Review of the Research Literature Related to the Principal Preparation Program (September 9, 2016)

Table 1: Display Comparing the Characteristics and Findings from a Series of Recently Published Studies Related to Principal Preparation Programs in the United States (2004-2016)

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs the Principal Preparation Project
School Leadership Interventions Under the Every Student Succeeds Act: Volume 1: A Review of the Evidence Base, Initial Findings	RAND Corporation, R. Herman, S Gates, E. Chavez-Herrerias, M Harris	2016	Surveys research to document studies showing that school leadership and student performance are related. Describes the 4 tiers of permissible evidence that ESSA accepts as justification for interventions that qualify for funding under Title I (improving basic programs at SEAs and LEAs), Title II A (Supporting Effective Instruction), Title IIB (National Activities). Tier I involves Randomized Control Trials. Tier II involves quasi-experimental research designs. Tier III involves well-designed correlational studies that control for selection bias. Tier IV involves high-quality research or positive evaluations suggesting that an intervention is likely to improve student performance (but must include proviso that ongoing efforts are underway to evaluate the intervention), Authors cite definitive studies that together make the case that ESSA funding should be permissible if the proposed intervention relies on one or another of the four tiers of evidence and is designed to promote the improvement of principal preparation (licensure and/or certification), principal professional development, supervision, and/or evaluation. Makes clear that under ESSA, USDOE does not favor one tier of evidence over another but does make it clear that the four tiers of acceptable evidence for Title I and II programming is different from the standard of evidence required under Investing in Innovation (I3) grants. Authors describe a logic model (simplified theory of action) that shows how principals act as a catalyst for change that alters the conditions of teaching and schooling in ways that are associated with higher student performance (and lower teacher turnover, etc). Points out ambiguities in ESSA (e.g., the term "outcomes" is not defined) that beg for guidance. Also identifies where and under what conditions USDOE will require a review of evidence (and when USDOE will simply accept the descriptions submitted by SEAs and LEAs "as is"). Concludes by itemizing ESSA-eligible school leadership improvement activities that presumably USDOE will consider worthy of federal funding under Title I, Title IIA, and/or Title IIB. These include the following: - Principal preparation programs (including internships, mentoring, and residency-based programming) - Strategic staff management (as documented in Charlotte-Mecklenberg's case) - Prof'l Learning (evidence backed as in NYC Aspiring Principal Program or UVA School Turnaround Project) - Working conditions (as found in the case of principal autonomy and comprehensive school reform) - Leader evaluation systems (aligning so they are matched up with 2015 ISLLC standards)	While the USDoE is still establishing rules concerning ESSA, it appears that federal funds may be used in the future to prepare school building leaders -- both aspiring and current principals -- as long as the proposed activities include evidence (a) suggesting that the principal preparation has a positive impact on teaching and learning and (b) that includes a provision for ongoing evaluation. Further, the forthcoming ESSA rules are likely to say that the leadership improvement programs that are fundable will include: - Clinically-rich practicum (leading to certif) - Prof'l learning activities that show promise - Align principal prep standards to research - Expanding principal autonomy to aid in comprehensive school reform activity
Improving University Principal Preparation Programs: Five Themes	Wallace Foundation P. Mendels, ed, compiled from reports by American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), American Association of School Superintendents (AASA), American Institute for Research (AIR), University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA)	2016	Identified 5 themes related to the role school principals play with respect to advancing student achievement - Supts are largely dissatisfied with principal prep program quality (universities say programs can improve) - Strong university-district partnerships are essential to high-quality preparation but are far from universal - The course of study at preparation programs does not always reflect the real job of a principal today - Some university policies and practices can hinder change. - States have a role & authority in improving principal prep, but many don't use it as effectively as possible	Because demands on principals are changing, it is important to review state expectations leading to principal certification (to ensure that a state's standards actually match reality of the principal's daily job). States play a role, but university-district partnerships are key. There is widespread agreement that principal preparation programs could and should be improved.

Table 1: Display Comparing the Characteristics and Findings from a Series of Recently Published Studies Related to Principal Preparation Programs in the United States (2004-2016)

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs the Principal Preparation Project
Improving State Evaluation of Principal Preparation Programs	New Leaders and the University Council Educational Administration G. Ikemoto, M. Keleman, M. Young, and P. Tucker	Feb. 2016	Identified design principles for leaders to use when revising how their states evaluate principal preparation. - Structure the review process in a way that is conducive to continuous program improvement - Create appropriate systems to hold programs accountable for effective practices and outcomes - Provide key stakeholders with accurate and useful information - Take sophisticated and nuanced approach to data collection and use - Adhere to the characteristics of high-quality program evaluation Included are examples from two states (Illinois and Delaware) that have adopted the improvement design and assessment rubrics. The states emphasize that the first and most important step is to outline a clear and concise focus of the plan and the technical abilities of their respective state departments of education. The appendix includes a chart to guide the process of amending current principal preparation standards.	Most important takeaway is that a state should be clear about its role in evaluating principal preparation programs and that the role of the state is chiefly to create conditions that allow the entire system to learn to get better faster. As a result emphasis should go toward creating incentives that build capacity and promote continuous improvement (vs compliance with rules). Data play an essential role in this and state efforts should be directed toward providing information the field finds useful.
Building a Stronger Principalship: Vol. 4 Evaluating and Supporting Principals	RAND Education L. Anderson & B. Turnbull	Jan. 2016	Focuses on the development or changes to the principal evaluation practices in six districts, as well as support system put in place to assist principals post-evaluation. The six districts' changed their mindset on evaluation as a means to develop principals rather than punish them. Using the frequently-vague big picture evaluation standards set by their respective state, districts were able to shape their own evaluation methods attempting create more of an on-going learning-centered conversation between principals and principal supervisors. Across the six districts' no evaluation system looked the same but each used their own research to develop a system that worked best (determining principal success without relying mainly on standardized test results). Important parts of the new models for evaluation used in these districts were satisfaction surveys and supervisor observations and growth measured by local standards. There are charts following the new standards of evaluation gauging principal and district reactions to the data garnered from the new evaluation system. Districts continued to modify their evaluation models yearly to capture the best method of evaluation. Over 90% of 1st year principals had a mentor or coach provided by the district. This number fell drastically after each year in position. Providing support to novice principals became a priority in all districts. Districts attempted to tailor support roles to the needs of the principal in position. The biggest takeaway from this is that evaluation systems take time to refine and may need to go through multiple regenerations in order to provide the models in order to accurately hold principals accountable.	When a district (or state) undertakes to change principal evaluation and support, it is vital to stay in close touch with those in the field directly affected by state changes. Systematically capturing feedback from the field can be a useful (necessary) way to identify mid-course corrections that are a vital element of continuous improvement. It is always good to recall that if continuous improvement is the goal, the reality is that you never arrive. Change is constant. While this can result in reform fatigue, if those that the reforms affect most directly (namely principals and aspiring principals) perceive that the changes are in their own best interest, resistance diminishes and change is more apt to be welcomed.
Building a Stronger Principalship: Vol. 3 Districts Taking Charge of Principal Pipeline	RAND B. Turnbull, D. Riley, & J. MacFarlane	Jan. 2016	Tells how 6 districts (NYC, Prince Georges, Denver, Hillsborough, Gwinnett, Charlotte-Mecklenburg) are implementing their plans and what policies have been adjusted after the initial year of Wallace funding. The data used to fill out this report was gathered between 2011 and 2014. A key finding from this report is that across all six participating districts' there was a feeling that not enough time had passed to make anything more than a preliminary impression, final evaluation of the policy changes will not take place until 2017, ending in April 2018. The initial takeaways for looking at the pipeline as a whole; district leaders tried to strengthen the caliber of candidates, most novice principals were positioned as vice/assistant principal for a significant amount of time, most successful principals served in school leadership positions (department	For an entity like a district (or a state?) to Successfully improve principal preparation, it takes a significant investment of time and a corresponding commitment by the leadership of the district (or a state?) for this work to be successful. Each grantee attacked the principal pipeline challenge in a different way. But all grantees found it was useful to pay particular

NOTE: CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

Table 1: Display Comparing the Characteristics and Findings from a Series of Recently Published Studies Related to Principal Preparation Programs in the United States (2004-2016)

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs the Principal Preparation Project
NOTE: CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE				
			chair, math coach, literacy specialist, etc.) prior to being hired as an SBL, districts reframed their expectations for specific positions. The districts have built a career path to Principalship with stages of leadership in order to create principals who are prepared to lead a specific school within a district. Districts play a distinct role in the process of preparing principals. Thus far, districts in this group had successfully bridged the gap between districts and universities/colleges. The establishment of succession plans has improved the candidate pools by targeting those with experience within district or similarly conditioned district. Every district added new hiring policies, modified selection criteria and gathered systemic data collection on candidates. The six districts' developed new evaluation standards and clarified criteria and expectations. Coaches were assigned to novice principals and data on principals strengths and weaknesses were collected. The districts extended their capacity for facilitating the training and professional development provided to novice principals. Across all six districts' there was a focus on preparing vice-principals who were in line to succeed the principal in his/her leadership position. Each professional development initiative systematically included assistant principals and vice principals.	attention to succession management and the preparation of aspiring principals. All grantees pulled assistant principals into the programs so they received support early in their development
A Shared Vision of Leadership: Creating an Aligned Understanding of the Principalship	New Leaders	2016	Makes compelling case for greater federal attention (& ESSA funding) to the task of developing school leaders. Because principals "account for a fourth of a school's impact on student achievement" principals are "the leverage point for education reform and the primary drivers of school improvement." Further, school leaders "are the best long-term investment in effective teaching at scale" largely because as principals they have an influence (albeit indirect) on all students in the school. Citing the National Association of Elementary School Principals and the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the authors point to the changing demands on school leaders. "Heightened accountability requirements . . . have significantly increased the complexity of the work of the principal." Based on deep analysis of 200 public schools, the authors claim that the most effective principals chiefly exercise leadership in three areas: - Instructional leaders - Talent managers - Culture builders	Due to their impact on a school (incl. staff, student body, and parent community), it makes good sense to focus on improving principal preparation. Demands on schools leaders are changing (largely due to accountability). The prime focus of attention today -- when it comes to the daily work of principals – is on providing instructional leadership, managing talent, and building healthy culture.
Pipeline Development: Cultivating Teacher Leaders	New Leaders	2016	Over the last 25 years, educators have exited teaching at an increasing pace. A quarter century ago, the modal value of teacher experience was 15 years; by 2007, the number dropped to one year of experience. When exiting teachers were asked why they were prompted to leave, over half (58%) said that their new profession offered better opportunities for advancement. The authors argue that building a better pipeline of talent is a challenge that is larger than any one individual can accomplish alone. What is needed is a culture whereby leadership is distributed and shared by teachers. This help build ownership for decisions and also has the effect of providing a runway for future principals. Given society's changing demography, special efforts should be devoted to recruiting, selecting, and supporting diverse leadership candidates. States and districts are well-served to eliminate barriers to teacher entry into the profession and to cultivate alternative career paths for teachers once they enter the profession.	While student learning is the central concern of all P12 educators, at the school level, focus must also be on the learning and growth of professional staff. As the rate of turnover has increased over the last decade, it is becoming abundantly clear that educators say they are willing to migrate toward work that provides for ongoing advancement.

Table 1: Display Comparing the Characteristics and Findings from a Series of Recently Published Studies Related to Principal Preparation Programs in the United States (2004-2016)

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs the Principal Preparation Project
Pre-Service Prep: Building a Strong Supply of Effective Future Leaders	New Leaders	2016	Going forward, principal preparation programs will need to feature one key element. That is, candidates for principal certification demonstrate their readiness and fitness for placement by demonstrating knowledge and skill. Data show there is an abundance of individuals who are certified to be principal but, according to 41 percent of superintendent respondents, many current principals are not well-prepared for the job. Further, 96 percent of principals report that on-the-job experiences were more valuable than graduate program work. While strong principal preparation programs demonstrate one or more of the following characteristics (actively seeking high-quality candidates, conducting rigorous selection processes, coupling demanding curriculum with strong and extended practicum experiences, and using ongoing assessment to customize learning for individual candidates), too many principal preparation programs lack one or more of these features. Compounding matters, state oversight too often lacks the requirement that principal preparation programs demonstrate candidate readiness for certification and success on the job. States that are serious about improving their principal preparation programming may want to consider using incentive grants to encourage innovations in programming. States may also consider changes to policies or rules that require clinically-rich practicum as a pre-requisite to certification. States may want to require that principal candidates demonstrate that they have at least two years of effective school-based experience as a condition of certification. Further, states may want to consider offering tuition offsets for promising principal candidates who agree to serve in hard to staff high-need schools. Finally, states may want to open up principal preparation to entities beyond those that traditionally have provided this service (namely IHEs) to include BOCES, large districts, museums, or other niche-based non-profit organizations.	NYS permits the Museum of Natural History to prepare and certify teachers. However, no analogous mechanism exists for an entity (other than IHE) to prepare and certify principals. Evidence from this New Leaders brief suggests that innovations in principal preparation can enhance the system in ways that furnishes a better supply of principal candidates who demonstrate they have what it takes to be effective as a school leader. The brief shows that it is widely believed (by superintendents) that learning in a clinical setting is more valuable to principal preparation than traditional graduate programs. Incentives can be a powerful tool for states that want to promote and encourage innovations in principal preparation.
Evaluation and Management: Continuous Professional Growth	New Leaders	2016	While studies showing that principals play a central role in supporting teachers and guiding instruction within a school, principals spend between 8 and 17 percent of their time on essential instructional leadership. Scant evidence exists of sound methods that can be used to help principals be more effective and efficient in their use of time for the purpose of instructional leadership. Further, better measures are needed to gauge principal effectiveness in general. These measures are needed so that diagnosis can occur and support can be provided to individuals in a targeted way. Evaluation methods in some districts and states lack the evidence base (over time) that is needed to make it possible to tell which methods are more or less effective. Too often, those who supervise principals are not well equipped to observe practice and provide meaningful actionable feedback.	Tie principal support to principal evaluation. At the state level, make funding for principal prep contingent on the collection and analysis of data that quantify the program's impact on the quality of the principal candidates. Develop models of sound principal preparation that others can emulate. Provide technical assistance to entities (IHE, districts, BOCES) that seek to improve principal preparation. Fund IHEs that partner with districts to provide clinically-rich practicum for candidates. Alter the expectations (standards) that apply to those who supervise principals making certain that the standards include providing customized and targeted support to principals.

Table 1: Display Comparing the Characteristics and Findings from a Series of Recently Published Studies Related to Principal Preparation Programs in the United States (2002-2016)

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs the Principal Preparation Project
SEP[3] Toolkit: State Evaluation of Principal Preparation Programs	New Leaders and the University Council for Educational Administration G. Ikemoto, M. Keleman, M Young, P. Tucker	2016	Provides rationale for the state role in assessing the quality of principal preparation programs. - State has statutory/regulatory authority concerning the provision of quality principal preparation programs - It is typically the case that states lack a strong model for assessing the quality of programs States typically face two problems related to assessing the quality of principal preparation programs - Evaluation should be driven by data about program quality/outcomes but state systems lack such data - If high-quality programming and continuous improvement are the aim (and they should be) then program Evaluation should be "diagnostic in nature, using program quality and outcomes data to drive inquiries into the source of success, improvement, and concerns. However, state system do not tend to be organized to use data in this way and states often lack the necessary capacity for diagnosis and support." Authors offer "core design principles". In their view effective evaluation of principal preparation programs will: - Promote continuous program improvement - Support states in holding programs accountable for effective practices and outcomes - Provide stakeholders with accurate/useful information that contributes to improved program performance - Are "sophisticated and nuanced in approach to data collection, analysis, and use - Adhere to characteristics of high-quality program evaluation After outlining a model 2-stage process for program evaluation (not an "off the shelf" guide) authors offer tools: - State readiness diagnostic rubric - Specifications for annual state report with data on inputs, process, outputs, and program graduate outcomes - Handbook for a process review - Handbook for a targeted review (for a principal preparation program that is struggling)	The "state readiness diagnostic rubric" offers a helpful starting point for any state that wants to identify where it stands on an improvement continuum. While the rubric may not be a perfect framework it can spark useful dialogue. It raises the key question, "If not this tool for diagnosing state readiness to improve principal preparation programs statewide, then what tool is better?
State Policy Guide Re-Imagining State Policy (Guide to Building Systems that Support Effective Principals), Version 1.0	New Leaders	2016	Authors take a system-level view of the continuum of human capital development, especially as it relates to school building leadership. Advocates for a vision of school building leadership that acknowledges the role of statute, regulations (or "rules"), models of excellence, capacity-building, investment in new ideas and approaches, and mechanism to provide public accountability. Brings to the forefront the importance of the "teacher leader" and the usefulness of providing career paths for effective teachers to become building leaders. Encourages exploring new incentives that can aid the development of teacher leaders. Authors cite examples Of school districts that are exploring novel arrangements that capitalize on teacher leaders. Authors also cite states (Illinois, Colorado, Florida) that are working toward moving in new directions that have shown some promise when it comes to pre-service preparation, statutory change, and evaluation systems that take some account of the performance of program graduates.	Offers a framework for thinking about any state-wide effort that aims to improve the preparation Of school building leaders. The document is not a set of nuts and bolts tactics. It is more a way to conceptualize the entire effort of any state.
What Districts Know – and Need to Know – About their Principals	American Institutes for Research	2016	Points out the "importance of improving the accuracy and availability of data to explore questions about how to find, support, and keep the best leaders. Highlights the need for "high-quality data about principal preparation, experience, and assignment (that are rarely available within districts. Calls for districts to collect and maintain consistent data about principal mobility at the beginning, middle, and end of a given school year. Identifies particular variables of interest to those who want to identify, develop, and retain great school leaders.	This document can be helpful when the time comes to develop a statewide leader tracking tool that can help district hiring managers Identify, select, develop, and retain high-quality school building leader candidates.

Table 1: Display Comparing the Characteristics and Findings from a Series of Recently Published Studies Related to Principal Preparation Programs in the United States (2002-2016)

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs the Principal Preparation Project
Statewide Data on Supply and Demand of Principals After Changes to Principal Preparation in Illinois	Center for the Study of Education Policy at Illinois State University A. Haller and E. Hunt	2016	Study seeks to document the impact of a law that Illinois enacted in 2010 (IL P.A. 096-0903) that reformed how principals are recruited, prepared, and credentialed in the state. Study sought to determine how changes in law affected the supply of potential principals. Study authors found that no statewide repository of data that would could reliably be used to estimate the supply of potential principals (prior to the policy change). Consequently, the authors stated it "would be premature to make any revisions to the new regulations." Instead, the study recommends three key strategies: - Develop a longitudinal data system to store metrics that can more accurately inform supply/demand studies - Identify regional differences in supply /demand and to help ensure equitable distribution of resources - Support district-level implementation of effective talent management including leadership vacancy strategies.	Points to the importance of having data of sufficiently good quality to enable sound analysis and defensible inferences.
Toward Convergence: A Technical Guide for the Postsecondary Metrics Framework	Institute for Higher Education Policy A. Janice & M. Voight	2016	Urges the creation of "transparent postsecondary system that facilitates effective policy and practice (and informed [consumer] choices." Offers a rationale for this call to action. "Many speculate about the value and outcomes of specific programs and institutions – in terms of both supporting students through to graduation and providing them with sufficient economic and noneconomic payoff. The information available today is Inadequate and simply leaves the public wondering about answers to key questions about access, progression, completion, cost, and outcomes. Sets forth metrics in three areas: - Measure of performance related to institutional access, progress, completion, cost, post-program outcome - Measure of efficiency and how resources impact program completion - Measure of equity that gauges the inclusion of populations that are typically underserved.	While the authors focus in a general way on the performance of collegiate programs (and not specifically on university-based programs to prepare school building leaders), the 3-part framework that is offered can be useful to efforts of the Principal Project Advisory Team members as they think about how to properly appraise the viability and success of these Programs.
Why Elementary School Principals Matter	New America Education Policy Program A. Loewenberg	2016	Points to nationwide trend whereby a growing number of states are enacting 3rd grade reading laws (require districts to intervene with struggling readers in kindergarten). Similarly, a growing number of states are now implementing state-funded full-day K, pre-K, and/or kindergarten readiness assessments. Also, the percentage of kindergarteners enrolled in full-day programs has nearly tripled between 1977 and 2013 (ChildTrends, Report titled "Full-Day Kindergarten Indicators on Children and Youth" dated February 2015), As a result, "elementary principals are increasingly expected to provide accurate, frequent evaluation and feedback to all of their kindergarten teachers. Successful elementary principals are called upon to establish a PreK-3 culture and continuum in their schools, build relationships with families and early-childhood providers, and ensure developmentally appropriate teaching and assessment within their school communities. As of 2014, only one state (Illinois) includes early childhood content and field experiences in its requirements related principal certification and/or licensure.	Highlights how expectations are changing for elementary principals due to changing laws related to early childhood education. Suggests that every state may want to consider how well-tuned its school building leader preparation program requirements are to the rising importance of early childhood educational programming.
Project Narrative: Creating a State Vision to Support the Design and Implementation of an Innovative Assessment and Accountability System	National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment S. Marion, L. Pace, M Williams, & S. Lyons	2016	This policy brief from the executive director of the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment offers a "theory of action" that builds on the guidance from the newly-enacted Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). It shows how any state can move toward the vision of a more-student-centered, personalized learning system that is designed to promote deeper and more-engaged student learning. While the document focuses on assessment and accountability, it stresses how assessment data should be transformed so it is more useful (to students, parents, and educators) and less important (uncouple it from high-stakes purposes). To accomplish that will require many states to pivot to invest more in capacity building so that school and district "leaders embrace the [design principles]" on which such a system is based.	The authors lay out a sequence for developing a "theory of action" that can keep a system oriented toward its chief and central aim. This "theory of action" becomes the blueprint for way forward. The Principal Preparation Project can potentially benefit from developing its own theory of action. Having a blue-print can explain design choices/ recommendations.

Table 1: Display Comparing the Characteristics and Findings from a Series of Recently Published Studies Related to Principal Preparation Programs in the United States (2002-2016)

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs the Principal Preparation Project

Standards for Advanced Programs (adopted by the CAEP Board of Directors, June 10, 2016 and Effective July 1, 2017)	Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)	June, 2016	As other accrediting agencies that institutions of higher education have relied on in the past (NCATE and TEAC) give way to a single accrediting agency (CAEP), the standards IHEs use for program approval are evolving. Below is a list of the five CAEP standards for advanced program that were CAEP Board approved on June 10, 2016. Special attention is given to the last two of these five standards (because of their relevance to the work of the Principal Project Advisory Team.
			- Standard 1 focuses on candidate outcomes specific to advanced-level study
			- Standard 2 provides flexibility in clinical experiences (encompasses uniqueness/diversity of grad level work)
			- Standard 3 emphasizes admission of qualified candidates who have shown the ability to do advanced work
			- Standard 4 focuses on completer and employer satisfaction
			- Standard 5 requests evidence of a quality assurance system specific to continuous improvement
			
			Standard 4 has two components:
			- Satisfaction of Employers
			  Provider show employers are satisfied with completers' preparation (they reach employment milestones)
			- Satisfaction of Completers
			  Provider shows completers perceive preparation as relevant to responsibilities they face on the job
			
			Standard 5 concerns "Quality and Strategic Evaluation" and "Continuous Improvement" and has 5 components:
			- A.5.1: Provider's quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that monitor advanced Program candidate progress, advanced completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness.
			- A.5.2: Providers quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid & consistent.
			- A.5.3: Provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, Tracks results over time, tests innovation and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent programs and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.
			- A.5.4: Measures of advanced program completer outcomes, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction. Outcomes include completion rate, licensure rate, employment rate in field of speciality preparation, and consumer information such as places of employment and salaries.
			- A.5.5: Provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.
				These CAEP standards are relevant to the work of NYS-based institutions of higher education in the following way. When Education Preparation Programs (EPP) with educational leadership programs leading to School Building Leader and School District leader seek CAEP accreditation, they can do so through a program review option known as "Program Review with National Recognition". In this case, the EPP must demonstrate that their programs meet the program standards of a Specialized Professional Association (SPA). The SPA for educational leadership programs is the National Policy Board for Educational Administration: http://www.npbea.org/. It could be helpful to EPPs with leadership programs to have NY Standards for school building leader programs that are aligned with NPBEA standards. That would be helpful if they wish to have their leadership programs nationally recognized as part of their CAEP Accreditation. Leeadership programs (such as School Building Leader programs) will be reviewed against CAEP's Standards for Advanced Programs. If all of these the standards are not aligned (cross walked), then to some extent, it creates much more work for the EPP. When there can be greater alignment, the tools for data collection\ and the data collected can be used to demonstrate meeting NY, NPBEA, and CAEP Standards.

Table 1: Display Comparing the Characteristics and Findings from a Series of Recently Published Studies Related to Principal Preparation Programs in the United States (2004-2016)

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs the Principal Preparation Project
Developing Excellent School Principals to Advance Teaching and Learning: Considerations for State Policy	Wallace Foundation P. Manna	2015	Creates useful context for those interested in principal preparation. Surveys the policy landscape and explains why principal preparation garners scant attention: - State department agendas that are crowded with higher-priority topics that over-shadow principal prep - Research/policy attention can tend to focus first on those directly affecting students (i.e., teachers) - Growing attention to distributed leadership & rising influence of teacher-leaders eclipses principal prep Explains why it is important for principal prep to be on the research & policy agenda for state departments - Effective principals are associated with measurable & positive effects on student & teacher performance - Through their positive impact on teachers and teaching, effective principals have a "multiplier effect" - State department policy initiatives depend on the willingness/ability of principals to support and execute To support reform and improvement efforts, states have access to policy levers: - Setting principal leadership standards - Recruiting/selecting top talent into the profession and supporting them to become aspiring principals - Managing principal preparation programs	Provides a point of reference for conversations and deliberations by the Principal Project Advisory Team. Asserts that state departments of education should focus on efforts designed to build capacity (with a focus on results that improve the performance of schools). For each recommendation that the author offers states, the author includes detailed examples. These examples could provide a jumping-off point for deliberations by the Advisory Team. One excerpt is particularly noteworthy. "Given the field's limited experience with principal evaluations, no set of best practices yet exists."
Supporting and Retaining Effective Principals: Policy Snapshot	American Institutes for Research L. Matlach	2015	Cites researchers who "generally agree that principals are second only to teachers in their influence on student learning (Seashore-Louis, Leithwoor, Walhstrom, & Anderson, 2010; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Grissom, Loeb, & Masters, 2015). Further identifies five competencies/outcomes of effective principals: - Shape mission and vision of school (Seashore-Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010) - Create school environments conducive to learning & teaching (Clodfelter, Ladd, Vigdor, & Wheeler, 2007; and Seashore-Louis et al., 2010) - Attract, support, and retain high-quality teachers (Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2013; Clotfelter et al., 2007) - Decrease student absenteeism (Branch el al., 2013, Clark, Martorelli, & Rockoff, 2009) - Increase the school graduation rate (Coelli & Green, 2012) Cites Farley-Ripple, Solano, & McDuffie (2012) to explain that "high principal turnover exacerbate inequities": - Declines in student achievement - Interruption of a program (or reform) implementation - Low teacher morale - Development of a change resistant culture Focusing on reasons principals leave their post after less than five years, says turnover rates are higher in: - Large urban districts (Burkhauser, Gates, Hamilton, & Ikemoto, 2012) - Low-performing schools (Loeb, Kalogrides, & Horng, 2010; Beteille, et al., 2012, and Branch et al., 2013) - Schools serving low-income students (Loeb et al., 2010; Beteille, et al., 2012; Branch et al., 2013) - Schools serving minority students (Loeb et al, 2010; Beteille, et al., 2012; Branch et al., 2013) Identifies three strategies states could pursue to reduce turnover: - Improve principal preparation through better selection - Greater transparency around program outcomes, - Funding for high-quality principal preparation programs that are focused on producing principals who are prepared to work in high-need schools	Offers evidence that state-level actions can help curb unwanted principal turnover. Highlights the role that state efforts can play in efforts to stem unwanted principal turnover. Points to the value of making program outcomes more transparent. And urges principal preparation programs to invest in better selection techniques. Finally, suggests funding be devoted to principal prep programs that furnish leaders for high-need schools.

Table 1: Display Comparing the Characteristics and Findings from a Series of Recently Published Studies Related to Principal Preparation Programs in the United States (2004-2016)

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs the Principal Preparation Project
Policymaker's Guide: Research-Based Policy for Principal Preparation Program Approval and Licensure	University Council for Educational Administration E. Anderson & A. Reynolds	2015	The authors pose and address two fundamental questions: - Which research-based components of high-quality, principal preparation programs are in state policy? - Which research-based standard for principal candidate licensure are included in current state policy? For the survey of 50 states, authors give rationale for including 5 policy areas concerning preparation programs: - Explicit selection process` - Program standards - Clinically-rich internship - University-district partnerships - Program oversight Further, authors identify a rationale for including 3 policy areas that pertain to candidate licensure requirements: - Experience requirements - Assessment requirements - Licensure renewal The authors then use the 8 criteria (5 areas related to preparation programs and 3 areas pertaining to licensure) to evaluate the adequacy of the policies in each of the 50 states in the nation. Exemplar are provided to show what more states could do in the 5 areas related to preparation programs and 3 areas pertaining to licensure.	Using the framework that the authors provide, It is easy to identify what NYS could consider If it wished to improve its programs to prepare aspiring school building leaders. Specifically, NYS could: - Enhance the existing selection process to support the selection of a diverse and high-quality candidate pool - Enhance how university providers of SBL preparation programs better collaborate with school districts when it comes to the process used to select program candidates - Enhance the program oversight in a way that more-closely matches the process used in exemplar states.
Improving Educational Outcomes: How State Policy Can Support School Principals as Instructional Leaders	National Governors Association C. Rowland	2015	With the advent of standards-based learning and heightened expectations for student performance, the role of the principal is changing. In response, state policy making should advocate for needed changes to the preparation of aspiring principals and for changes in the support provided to current principals (ongoing professional training. As more states turn to standards to focus teaching/learning, demands on principals shifted from "maintaining operations and managing discipline" to "instructional leadership". Effective school leaders today "must possess 3 critical skills": - A knowledge of student learning standards - An ability to identify effective instructional techniques to meet those standards - The ability to coach teachers toward enhancing their instructional techniques In short, principals must be quipped to "help teacher transition from old to new ways of teaching." The rationale for states to focus attention and resources on principal preparation is that "by improving the quality of school principals . . . efforts [are focused] on individuals who can dramatically improve teacher quality, and thereby student learning, especially in the lowest performing schools." Steps that states can take include: - Raising admission standards for programs that prepare future school building leaders - Monitoring prep programs by holding institutions accountable for educating school leader candidates - Ensuring that certification processes that gauge principal readiness measure candidates understanding of standards and their ability to lead teachers and students in achieving those standards - Allocating resources for ongoing, high-quality coaching for existing school building leaders - Ensuring effective teacher have the opportunity to share leadership responsibilities in the school	

NOTE: CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

Table 1: Display Comparing the Characteristics and Findings from a Series of Recently Published Studies Related to Principal Preparation Programs in the United States (2004-2016)

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs the Principal Preparation Project
NOTE: CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE				
			The author cites research (School Leaders Network, *Churn: The High Cost of Principal Turnover*, 2014) showing: - Cost of training new principal before they enter the field ranges from $37,000 to $303,000 (ave = $75,000) - Half of principals stay in the role three years (at a time that reform typically require five years to take root) Unfortunately, "when principals enter situations for which they are poorly trained and receive little support, they are more apt to leave." Preparation of future principals today requires equipping leader candidates with the skill and knowledge that enables them to lead and coach teachers who are now expected to facilitate learning through activities that focus on critical thinking (reducing the amount of rote learning that existed in the past). This kind of leadership requires principals who can provide collaborative planning time and can identify instructional needs and provide effective targeted assistance to teachers who are striving to improve their instructional practice.	
From Procedures to Partnership: Redesigning Principal Supervision to Help Principals Lead for High-Quality Teaching and Learning	University of Washington L. Rainey & M. Honig	2015	Authors refer to efforts underway in 11 school systems that focus on principal supervision. These efforts make the claim and present the case that the central office staff members who typically supervise principals "can be an important resource for school improvement when they emphasis principal growth and learning." The authors support the claim with research (Honig, Copland, Rainey, Lorton, & Newton, 2010; Honig, 2012; Honig & Rainey, 2014). These 11 school systems include Hillsborough, Denver Prince George's County, Tulsa, Green Dot, Pittsburgh, & others). The report presents themes/trends emerging from this work in 11 systems. - Define the principal role as squarely focused on principal growth and learning - Define the principal role as focused on instructional leadership - Principal supervisors report to or near the system superintendent - Principal supervisors work with a manageable caseload of principals (between 8 and 12) - Principal supervisors oversee a subset of strategically grouped principals - Ensure that the principal supervisors view their job as teaching principals to be instructional leaders - Provide principal supervisors with professional training focused on improving principal capacity - Proactively protect the time of principal supervisors - Transform central office so it performs in ways aligned with the principal supervisor-principal relationship.	
Professional Standards for Educational Leaders	National Policy Board for Educational Administration (copyright, Council of Chief State School Officers)	2015	"2015 Standards embody a research- and practice-based understanding of the relationship between educational leadership and student learning. In all realms of work, educational leaders must focus on how they are promoting the learning, achievement, development, and well-being of each student." The 10 standards include the following: - Mission, Vision, and Core Values - Ethics and Professional Norms - Equity and Cultural Responsiveness - Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment - Community of Care and Support for Students - Professional Capacity of School Personnel - Professional Community for Teachers and Staff - Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community - Operations and Maintenance - School Improvement	

Table 1: Display Comparing the Characteristics and Findings from a Series of Recently Published Studies Related to Principal Preparation Programs in the United States (2004-2016)

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs the Principal Preparation Project
Promises to Keep: Transforming Educator Preparation to Better Serve a Diverse Range of Learners	Council of Chief State School Officers	2015	"Struggling learners, including students with disabilities, English language learners (ELLs), or students with other unidentified learning and behavior needs, can succeed in meeting college- and career-ready standards only if educators are prepare to meet their needs." This document is a report on the progress made since 2012 when CCSSO published a set of recommendations (titled *Our Responsibility, Our Promise: Transforming Educator Preparation and Entry into the Education Profession*) This report reiterates recommendations to State Departments of Education and their leaders. - Beginning with educator preparation programs, define the knowledge and skill needed by educators to Implement differentiated, high-quality, core content instruction to meet the needs of all learners, to monitor their progress, and identify and provide increasingly-intensive support - Provide multiple opportunities for deliberate feedback to educators as they learn new strategies/techniques - Ensure the outcomes of all students (including those with disabilities) are an integral part of every educator preparation program. - Hold educator prep programs accountable and provide feedback on how the institutions that administer these programs can improve to ensure candidates are prepared for success the moment they step into job.	
Unintended Impacts of Performance Funding on Community Colleges and Universities in Three States	Teachers College Columbia University Community College Research Center H. Lahr, L. Pheatt, K. Dougherty, S. Jones, R. Natow, & V. Reddy	2014	This study identifies and analyzes the unintended consequences of performance-based funding policies on institutions of higher education in three states (Ohio, Indiana, and Tennessee). A total of nine community colleges and nine public universities were included in the sample. Phone call interviews were conducted with from these 18 institutions. The respondents were 200+ college personnel program administrators (including deans or senior or middle-level administrators). In closing, the authors offer two policy prescriptions. In their analysis, the authors call rely on the "principal-agent problem". The authors identify five potential impacts or unintended consequences: - Narrowing or more-selective admissions criteria can conflict with desire to enroll diverse candidate pool. - Inflating grades to improve completion rate conflicts with desire to prepare enrollees to succeed on the job. - Incurring costs to show compliance with new laws drains resources from programs that laws aim to improve. - Increasing competition can dampen willingness of faculty to cooperate with colleagues from other institutions. - Focusing on productivity/cost can drain faculty morale and diminish faculty voice in institutional governance. The authors offer two policy prescriptions: - To ensure institutions maintain (or improve on) a diverse pool of program applicants, states may want to offer premium for graduating student who are low-income or who face other challenges (non-native English speakers, etc.) - To guard against grade inflation that could signal a lowering of expectations of students, states may want to conduct analyses that gauges whether the cumulative grade point averages of exiting graduating classes is similar to or different from previous graduating classes. Incentives could be offered to guard against this.	

Table 1: Display Comparing the Characteristics and Findings from a Series of Recently Published Studies Related to Principal Preparation Programs in the United States (2004-2016)

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs the Principal Preparation Project

Improving School Leader Preparation: Collaborative Models for Measuring Effectiveness	American Institutes for Research
	N. Yoder, D. Freed, & J. Fetters
		2014	Authors describe the measures most states use to collect data on program performance as well as new accountability models that are arising. A glimpse is offered of more-collaborative models that may be in the future. Authors report that "principal preparation programs ascribe to common standards for principal preparation, but programs do not commonly have performance measures that are tied to principals' post-graduation experiences. Authors note that "previous reviews of state accountability and approval system for leadership preparation have Identified an overall lack of rigor in program accountability measures and inadequate data on program impacts (Briggs, Cheney, Davis, & Moll, 2013). No widely accepted model of preparation program accountability exists and few research studies find connections between principal preparation program features and principal success, school performance, or improved school culture. This lack of guidance makes collaboration among multiple actors – state education agencies, policymakers, institutions of higher education, national associations, districts, and foundations – crucial in identifying new models for leadership accountability and program evaluation."
			
			Authors describe two categories of measures that states typically use to collect data on program adequacy:
			- Program characteristics
			  o Candidate selection criteria
			  o Program standards
			  o Candidate completion requirements
			  o Coursework requirements
			  o Clinical experience descriptions
			- Program outcomes
			  o Rates of certification by program participants
			  o Graduation rates (program completion rates)
			  o Job placement rates
			  o Candidate success in program (GPA, etc.)
			  o Program completers record of effectiveness in the job after program graduation and certification
			  o Performance evaluations for program participants after they graduate from program & are certified
			  o Climate of schools they lead for program participants after graduation from program and certification
			  o Academic performance of schools they lead after graduating from program and earning certification
			  o Teacher effectiveness/retention in schools they lead after program graduation & earning certification
			  o Employer satisfaction surveys
			  o Student graduation rates in high schools they lead after program graduation and earning certification
			
			Authors describe emergence and ascendancy of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) and its emphasis on a "culture of evidence" of program benefit and value. The authors state that mechanisms like CAEP accreditation arose in response to a national desire for "stronger mechanisms for preparation program accountability that included linking preparation programs with their graduates' performance evaluation data after placement." Continuing, the authors observe that "few states are currently far enough along to actually produce this data linkage . . . to include program participant satisfaction survey results & graduate performance evaluation data, e.g., impact on school climate, teacher quality, and student learning.	

Table 1: Display Comparing the Characteristics and Findings from a Series of Recently Published Studies Related to Principal Preparation Programs in the United States (2004-2016)

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs the Principal Preparation Project
New York State Teacher Certification Examinations: School Building Leader Assessment Design and Framework	NYSED	2014	Describes the purpose, specifications, and expected respondent burden for the two-part School Building Leader Certification Exam. - Part One Includes one extended performance task that requires candidates to read a school-based scenario and analyze performance data, formative assessment data, student and teacher survey results, and teacher evaluation and observation data. Candidates use the information to respond to prompts. There are shorter performance tasks each of which presents an authentic situation involving the school culture, learning environment, or equity concern in a school. - Part Two Includes two extended tasks. The first requires candidates to analyze and evaluate a teacher's video-recorded classroom performance using a state-approved rubric. The second task requires candidates to analyze teacher evaluation data as well as other types of authentic evidence related to human capital development (e.g., teacher observation data, teacher survey data, state assessment results). Both Part One and Part Two include selected response item sets. The document identifies the number of items that are devoted to each section as well as the corresponding percentage of test score that is attached to each section of the exam. The Framework includes a narrative describing the knowledge, skills, competencies, attributes, and dispositions that successful aspiring school building leader candidate are expected to be able to demonstrate proficiency. The Framework defines the performance indicators associated with each area of knowledge, skill	
Change Agents: How States Can Develop Effective School Leaders Concept Paper	New Leaders M. Young with J. Gran, B. Fenton, G. Ikemoto, E. Adams, M. Kelemen, S. Todd, K. Gilligan, and T. Kneisel	2013	Provides rationale for efforts to enhance preparation of school building leaders. Emphasizes research showing that "principals account for 25% of a school's total impact on student achievement. Citing RAND Corporation research, report authors describe the superintendent view of the readiness of principals for rigors of the job. - 41% of superintendents report principals could be better at their performance on the job - 33% of superintendents report that principals are better prepared than in the past - 77.5% of principals across six urban districts were still in the role after three years Citing research by A. Farkas, J. Johnson, A. Duffet, and J. Vine, authors report principal views of their prep: - 96% agree that on-the-job experiences was better training than their graduate programs for - 66% say their preparation programs were "out of touch" with the skills principals need (insofar as using data) Citing the National Associations of Elementary and Secondary School Principals, the authors of this report indicate that "heightened accountability requirements under which schools operate have significantly increased the complexity of the work of the principal". Report authors argue that highly effective principals play three key roles in a school: - Instructional Leader (focused on teaching and learning that standards-based and data-driven) - Human Capital Manager (focused on attracting, selecting, developing, and retaining a well-prepared teaching staff) - Culture Builder (focused on cultivating a belief-based school culture espousing view that all students will succeed)	Provide research findings that suggest views of those in the field are that the current preparation programs are in need of improvement.

Table 1: Display Comparing the Characteristics and Findings from a Series of Recently Published Studies Related to Principal Preparation Programs in the United States (2004-2016)

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs the Principal Preparation Project
Preparing School Leaders for a Changing World: Lessons from Exemplary Leadership Development Programs – Final Report	Stanford Educational Leadership Institute, L. Darling-Hammond, M. LaPointe, D. Meyerson, M.T. Orr, and C. Cohen	2007	Addresses three related sets of questions: - What are the qualities and design principles of effective principal preparation programs? - What are the outcomes of effective principal preparation programs? - What role can and do states and districts play in launching effective principal preparation programs? This study focused on 8 pre-service and in-service principal preparation programs (including Bank Street). Using its study of 8 pre- and in-vice programs as a base, the study developed 5 state-level case studies. One case study addressed New York State (others incl California, Connecticut, Kentucky, and Mississippi). Rounding out the sample case studies were developed for 3 other states (Delaware, Georgia, N. Carolina). Study authors based inferences on self-reported opinion data drawn from a national sample of principals. Their findings included the following: - Evidence shows exemplary prep programs can produce principals who engage in effective practice. - The opportunity to learn what is needed to effectively lead a school varies widely across the country. - In part, the variability in opportunity and program quality is due to inconsistency in program standards. - Exemplary pre- and in-service programs do share some common features, including: o Comprehensive and coherent curriculum that is aligned to state and national standards (ISLLC) o Curriculum stresses the importance of principal leadership of instruction & school improvement. o Activities for pre- and in-service principals call upon them to apply learning in clinical settings. o Faculty members who provide instruction (both pre- & in-service) are well-qualified practitioners. o Programs feature a supportive cohort structure that includes mentoring. o Recruitment/selection of aspiring principal candidates intentionally seeks to enlist expert teachers. o Programs include on-site internships that involve close supervision over extended periods of time. o Have access to ample resources, active district-university partnerships, and leadership champions. o Take the initiative to ensure standards for individuals & programs are aligned to national standards	Offers specific areas where improvement efforts can focus (for those concerned with enhancing principal preparation)
How Leadership Influences Student Learning: Review of the Research A Policymaker's Guide Research-Based Policy for Principal Preparation Program Approval and Licensure	K. Leithwood, K. Seashore Louis, S. Anderson, K Wahlstrom	2004	This summarizes a range of studies from the research literature on the influence of school leaders on student success. A key theme is that school leadership is second only to classroom instruction when it comes to influencing student success. This review provides a starting point for a new effort (undertaken by the Wallace Foundation) to better understand how leadership and learning are linked. The review looks at the types of leaders influencing students and their role in student success. It also considers school leadership from the perspective of the State, the district, family/community, outside stakeholders (media, unions, volunteers, and town), school/classroom conditions and teachers. The study brings to the surface the notion of distributed leadership. It concludes that leadership's influence on student success can be traced to sources beyond those figures traditionally linked with school leaders (i.e., superintendents and principals).	Frequently cited study that shows principal leadership is second only to teacher influence when it comes to impact on student success. Raises awareness of distributed leadership and its impact on the role of the principal today.