Principal Project Advisory Team (Phase 2)
Attendees Meeting 2
January 31, 2018

Absent (8)
Marina Cofield
Doug Fisher *
David Flatley
Reginald Landeau, Jr.
Edwin Quezada **
Reginald Richardson
Allen Williams **
Larry Woodbridge

Withdrew (2)
Susan Doyle
Melissa Garofalo

Attendees (42)
Louise Alfano
Greg Avellino
Zheadric Barbra
Jackie Bennett
Peggy Boorady
Mark Brooks
David Cantaffa
Hazel Carter
Bill Clark
Gladys Cruz
Sheila Durant
Clarence Ellis
Paul Fanuele
Kathleen Feeley
Soribel Genao
Cecilia Golden
Mari Guillaume
Al Inserra
Stephen Jambor
Tracey Johnson
Chuck Khoury
James Kinnier
Mac Knight
Sister Remigia Kushner
Kevin MacDonald
Lynn Lisy-Macan
Yvette Maleve-Diaz
Colleen McDonald **
Carol Murphy
Andrea Fortin-Nossavage
Terry Orr (invited speaker)
Lynda Quick
Suzanne Rosenblith

Chuck Russo
Deb Shanley
Mary Strain (invited expert)
Stephen Todd
Ken Turner (facilitator)
Elizabeth Waite
Xiao-lei Wang
Kim Wilkins
Jennifer Wolfe
John Zampaglione

*   Denotes non-resident external experts; their attendance, while welcomed, is not expected
**   Denotes ex officio members who have schedule conflicts that make it impossible to attend more than two meetings

Principal Project Advisory Team
Summary (minutes) of January 31, 2018 Meeting

The co-chairs opened the second meeting of the Phase 2 Advisory Team meeting at 10:45 am. The co-chairs include Gladys Cruz (District Superintendent) and Suzanne Rosenblith (School of Education Dean at a Higher Education Institution). Members introduced themselves.

The meeting goal was reviewed.   It was to "develop 1-3 preliminary recommendations for each area the 5-part charge."

A description was provided of what had transpired since the first meeting. That included federal approval of the *Every Student Succeeds Act* (*ESSA*) plan for NYS. In part, it says that 3% of Title IIA funds can be used for principal preparation.

Agreement was reached to accept the minutes (to include the attendance list and transcription of notes) from meeting #1.

Attention was drawn to results of a SurveyMonkey distributed following meeting #1. It asked members to evaluate meeting #1. Two thirds of members responded. An area of needed improvement was the provision of tea and coffee.

The topic of logic models was addressed. Because *ESSA* requires states to develop and use a logic model when using Title funds to support principal preparation, members considered a proposal calling for staff to create a logic model that ties together recommendations that the Phase 2 Advisory Team is expected to generate. Members agreed to that using "Fist to Five". Members will consider a logic model at meeting #3 on February 28, 2018. The logic model will follow the format provided by RAND and illustrated by University of Southern Illinois.

Members considered results from a SurveyMonkey on "First Principles." The Advisory Team chair-persons suggested that the Advisory Team members to consider adopting a small set of "first principles" because it could help bring coherence to the recommendations emerging from the 5-part charge given to the Advisory Team. Using "Fist-to-Five" the members approved a proposal to bring this topic back for consideration at Meeting #3 on February 28, 2018.

An invited speaker (Margaret "Terry" Orr from Fordham University) provided a presentation on competency-based assessment and how it is used by other states (Massachusetts and California) and how that work can inform our work. A Q&A session followed.

Members met in small groups and worked to develop 1-3 preliminary recommendations for each area the 5-part charge.

After spending one hour, teams returned to form a whole group and to participate in a "Q-Storm". Individual members offered feedback to each small group concerning their preliminary recommendations. After each small group presentation, members of entire team posed questions "I wonder whether . . . ?" "Have you considered . . . "

After lunch, members reconvened in small groups to revise recommendations given Phase 2 member feedback.

Members re-convened as a whole group. One after another, the co-leaders of each small team described to the whole group any changes that had been made to preliminary recommendations.

Members adjourned at 3:05 pm

Second Meeting on January 31, 2018 of the Principal Project Advisory Team (Phase 2)
Agreements Reached and Transcription of Small-Group Notes from Chart Paper

Prior to meeting #2, 27 members responded to a SurveyMonkey asking for an evaluation of the January 17, 2018 meeting. A table shows results (n=27, totals may not sum to 100 due to rounding).

Table 1: Summary of member evaluation of meeting #1, Jan. 17, 2018)

	Percent Strongly Dissatisfied	*Percent Dissatisfied*	*Percent Satisfied*	*Percent Strongly Satisfied*	*Percent Satisfied or Strongly Satisfied*
Material organization			33	67	100
Usefulness of materials			42	58	100
Focus of the meeting			19	81	100
Organization of the agenda			22	78	100
Pacing of the meeting		4	30	67	96
Range of viewpoints			31	69	100
Member participation			33	67	100
Ability to reach agreement			41	59	100
Diversity of viewpoints		4	38	58	96
Seeking member opinion before meeting			52	48	100
Makeup of the five small working groups			48	52	100
Facilitation			19	81	100
Adequacy of lunch			38	62	100
Coffee, tea, snacks	21	42	21	17	38
Venue size, acoustics, comfort			22	78	100

Table 2: Summary of response to a question, How confident are you we will reach our goal (of drafting recommendations)?

	Percent
Little confidence	4
Moderate confidence	26
Great confidence	70

Prior to meeting #2, a total of 28 Advisory Team members responded to a SurveyMonkey on the topic of "first principles." This asked members to consider whether adopting a small set of statements could provide each of the five small working groups with a common foundation. If a set of "first principles" was adopted by the entire membership, then these statements could help link the recommendations emerging from the five different small groups. A summary of survey results follows (note that the figures in parentheses are those indicating "complete support" plus those indicating "qualified support" equals the "total of complete support and qualified support").

1. Ongoing Support and Guidance in the Form of High-Quality Mentoring and Coaching **(92% + 8% = 100%)**
   Continuous learning is a necessity because principals must be well-adapted to current conditions but also adaptable to changing conditions; thus ongoing support in the form of high-quality mentoring and coaching are vital (not just up to but through the full first year on the job as principal)

2. P20 Partnership **(80% + 20% = 100%)**
   Districts are clients of principal preparation programs so feedback from (and meaningful 2-way collaboration with) field-based practitioners are vital elements of university-based principal preparation programs

3.   Purpose and Effect of this Project **(72% + 24% = 96%)**
     The intent is a to create a leader preparation system that learns to get better at getting better (by improving principal preparation we thereby contribute to greater school and student success)

4.   The Value of Feedback and the Role of Data **(72% + 20% = 92%)**
     Feedback is at the heart of learning to get better; thus data collection, analysis, and reporting are vital because they make it possible to gauge whether activity and change translate into desired improvement.

5.   Aim of Preparation Programs **(68% + 32% = 100%)**
     Sound programs equip candidates to lead schools in continuous school improvement and to lead turnaround in schools that struggle most

6.   Quality as the Driver of Preparation Programs, not Dollars **(68% + 32% = 100%)**
     Program graduates' ability to assume a leadership role and lead schools to higher ground is not just the aim and purpose of prep programs but the measure and driver of program success (not revenue generation)

7.   Defensible Judgments **(68% + 32% = 100%)**
     Judgements concerning the adequacy of preparation programs and/or candidate readiness for certification must be reliable, valid for their purpose, and comparable across individual, program, and year

8.   Competency Matters Most **(60% + 40% = 100%)**
     As part of their principal preparation, candidates enrolled in programs demonstrate certification readiness by leading efforts at a district school that lift staff, student, or school performance

9.   Residency Runway **(60% + 36% = 96%)**
     During a full-time, year-long, (ideally paid), school-based internship, candidates identify problems of practice and design and lead interventions that help improve opportunities/outcomes for staff and students

10. Problem Statement **(56% + 40% = 96%)**
     There is an ample supply of those certified to be principal, but not enough who are certified have what is needed to lead and effectively improve schools; "what is needed" includes support for continued learning

11. *PSELs are Foundation of (and Organizing Concept for) Principal Preparation Programming* **(52% + 48% = 100%)**
     Realizing educational excellence and equity throughout NY requires well-trained leaders who have a convincing command of competencies associated with *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders*

12. The Pathway to Improvement **(44% + 56% = 100%)**
     A principal preparation environment strongly encourages innovation and creativity yet is tempered by a few universal no-fault expectations (Standards but not standardization)

Notes follow describing the preliminary recommendations generated by each of the five small work groups.

MICRO-CREDENTIAL

Recommendations:
- The State should create qualitative knowledge around [identified] fields [that describe] what practitioners [should know and be able to do]. Empower districts to recognize or develop micro-credentials to address the unique goals and/or needs of the district/schools.
- Shift CTLE focus from seat time to competency-based learning by expanding definition to include micro credentials
- Create stackable micro-credentials to support multiple entry points and pathways
- Expand existing CTLE approved providers to include micro credentials
- Enhance prep programs by incorporating micro-credentials to personalize learning using existing content standards

Questions:
- Will or could micro-credentials apply to aspiring principals as opposed to those already in principal position?
- What would make micro-credentials portable?
- I wonder about how micro-credentials are stackable?
- If micro-credentials are "bite-sized", how big is the bite?
- Are micro-credentials earned through district or through university; how do we get everyone on same page?
- How will micro-credentials be transferable between districts in NYS (and/or to other states)?
- Does the CTLE seat time requirement need to be lifted or changed?
- I wonder how to create incentives for districts to adopt and use micro-credentials?
- I wonder how some areas may rely on micro-credentials more than other areas?
- I wonder if using micro-credentials is better?
- I wonder about how learning is better with micro-credentials?
- I wonder about credential incentives [offered] by districts?
- I wonder how much is involved in creating a system of micro-credentials?
- Can districts adopt a micro-credential approach?
- I wonder how would micro-credentials shape professional development?
- Can you cluster micro-credentials (or split up the skills)?
- Are they stackable (and if so, then how)?
- I wonder about micro-credentialing during principal preparation?
- I wonder how do we create an evaluation to see the impact of this approach?

COMPETENCY-BASED ASSESSMENT

Agreement reached on these recommendations:
- There is a need for a competency-based system
- Scaffold implementation of the roll-out (using a blended approach)
- Before implementation happens, identify the competencies

Part 1 (2)
- Attend to human capital (this is accomplished using professional development)
- First attend to culture. This includes teachers, staff, students, families and others
Part 2

Questions:
- How do we identify desired competencies?
- What about cost?
- How does the environment lend itself to competency-based approach?
- What about professional development for university faculty?
- What process do we have in mind (for undertaking change in this direction)?
- What about the participant experience of a competency-based approach?
- What can we say about the success of those participating in a competency-based approach?
- I wonder about coaching and mentoring and how that would be involved and used?

P20 PARTNERSHIP

This small group evaluated the adequacy of a two-page concept paper titled "P20 Partnership for Principal Preparation; Equipping School Building Leaders to Successfully Turn-Around Schools". In part, it states:

- This initiative seeks to develop a program that will bring together leaders from school districts that have a successful record of preparing aspiring principals, scholars from university-based graduate programs with national expertise in school leadership development, and potentially other entities with leadership development expertise (possibly Boards of Cooperative Educational Services, etc.) to collaborate on the re-design of preparation programs so that leaders who emerge are better equipped to turn around schools that struggle most.

- Using Title IIA funds that the federal government provides to NYS, we are proposing to establish models that can be used to spur and support a growing statewide network of Regional P20 Partnership Programs in New York State that share the aim of improving principal preparation and thereby enhancing staff and school performance and contributing to improved student academic success.

- We are exploring opportunities to develop innovative partnerships that will provide aspiring principals with the knowledge, skill, and experiences to lead, guide, and support schools to higher levels of performance with special attention to preparing candidates to successfully turn around chronically-struggling, high-need schools.

- Committed to advancing educational excellence and enhancing equity of opportunity, federal funds provide seed resources to underwrite the design and launch of model P20 Partnership Programs that are sustainable over time. These will

The two-page concept paper includes 15 characteristics.
a. Provide extended (year-long) internship learning experiences for aspiring principals that are grounded in a clinically-rich, and well-supervised set of practical experiences

b. Develop competencies aligned to the 2015 *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders* and use those as the focal point for competency-based determination of candidate readiness for certification

c. Use tools that meet ESSA evidence requirements to prepare aspiring principals so they can organize time in ways that improve instructional focus (pursuant to RAND report titled *School Leadership Interventions Under Every Student Succeeds Act: Evidence Review*, Jan., 2017, pg. 24).

d. Design and launch the machinery to systematically disseminate lessons learned so these lessons inform the field and State Education Department and help NYS fine-tune the development of a statewide framework of Regional P20 Partnerships Programs

e. Couple existing capabilities that a district has to monitor the identification, development, and placement of school leaders (capabilities presently exist or are currently being pilot tested) with data analysis and reporting abilities to provide a foundation for a credible third party evaluation that will monitor and quantify model impact thereby helping NYS to meet the evidence requirements of *Every Student Succeeds Act*

f. Specify the expectations and professional responsibilities of mentors and coaches of aspiring principals

g. Alter how determinations about candidate readiness for certification are made so that decisions are shared by university-based scholars and field-based practitioners

h. Design and implement an internship experience that calls upon a knowledgeable in-district expert to observe, supervise, mentor, coach, and attest that a candidate has demonstrated competency with respect to a particular certification standard

i. In lieu of School Building Leader (SBL) examinations, design competency-based assessments that call upon candidates to identify a problem of practice for a school, to design and lead the implementation of the intervention, and then to evaluate and document in what way and how well the intervention improved staff functioning, student learning, or school performance.

j. Culminate in issuance of a micro-credential that is recognized by NYS as partial fulfillment of the requirements for School Building Leader (SBL) certification

k. Establish for each Partnership Programs a written agreement between the district and the university that stipulates how revenue collected during an internship benefits the organization(s) and individual(s) that bear responsibility for supervising candidate internship.

l. Design and implement a process whereby judgments of candidate readiness for certification that are made by each program are comparable across individual, program, and year and that judgments made about candidate fitness are educationally sound, credible, defensible, reliable and valid for their intended purpose

m. Set and meet goals, targets, and milestones (and then report success in efforts) to recruit, select, develop, and place in school leadership roles individuals from historically under-represented populations and subsequently to annually increase the number and percent of candidates from these historically-under-represented student populations who assume school building leader responsibilities in a struggling school and successfully improve on the school's performance.

n. Pair internship with high-quality coaching and mentoring support that extends through first full year that a candidate is in the principal job (enumerating what will the university, the district, and each school will do to assure quality mentoring/coaching)

o. Implement ways to build sustainability and progressively shift financial responsibility from the state to the P20 partnership

---

Recommendations from the small groups - Add the following to the two-page concept paper:
- Provide fully integrated, immersive, year-long internship experiences for aspiring principals that are grounded in a clinically-rich, and well-supervised set of practical experiences aligned with national standards.

- Develop a funding model that encourages and supports the recruitment of high quality candidates with special attention to candidates from historically-under-represented populations.

Questions:
-   I wonder how do you partner with districts that do not follow best practices?
-   I wonder how can the partnership concept be inclusive (regardless of district size)?
-   What has derailed P20 partnerships in the past in New York State?
-   I wonder how to overcome the things that have derailed P20 partnerships in the past in New York State?
-   Why call it a P20 Partnership and not a broader coalition that includes more than just educational community?
-   What about the idea of moving away from "partnership" to the idea of "one profession?"
-   I wonder if funds are available to accomplish these partnerships?
-   I wonder how might funding could be re-distributed so higher education isn't taking all the funding?
-   I wonder about how we might structure incentives and resources so as the benefits of a partnership improve the resources that flow to that partnership increase?

STANDARDS FOR PRINCIPAL SUPERVISORS

This small group evaluated the adequacy of a document that CCSSO produced that is titled "2015 Model Supervisor Standards." This includes 8 standards. The small group line edited the first 4 of these 8 standards.

Recommendations:
-   In the interest of creating a unified system of accountability and support, this small group recommends a shift away from emphasis on the formal evaluation of a principal and towards support for the growth and development of a principal.

    [Parenthetically, the rationale here is that each district has a formal evaluation process. The need is for more, better, and different support so principals grow, develop, adapt, and improve their professional practice.]

-   This means we uncouple coaching from evaluation. While evaluation occurs within [e.g., is a component of the] the larger process of supervision and evaluation, it is expected that growth will evolve from [or should be a by-product of] both processes.

-   In the interest of creating a unified system of accountability and support, attention in the standards is focused on using coaching within the supervisory process [to promote] the growth of principals. Via COSERs, the coach may come from (and be trained and supported by) the local BOCES.

-   This shift in emphasis is best reflected in the changes that the small group proposes to the 4th of 8 standards.

    Original Form of Standard 4
    Principal supervisors engage principals in the formal district principal evaluation process in ways that help them grow as instructional leaders.

    Proposed Change to Standard 4 (strikethrough used for deleted language are capitals used for new language)
    ~~Principal~~ COACHES ~~supervisors~~ engage principals in the PROFESSIONAL LEARNING ~~formal district principal evaluation~~ process in ways that help PRINCIPALS ~~them~~ grow as instructional leaders.

    Clean Form of Revised Standard 4
    Coaches engage principals in the professional learning process in ways that help principals grow as instructional leaders.

Questions:
- Who is doing the work of coaching and mentoring for principals (is this a new role)?
- Is any training required of coaches (and if so, training in what)?
- Who appoints coaches?
- Should coaches come from outside the district?
- To what extent does a principal have a say in who does the coaching?
- Is there a mandate for mentoring to be provided to principals (and if there is, should it be strengthened somehow)?
- What role does or should the state play in this?
- Who is accountable to whom and for what?
- How will a coach work with higher education?
- What do we mean by "uncouple" or "decouple"?
- What if the evaluator and the coach are the same person?
- What credentials are needed or expected of those who coach and/or mentor?
- Do the terms "coach" and "mentor" have the same meaning throughout NYS (if not, how does meaning vary)?
- How do we evaluate the effectiveness of coaching and/or mentoring?
- Are there standards for supervisors (and shouldn't there be)?
- What about revising standards for School Building Leaders (SDL)?
- How do our recommendations taken into account that a principal supervisor is not always the superintendent?
- How do we calibrate training for coaches so that we ensure and maintain quality in the coaching experience?
- Are we really implying that the coach is now the evaluator (don't think so but have to ask?
- With superintendents working in so many different settings and contexts, <illegible>.

STANDARDS TO GUIDE UNIVERSITY-BASED PRINICPAL PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Members of the small group found that when it comes to the topic of regulations to guide the design of university-based Principal prep programs, the real question is this.

How will the *PSELs* be distilled into a manageable set of guiding principles?

In NYS, because of Regent action in Dec., 2017, PSELs have become the foundation of principal preparation (and ultimately principal practice). Small group members agree that PSELs are and should be the North Star.

Members of this small group identified features that might become part of SED guidance to institutions of higher education (IHE). Possibilities follow:

Recommendations:
- To connect theory & practice Principal prep program internships must be connected to work of P-12 systems.
- SED needs to include P-12 advisory groups in registration and/or re-registration process of university-based principal preparation programs
- Micro-credentialing can be a way to get to specializations and specialized pathways
- Needs to be a core in the P12 leader prep programs at higher education institutions (micro-credentialing can help differentiate elementary versus middle level versus high school)
- Revisit current certification requirements for School Building Leaders (SBL), School District Leaders (SDL), and tenure.
- Answer the question, are higher ed principal prep programs oriented to principals (if not, should they be)?

Questions:
- If program quality is important, how will program quality be assured?
- Should there be a standard required of all candidates (regardless of the different settings they head off to)?
- Are or should you consider a differentiated preparation pathway (one for APs and another for principals)?
- Are there pathways that are differentiated to account for the various types of districts that programs serve?
- What non-pecuniary incentives (that would not cost the state anything at all) might exist that can help attract desirable candidates (historically-under-represented populations) into principal preparation programs and then to become principals?
- Would there be (or should there be) a rubric developed -- or a series of rubrics -- that reflect the different developmental levels (and/or different levels of proficiency)?
- Who is responsible for doing the work?
- Does this small group envision State approval of a principal prep program as a "license for the program to operate" or could the State approval of a principal prep program have some tangible importance or meaning or currency for an individual graduate of the principal prep program (similar to how in some states, a diploma from an IB-authorized high school allows the graduate to enter their college program as a junior (at state-funded universities in that state)?
- Should there be common admission standards for principal prep programs?
- Is there a way to balance a safety net with <unfinished idea>?

Members of this small group focused on the reality that a delay in the final publication of the *National Educational Leadership Preparation Standards* (*NELP*) could affect the work of this small group. A speaker (Terry Orr) had indicated that she thought it would be premature for the Phase 2 Advisory Team to issue a recommendation concerning expectations for university-based principal preparation programs prior to seeing the final version of the *NELP* standards. The members of this small group brainstormed various approaches that the small group might take, given this delay in the publication of the final *NELP* standards. Beginning a year ago, *NELP* embarked on an effort to reconcile standards from *PSEL* and *CAEP*. In this context, the term *PSEL* means *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders*. And CAEP means *Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation.*

One member of the small group also reminded his colleagues in the small group that the NYS Board of Regents was considering taking action that might allow any university to appeal to the SED to request approval to pursue an alternative to *CAEP* accreditation. While this proposal is out for public comment, if approved by the Regents it would allow any institution of higher education five years to initiate and complete an accreditation review using an alternative process that met with the NYS Board of Regents approval. Deliberations about this inject another level of uncertainty.

Members weighed how to deal with the uncertainty. One option would be to refrain from taking any action at all. Another option would be to prepare a recommendation that commented upon the *NELP* standards in their current form and/or the suggested improvements to *NELP* that had been identified by the *Metropolitan Council for Educational Administration Programs* (*MCEAP*).

Members heard how those in a neighboring state (Connecticut) approached the topic of reforming the standards to guide university-based principal preparation programs. A non-resident external expert to the Phase 2 Advisory Team explained how an outreach effort was organized in Connecticut. Practitioners were asked a single question. This question was, "What do you expect every graduate of a principal preparation program in our state to know and be able to do?" In this context, the phrase "to know and be able to do" means "can appropriately and consistently apply in different contexts and situations." Connecticut used this outreach effort to identify the factors and elements to include in a state-level framework to guide principal preparation programs in that state.

Members of this small group discussed the idea and merit of building understanding and expectations from the bottom up. It was understood that at some point the dust will settle on the national scene and something will emerge insofar as *NELP* is concerned.

Presumably a listening tour would not invite participants on the tour to re-think the merits of PSELs altogether, but instead would ask participants to review suggested improvements to NELP that MCEAP offered did and simply ask "if not these additions, then what additions to NELP (so NELP standards better conform to PSELs)?"