help candidates attain identified knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions outlined in NELP, state, and institutional standards.

Students. Children and youth attending P-12 schools as distinguished from candidates enrolled in leadership preparation programs within higher education institutions.

Student Sub-Groups. In education, student subgroup generally refers to any group of students who share similar characteristics, such as gender identification, racial or ethnic identification, socioeconomic status, physical or learning abilities, language abilities, religion, or school-assigned classifications (e.g., English language proficiency, levels of literacy, special educational needs, etc).

Technology. Technology includes what candidates must know and understand about technology in order to use it in working effectively with students and professional colleagues in (1) the delivery, development, prescription, and assessment of instruction and adult professional learning; (2) problem solving; (3) school and classroom administration; (4) educational research; (5) electronic information access and exchange; (6) personal and professional productivity; and (7) communication.

Unit. The college, school, department, or other administrative body in colleges, universities, or other organizations with the responsibility for managing or coordinating all programs offered for the initial and advanced preparation of teachers and other school professionals, regardless of where these programs are administratively housed in an institution, also known as the “professional education unit.” The professional education unit must include in its accreditation review all programs offered by the institution for the purpose of preparing teachers and other school professionals to work in pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade settings.

Unit Review. The process by which CAEP applies national standards for the preparation of school personnel to the unit.

Well-being. Well-being is the state of being healthy, comfortable and happy. Educational leaders are concerned about the well-being of students, staff members, parents and community members as well as their own well-being.

Appendix 5: NELP Reviewer Selection and Training

Program review with National Recognition using NELP standards is a process through which the NELP SPA assesses the quality of programs offered by educational leadership preparation programs. Program review helps to address the following questions:

- Have candidates mastered the required content knowledge?
- Can candidates conceptualize and plan their teaching or other professional education responsibilities?
- Can candidates implement their conceptual plan with students, colleagues and students' parents/guardians?
- Are candidates effective in promoting student learning?
- Do candidates meet state licensure requirements?

Reviewers play a critical role in evaluating program evidence that candidates are proficient in the NELP standards. To ensure that the NELP SPA has a representative and well-trained pool of reviewers, it engages in intentional reviewer recruitment, selection and training processes.

Reviewer Recruitment and Selection

Through the NELP SPA's parent organization, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA), the NELP SPA encourages school and district level educational leadership practitioners and higher education faculty who prepare school and district leaders to become involved and serve as volunteers on NELP's educational leadership program review teams. Each of the NELP organizations (NAESP, NASSP, ICPEL, and UCEA) actively and continually recruits new reviewers at national, regional and local meetings to develop and ensure the diversity and expertise of the reviewer pool. In addition to increasing the number of expert reviewers, both the organizations that make up the NELP SPA and the NPBEA regard reviewing as an opportunity for leadership practitioners and higher education faculty to strengthen their understanding of the CAEP and SPA requirements that preparation providers must meet to become nationally recognized.

The NELP SPA Coordinator is responsible for reviewing candidate nominations and selecting new NELP reviewers for training. Selections are made based on the SPA's desire to ensure a diverse pool of reviewers, an equal representation of practitioners and scholars in educational leadership, and an equal representation of reviewers from NELP associations.

Each NELP reviewer candidate nomination must meet the following qualifications:

- Must be members in good standing with their representative association;
- Must be currently employed in the educational leadership field, either as a school or district leader or as a scholar within a "Nationally Recognized" educational leadership program at a CAEP institution;
- Must have expertise in the field of educational administration;
- Must be able to convey clearly and concisely observations and judgments in writing;

- Must be able to make unbiased professional judgments about educational administration programs based on NELP standards for programs in educational leadership;
- Must be able to function effectively in a team environment;
- Must be technology proficient and have access to the internet to pull down documents from the CAEP website, review documents online, and electronically submit Program Report findings;
- Must be able to commit personal time to review Program Reports within a two-month time frame, submit written report findings to team leader in a timely manner, and participate in team meetings to reach consensus.

Information about review qualifications and application can be found on the NPBEA website, which will be updated once the NELP standards are approved: <http://www.npbea.org/about-npbea/major-projects/elcc-program-review-material/>

Reviewer Training and Evaluation

Quality assurance occurs at three stages: 1) through initial qualification of new reviewers, 2) through peer review with team members, and 3) through the Audit Committee review. The NELP SPA is responsible for training peer reviewers from the educational leadership field to conduct electronic reviews of Program Reports submitted by higher education institutions undergoing CAEP accreditation.

Two member teams consisting of school and district leaders and university/college scholars in educational leadership are trained to assess administrator preparation programs to determine their degree of compliance with NELP standards. Each team member submits a report of their findings to a lead reviewer who then convenes a team meeting to discuss the independent results. After the team reaches consensus, the lead reviewer compiles an electronic report on the team's findings and program status recommendation. This report is sent to the NELP Audit Committee for review. The Audit Committee considers the team's report and makes a determination on whether to grant national program recognition. The team report and program status decision is then sent to CAEP and this information is used in the overall accreditation of the university or college campus.

Each new reviewer must complete an initial rigorous qualification process and all reviewers must participate in a recalibration process prior to participating in review cycle. The SPA Coordinator provides both scheduled training and ad hoc training based on identified needs.

Using the materials included in Appendix 1: Using NELP Standards for Program Evaluation, training for new program reviewers are conducted online twice a year, once in the spring and once in the fall. Trainings include:

- Attending two one-hour webinars that provide an overview of the roles and responsibilities of the reviewers; the review process; steps in reviewing Program Reports; and, directions for completing the Recognition Reports

- Completing mock Program Report reviews
- Evaluation of Recognition Report writing

If the results of a training show that a program reviewer does not meet NELP reviewer qualifications, the NELP SPA Coordinator may provide additional trainings and/or pair the reviewer with an experienced lead reviewer to practice evaluation skills until the reviewer has acquired sufficient skill to be placed on an NELP review team.

Experienced Lead and Program Reviewers are required to review recalibration materials prior to participating in a review cycle. The NELP SPA coordinator establishes and provides access to an electronic, shared NELP Reviewer folder that houses the most current SPA reviewer documents including an updated, recorded training webinar and related NELP SPA and CAEP materials, including, but not limited to

- Guidelines on Submitting a SPA Initial Review Report
- Guidelines for Submitting Revised SPA Program Reports
- How to Plan for the Response to Conditions Report Submission
- Guidelines for Using and Documenting Course Grades as an Assessment of Candidate Content Knowledge
- Reviewer Report Writing Document
- 2018 NELP Building and District Level Standards documents, which includes Appendix A: Using NELP Standards for Program Evaluation

After the NELP Audit Committee completes its review of the team reports, Lead Reviewers and review teams are informed of any changes or revisions to their team reports resulting from the audit team review. The SPA coordinator evaluates the results of the audit team review and 1) revises training to address areas of development, and 2) identifies reviewers who may require additional training.

Given that one of the primary goals of NELP is to support preparation programs in educational leadership, in addition to Program Reviewer trainings, the SPA coordinator provides NELP Program Report Training Workshops at least twice a year. These workshops are provided most often in association with two of the NELP SPA organizations (UCEA and ICPEL) that represent higher education.

The NELP SPA is developing a Program Report Writing Guide and a parallel NELP Reviewer Guide. These documents will be finalized after the standards are approved by CAEP, and will be available online at: www.npbea.org.

Reviewer Diversity

The NELP SPA and its sponsoring organization, NPBEA, purposefully make every conceivable effort to recruit, train and maintain a diverse pool of reviewers who represent racial, ethnic and gender diversity, geographic diversity and diverse roles. The NELP SPA is transitioning from a

paper to an online submission beginning with the NELP Program Reviewer application form. During this transition process, the form will be revised to capture the demographic information requisite to evaluating the diversity of NELP reviewer applicants. (Note: the online form will launch with the release of the 2018 NELP Standards.) In addition, using a “Call for Program Reviewers” each of the NPBEA organizations (NAESP, NASSP, ICPEL, and UCEA) will actively and continually recruit new reviewers at national, regional and local meetings to ensure the diversity in roles (i.e., university faculty, school and district administrators and expertise of the reviewer pool. For example, NELP SPA member organizations have committed to the following activities: 1) Executive Directors will distribute an annual letter of invitation to members to serve as a NELP reviewer and 2) each organization will provide Ad space for a “call for reviewers” in membership magazines. Furthermore, NELP SPA organizations have committed to recognizing reviewers for their service (e.g., having the NELP SPA of NPBEA send an e-certificate of appreciation to reviewers after first full successful year and list reviewers names and institutional affiliations on the NELP section of the NPBEA website) each of the NPBEA organizations (NAESP, NASSP, ICPEL, and UCEA). Finally, NELP organizations will actively and consistently recruit new reviewers at national, regional and local meetings to ensure diversity with regard to the professional roles and expertise (i.e., university faculty, school and district administrators) of the reviewer pool. As the organizations are national in scope, it is possible to reach a broad spectrum of states and regions. At the end of each calendar year, the SPA Coordinator will assess and evaluate the diversity of the reviewer pool and coordinate with the Audit Committee chair, should the SPA need recruit a more representative pool of reviewers.

During each CAEP review cycle, the SPA Coordinator purposefully identifies the most diverse pool of Lead and Program Reviewers based on reviewer availability after the completion of the CAEP’s Conflict of Interest form. Team selection also includes pairing diverse members, as feasible. The table below displays the diversity of the reviewers over the past three years.

NELP Reviewer Profiles: 2014, 2015, 2016							
	Role			States	Gender		Total N
	School Leader K-12	District Level Leader	University Faculty	Number States Represented	M	F	
2014 S & F Cycle	1		36	18	14	23	37
2015 S & F Cycle			34	16	14	20	34
2016 S & F Cycle		1	28	16	11	18	29

Appendix 6: NELP Development Committees

Significant appreciation is extended to the following individuals for their time, expertise and leadership in the development of the National Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) standards for Building-Level leaders.

Committee Members:

Joan Auchter, National Association of Secondary School Principals; ELCC SPA Coordinator
Tom Bellamy, Associate Dean and Professor, University of Washington-Bothell
Monica Byrne-Jimenez, Professor, Indiana University
David Chard, President, Wheelock College
David DeMathews, Associate Professor, University of Texas-El Paso
Ellen Goldring, Professor, Vanderbilt University
Gina Ikemoto, Consultant
Paul Katnik, Missouri Department of Education
Susan Korach, Professor, University of Denver
Glenn Pethel, Assistant Superintendent, Gwinnet County Public Schools
Don Peurach, Professor, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor
L. Oliver Robinson, Superintendent, Shenendehowa Central School District
Cathy Shiffman, Professor, Shenandoah University; ELCC Audit Committee
Pamela Tucker, University of Virginia
Rose Young, Field Placement Coordinator, Bellarmine University; NAESP
Michelle D. Young, Executive Director, UCEA; NELP Committee Chair

Ex-Officio Members and Research Support:

Erin Anderson, University of Denver
Mary-Dean Barringer, CCSSO
Irving Richardson, CCSSO
Monica Taylor, CCSSO
Saroja Warner, CCSSO

Appendix 7: NELP Building-ELCC 2011-PSEL 2015 Crosswalk

Introduction

The purpose of the NELP Standards is to define for preparation programs the knowledge that candidates for building level leadership positions should acquire during their preparation and be able to apply once they are hired. The following crosswalk details the relationships among the National Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) standards for Building Level leaders, the 2011 Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) standards for Building Level leaders, and the 2015 Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL).

The new NELP standards for building level leaders reflect all of the elements of the 2011 ELCC for building level leaders and the majority of elements from the PSEL standards, as demonstrated in the crosswalk below. Of key interest to those who are transitioning from the 2011 ELCC standards to the NELP standards is the areas of difference between these two sets of standards. First, and perhaps most noticeable, is the total number of standards. The six content standards found in the 2011 ELCC standards have been increased to seven NELP standards. The expansion enabled the NELP committee to develop standards that more closely reflect current understandings of building level leadership, to better align to the ten PSEL standards, and to more clearly delineate several core leadership functions. For example, the 2011 ELCC standards addressed core values, professional norms, ethics, and equity within one standard. The new NELP standards, like the 2015 PSEL standards, address these knowledge and competency standards separately. The NELP standards, like the 2015 PSEL standards, include one standard for ethics and professional norms (Standard 2) and one for equity, inclusiveness and cultural responsiveness (Standard 3). A second difference is represented within the stem statement of the NELP standards. The NELP standards expands ELCC's concern for supporting "the success of every student" to promoting the "current and future success and well-being of each student and adult." A third difference in the 2018 NELP standards is the addition of the building level leaders' responsibility for the well-being of students and staff as well as their role in working with others to create a supportive and inclusive school culture. In addition to being included in each of the standard stem statements, this focus is found within components 2.1, 3.2, 4.3, and 7.2.

The NELP standards also articulate the building level leaders' role in ensuring equitable access to educational resources and opportunities (3.2), the leaders' role in evaluating, developing and implementing formal and informal assessments (4.3); and the leaders' role in engaging staff in a professional culture that promotes improvement, retains teachers and focuses on the success and well-being of the students and adults who attend, and work in, the school. Another important change in the 2018 NELP standards is

Component 6.2 that requires building level leaders to *“reflectively evaluate, communicate about, and implement laws, rights, policies, and regulations to promote student and adult success”* but does not expect building level leaders to act to influence those laws, rights, policies and regulations. A final difference between the 2018 NELP standards and the 2011 ELCC standards is the expanded focus of Component 7.1. This component expects building level leaders to *“develop the school’s professional capacity through engagement, recruiting, selecting and hiring staff.”* This expectation greatly expands upon the 2011 ELCC element 6.2 that only expected leaders to *“understand and sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning...”*

NELP Building-ELCC 2011-PSEL 2015 Crosswalk

<p><u>NELP Building Standard One:</u> <u>Mission, Vision, and</u> <u>Improvement:</u> to collaboratively lead, design and implement a school mission, vision and process for continuous improvement that reflects a core set of values and priorities</p>	<p>2011 ELCC Program Standard Elements</p>	<p><u>2015 PSEL Standard Elements</u></p>
<p>Component 1.1: Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to collaboratively evaluate, develop, and communicate a school mission and vision designed to reflect a core set of values and priorities.</p>	<p>ELCC 1.1: Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning for a school. ELCC 1.2: Candidates understand and can collect and use data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement plans to achieve school goals.</p>	<p>1a. Develop an educational mission for the school to promote the academic success and well-being of each student. 1b. In collaboration with members of the school and the community and using relevant data, develop and promote a vision for the school on the successful learning and development of each child and on instructional and organizational practices that promote such success. 1c. Articulate, advocate, and cultivate core values that define the school’s culture and stress the imperative of child-centered education; high expectations and student support; equity, inclusiveness, and social justice; openness, caring, and trust; and continuous improvement. 1d. Strategically develop, implement, and evaluate actions to achieve the vision for the school. 1e. Review the school’s mission and vision and adjust them to changing expectations and opportunities for the school, and changing needs and situations of students 1f. Develop shared understanding of and commitment to mission, vision, and core values within the school and the community 1g. Model and pursue the school’s mission, vision, and core values in all aspects of leadership.</p>
<p>Component 1.2: Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to lead improvement processes that include design, implementation, and evaluation.</p>	<p>ELCC 1.3: Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable school improvement. ELCC 1.4: Candidates understand and can evaluate school progress and revise school plans supported by school stakeholders. ELCC 4.1: Candidates understand and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school’s educational environment.</p>	<p>10a. Seek to make school more effective for each student, teachers and staff, families, and the community. 10b. Use methods of continuous improvement to achieve the vision, fulfill the mission, and promote the core values of the school. 10d. Engage others in an ongoing process of evidence-based inquiry, learning, strategic goal setting, planning, implementation, and evaluation for continuous school and classroom improvement. 10g. Develop technically appropriate systems of data collection, management, analysis, and use, connecting as needed to the district office and external partners for support in planning, implementation, monitoring, feedback, and evaluation. 10h. Adopt a systems perspective and promote coherence among improvement efforts and all aspects of school organization, programs, and services. 10j. Develop and promote leadership among teachers and staff for inquiry, experimentation and innovation, and initiating and implementing improvement.</p>

<p><u>NELP Building Level Standard Two:</u> <u>Ethics and Professional Norms:</u> to understand and demonstrate the capacity to advocate for ethical decisions and cultivate and enact professional norms</p>	<p><u>2011 ELCC Program Standard Elements</u></p>	<p><u>2015 PSEL Standard Elements</u></p>
<p>Component 2.1: Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to reflect on, communicate about, cultivate, and model dispositions and professional norms (e.g., equity, fairness, integrity, transparency, trust, collaboration, perseverance, reflection, life-long learning, digital citizenship) that support the educational success and well-being of each student and adult.</p>	<p>ELCC 2.1: Candidates understand and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students ELCC 5.1: Candidates understand and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure a school system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success. ELCC 5.2: Candidates understand and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school. ELCC 5.3: Candidates understand and can safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the school. ELCC 5.5: Candidates understand and can promote social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.</p>	<p>2b. Act according to and promote the professional norms of integrity, fairness, transparency, trust, collaboration, perseverance, learning, and continuous improvement 2c. Place children at the center of education and accept responsibility for each student’s academic success and well-being. (Implicit in all standards) 2d. Safeguard and promote the values of democracy, individual freedom and responsibility, equity, social justice, community, and diversity. 3h. Address matters of equity and cultural responsiveness in all aspects of leadership.</p>
<p>Component 2.2: Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to evaluate, communicate about, and advocate for ethical and legal decisions.</p>	<p>ELCC 5.4: Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school.</p>	<p>9h. Know, comply with, and help the school community understand local, state, and federal laws, rights, policies, and regulations so as to promote student success.</p>
<p>Component 2.3: Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to model ethical behavior in their personal conduct and relationships and to cultivate ethical behavior in others.</p>	<p>ELCC 5.2: Candidates understand and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school.</p>	<p>2a. Act ethically and professionally in personal conduct, relationships with others, decision- making, stewardship of the school’s resources, and all aspects of school leadership. 2e. Lead with interpersonal and communication skill, social-emotional insight, and understanding of all students’ and staff members’ backgrounds and cultures. 2f. Provide moral direction for the school and promote ethical and professional behavior among faculty and staff.</p>

<p><u>NELP Building Level Standard</u> <u>Three: Equity, Inclusiveness and Cultural Responsiveness:</u> to develop and maintain a supportive, equitable, culturally responsive and inclusive school culture.</p>	<p><u>2011 ELCC Program Standard Elements</u></p>	<p><u>2015 PSEL Standard Elements</u></p>
<p>Component 3.1: Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to evaluate, design, cultivate, and advocate for a supportive and inclusive school culture.</p>	<p>ELCC 2.1: Candidates understand and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students</p>	<p>3a. Ensure that each student is treated fairly, respectfully, and with an understanding of each student’s culture and context. 5a. Build and maintain a safe, caring, and healthy school environment that meets that the academic, social, emotional, and physical needs of each student 5b. Create and sustain a school environment in which each student is known, accepted and valued, trusted and respected, cared for, and encouraged to be an active and responsible member of the school community. 5d. Promote adult-student, student-peer, and school-community relationships that value and support academic learning and positive social and emotional development. 5f. Infuse the school’s learning environment with the cultures and languages of the school’s community.</p>
<p>Component 3.2: Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to evaluate, cultivate, and advocate for equitable access to educational resources and opportunities that support the educational success and well-being of each student.</p>		<p>3c. Ensure that each student has equitable access to effective teachers, learning opportunities, academic and social support, and other resources necessary for success. 3e. Confront and alter institutional biases of student marginalization, deficit-based schooling, and low expectations associated with race, class, culture and language, gender and sexual orientation, and disability or special status. 3g. Act with cultural competence and responsiveness in their interactions, decision making, and practice. 3h. Address matters of equity and cultural responsiveness in all aspects of leadership. 5e. Cultivate and reinforce student engagement in school and positive student conduct.</p>
<p>Component 3.3: Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to evaluate, cultivate, and advocate for equitable, inclusive and culturally responsive instruction and behavior support practices among teachers and staff.</p>	<p>ELCC 3.3: Candidates understand and can promote school-based policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff within the school.</p>	<p>3b. Recognize, respect, and employ each student’s strengths, diversity, and culture as assets for teaching and learning. 3d. Develop student policies and address student misconduct in a positive, fair, and unbiased manner. 3g. Act with cultural competence and responsiveness in their interactions, decision making, and practice. 3h. Address matters of equity and cultural responsiveness in all aspects of leadership. 5e. Cultivate and reinforce student engagement in school and positive student conduct. 7b. Empower and entrust teachers and staff with collective responsibility for meeting the academic, social, emotional, and physical needs of each student, pursuant to the mission, vision, and core values of the school.</p>

<p><u>NELP Building Level Standard Four:</u> <u>Learning and Instruction</u> to evaluate, develop, and implement coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, supports and assessment.</p>	<p><u>2011 ELCC Program Standard Elements</u></p>	<p><u>2015 PSEL Standard Elements</u></p>
<p>Component 4.1: Program completers understand and can demonstrate capacity to evaluate, develop, and implement high-quality, technology-rich curricula, programs and other supports for academic and non-academic student programs.</p>	<p>ELCC 2.1: Candidates understand and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students ELCC 2.2: Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program.</p>	<p>4e. Promote the effective use of technology in the service of teaching and learning. 5c. Provide coherent systems of academic and social supports, services, extracurricular activities, and accommodations to meet the range of learning needs of each student.</p>
<p>Component 4.2: Program completers understand and can demonstrate the capacity to evaluate, develop, and implement high-quality and equitable academic and non-academic instructional practices, resources and services that support the student and adult learning.</p>	<p>ELCC 2.3: Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff. ELCC 2.4: Candidates understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning in a school environment.</p>	<p>3h. Address matters of equity and cultural responsiveness in all aspects of leadership. 4c. Promote instructional practice that is consistent with knowledge of child learning and development, effective pedagogy, and the needs of each student. 4d. Ensure instructional practice that is intellectually challenging, authentic to student experiences, recognizes student strengths, and is differentiated and personalized.</p>
<p>Component 4.3: Program completers understand and can demonstrate the capacity to evaluate, develop, and implement formal and informal culturally responsive and accessible assessments that support instructional improvement and student learning and well-being.</p>		<p>3g. Act with cultural competence and responsiveness in their interactions, decision making, and practice. 3h. Address matters of equity and cultural responsiveness in all aspects of leadership. 4f. Employ valid assessments that are consistent with knowledge of child learning and development and technical standards of measurement. 4g. Use assessment data appropriately and within technical limitations to monitor student progress and improve instruction</p>
<p>Component 4.4: Program completers understand and demonstrate capacity to collaboratively evaluate, develop, and implement the school’s curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices in a coherent, equitable, and systematic manner.</p>	<p>ELCC 3.5: Candidates understand and can ensure teacher and organizational time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning. ELCC 6.3: Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.</p>	<p>3h. Address matters of equity and cultural responsiveness in all aspects of leadership. 4a. Implement coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, and assessment that promote the mission, vision, and core values of the school, embody high expectations for student learning, align with academic standards, and are culturally responsive. 4b. Align and focus systems of curriculum, instruction, and assessment within and across grade levels to promote student academic success, love of learning, the identities and habits of learners, and healthy sense of self.</p>

<p><u>NELP Building Level Standard Five: Community and External Leadership:</u> to engage families, community, and school personnel in order to strengthen student learning, support school improvement and advocate for the needs of their school and community.</p>	<p><u>2011 ELCC Program Standard Elements</u></p>	<p><u>2015 PSEL Standard Elements</u></p>
<p>Component 5.1: Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to understand and collaboratively engage diverse families in strengthening student learning in and out of school.</p>	<p>ELCC 4.3: Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers.</p>	<p>3b. Recognize, respect, and employ each student’s strengths, diversity, and culture as assets for teaching and learning. 3g. Act with cultural competence and responsiveness in their interactions, decision making, and practice. 8a. Are approachable, accessible, and welcoming to families and members of the community. 8b. Create and sustain positive, collaborative, and productive relationships with families and the community for the benefit of students 8c. Engage in regular and open two-way communication with families and the community about the school, students, needs, problems, and accomplishments.</p>
<p>Component 5.2: Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to understand, collaboratively engage and cultivate relationships with diverse community members, partners, and other constituencies for the benefit of school improvement and student development.</p>	<p>ELCC 4.2: Candidates understand and can mobilize community resources by promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources within the school community. ELCC 4.4: Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive school relationships with community partners.</p>	<p>3g. Act with cultural competence and responsiveness in their interactions, decision making, and practice. 8b. Create and sustain positive, collaborative, and productive relationships with families and the community for the benefit of students 8c. Engage in regular and open two-way communication with families and the community about the school, students, needs, problems, and accomplishments. 8d. Maintain a presence in the community to understand its strengths and needs, develop productive relationships, and engage its resources for the school. 8e. Create means for the school community to partner with families to support student learning in and out of school. 8j. Build and sustain productive partnerships with public and private sectors to promote school improvement and student learning.</p>
<p>Component 5.3: Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to collaboratively engage the larger organizational and policy context to advocate for the needs of their school and community.</p>	<p>ELCC 6.1: Candidates understand and can advocate for school students, families, and caregivers.</p>	<p>8h. Advocate for the school and district, and for the importance of education and student needs and priorities to families and the community. 8i. Advocate publicly for the needs and priorities of students, families, and the community.</p>

<p><u>NELP Building Level Standard Six: Operations and Management</u> to improve management, communication, technology, school-level governance, and operation systems, to develop and improve data-informed and equitable school resource plans, and to apply laws, policies and regulations.</p>	<p><u>2011 ELCC Program Standard Elements</u></p>	<p><u>2015 PSEL Standard Elements</u></p>
<p>Component 6.1: Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to evaluate, develop and implement management, communication, technology, school-level governance, and operation systems that support each student’s learning needs and promote the mission and vision of the school.</p>	<p>ELCC 3.1: Candidates understand and can monitor and evaluate school management and operational systems. ELCC 3.2: Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations. ELCC 4.1: Candidates understand and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school’s educational environment.</p>	<p>4e. Promote the effective use of technology in the service of teaching and learning. 9a. Institute, manage, and monitor operations and administrative systems that promote the mission and vision of the school. 9b. Strategically manage staff resources, assigning and scheduling teachers and staff to roles and responsibilities that optimize their professional capacity to address each student’s learning needs. 9f. Employ technology to improve the quality and efficiency of operations and management. 9g. Develop and maintain data and communication systems to deliver actionable information for classroom and school improvement.</p>
<p>Component 6.2: Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to evaluate, develop and advocate for a data-informed and equitable resourcing plan that supports school improvement and student development.</p>	<p>ELCC 3.2: Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations.</p>	<p>3h. Address matters of equity and cultural responsiveness in all aspects of leadership. 9c. Seek, acquire, and manage fiscal, physical, and other resources to support curriculum, instruction, and assessment; student learning community; professional capacity and community; and family and community engagement. 9d. Are responsible, ethical, and accountable stewards of the school’s monetary and non- monetary resources, engaging in effective budgeting and accounting practices.</p>
<p>Component 6.3: Program completers understand and demonstrate the capacity to reflectively evaluate, communicate about, and implement laws, rights, policies, and regulations to promote student and adult success and well-being.</p>	<p>ELCC 5.4: Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school. ELCC 6.2: Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment.</p>	<p>9h. Know, comply with, and help the school community understand local, state, and federal laws, rights, policies, and regulations so as to promote student success.</p>

<p><u>NELP Building Level Standard Seven: Building Professional Capacity</u> to build the school’s professional capacity, engage staff in the development of a collaborative professional culture, and improve systems of staff supervision, evaluation, support and professional learning.</p>	<p><u>2011 ELCC Program Standard Elements</u></p>	<p><u>2015 PSEL Standard Elements</u></p>
<p>Component 7.1: Program completers understand and have the capacity to collaboratively develop the school’s professional capacity through engagement in recruiting, selecting and hiring staff.</p>	<p>ELCC 2.1: Candidates understand and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students.</p>	<p>7c. Establish and sustain a professional culture of engagement and commitment to shared vision, goals, and objectives pertaining to the education of the whole child; high expectations for professional work; ethical and equitable practice; trust and open communication; collaboration, collective efficacy, and continuous individual and organizational learning and improvement. 7d. Promote mutual accountability among teachers and other professional staff for each student’s success and the effectiveness of the school as a whole. 7e. Develop and support open, productive, caring, and trusting working relationships among leaders, faculty, and staff to promote professional capacity and the improvement of practice. 7g. Provide opportunities for collaborative examination of practice, collegial feedback, and collective learning.</p>
<p>Component 7.2: Program completers understand and have the capacity to develop and engage staff in a collaborative professional culture designed to promote school improvement, teacher retention, and the success and well-being of each student and adult in the school.</p>		<p>6a. Recruit, hire, support, develop, and retain effective and caring teachers and other professional staff and form them into an educationally effective faculty. 6b. Plan for and manage staff turnover and succession, providing opportunities for effective induction and mentoring of new personnel.</p>
<p>Component 7.3: Program completers understand and have the capacity to personally engage in, as well as collaboratively engage staff in, professional learning designed to promote reflection, personal growth, cultural responsiveness, distributed leadership, digital literacy and citizenship, school improvement and student success.</p>	<p>ELCC 3.4: Candidates understand and can develop school capacity for distributed leadership.</p>	<p>3h. Address matters of equity and cultural responsiveness in all aspects of leadership. 4e. Promote the effective use of technology in the service of teaching and learning. 6c. Develop teachers’ and staff members’ professional knowledge, skills, and practice through differentiated opportunities for learning and growth, guided by understanding of professional and adult learning and development. 6d. Foster continuous improvement of individual and collective instructional capacity to achieve outcomes envisioned for each student. 6g. Develop the capacity, opportunities, and support for teacher leadership and leadership from other members of the school community. 7a. Develop workplace conditions for teachers and other professional staff that promote effective professional development, practice, and student learning. 7f. Design and implement job-embedded and other opportunities for professional learning collaboratively with faculty and staff.</p>
<p>Component 7.4: Program completers understand and have the capacity to evaluate, develop, and implement systems of supervision, support and evaluation</p>	<p>ELCC 2.3: Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff.</p>	<p>6e. Deliver actionable feedback about instruction and other professional practice through valid, research-anchored systems of supervision and evaluation to support the development of teachers’ and staff members’ knowledge, skills, and practice. 6.f. Empower and motivate teachers and staff to the highest levels of professional practice and to</p>

designed to promote school improvement and student success.		continuous learning and improvement.
---	--	--------------------------------------