

Responses from Advisory Team Members to Survey Monkey administered from May 25, 2017 to May 30, 2017
 May 30, 2017

Table 1: Concerning the Preamble

<i>Advisory Team Members</i>	<i>Preamble is an accurate description.</i>	<i>Please explain.</i>	<i>Consideration</i>
Respondent #11	Disagreed	<p>I disagree with the preamble because it depicts the current higher education programs as failing to adequately prepare candidates. I strongly believe that our colleges and universities have been doing a good job of preparing candidates. Improvement is always necessary to keep up with societal changes but we must not disparage a system that has been doing a good job as evidenced by so many outstanding administrators in our schools.</p> <p>I disagree with the statement "many earn SBL certification in NYS but too few who do are ready to step into the position of principal and be successful". I also disagree with Insight 1. " Many are certified to be school building leaders in NYS but few have what is needed to be effective." Insight 3. "There is a mismatch between what is needed to be a successful principal, what is taught in SBL programs and what it takes to be SBL certified" These statements make assumptions about current SBL programs that are not true. The reasons people may not be successful are often situational, political or personal it is NOT because they were not prepared by the college or university.</p> <p>I also disagree with the wording for Insight 4 "insufficient opportunities exist for school building leader candidates to lead to projects P12. More opportunities should be encouraged but I know that many current programs provide sufficient opportunities to lead P12 projects.</p>	<p>The respondent has a point. It is not surprising that the opinions and perceptions of Advisory Team members may differ from opinions and perceptions of those who participated in focus groups or who responded to surveys. The challenge for the Advisory Team is to accurately portray feedback from the field.</p> <p>Within the Preamble, the third paragraph of the section titled "Context" states, "Through surveys, focus groups, and interviews, practitioners have noted and expressed concern that the preparation of school building leaders has not kept pace with these changes." ("These changes" refers to changes in technology, demography, and laws).</p> <p>The basis for the above statement in the Preamble is found in an online survey administered Oct. 11-Nov. 2, 2016. Question 3 asked whether "leader preparation programs are sufficiently responsive to" certain factors. About half of the 676 respondents indicated that was the case with respect to "trends in technology" (54% agreed or strongly agreed) and about half indicated that was the case with respect to "varying demographic characteristics of the student population" (53 percent agreed or strongly agreed). A total of 77% agreed or strongly agreed that was the case for "changes in laws that affect public education."</p> <p>Likewise, Question #5 from the same online survey administered Oct. 11-Nov. 2, 2016 asked "within available resources, [what are] areas of possible improvement?" A large majority (91% agreed or strongly agreed) that "preparation programs could be organized around the most current (2015) national leadership standards.</p> <p>The Advisory Team member cautions against disparaging a system of colleges and universities that have been doing a good job.</p> <p>That sentiment is echoed in the Preamble (see the third paragraph of the section titled "Context") where it states, "Through interviews, surveys, and focus groups t is clear that some forward-thinking principal preparation programs stand out for the proactive way they have adapted to take on these new challenges."</p> <p>In part, a statement within the Preamble suggesting that there is room to improve the preparation of future school leaders is based on response to Question 5 from the online survey administered Oct. 11-Nov. 2, 2016. That question asked "within available resources, [what are] areas of possible improvement?" A total of 85% of the 676</p>

			<p>respondents agreed or strongly agreed that “steps could be taken to support development of ethnically or racially diverse leaders.” And 80% agreed or strongly agreed that “prep programs could be evaluated annually to gauge program adequacy.” 82% agreed or strongly agreed that “state oversight of leader prep programs could include a feedback cycle to improve practice.”</p> <p>Finally, these observations from survey respondents mirror findings reported on pages 110-111 in a 2015 publication from UCEA (titled “Policymaker’s Guide: A Research-Based Policy for Principal Preparation Program Approval and Licensure” (by Erin Anderson and Amy Reynolds). That document is found within the readings on the web site for our project. See http://www.nysed.gov/common/nysed/files/file-20-policymaker-guide-research-based-policy-for-principal-prep-2015.pdf</p>
Respondent 13	Disagreed	<p>Some small, but I think important, changes: Because the second paragraph refers to support of principals, the first paragraph should also. Instead of "...effective, well-prepared..." I suggest "well-prepared and well-supported." In the third paragraph, I would change "marshaled" (because of its military connotation) to something like "gathered." In the fourth paragraph, in addition to enhanced quality and quantity, we are seeking enhanced retention (which will help address the quantity concern). After "improve the support for existing principals," I would add something like: "to improve retention of excellent principals." In the opening of the context section, remove "for better or worse" - it seems unnecessarily argumentative. For insights #1, add "as a principal" to the end of the statement. And, change "few" to "not enough." The insights section should make reference to professional accreditation (e.g., CAEP) standards and processes as in important informant of preparation programs. Also, throughout this section, I think it would be important not to paint with a broad brush that makes claims about all programs, because there might be pockets in which referenced practices are occurring. The importance in relation to the work of this group is that it is recognized that such practices are not standard and regulatory changes can help standardize in helpful ways.</p>	<p>If the Team agrees on May 31, 2017, tehn make the following revisions.</p> <p>The following change could enhance paragraph one of the Preamble:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Exchange “effective, well-prepared” for “well-prepared and -supported” <p>Enhance the third paragraph with this proposed change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replace “marshaled” with “gathered” <p>Enhance the fourth paragraph with this proposed change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add this to last sentence “and improve retention of effective leadership” <p>Enhance the section subtitled “Context” by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Deleting “For better or worse” <p>Enhance the section subtitled “Insights” by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adding “as a principal” to the end of the first sentence in the first insight - Replacing “few” with “not enough” in the first sentence in the first insight - Adding a new insight <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o By regulation (8 CRR-NY 52.21 (c)(1-2)), higher education institutions that enroll aspiring principal candidates “shall be continuously accredited by either an acceptable professional education accrediting association, meaning an organization which is determined by the department to have equivalent standards to the standards set forth here, or by the Regents, pursuant to a Regents accreditation process.” Note that this refers to organizations such as the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation or CAEP).

Table 2: Concerning the Beliefs

Advisory Team Member	<i>Beliefs are identical to the 9 beliefs Team agreed by consensus to support on May 1, 2017</i>	<i>Please explain.</i>	<i>Consideration</i>
Respondent #13	Disagreed	In the equity belief, did we finalize the list? Also, using the term "regardless of" seems to position difference as problematic. We should consider adjusting this term	<p>Rather than extend or finalize the list, the term "and other characteristics" is used to show the list is not forever fixed but is fluid.</p> <p>At meeting #6 on May 1, 2017, the Advisory Team agreed to support 9 beliefs and the recommendations. A pledge was made to include this language "verbatim" when a summary of the Advisory Team work is forwarded to the Commissioner and the Regents. Thus the May 1, 2017 language will be appended "as is" to the findings that are ultimately forwarded to the Commissioner and Regents (with a note indicating these were approved by consensus).</p> <p>If on May 31, 2017 the Advisory Team reaches agreement to alter this language in some manner then that will supersede what was created on May 1, 2017.</p>

Table 3: Concerning the Consolidated Recommendations

Advisory Team Member	Consolidated Recommendations accurately capture ideas from May 1, 2017	Please explain.	Consideration
Respondent #8	Disagreed	See the comments from the MCEAP. Each one of their concerns needs to be addressed	<p>The MCEAP members have offered comments that can be especially helpful as this work moves into the next phase.</p> <p>However, at the outset of the current project (at the initial meeting on Sept. 22, 2016), the Advisory Team members agreed to “avoid revisiting decided issues”. To accomplish this, the Team agreed to “lock in agreements” and “record them in minutes”.</p> <p>At meeting #6 on May 1, 2017, the Advisory Team agreed to support 9 beliefs and the recommendations. A pledge was made to include this language “verbatim” when a summary of the Advisory Team work is forwarded to the Commissioner and the Regents. Thus the May 1, 2017 language will be appended “as is” to the findings that are ultimately forwarded to the Commissioner and Regents (with a note indicating these were approved by consensus).</p> <p>If on May 31, 2017 the Advisory Team reaches agreement to alter this language in some manner then that will supersede what was created on May 1, 2017.</p>
Respondent #11	Disagreed	<p>I disagree with and have some questions with the Recommendations (draft May 19, 2017). Here is a summary of my concerns: recommendation VII - Not sure what you mean by "revise the expectations within CTLE requirements in such a way that in order to re-register ...that address the learning needs of a diverse student population". This seems subjective and punitive.</p> <p>Recommendation IX - The University-based programs I am familiar with across WNY have done everything in their power to increase the number and percent of candidates from historically-under represented populations but often there are circumstances beyond their control that prohibits the growth they would like to see. The same can be said for school districts. They should not be punished for matters outside their control. Recommendation X - I do not know what you mean by "deploy non-public</p>	<p>The Advisory Team member makes a point here. Changes to NYS regulations should <u>address a real need</u>, <u>set a reasonable expectation</u>, and <u>include a way for the state to support changes</u> that are recommended.</p> <p>Is there <u>a real need</u> (to address the need among current principals to acquire the knowledge and skill to address the learning needs of an increasingly-diverse student population)?</p> <p>In part, the answer comes from stakeholders in NYS who were asked to participate in an online survey administered Oct. 11-Nov. 2, 2016. The survey included a question (#3) that asked whether “leader preparation programs are sufficiently responsive to” certain factors. About half indicated that was the case with respect to “varying demographic characteristics of the student population” (53 percent agreed or strongly agreed).</p>

		<p>sources of funds to improve the ability of district hiring managers to identify, recruit , select, place and develop talented principals ". Also not sure what you mean by "implement indicators and measures to gauge the efficacy of SED efforts..." What indicators and measures are you referring to?</p>	<p>Beyond that, the observation that current principals need to be equipped to address the needs of a student population in New York State that is increasingly diverse also surfaced in quantitative data that the Advisory Team assembled and considered. For instance, at its Nov. 30, 2016 meeting, the Advisory Team reviewed information showing that by 2011 more than 50% of the student population in NYS was non-White. Yet in the four-year period leading to 2011, the share of non-white principals had declined from about one fourth (26.2%) to about one fifth (21.3%). This information was drawn from the National Center for Educational Statistics <i>School and Staffing Survey</i>. See http://www.nysed.gov/common/nysed/files/principal-project-mismatch-display-nov-1-2016.pdf</p> <p>Likewise, at its sixth meeting on May 1, 2016 members of the Advisory Team considered a 2014 report from UCLA that stated that even while the number of non-White students has increased in NYS, there is growing racial isolation schools. When compared to all other states, schools in NYS are now (and have been) among the most racially isolated in the nation. In the words of UCLA Civil Rights Project co-director Gary Orfield, "In the 30 years I have been researching schools, New York State has consistently been one of the most segregated states in the nation--no Southern state comes close to New York." This UCLA report was titled "New York State's Extreme School Segregation." See http://www.nysed.gov/common/nysed/files/kucsera-new-york-extreme-segregation-2014.pdf</p> <p><u>Is it a reasonable expectation</u> (that current principals acquire knowledge and skill with respect to culturally-responsive practices)?</p> <p>Members of the Diversity Breakout Group acknowledged that it was vital to address the preparation of future school building leaders (by adopting the <i>Professional Standards for Educational Leaders</i> that includes references to culturally responsive practices), but at the same time attention should be devoted to considering and addressing the learning and development of current school building leaders. The CTLE requirement to "re-register every 5 years" is already in place in NYS. While leaving it up to individuals to decide the best way to acquire the needed knowledge and skill, recommendation #7 creates an expectation that current principals will assume responsibility for acquiring the needed knowledge and skill. Creating this expectation is not intended to be punitive but instead to express the importance of continued efforts to</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Under Diversity # 2. This is a noble goal and districts have been trying to increase the number of historically under represented populations in the ranks of SBL's. However many aspects and circumstances are out of their control. This recommendation could be punitive and cause unnecessary work for districts already trying to address this situation. Punitive measures will not help this situation.</p> <p>Under Diversity # 3 - Future state approval for university based SBL programs will be predicated on the SBL program setting and reporting publicly on program progress on annual goals that seek to increase the # and % of historically underrepresented populations... This is a punitive measure that will not solve the problem. University-based programs have been trying to address this situation but many factors are outside their control. Regulations, red tape and punishments are not the answer to help universities to help this situation. Under Professional Learning and Ongoing Support # 1 Create a measurable first year mentoring requirement that features a full year of formal mentoring. It sounds good on the surface but I have many questions regarding the practicality of this recommendation. How will this be measured? How will mentors be selected? How much will it cost? This also assumes that candidates will graduate and immediately get a job. There are too many</p>	<p>improve the skillset of practicing school building leaders. Induction for new arrivals is one way this can be accomplished.</p> <p><u>Is there a way for the state to support these recommendations?</u></p> <p>Recommendation X states, “in support of VIII and IX, identify and deploy non-public sources of funds”. In part, the charge to the Principal Preparation Project calls for “Developing and deploying data visualization tools that identify current and prospective school principals and display the progress of aspiring principals (through graduate school) and then into placement as school building leaders (including career changes over time). This work is being funded by a grant of non-public funds from the Wallace Foundation.</p> <p>This recommendation creates no new work for districts that are already trying to increase the number of historically under represented populations in the ranks of SBLs. Districts already prepare staff development plans and submit them to SED. Any district already working on this will presumably have a goal. If not, it is not invasive to craft a goal (and incorporate it into a plan that districts are already in the habit of preparing and providing the state). No consequences are attached to this recommendation so it is difficult to understand how this is punitive.</p> <p>It is difficult to understand how recommendation is punitive if it creates no new burden on universities that seek to enroll students in a program leading to SBL certification. That is to say, existing NYS law (8 CRR-NY 52.21 (c)(1-2)) states that programs to prepare School Building leaders “shall be continuously accredited by either an acceptable professional education accrediting association, meaning an organization which is determined by the department to have equivalent standards to the standards set forth here, or by the Regents, pursuant to a Regents accreditation process.”</p> <p>It is understandable that questions arise related to mentoring cost and mentor selection. These would be addressed once Regents make determination about the importance of and need for mentoring. It is worth stating that mentoring is now provided to teachers by law in NYS.</p> <p>In an online survey administered Oct. 11-Nov. 2, 2016, question 8 asked stakeholders to identify “elements that are vital to high-quality leader preparation programs.” A total of 99% of the 676 respondents</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>unanswered questions and unforeseen situations to make this recommendation</p>	<p>agreed or strongly agreed that they believed that “mentoring for aspiring school building leaders prior to graduation from the program” was vital to high-quality leader prep programs. Likewise, 96% indicated in their response to question 9 that they agreed or strongly agreed that “continued support to program graduates through their first year on the job as a school leader” is one of those elements that is vital to a successful school building leader prep program.</p>
<p>Respondent 12</p>	<p>Disagreed</p>	<p>Being on the internship team, I am concerned that the idea of "stackable credentials" or the ability to demonstrate competency in each of the standards IN THE FIELD but within coursework throughout a preparation program is not communicated, and the only reference to the length of the internship is that it is sustained...I believe that the intent was that there be a "sustained presence" in a particular setting, but that this amount of time could be different depending on what competencies have already been demonstrated</p>	<p>These are helpful observations. They move beyond what the Advisory Team agreed to support at the sixth meeting on May 1, 2017.</p> <p>At the outset of the current project (at the initial meeting on Sept. 22, 2016), the Advisory Team members agreed to “avoid revisiting decided issues”. To accomplish this, the Team agreed to “lock in agreements” and “record them in minutes”.</p> <p>At meeting #6 on May 1, 2017, the Advisory Team agreed to support 9 beliefs and the recommendations. A pledge was made to include this language “verbatim” when a summary of the Advisory Team work is forwarded to the Commissioner and the Regents. Thus the May 1, 2017 language will be appended “as is” to the findings that are ultimately forwarded to the Commissioner and Regents (with a note indicating these were approved by consensus).</p> <p>If on May 31, 2017 the Advisory Team reaches agreement to alter this language in some manner then that will supersede what was created on May 1, 2017.</p>