

**Principal Preparation Project  
Remarks Collected during 11-Stop Listening Tour  
September 28, 2017 through November 21, 2017  
Total participants through all 11 meetings = 275**

**MEETING #1: Albany, *Professional Standards and Practices Board*, September 28, 2017, 20 attendees**

1. Distributive leadership (scant attention is devoted to this important topic)
2. Standards are a step in the right direction; it is vital that attention and effort continue through implementation
3. What will “competency based assessment” look like (need definition or additional work around this)
4. Support needs to be in place for implementation to succeed (that includes internships, mentoring, coaching, etc.)

**MEETING #2: Manhattan, City College, October 10, 2017, 8 attendees**

1. Take steps to ensure the cross-walk between 2008 *ISLLC Standards* and 2015 *PSELs* is on NYSED web site (as well as the letters that SAANYS and CSA sent to the SED in July, 2017)
2. CSA relies on the Executive Leadership Institute to furnish school leaders with professional development (and could possibly be a resource to the SED for work on topics like “cultural responsiveness”)
3. It would help if SED developed a timeline showing the sequence of milestones leading to implementation of the 11 recommendations from the Principal Project Advisory Team
4. A publicly-disseminated timeline of steps leading to full implementation can be a this is a good way for SED to hold itself accountable to service to the field
5. Engage NYC educators in developing future training options related to this project
6. Avoid (or at least think carefully) about whether to develop a 2-tier certification process; that is, one tier for AP and another for principal
7. Learn what districts throughout NYS are doing in relation to Standard 3 (Equity and Cultural Responsiveness)
8. Identify and disseminate a definition of “cultural responsiveness”
9. Consider assembling a “best leadership practices” library of visual recordings
10. To help build the talent pipeline, create mechanisms to identify standout teachers (future principal candidates) and also standout college or high school students (who could become teacher candidates)
11. Engage the Professional Standards and Practices Board in establishing criteria for high-quality principal PD
12. Ensure the preparation of school principal supervisors is attuned to the new needs of principals

**MEETING #3: Manhattan, St. John's, Metropolitan Council, Educational Administration Programs, Oct 9 2017, 35 attending**

Prompt: How can MCEAP support implementation of the PSELs?

1. MCEAP urges SED to expect principal prep programs to earn national accreditation. While advanced CAEP standards exist and pertain here, NELP standards are forthcoming. It would be useful for SED to issue some clarification stating that by Dec 2020 all programs offering SBL preparation need to re-register with the SED and demonstrate that their programs have been modified so they are organized around the *PSELs*, not the 2008 *ISLLC Standards*. It would be helpful if the clarification also explained when and how adjustments to the SBL exam will be completed.
2. At a minimum, by December 2020 the SED must have completed needed adjustments to the SBL exam.
3. While those in the field appreciate being consulted on and involved in sessions in Malta that Pearson convenes (for the purpose of revising the SBL exam), MCEAP members recognize that Pearson has a profit motive and a narrow frame for the work. Consequently they are not necessarily interested in deviating too far from the established tests. So will (and how will) SED respond to that?
4. It was suggested that MCEAP (or a working group of MCEAP members) help SED define "cultural responsiveness" and identify some guiding principles for the term (by Thanksgiving so the response is ready to provide to Regents at the December 2017 meeting). Parenthetically, it was pointed out that the read-ahead materials offered an approach to this and SED indicates it is wide open to help from MCEAP on this.
5. University-based program directors would appreciate clear guidance outlining expectations describing how SBL preparation programs will be reviewed and how it will be determined whether their programs are sufficiently based on 2015 *PSELs*. The field needs to know who is responsible to whom and for what.
6. The field would welcome efforts on the part of SED (when reviewing SBL preparation programs) to help ensure reviewers are not overly-literal in interpreting and applying regulations. It would be especially helpful if reviewers had functional experience and leadership background that could be brought to bear. Alternatively, perhaps the review could include some back and forth with those submitting a program for review and approval.
7. As it goes about this work, SED might benefit (and borrow) from the TLQP design principles related to content, field work, and assessments.
8. SED and the state could benefit from suggestions that MCEAP (or a working subgroup of members) can offer related to a definition and guiding principles for "cultural responsiveness" and for "community and family engagement."

Prompt: How can MCEAP lend support to the development of programming (especially as it relates to curriculum and professional development for existing school building leaders)?

1. MCEAP urges SED to refrain from so-tightly prescribing what university-based SBL prep programs should provide (concerning program content and/or curriculum and/or professional development that is linked to *PSELs*) that it leaves universities no latitude to respond to the specialized needs of the district(s) in their respective region. For instance, within NYC certain districts (e.g., 7, 9, 10, and 11) face emerging needs related to immigrant influx. It would be useful (at a minimum) that SED allow for an "other" box to be checked if a particular university finds that its SBL prep program is addressing needs that are real but not anticipated by SED.

2. It would be useful for SED to clarify (in writing to the field) if and how joint SBL-SDL programs are affected. MCEAP welcomes an approach that enables SED to expect changes in SBL programs but simultaneously “holds harmless” universities that have such joint programs.
3. MCEAP encourages SED to take steps to elaborate on the SDL designation and expand it beyond the superintendent and address preparation for district-level leadership development in areas like CIO, ELL, Special Education, etc.
4. MCEAP welcomes efforts by SED to create a “culture of evidence”.
5. SED might consider a “pilot program” designation that enables an innovative program to gain approval.
6. MCEAP urges SED to strive to create a process that allows for university-based staff who have submitted an SBL prep program for review (for the purpose of registration or re-registration) to sit and converse with reviewers about the submission (in order to identify questions and address any areas of need).
7. In order to support and promote the growth of innovative programs MCEAP urges SED to chiefly consider evidence of success (in terms of outcomes) and further for SED to establish a shareable collection of ideas that can help the state get better at getting better.
8. MCEAP reiterates its recommendation that SED make data more easily accessible in the interest of promoting R&D geared to continuous improvement.
9. MCEAP is interested in forward-looking predictive analytic projects and studies but not solely interested in this; MCEAP is also interested in historical data and R&D related to same.
10. USDE was critical of states submitting *ESSA* plans saying they were not innovative enough. This suggests SED may want to provide even more support for innovative programs.
11. MCEAP urges SED to clearly allay concerns from the field that the regulation changes that the Regents are now contemplating will not negatively impact universities with joint SBL-SDL programs.
12. MCEAP urges SED to put in place a process that clearly provides a way to support (rather than punish) a program that seeks to register (or re-register) but which is unsuccessful. It would be helpful if SED provided support and assistance so the university can apply a needed remedy.

Prompt: How can MCEAP lend support for the training of coaches?

1. MCEAP could help by creating a work group that can help SED create an RFP process that provides the field enough notice and sufficient guidance to make it a possible for small districts to submit a bid.
2. MCEAP urges SED to promote the creative use of Co-Sers that widen the field of possibility for funding mechanisms and possibly enable cost-sharing by various entities (e.g., districts, universities, BOCES etc.).
3. MCEAP urges SED to consider the value of face-to-face (as opposed to virtual) coaching and how real-time, in situ feedback can enhance the value of the coaching experience.

**MEETING #4: Rochester, Mustard Street Conference Center, *Hillside Family of Agencies*, Oct. 23, 2017, 6 attending**

1. Cultural responsiveness must be an essential element of the preparation for future principals.

2. PSELs represent a welcome improvement. In large part that is because of the emphasis that is placed on equity and cultural responsiveness. The *PSELs* are a step in the right direction because they put us in position to better prepare aspiring school building leaders to meet the challenges of the job.
3. Down the road, it will be important to be sure that the requirements that university-based preparation programs must meet (either through CAEP or some other state-approved system) are aligned with the PSELs.
4. Forthcoming *National Educational Leadership Preparation Standards (NELP)* seem to be well-matched to *PSELs*.
5. A vitally-important piece is the provision of coaching, not just for new principals but for all principals. We distinguish from mentorship because ideally (and hopefully typically) the coach is not someone who is a fellow-administrator from the same district. The value of the coaching experience is, in our view, greater when the coach is not from the same district. And because mentors tend to be fellow administrators from the same district, we view coaching as potentially having greater benefit. Skilled coaches (on site, not virtual) can be the lifeline that a principal needs so (s)he can work in a safe environment on areas of need.
6. A peer-walk-through schedule can greatly aid the development of any principal (new or current). All principals need to grow in their instructional effectiveness and a well-structures three-day collegial process that culminates in walk-through with experienced and knowledgeable colleagues can help accelerate the development of a principal and his/her staff.
7. We should not under-state the value of an extended period (year-long, if possible), job-embedded, internship (that is ideally paid). The experience should call upon the aspiring school building leader to actually lead, not watch or simply participate as another member of staff.
8. School districts (especially larger and urban districts) are a good source of information for a State that is interested in defining “cultural responsiveness”. The Rochester City School District has been providing structured learning experiences in this arena for all building administrators (as well as principal supervisors).
9. It has been especially useful (in the College at Brockport in the SUNY system) for an aspiring principal to bring into the university-classroom setting a particular “problem of practice”. These provide a bridge from the theoretical to the practical.
10. Advisory Teams of field-based practitioners can help ensure that university preparation programs remain relevant and grounded in what is real. It is helpful to have a blend of adjunct professors but for those professors who have not been a building leader, advisory teams help keep higher education programs honest and focused on the right stuff.
11. Everyone benefits when there is a healthy and sustained relationship between a university-based principal preparation and a local school, school district, or schools (and school districts). An ongoing dialogue can be focused on planning and modifying program offerings. It can be focused on identifying future talent and it can help ensure that the internship decisions that are made are productive.
12. There are some settings where a principal may need some specialized knowledge and skill. As an example, the principal of a turnaround school may benefit from additional training. It would be helpful if the system allowed for specialized training to take place (it could also be useful for those building administrators who are responsible for a school that has large numbers of English learners or special need students).
13. Some institutions of higher education (Brockport for example) offer a program leading to certification in SBL and SDL. While the proposed change in standards for SBL are helpful, it is a good idea to not simultaneously expect all SDL programs to adapt on the same timetable. Changes in the SBL program will understandably alter the

programming involved in the SDL prep programs but a “hold harmless” assurance for universities that have a joint SBL-SDL program would be welcome and sensible.

**MEETING #5: Bronx, Lehman College, October 25, 2017, 25 attendees**

Prompt: Who does what so implementation benefits current (and future) principals and ultimately student learning?

1. Transparency to the field is important (so practitioners know about and clearly understand expectations)
2. Systemic approach to implementation so the entire educational community understands the impact of this on school building leader preparation and practice
3. It would be helpful to know if these are applicable to all school building leader or if they are somehow adapted or tailored to be appropriate for the new or novice principal.
4. When it comes to implementing these standards, clarity is important. The vision should be clearly communicated.
5. How and when will these be aligned with the current evaluation system? These new standards make sense, but we don't need one more layer that is not aligned to other elements.
6. Is it true that the *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders* represent nothing really new? Standards to guide preparation have always existed. What are schools doing now with the current standards and what are districts doing? It will be important to disseminate these to staff who will be involved and affected by the rollout. [It was later explained in the session that the *PSELs* place greater emphasis on equity and also on cultural responsiveness.]
7. A lot of work will be needed to translate these standards into measurable competencies. That is especially true for something that is new like cultural responsiveness.
8. It is important that the supervisors of principals are involved in implementation. We will want to think about how the transition may differ for communities that have varied needs (rural schools differ from urban schools, etc.).
9. Partnerships between P12 and higher education are important during implementation. These need to be strong, sustained partnerships. Those of us in higher education may understand the research and the theory but we need practitioners to tell us whether our approaches are practical.
10. As a “newbie”, I was fortunate. During my internship I had real-time coaching on the job. And not just for the internship but into year 1 and even year 2. We need to think about what kind of support is needed. How long it is needed. In New York City, we now provide 72 hours of on-site coaching for first year principals. This is vital.
11. With cultural diversity such a reality for us, we need to infuse preparation with as many points of view as possible. What does a set of competencies look like not just for principals but for their supervisors?
12. How do we as leaders identify and connect with widely-different communities?
13. Internships must be realistic. They need to take place in authentic surroundings, not just in comfortable surroundings. They need to present a challenge to the future principal. I was a Leadership Academy person (a grad of the Leadership Academy) and I had a rich placement. That is what everyone needs.
14. I don't know if I agree with that. I'm not certain I'd want just anyone to come to my school. What seems important is that there be options for individuals. The first option is to have a strong partnership developed

between a university and a school or school district; over time, that can help to develop a pipeline. The second option is to fund clinically rich internships. What can we do to help with implementation? We can strategically fund the internship so it is year-long and authentic and ideally the aspiring principal is paid during the internship.

15. I agree we need a full-year, year-long internship. That will help prepare and retain good candidates.
16. An ideal partnership involves a university and a school district or school districts that co-develop a certification program that includes a quality internship.
17. I think we need standards but not standardization. If we standardize around one approach a handful of people will fall through the cracks. The exact form of the partnership will reflect the kind of community that is being served. What we need is standards but enough flexibility in the system that we're responsive to community needs.
18. The internship should enable aspiring principals to apply what they learned in the coursework. I was at Fordham Prep and now I'm at <inaudible>. I learned through my internship how to recognize and respond to uncomfortable questions. We need to recognize that the prep programs will be re-organized around these standards by 2020. And beginning in late 2022, the evaluation of principals will happen (based on the *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders*).
19. I completely agree that we need to move away from one size fits all. The standards will be translated into competencies. That makes sense. But then, depending on the community that is being served, some competencies may have more weight; other competencies may have lesser weight. And if candidates have been exposed to different kinds of schools and different kinds of school communities, then they will see how some competencies are more in play in one community than in another.
20. Mentoring and coaching are very important. We all probably see and agree with that. But I am thinking about the decision-making process that leads to a match between a particular candidate and a particular coach or mentor. What does or should the flow of match-making look like ("match-making" means pairing a mentor and a mentee)? Does the decision (about a match) flow from superintendent to school or from university to superintendent or from experienced-principal to aspiring-principal? Or does the aspiring principal choose? The flow of decisions can greatly affect the quality of that interaction.
21. That is an important point. A mentor that a Superintendent has assigned to a candidate has a different feel than the mentor who has been chosen by the candidate. These details matter.
22. I've been thinking about Professional Development. PD is a learning process. It is not (or should not be) an inoculation. I think the 5<sup>th</sup> year principal needs a mentor just as much as the first year principal. We should not just inject new candidates into the job of principal and expect them to flourish. The mentor needs to be non-evaluative.
23. I think we need coaching or mentoring at least until the 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> year.
24. Maybe we should approach this like in theatre, where there is an under-study. An apprentice, if you will.
25. I think we need to look to ourselves for help. There is an enormous number of principals and a peer-to-peer setting can provide a way for principals to assist each other in working through tough challenges. Fiscally, unless a lot of money falls out of the sky, we may need to make this work within ourselves somehow. Peer arrangements like that (Professional Learning Communities made up of principals) may be the way.
26. Those of us who came through the Leadership Academy had regular contact with our peers in the way you describe. But it sounds like not everyone had that. It seems to me we need to find a way to hear the challenges

people are facing, without the fear of judgment and punitive consequence. We need to honor the self-disclosure, the honesty, and see the value of collegial assistance.

27. I think we agree that the internship ramp or the runway to the principal-ship needs to be longer and rich with practice, not just observation or sitting on the sidelines, but in there leading the work on the ground.
28. What is missing is recognition of the time it takes to do this preparation well. What is somehow glossed over is how we support those whose job it is to prepare aspiring principals. What is the professional development for those teaching in preparation programs?
29. I worry that the *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders* may merely be seen as an evaluation tool. That instills fear. And fear robs us of the ability to use these standards to do this work better. What we need is not just more accountability but accountability (ok, we all get that) backed up by lots of high-quality support for continuous improvement and learning. There needs to be a continuum of dialogue around these new standards. Coaching and mentoring are an important element. So a code of ethics can provide guardrails and boundaries on healthy coaching.
30. It is helpful to think about the difference between a mentor and a coach. Whereas a mentor provides answers for questions, a coach may question my answers in a way that helps me grow and improve my practice. If it is true that 50 percent of principals turnover by the end of their third year (and 30 percent turn over after one year), then we need to be doing all we can to better support people early in their careers. Coaching is part of that.
31. The more-connected that university principal preparation programs are to the realities of daily practice, the bettered those aspiring principals will be who go through our programs. We are all really needing to better understand what the standards mean and how they are connected to practice.
32. Some really great work is coming out of the Council of Great City Schools that can help us all understand what important pieces of the *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSELs)* mean (especially things like cultural competency). We need to figure out what it means that the *PSELs* are aspirational (and apply to the entire school building leader career) then how they align to or translate into expectations for newly-appointed principals. Clarity is key.
33. Further, we (universities and school districts) absolutely need to co-develop preparation programs. Pilot projects can be really helpful here especially if they enable us to identify effective approaches and share these promising practices with others in the field. This can help us scale up the approaches that work.
34. As someone who is responsible for a principal preparation program, I certainly can't argue with the standards but we need clinically-rich experiences for aspiring principals that are extended in length so they get the full principal experience. The Sustainable Funding Project (SFP) at Bank Street College is an example of a method that can be used to underwrite the experience so every up-and-coming participant is paid during the experience.
35. Co-teaching (a university professor paired with a current and successful school building leader) is a good way to couple theory and practice.
36. I know we are focused on the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders but I have to say that it is so appropriate that one of nine belief statements that the Principal Project Advisory Team produced is just right. It uses the word "grace" to describe what is needed in school building leaders who have to navigate change every day.
37. Given our financial situation, the reality is that principals in NYC can benefit enormously from the regular collegial exchanges with their principal counterparts. Those who work in the same geographic area can routinely gather to

exchange ideas and learn how to do this challenging work well. These experienced principals perhaps best understand what it looks and feels like to confront rising poverty and what it takes to be an instructional leader when classrooms are filled with growing numbers of children who experience trauma first-hand. In my experience, each principal who has participated in these collegial meetings has left better prepared to meet the daily challenges of their building.

38. I agree. It should not be a novelty that school building leaders get together to share with and learn from their colleagues.
39. Although I am a retired principal, I am a firm believer that there is great value in working your way up through the ranks to become principal. Too many, in my mind, who become principal today lack the foundation of experience that is needed for them to be an effective resource to teachers.
40. Although I am in teacher education (a professor at the university), I am seeing similarities between teacher preparation and principal preparation. The need to shift as a profession (with respect to cultural responsiveness, for instance) is real for both teachers and principals but the reality is that we don't shift culture on a dime. It is easy to say and hard to do. But it is necessary.
41. Principal preparation needs to start with "real conversations". We must come together to identify the toughest struggles we face as principals (say our dealings with matters related to the teacher union, as an example) and we need to engage aspiring principals in those conversations so they see and understand what the job is really about and what it takes to be effective. These experiences should not necessarily be designed to be comfortable, but in reality uncomfortable. Because that is the way the job is.
42. In this work on principal preparation let's not lose sight of the Assistant Principal and their preparation for the job. Comprehensive and ongoing professional development is needed.
43. I'm not clear whether and how the *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders* pertain to School District Leaders. How do they?
44. My question in all of this is this. What master do these new standards serve? If it is accountability then they are just going to be perceived as leverage for discipline. I would hope instead that they exist to support the growth and development of educator. Successful implementation depends on being as clear about that as we can be.

#### **MEETING #6: Brooklyn, Brooklyn College, October 25, 2017, 16 attendees**

Prompt: Who does what so implementation benefits current (and future) principals and ultimately student learning?

1. I worry that *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders* will suffer the same fate as QR (Quality Review) rubric. The QR rubric could have been a guide to what "good education process" looks like. But when it was used more for principal evaluation it became tainted. Healthy implementation means we do whatever it takes to avoid that.
2. For me, healthy implementation means aligning standards. In this city the NYCDOE has its standards. CAEP has its standards. We have the 2008 *ISLLC Standards*. And the state of NY has its own set of standards that come into play for target and focus schools. So now we have the *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders*. They are presented to us in a clear and impressive document. I wonder how all of these standards intersect. I want them to intersect so we don't have disconnected things.
3. I think two things matter in implementation; one is prominence and the other is resonance. For implementation to succeed we need both prominence and resonance. I'll explain. The QR is very prominent (that's good) but does not resonate with those in the field (that's bad). So, the challenge for the state is to work with those of us in this



city (and elsewhere in the state) to make sure the *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders* are both prominent and that they resonate. For aspiring principals in NYC, getting into the principal pool is the big concern. How will *PSELs* figure into that? Aspiring principals will want to know that.

4. It is unfortunate that in NYCDOE the QR tool is being misused as a tool to evaluate the principal. The PPO evaluation and the QR are intended to be separate processes. The QR applies to the school and its processes. The PPO is for the principal evaluation solely. But that is not what is actually happening.
5. I need clarification. Are the *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders* limited to principal preparation or do they extend to (and apply to) practicing principals? [After the first hour of discussion, the answer to this question was provided. The proposed change in regulation means that the *PSELs* will apply both to principal preparation and to practicing principals.]
6. My concern is not with the *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders*. They're good. But I am unsure how quantifiable some aspects are. I want to know where we go next in implementation (so we figure that out).
7. The unfortunate reality for principals is that it is too often an immersion experience. You finish the formal preparation program and are dropped into a building and that's it. Fortunately, I found my own mentors and access to them was the most helpful thing to me. Preparation for the job of principal should not be like an inoculation. It should be a continuous process. Aspiring principals need to acquire a knowledge and grasp of systems and structures. Because wherever they happen to do their internship, chances are they will end up in a setting that is somehow different. They need to know how to operate when structures and system change.
8. I think that relevance to my practice matters. I care whether the *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders* are connected to and reflect what I am expected to do on the job. The *PSELs* should be more-closely connected to my practice and how I am evaluated (than the QR is now).
9. Readiness for the job of principal seems to be the focus here but what about the rest of the learning process for those who are doing the job right now? Ongoing support for the principal is critical. That is why mentoring and coaching is [inaudible]. Principals on the job often need help making a decision and that is where mentoring and coaching come in.
10. I think standards should be stable over time. What should be certified is permanent. Consider how the field of law works. You can't come right out of law school and instantly become partner. We seem to rush people to become certified. We could have apprenticeships. Once certified, continuing education is of course important in order to stay current with changes in the discipline. But I think the standards should be the standards.
11. I think there is something to the idea that certification doesn't matter enough right now. We could look to the rollout of tenure in teaching to see how people in NYS now aspire to gain tenure. Recent changes have created a situation where the superintendent review (leading to granting tenure) actually means something to the person who is seeking tenure.
12. A long time ago, you had to first be an assistant principal before you could become a principal. But nowadays you can be an architect one day and a principal the next day. We need to re-create a longer runway leading to the principal-ship.
13. I think the *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders* should give guidance to supervision but don't turn *PSELs* into an evaluation tool. We can't have a QR rubric repetition.

14. Maybe the state should be involved more vigorously so principals who are assigned to a building aren't left to "sink or swim." This immersion mentality is not useful. People should not have to survive or leave. The system ought to actually offer and provide support so people learn to be more effective leaders.
15. I think it is important for the state to consider the differentiated contexts in which we find schools today. We have large comprehensive high schools. We have small school settings. Districts need leaders who match up well with the needs of their own community. It helps if the candidate knows which kind of community (s)he is going to work in after leaving the prep program.
16. Something that is missing today is a paid, year-long internship placement for every candidate.
17. New principals need firm foundation in instructional supervision. Right now, there little alignment between the city rubric and the state rubric. So if you are a principal of a focus or priority school in NYC then you have problem of deciding which rubric to pay attention to; is it the city that will grade you or the state that could close you?
18. As a technology person, I wonder whether some principal duties could be automated. Handled differently, the principal could focus more on instruction.
19. Yes, but at the same time we don't want technology to create and impose its own set of burdens on the principal.
20. Right, like scanners in schools. For a school to be true to its mission, it needs trust. Kids have to feel safe.
21. It seems like we need to have a consistent set of standards but we need a graduated set of expectations. The novice principal is not evaluated in precisely the same way or with the same expectation of performance as the apprentice or the master principal. Local standards and state standards need to match up.
22. I want to advocate for standards that are clear and consistent across the state but that our evaluation tools take into account the variability in local settings, their challenges, and their needs.
23. As a coach I am thinking about how to provide non-evaluative feedback in real-time so that people can grow and become even more effective school building leaders. I'd like to see a cross-walk between the 2008 *ISLLC Standards* and the 2015 *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders* [a link was provided to cross-walk document developed by the Council of Chief State School Officers].
24. I disagree with [name mentioned]. Instead, it sounds to me like we want standards without standardization. We want learning support provided during the course of practice. Ideally it would be a paid internship. The students that I have in my [university preparation] program go off to any number of schools across the country. I want them educated so they are prepared no matter where they end up. Standards are useful. They help guide the internship experience. But how we do this (implement the standards) needs flexibility. That's the key.
25. Yes, but here is how I see it. Some level of standardization is needed. If there is a lack of standardization then programs can vary dramatically from one another. Of course, we don't need or want to create factories.
26. Let's remember that the standards are the goals. We are trying to implement them so students flourish. There isn't enough of a "growth mindset" around here.
27. I don't want to be misunderstood. The tool should be based on standards but not so heavily weighted toward accountability that it poisons things.
28. It feels to me like no one or very few really want the job of principal anymore. If true, we should figure out why that is (and the role, if any, that standards play in it all).

29. In NYCDOE, 300 people interviewed for assistant principal job this year. That is 10% of the field. So there is enthusiasm for the assistant principal job. That is still a lot of turnover. And in 1 to 3 years, these assistant principals will be ready to consider going for a principal job.
30. I'm unaware of a citywide study that definitively says what percent are responding and applying. My bet is that a small percentage today say, "I'll never want that job." But APPR has disillusioned folks.
31. I believe we are not getting the best candidates coming out to try and become principals. Those who are more-veteran or more-senior just don't want it.
32. I'm very opposed to standardization. I think the state can be more creative in how it evaluates prep programs. The more we can focus on outcomes (and not become obsessed with the process) the better. Why should any centralized authority have any say at all when students in a school are flourishing?
33. I think back to my own preparation as a principal that was focused on the 2008 *ISLLC Standards*. There was some good stuff there. It provided "look fors". There were things in the category of Knowledge, Dispositions, and Performance. Helpful. Will we have that for the *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders*?
34. Let's remember that few if any principals in our schools today have more than 10 years of experience. They just don't exist. They move up, or move on, or move out.
35. And let's remember that adoption of the *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders* is subject to collective bargaining.
36. For implementation to be successful, coaching should be provided routinely to principals.
37. We need to ensure that 21<sup>st</sup> century knowledge and skills are part of the preparation program for principals.
38. I don't think it is fair that assistant principals are evaluated differently than principals are.
39. We need to make sure academics are available to [all] our students. We ought to be able to look at and analyze the academic results for all of our principals (that is, the results for students in schools led by principals).
40. I have to point out how so many people seem to be willing to say that "I learned nothing in my preparation program." It is short-sighted for us to talk about principal preparation but ignore the ongoing supervision and ongoing professional development of our building leaders. This need is real.
41. Agreed. Once hired, people need support that begins at the point they are hired and then continues for two or three years.
42. I want to return to our conversation about standards and standardization. I just ask us all to think about and commit to making sure that we keep a clear focus on one thing. That is equity. Through the transition, will or how will these standards and/or standardization impact equity? It is easy to say that implementation matters. What really matters today is that equity is advanced.
43. I may be the lone voice here of the suburbs schools. I'm from Rockland. My own principal training was focused on the 2008 *ISLLC Standards*. I want to know how principals in suburban schools are better served because of these new standards.

44. I have two points to make. First, I think we need to encourage pilot programs more than we do now. Second, I think we need to remember that a standardized score is not the end-all and be-all.
45. I look at the *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders*. While they are good, there are 100 items (if you count each item under every standard). It is a bit like an arms race. We just keep stockpiling. We need to remember that work-life balance matters. Let's bear in mind that we have novice principals, apprentice principals, and those who are highly experienced.
46. What guidance will the supervisors of principals get? Any?

**MEETING #7: Syracuse, School District Professional Development Center, November 2, 2017, 91 attendees**

Prompt: Who does what so implementation benefits current (and future) principals and ultimately student learning?

1. While the state now requires school building leader candidates to have at least three years of experience teaching (or similar length experience in pupil personnel services), the state may want to consider candidates who have at least three years of experience in other fields. [Note: A total of 3 tables offered the same suggestion.]
2. I know there is a belief statement about equity (from the Advisory Team report) but there needs to be a definition of cultural responsiveness and also a definition of equity. [Note: A total of 7 tables offered the same suggestion.]
3. The state should modify the exam (for school building leader certification) so it better addresses equity and cultural responsiveness. [Note: A total of 7 tables offered the same suggestion.]
4. As part of their preparation to be certified, candidates should be expected to draft a job entry plan. [Note: A total of 3 tables offered the same suggestion.]
5. School districts could arrange time for current principals and their supervisors to study the *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders*. [Note: A total of 5 tables offered the same suggestion.]
6. When judgments are made to determine whether aspiring principals are ready for certification, a competency-based assessment makes sense. Candidates could/should be expected to produce artifacts like a master schedule or a school budget. [Note: A total of 3 tables offered the same suggestion.]
7. University-based principal preparation programs could infuse all courses with authentic experiences that help aspiring principals link what they are learning to practice. [Note: A total of 6 tables offered the same suggestion.]
8. If university-based principal prep programs used more authentic experiences and if these somehow became part of the certification process, then we should have measurable outcomes especially for concepts like cultural responsiveness. [Note: A total of 3 tables offered the same suggestion.]
9. SED should expect universities that want to offer principal preparation to partner with local school districts to co-develop clinically-rich experiences for aspiring principals. [Note: A total of 14 tables offered the same suggestion.]
10. When it comes to APPR and judging individual principals, attention should be devoted to the scales that are used. Inadequate attention is given to the growth of individuals along a continuum. Beginning people and more-experienced people are now judged on the same scale. We ought to have more of a growth-mindset at work. [Note: A total of 5 tables offered the same suggestion.]

11. The date of 2020 is a realistic timeline for universities to adjust their principal preparation programs so they are organized around the 2015 *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders*. [Note: A total of 4 tables offered the same suggestion.]
12. University-based principal preparation programs could/should train aspiring principals in de-escalation techniques and tactics (in conjunction with the concept of cultural responsiveness). [Note: A total of 4 tables offered the same suggestion.]
13. In relation to APPR, if values and beliefs are at the heart of this work and are the foundation for these recommendations (and if some of these beliefs pertain to equity and cultural responsiveness), then we need to hold people to account for these. But we should not just rely on quantitative measures for this. For instance, we need to ask, “What have you done (and what can you show us) that has advanced equity and cultural responsiveness? How do you know that it has advanced equity and cultural responsiveness?” [Note: A total of 4 tables offered the same suggestion.]
14. There needs to be a focus during principal preparation -- and in district professional development – on how we achieve greater equity and what it means to be culturally responsive. [Note: A total of 5 tables offered the same suggestion.]
15. To help prepare individuals in cultural responsiveness, principal preparation programs need to assemble a set of experiences for aspiring principals (beginning in coursework in the first year of the preparation program and then following into the internship) that bring candidates into settings with a range of diverse learners. [Note: A total of 2 tables offered the same suggestion.]
16. As they are now, the *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders* seem to set cultural responsiveness by itself in Standard #3. But shouldn’t equity and cultural responsiveness (that are the title of Standard #3) be embedded in every standard? [Note: A total of 11 tables offered the same suggestion.]
17. University-based principal preparation programs need to work closely with practitioners to arrange so candidates have a mentor who currently is a successful school building administrator. [Note: A total of 2 tables offered the same suggestion.]
18. Under APPR, is it fair that novice principals and experienced principals are evaluated using the same rubric? If we really want to encourage people to become school building leaders, we need to create rubrics that reflect the stages of development that school building leaders undergo. [Note: A total of 2 tables offered the same suggestion.]
19. There ought to be statewide incentives for colleges and school districts (and especially urban school districts) to co-design principal preparation programs. These programs should create incentives for program graduates to stay in the urban district. The incentives could include financial support to the organizations (university and the school district) to partner on the creation of these model programs. There might be funding made available for housing for those candidates that participate in the program. [Note: A total of 2 tables offered the same suggestion.]
20. What happened to the idea of alternative certification for candidates that want to become school building leaders? I’m thinking of principal preparation programs like *New Leaders for New Schools*. [Note: A total of 1 table offered the suggestion.]
21. We see the need for differentiated professional development for school building leaders. As experience grows there might be a gradual release of responsibility for providing this professional development. For instance, with principals in the early years of their career the district might have greater responsibility for providing specific professional development, say with respect to cultural responsiveness. But as the individual leader acquires

knowledge and skill through practice, the responsibility for professional development shifts from the district to the individual school leader. [Note: A total of 1 table offered the suggestion.]

22. We'd like to see better alignment between what is taught and expected within the university-based principal preparation program and the realities of the P12 school setting. We could see the local district identifying a specific problem of practice (or a set of problems) that the aspiring principals would take on as part of their preparation. Collecting these might really help the district build a collection of tools, techniques, and approaches that can assist the district and practicing administrators. It might even be a textbook that is created that includes a collection of these problems of practice. [Note: A total of 1 table offered the suggestion.]
23. The deadline of 2022 is OK for the evaluation of principals using a rubric that is based on the *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders*). [Note: A total of 9 tables offered the same suggestion.]
24. It is important for higher education institutions and NYSED to communicate so that program requirements are tightly aligned. [Note: A total of 3 tables offered the same suggestion.]
25. While the 2020 date is a reasonable timeline for higher education institutions to adjust so their principal preparation programs are organized around the *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders*, there are accrediting organizations (like CAEP) that hold us to a different set of standards. What about that? [Note: A total of 11 tables offered the same suggestion.]
26. We would like to talk about if the 2020 timeline is appropriate. [Note: A total of 11 tables offered the same suggestion.]
27. How do we find enough high-quality mentors and coaches to fill the need that exists? [Note: A total of 1 table offered the suggestion.]
28. We wonder whether we will have the technology solutions ready by the time we reach these deadlines of 2020 and 2022. [Note: A total of 1 table offered the suggestion.]
29. We don't think it is that difficult for a university to meet the 2020 deadline, at least when it comes to adjusting the content of courses. But it is another matter with respect to the internships. Creating meaningful internships that really align to the new *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders* could take some doing. That is going to take some thought. [Note: A total of 11 tables offered the same suggestion.]
30. We can see the need to prepare future principals for the demands of specific communities. We're thinking of places like Syracuse and Rochester. In places like that it may be practical and useful to develop learning materials that are organized around real problems of practice. [Note: A total of 7 tables offered the same suggestion.]
31. We see the need for internships to be at least one year in length. It could be more like the residency programs found in the medical model. Or it could be more like an apprenticeship. [Note: A total of 1 table offered the suggestion.]
32. How will the state handle universities that now have a joint SBL-SDL preparation program? [Note: A total of 1 table offered the suggestion.]
33. Districts and universities could develop and assemble specific strategies and resources that are aligned to each of the new standards. [Note: A total of 1 table offered the suggestion.]
34. Simulations could help aspiring principals build knowledge and skill. [Note: A total of 1 table offered the suggestion.]

35. The State (working with university-based preparation programs) could help candidates identify the “best fit” of their skills and abilities to various school settings. [Note: A total of 1 table offered the suggestion.]
36. SED could create (or make available) cross-walks that show how the *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders* correspond to the 2008 *ISLLC Standards*. [Note: A total of 1 table offered the suggestion.]
37. Newly-hired principals could be part of a required PLC (Professional Learning Community) for at least one full year after they first come on the job as principal. [Note: A total of 1 table offered the suggestion.]
38. Local school districts should regularly confer with the local university(ies) that have principal preparation programs to alert them about performance gaps that the district is seeing. These gaps could be in terms of student performance but also in terms of the performance of those who graduate from the principal preparation programs. [Note: A total of 1 table offered the suggestion.]

**MEETING #8: Manhattan, Council of Supervisors and Administrators, November 7, 2017, 24 attendees**

Prompt: Who does what so implementation benefits current (and future) principals and ultimately student learning?

1. What explains why novice principals and experienced principals are evaluated using the same scale? Why isn't discretion permitted?
2. What do we prepare of principals for Career and Technical Education schools?
3. How do we currently assess the 2008 *ISLLC Standards* in our schools?
4. What global perspectives on education were considered when the Advisory Team did its work? Are we just considering how our students perform with respect to their counterparts in other states in this country or are we considering how our students compare to students internationally?
5. It seems to me the biggest adjustment is trying to achieve a common language and understanding of what these standards really mean so we can all be evaluated fairly. So that makes me wonder what kind of professional development will be available. We'll probably need lots of professional development for teacher leaders too.
6. I graduated 7-9 years ago so what I see happening is that the world of computer technology is being felt in a big way. I have some limitations in that. We'll definitely need technology professional development.
7. I am looking at the question about “what are the precursors to a smooth and effective implementation?” Adapting a growth mindset seems most important here. If we can all come to agreement about the importance of a growth mindset, that will help pave the way.
8. I'm focused on cultural responsiveness, cultural awareness, and equity. I'm thinking that they don't fit neatly into one of these boxes. It requires thinking outside of the box for Standard #3 (Equity and Cultural Responsiveness). Across the curriculum, this (cultural responsiveness and equity) is vitally important. We have good intentions but that isn't enough. People need to mold these ideas into something that is doable. We're in a fast-moving world. We're moving so fast do we have the time it will take to make these ideas part of everything we do?
9. I agree that the PD (professional development) is needed across the board so everyone gets a unified understanding of what this looks like in practice (by “this” we mean cultural responsiveness and the PSELs). For that, mentors and coaches are important. [At this point, someone clarified that in NYCDOE the understanding of what a coach is versus what a mentor is may differ from the understandings elsewhere in NYS. The main idea is

that mentors in NYCDOE play a non-evaluative role. By contrast, in NYCDOE, coaches can sometimes be people who are connected to the evaluator or are even actually the evaluator]

10. How do we prepare future school building leader to address forces outside the control of school?
11. I'm looking at the sub-components of each of these standards (PSELs) and the challenge that will be there to see these implemented with fidelity across so many sites.
12. It seems that the internship experience looks very different depending on the job setting. It would be good to have some kind of standards (our guidelines) that apply to the internship itself. There should be an expectation and an understanding that the intern is "all in" and almost being called upon to do the actual job of a school principal. The arrangement, in the ideal, would be a side-by-side with the principal.
13. How does the state fund an internship that allows for a full-time extended period? Even if we can't do a full year paid internship, how can we make it a half year? The candidate really needs experience with different settings and different populations (Special Education, English Language Learners, etc.).
14. It seems that the mentor should have more influence or more "pull" on a candidate's course grade than is currently the case. Or the mentor should have the ability to weigh in on the candidate's readiness for certification. Feedback from the mentor is in my mind most valuable. I mean, right now the final grades come from the university professor but the mentors are the ones who see the candidate putting their knowledge and skill to use in a real school setting.
15. Chances are it is different here in NYC but for most of us who are principals we started as Assistant Principals. We can talk about the internships and coaching but it is very abstract. The real thing is the AP job itself. Transition happens in the shift from teacher to AP and in the transition from AP to principal. I almost see it as SBL part 1 and SBL part 2.
16. I'd like to see a paid internship continue for a whole year.
17. I think the AP is the first step in the journey to becoming a principal.
18. Perhaps preparation should look different for an AP (versus a principal). But I wonder how that would work when there are unexpected vacancies that pop up in the middle of the year. That creates immediate challenges and often the preparation of people changes in situations like that. The two-tier principal pool in NYCDOE is [inaudible].
19. I want to observe something. The burden of responsibility for implementation of the PSELs will fall more heavily on the leader of the school. How can the burden not fall disproportionately on the principal? That is, what can we do so that doesn't happen?
20. I can see a progression from a teacher who is a school building leader to an AP to building principal. Seems to me we should be looking across this continuum.
21. It is worrisome to me that there is a shortage of people who are ready, willing, and able (to step up and into larger responsibilities as a principal). So we don't want to discourage people from considering becoming a principal by creating too many hurdles.
22. Is that what the data say (that there is a shortage of principals)?



23. If it turns out that three out of four principals are asked to resign, then of course there will be a shortage. But I don't know if three out of four is an accurate description.
24. I wonder what piece is missing that we could add so people don't step away from the principal-ship? How do we do a better job of attracting and advertising the job of principal? I mean, I loved being a teacher. I wanted to be a teacher forever. But at some point, you have the desire to affect more lives. How do we let people know that in a way that attracts people (to want to become a principal)?
25. The word is out. You can't have a blanket rating system. A lot of the rating falls on a principal. The principal's work is not done in isolation.
26. So many students struggle and flirt with failure. Those who take on the task of being a principal need to understand that. What matters is not where my school is but where my school is performing compared to yesterday. If it takes 5-7 years to turn around a school then how can we realistically expect a school to be magically transformed in 2 years? If 5-7 years is needed, how many principals actually get to stay long enough to see their efforts gain traction?
27. The work should be about the growth. The Quality Review process and the PPO, they have become twisted up.
28. I see a disconnect. It takes 5-7 years to turn around a school. The needs to be a framework for improvement. There needs to be a year to year scaling up process. A person who steps in as principal needs a theoretical framework and some kind of timeline that is logical and sensible. We understand that leadership success is often mostly about the geographic assignment that gets made. If the school (that a person is assigned to as principal) is in a good Queens neighborhood then being the principal will mean one thing versus a school in a tough neighborhood. What matters is the change that happens from one year to the next at a school. The growth is what matters. If you ignore the growth, then what happens is that we throw out the baby with the bath water. And a person who is the principal is considered subpar when actually the school may have been improving and it is just that enough time wasn't given.
29. I'd like to see a summary of the theory.
30. If we want equity and cultural responsiveness, are the PSELs the "right driver?" [at this point, the facilitator asked, "if standards aren't the right driver, what is?"]
31. I want to talk about the timelines. It seems to me that the universities have enough time to adjust the content. I do think there needs to be more guidance available to teacher leaders. What constitutes best practices in terms of cultural responsiveness, for instance?
32. I would look at some of the aids that have been developed to go along with the 2008 ISLLC Standards.
33. How do we know whether every university that now offers SBL program will choose to implement the PSELs? What happens if a university does not implement the PSELs?
34. Within this conversation can we re-think the 184-day structure of school? Can we re-think how schools look?
35. It seems to me that the role and job of principals differs from the role and job of assistant principals. But I don't see that the PSELs address that. How will that be accommodated?
36. If the due date for universities to re-register their SBL programs is December, 2020, what will happen to people who enroll in an SBL program in 2019? Will universities run two SBL programs in parallel during the transition period?

**MEETING #9: Buffalo, Center for Tomorrow on the campus of University at Buffalo, November 8, 2017, 22 attendees**

Prompt: Who does what so implementation benefits current (and future) principals and ultimately student learning?

1. Developing a talent pipeline is a big part of our strategic plan at Western New York Consortium of Higher Education (WNYCHE). Creating partnerships with 21 different institutions is how to move needed change forward.
2. I wonder how much receiving recognition for life experience matters here. I see us (districts and universities) working closely to get genuine feedback to candidates. That can help us set up professional development goals for individuals.
3. The internship can't just be a collection of mini projects. The LIFT program hosted by the University at Buffalo was the way to go. Internship hours were not just a compliance thing. It wasn't just "let's get the hours in." Getting candidates into situations where they were really don't the work. They were applying what they learned in the (university) classroom. Some district settings were better at that than others.
4. I think we need a clearer focus and better guidelines for supervisors in the field, so they know what is expected.
5. A timeframe would be helpful. If the candidate needs to be doing a certain amount of hours in a particular capacity, it helps to know that up front. And when during the school year should that be happening? We could use help knowing that.
6. All local institutions (districts) are hosting internships. But is it really imperative that a candidate does his/her internship in a district other than his/her home district? Why is that? Can't the internship happen in their home district? Sometimes it would be good to have our own people doing internships in our own district. It would be good if there were flexibility in that.
7. The timing of the internship is important. It is almost artificial if it happens in the summer. We need consistency in how the internships are arranged.
8. When I did my internship, I had the luxury of having a paid internship. The Co-Ser with the local BOCES coupled with the university creativity made that a possibility. I can see a lot of value in having a full time paid internship for candidates who are working to become principals in a system that is organized around the PSELs.
9. When it comes to making the internships happen, the state needs to take a more-active role fiscally speaking. They're asking people to volunteer their services to supervise and sponsor aspiring principal candidates. Mentors need to be trained. You can't leave that to chance. The state should provide support for substitute teachers while the intern is away from the regular classroom assignment.
10. The quality of the mentors matters. If you look at the three *PSEL* standards (#3, #5, and #8) that represent a big change from the 2008 *ISLLC Standards*, then the aspiring principal candidate needs to be placed in settings with mentors that are high-quality. The mentors need guidance and training too.
11. We should recognize that some folks don't know how to mentor effectively. There could be conferences scheduled that the aspiring principal and their mentor attend together.
12. I think it would help to clarify what we mean when we use the term "mentor." I'm not sure we are all using the same definition. Being paired with a mentor is not like assigning a Big Brother.

13. Given the shift from 2008 *ISLLC Standards* to 2015 *PSELs*, what resources will be available for faculty to help Higher Ed faculty make the adjustment?
14. From my seat in higher education, I see the teacher shortage. We can soon expect to see a similar shortage (if we're not seeing it already) in the administrator ranks. What is the root cause of the shortage? Is it the added number of "hoops" that people have to jump through? If we make it so difficult for people to navigate, they may choose to forgo becoming a teacher (or a school administrator).
15. There is a lot to like about the *PSELs*. They're aligned to important things. As an administrator in a school and a school district that has experienced the *Comprehensive Diagnostic Need Assessment* that the NYSED conducts (where they use a tool called the *Diagnostic Tool for School and District Effectiveness* or *DTSDE*), I think there should be alignment between the *PSELs* and these processes. As well, I think there should be an alignment between *PSELs* and the *Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR)*.
16. My issue is accreditation. The *CAEP* and *PSELs* should be aligned. What consideration is being given to the alignment of these? [Note: During subsequent discussion in this group, it was pointed out that the next phase of work involves adopting the *National Educational Leadership Preparation Standards* which were derived from the *CAEP* and *PSELs*. The *NELP Standards* are intended to be used to guide university-based programs that prepare future school building leaders.]
17. In terms of any shortage of principals in New York State, are we saying that the people who apply are unprepared for the challenge? Or are we saying that those who currently serve as principal are needing additional knowledge and skill? Is this about preparation of new principals or development of existing principals (or both)?
18. Will changing these standards for principal preparation change the outcomes we see with students?
19. It seems like the standards are an important steps but not the whole story. Resources have to be applied at the higher ed level and at the district level to make the standards practically important. How prepared is the state to attend to the needs of aspiring and current principals for high-quality coaching? Will the state make the need investment that it will take to make the PSEL standards come alive?
20. In terms of the shortage in NYS of principals, I'm not sure I see that. Does the data show that we have a shortage? [Note: In subsequent discussion in this group, it was mentioned that in the opinion of some of those on the Principal Preparation Project Advisory Team and in the opinion of some of those who have participated in earlier listening tour sessions, there are not enough school building leader certified candidates who have what is needed to be successful and effective in improving schools they lead, especially schools that struggle the most.]
21. I can respond to that (previous speaker). As an administrator in Buffalo City School District I know we face a shortage of applicants for principal jobs in struggling schools. I have heard that in more-rural areas surrounding Buffalo, districts are experiencing a shortage of well-prepared principals. In some of those smaller rural districts (where schools have only a principal and not AP), it is fairly common to see someone move straight from being a classroom teacher to being a principal.
22. So where does School District Leader (SDL) preparation fit in this conversation? I suggest we think about that. Principals need supportive supervisors. That takes preparation.
23. I want to point out that having an internship in the district where you work might not be a bad thing. Especially in an urban district that faces a host of challenges, you need principal candidates who deeply believe that every student can be successful. If you are headed into (or seeking) a principal position in a school in a district like that, it just makes sense to do your internship in that kind of environment. So can we consider a differentiated pathway to the principal-ship that would allow for some people to do the internship in their home district?

24. Mentors will need reimbursement, if we want the experience to be high-quality. I think that some of the summer months could be spent doing internship work. For too many aspiring principal candidates, they squeeze their internship into the vacation periods or inter-session or end of the school day.
25. From the standpoint of disruptive innovation, is there something other than an internship that may have an important impact? Does it make sense to investigate the impact of another approach or greater latitude (that is, permitting more innovative or creative approaches) with respect to the design of the preparation experience?
26. Models of appreciative inquiry may be helpful here. That is the search for aspects of organizations, communities, and human systems that are found when they are most alive and effective. The Council of Great City Schools can be a resource for this, if we are interested. Places like Cleveland and Broward County Schools have pursued this. Taking this approach might ground our research in successful practice.
27. I see smaller numbers of entering classes of people seeking to become principals. How do we create a better incubator for talent? How do we build a bench of talent? How do we create – excuse the baseball metaphor -- a farm system? Why don't we try to identify promising talent earlier? Why don't we identify (and then develop) student teachers who display characteristics and behaviors that we think we find in the most-effective school building leaders?
28. At CIDEL (Committee to Identify and Develop Educational Leadership), we have a leadership conference that is a 2-day gathering for the expressed purpose of doing just that.
29. A few years ago, as part of our STLE grant (Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness) we developed a leadership continuum that had some promise. We looked to other places (Denver Public Schools was one) that have done great work in developing scaffolding for leaders. Through STLE we created stipends for TOSAs (Teachers on Special Assignment). That turned out to be the kind of professional development that really boosts the growth of emerging and fledgling leaders. It was the “boots on the ground” approach. These TOSAs took on real problems and as they did they worked under a skilled and successful practicing administrator who mentored them. It introduced these aspiring school building leaders to the culture of the principal-ship.
30. The new administration in the Buffalo City School District is looking at data. We are gathering information about what the challenge of leading a struggling school involves. We are finding that too often people go through a program only to discover that this is not what I thought it would be. So we want to create more opportunities earlier in the program of preparation that put the candidate in a position to experience the reality of the job.
31. I think the state can be helpful here by keeping track of the churn or turnover in principal-ships. If we knew what the regular rate of turnover is and if we knew the history of that in each region of the state, we would then be better able to say “we know we will need 200 new building leaders in this area within the next five years.” We have to push back on systems that say we need to pump out 200 new people every year. The data may show us that that may not be the case. But the reality is that too often administrator preparation programs drive revenue in higher ed. For that to happen, for the state to be able to help us see and monitor the turnover rate we must have data that are standardized across the state. The rates at which we certify new people have to be comparable across the state.
32. I wonder. Can you teach people what they need to be a successful school principal? To place someone in the principal-ship in Buffalo City Schools, it must be someone who knows what they are getting into. They must have certain characteristics.

33. I don't think we do enough to retain our most effective school building leaders. Yes, maybe we get fewer people coming into the principal-ship. But if we could reduce the exodus of capable and talented people from the principal-ship, we might find that we don't have as big a problem.
34. There are things we could learn from other places. For instance, the Clark County School District in Las Vegas, Nevada partners with UNLV to create a flow of talent into the principal-ship.
35. I can say that the University at Buffalo is partnering with Kriner Cash and the Buffalo City School District in way that is useful.
36. To what extent are we pursuing one path and forgetting other paths? For instance, there is evidence that charter schools are successful (even more successful than non-charter schools have been in certain environments). If that is so, my question is this. How open are we to a game-changing approach? What if there are better ways to prepare school leaders for success in challenging environments? I guess my bias with the PSELs is that a better entry point may be opening up the charter school avenue.
37. I'll speak for UB about that. We track our alumni from the preparation program and we call them to see what they are doing and how they are doing. We do that so we can tell whether our preparation approach is sound or if it can somehow be enhanced.
38. The PSELs are moving in the right direction. They are moving us toward the kind of preparation that will equip our graduates to thrive in the conditions that exist in schools today. They aren't the whole story but they help us create a better talent pipeline because the focus on the right stuff.

**MEETING #10: Albany, School Administrators Association of New York State (SAANYS), November 13, 2017, 11 attendees**

Prompt: Who does what so implementation benefits current (and future) principals and ultimately student learning?

1. It will be important to manage the transition from existing standards (2008 *ISLLC Standards*) to the new set (*Professional Standards for Educational Leaders*). Effective professional development is the key. I think it will be important for the state to be prescriptive and require training for people who are affected. We will be running under one system (the current one) up until December 2020; but then those who enroll in preparation programs will come in under a new set of standards (PSELs).

[In the conversation that ensued, it was discussed that this is a lot like how a course catalog works for students entering a high school in 9<sup>th</sup> grade. In a way, the course catalog is the contract between the school and the student. The graduation requirements that are outlined in the course catalog are the ones that pertain to this student throughout his/her career at the high school. Even if the graduation requirements for the district change in a year, the student is grandfathered under the requirements that appeared in the original course catalog. The same kind of arrangement is happening here in NYS with the shift from 2008 ISLLC Standards to 2015 PSELs. So for a period of time during the transition (around 2020 to 2022 or 2023), it is accurate to say that a university-based principal prep program may be operating with two parallel sets of expectations for aspiring principals.]

2. NYSED will set the regulations and will specify the time for this transition, yes? [The answer is yes]
3. I wonder what how the rollout will look for small versus medium versus large institutions. How safely can we assume that all will have a clear understanding and be supportive of the change?
4. When you think about the emphasis on cultural responsiveness and equity, it is a big shift. It seems to me that the way these ideas are worded could and maybe should be adapted so they are appropriate for different audiences.

5. There are some concepts (like the reference to “social justice”) that set a moral direction. I am not sure how well this matches up with *APPR* (*Annual Professional Performance Review*).
6. What metrics will be used to measure some of these things in practice? If these are important ideas (like “social justice”) then they presumably will be measured so my question is how will that happen? If it will happen in a different way than how it is now done, that will be good to know and interesting to see.
7. I’m not sure the statute for educator evaluation is linked up to the proposed shift to *PSELs*. Will this action by the Regents do that?
8. The state has to look at *APPR* and student achievement at the same time. There are a half dozen rubrics out there now. It could create problems if SED comes in now and says “adopt these rubrics because they are linked up to the *PSELs*” but it turns out that the rubrics SED mandates are not consistent with the terms of our bargaining agreements. You run that risk if the regulation changes are not synched up with changes in statute.
9. I think that two ideas matter a lot. They are usefulness and usability (or user-friendliness). If you are greeted with less than enthusiastic reception my bet is that it is because people don’t see these as particularly useful or usable. And people don’t want to put a lot of energy into things unless it helps their practice. And it is tough when we don’t yet know what it will take to be judged “effective.”
10. On a different note, I don’t like the deficit model. I think it is dangerous to have a message go out that not enough principals have what it takes to be successful. I think we have a lot of successful principals; many sitting here in this room right now. I don’t think you get much traction if you set out to “fix our principles.”
11. Does SED plan to provide funding for extended internships for aspiring principals?
12. Districts have to be a part of the implementation plan. If they aren’t, we won’t see any progress.
13. The focus should be on the growth of principals, not a deficit approach. If we want to do it right we could take on *APPR*. We need to continue to harness up with growth. Buy-in among those in the field will be greatest if we focus on principal growth.
14. Within the *PSELs*, standard #3 talks about equity and cultural responsiveness. If I asked 100 principals to give me a definition or to tell what proficiency looks like in terms of cultural responsiveness or in terms of equity, I don’t know that I would get two people agreeing. When the Charlotte Danielson framework was adopted it happened under a state mandate. The challenge I see here with the *PSELs*, is that I don’t see any rubric or any performance standards. If I were to give you advice about what is needed for implementation, I would say we need those things. [In a subsequent conversation, the next steps in the process were discussed. It was pointed out that if the Regents adopt the *PSELs*, the next steps are to convert the standards into competencies. Then the process calls for translating the competencies into a rubric for professional development. The process also involves translating the competencies into a rubric for evaluation. Finally, the process involves adjusting the exam used for certification (or replacing it with a competency-based assessment).]
15. I understand the philosophy behind the *PSEL* framework, but until such time as we have performance expectations for new principals and for experienced principals, it is hard to say that we have what we need. As a coach, I would need that in order to provide good feedback to candidates who are in their internships.
16. I don’t know if training is possible in all of the things that appear underneath one of the *PSEL* standards. Some of these may not lend themselves to quantitative measures. Maybe what needs to happen is that we focus on selected standards.

17. When we were adopting Danielson and we were working to fit it into our district processes, we had guidance on how to do that. We also had access to grant money to fund the professional development that we had to do. I still have the rubrics we developed as part of that work. I suggest we end up adopting or creating or having something like that. Tools like that make it easier to see what is expected and how this will work.
18. It seems to me that a big challenge we all face is this. We all come from different districts. We each have a different superintendent. We have our own supervisors. We are independent entities and that's a good thing. But how do we make sure there is a common understanding about the PSELs and how do we make sure we have a unified approach to implementing the standards? Do we submit a bucket full of artifacts that demonstrate that we are following the new PSEL standards? If so, then are we running around trying to collect things in a way that really isn't that helpful.
19. I can see developing a rubric that is specific to elementary principals, and another that applies to middle level, and a third that is for high school principals. I think collecting artifacts can be helpful but only if it helps us all see what good enough looks like.
20. For me, alignment is the main idea. We need to know that the superintendent has a good understanding of the PSELs. I want to be sure that the way I as a principal am evaluated is well understood by the superintendent and by my supervisor.
21. Will this extend to Assistant Principals too? If we are going to go in this direction (and it seems like we as a state), then it would help if the professional development for all administrators were aligned to the PSELs. That includes APs, principals, supervisors, and superintendents.
22. I'm going to put on my hat as a member of the ESSA Think Tank. It may make sense to have a pilot. The idea of instructional bias is something I could see figured out in a pilot. We all tend to automatically go to a metric to figure out how these things will be measured. But some of these standards (or some of the things in these standards) don't easily lend themselves to our present evaluation system. I don't know if we have the flexibility to consider a pilot, but if we do, it might help us learn what we need to make sure the implementation goes smoothly.
23. I don't see much of anything here to help principals build student engagement and yet that seems to be at the heart of it. The 9 consensus belief statements that the Advisory Team developed talk about good stuff. I'd like to see more specifics about "how to" and what is good enough.
24. So maybe I missed it but what are the dates that this takes effect [in subsequent discussion it was pointed out that university-based principal prep programs must be re-registered by December 2020 and that principal evaluation (based on PSELs) takes effect in December, 2022.]
25. The micro-credential is something I'd like to know more about. What are they? What is their purpose?
26. The state might consider the concept of an apprenticeship, where an individual gets to work side-by-side for an extended period of time with a highly-skilled and successful practitioner. It is a thought.
27. I'd like it if the State continued to listen and learn and monitor and adjust the implementation. My fear is that we get 5 years out from here and some are unprepared to shift gears.
28. I get weary of constant shifting in general.
29. I think what we want to avoid is implementation that is "ziggy" and "zaggy". To make something work, it has to be meaningful to people on the ground.

30. I want to make sure this becomes more than a “check box” exercise. With Danielson, [inaudible] the difference between “effective” and “highly effective”.
31. As a relatively young school administrator, I want good feedback. We seem to get too caught up in “this is a 3” or “this is a 4” when what matters is not the score per se but how we all view and understand what a score represents.
32. The universal conversation is something we need to think about. Whether you find yourself in a rural school or a suburban school or an urban school, what does each standard mean to you? And are folks elsewhere viewing and understanding it the way you are?
33. It is a big task to come up with a common understanding of (and a common language to describe what we mean by) the concepts in the PSELs. Not too many years ago we saw the impact of a rushed implementation on the field’s embrace of the common core. We want to avoid that. Does SAANYS have a role to play in that? Where do 3<sup>rd</sup> party vendors come in? How do we work with SED to create synergy statewide?
34. The point is pacing that brings consistency. Where you multiple providers it is challenge but also an opportunity.
35. We have to get implementation right (for this to have a positive impact on staff, school, and students). If we don’t mindfully train, who will know and understand what the PSELs really mean?
36. I think about the connection that should exist between the content standards and these PSELs. I worry about decoupling of principal evaluation and teacher evaluation. If we aren’t careful we could de-couple teachers and principals. I think the standards that pertain to teaching and the standards that pertain to principals (PSELs) should be consistent and compatible.
37. What have the state boards in other states done in terms of PSEL adoption? What have their rollouts looked like?
38. It seems to me that the state has to mandate the training. The state has to mandate a set amount of professional development on PSELs. Otherwise you could lose uniform understanding that you need for this to be successful. So how do you go beyond using a survey to find out what people know and understand about PSELs?
39. In principal evaluation, the problem arises when score becomes everything. When chasing the 1 to 4 score becomes a game, you’ve lost.
40. Have any of the states that have implemented PSELs modified the word “ensure”? My problem with that word is this. If you want to ensure something you have to be in control of all the factors involved. And every school building leader knows that the principal does not control everything. As we think about implementation, I suggest we think about altering that word.
41. I’d like to speak to those who are designing and delivering the training. A lot of policymakers have the perception that the principal’s job is to hold teachers accountable for student performance. But the number of qualified candidates (who are looking to become principals) that is available has diminished. It is harder to find teachers to go into the principal-ship. It says something if the only people willing to become principals today are retired principals who agree to come back for a year to two. We have an opportunity to really attract great people to become school principals. That seems to be at the heart of our challenge today.
42. It thought the PSELs refer to “school leaders” and not specifically or solely “school principals.” Is it true that PSELs apply to both principals and superintendents (or principal supervisors)? [Subsequent the follow-up conversation, it was clarified that PSELs were designed to apply to not only to principals but also school district leaders.]



43. If implementation reduces the PSELs to a checklist then we've lost what really matters. It will have just become rhetorical.
44. Are there any plans for a phase 2 of the principal preparation project? Will there be an opportunity to work on the next steps for implementation?
45. What happens if the State Board of Regents does not adopt the PSELs? Wasn't the goal of the principal preparation project to improve the support from the state for the preparation of future principals and the development of current principals?
46. I don't know if it is all about competencies. There should be a balance between competencies and knowledge and skill. I remember learning basic theories of learning in my preparation. That helped me but it didn't end up being part of what I was evaluated on regularly. We shouldn't lose sight of that.
47. In the end, funding to support this work is an issue. Without those funds going to districts to support the training that happens with their administrators, you'll get [inaudible].
48. There are important responsibilities that apply to superintendents in all of this. If there is a mandate, then the onus will be on superintendents to get in the game. I don't mean just mastering the lexicon. But walking the talk.
49. We should think about differentiating the PSEL implementation. How they apply at one level (elementary) may differ from how they apply at another level (high school). And how they apply in certain communities may vary (urban versus suburban versus rural).
50. SAANYS would like to work with SED to plan for and support the implementation. SAANYS would like to be part of phase 2 of the project (assuming that happens). Embedded professional development seems important.

**MEETING #11: Westchester County, *Empire State Supervisors and Administrators (ESSAA)*, Nov. 21, 2017, 17 attendees**

Prompt: Who does what so implementation benefits current (and future) principals and ultimately student learning?

1. Will any attention be given to the preparation for other administrative roles (besides principal)? I think about my own role as an educational leader. I am the Director of Cultural Affairs in my district. How will the work of the principal preparation project apply to me and support my development?
2. As a dimension, school leadership has many facets. I want to underscore the something. I acknowledge the importance that leadership plays in achieving school success. I firmly believe that anywhere you see a thriving school you have a successful school building leader. I often say I don't think you can find a successful school that has an ineffective principal. The genesis of the term "principal" comes from the idea that there was a principal teacher in the school. The work of developing school leaders is vital to school success.
3. I think we all agree the standards (PSELs) are important. And some of the things in the PSELs are already in the current standards (2008 ISLLC Standards). There are many good things in the existing standards. I don't think we just throw that away. But we add to it.
4. I think about what we can do as school leaders to help those from the teaching ranks to meet the challenges today.
5. I value the experience I gained [as an AP first] in my journey to becoming a principal. It gave me the experience to know and take on the role of a building leader. I learned to wear the many hats that a principal has to wear. I

learned the skillset that matters. Often you hear a new administrator say things like “Until I took this job I didn’t realize all the complexities of the job.”

6. Funding a paid, year-long internship is important. I think of it as like a medical residency. We are seeing less experienced people coming into the principal-ship today. People who are training to become a school principal are squeezed by the realities of having to carry out the duties of their everyday job (as a teacher) while cramming in some experiences during the summer or after school. It isn’t ideal.
7. I don’t think it is a quality experience (the internship) if you have to step out of your teaching job for one period in the middle of the day to take on an administrative task. To be prepared, really prepared, to be a principal you have to be fully immersed in the experience while you an intern.
8. The piece that impressed me was the part about the need for and importance of social intelligence. The importance of emotional intelligence is a big part of the job. I agree that things like school law and school finance matter. But as a principal you have to talk with and relate to so many different kinds of people. There are students and teachers and support staff and parents (all types of parents). Some are anxious. Others are hesitant. Some are angry. You don’t learn this from a book.
9. The internship is essentially the way you get the flywheel moving. Think about medicine again. There are medical rounds. Through that experience, the resident gets to see the full range of the work. That’s real. Principal preparation should be like that.
10. In my experience, some programs do prepare people that way but it is not consistently the case that programs do. I think the internship is the way you learn to see, appreciate, and master the intangibles in this job. The internship, like the job of being a principal, is more than a series of tasks. An important part of this is who is your advisor when you are in the internship.
11. Beyond everything we’ve said here about the importance of the internship, I don’t think we do what we can to help aspiring principals build a network of support among colleagues. I had to start and grow my own network. We each try to do that but with more intentional support it could happen with greater effect. As a state system we could identify exemplary [inaudible] to show the way.
12. PSELs seem to tie together preparation and practice. I would hope that what we create helps us go beyond “luck of the draw”. By that I mean that the field experience that aspiring principals have could benefit from some quality control. It would help if we tightened up the expectations. For instance, specify that all candidates who enter the internship should draft the next school-year budget for the building (other examples cited). With due respect to the researchers and post-docs at our universities, what they are offering may not be what is needed most. Aspiring principals need close contact with a polished practitioner. So many parts of the job of principal are learned on the job. There we tie together our beliefs and knowledge.
13. A high-quality internship is absolutely the key. New teachers are most concerned with classroom management. That is a given. You have to have that (ability) as a principal. To become skilled in that, candidates need to have experience in different school settings. The job is too big to pick up solely through learning in the university classroom. I agree that a paid year-long internship is critical.
14. As a member of the Principal Preparation Project Advisory Team I know we thought about the internship a lot and carefully. We agreed that an internship really matters in the development of future principals. But the reality is that many of those who would consider becoming a principal have a family to support. Often those that do (have a family to support) can’t leave work to do a full-time internship if it means no money is coming into the family. For this reason, the medical model for a residency is a great example for us to consider. It is through a full-year internship that people really see and can learn the value social intelligence.

15. I wonder what the university coursework will look like once the PSELs are adopted. What kind of assurances will be get that higher ed will support preparation in a real and meaningful way? What will (or could) the P20 relationship look like? We need a clear understanding and agreement from higher ed institutions about the focus (on PSELs).
16. I want to revisit this “luck of the draw” idea. The internship is important but I wonder if there is some way to systematize it so the experience is more consistent across the state. During my own preparation to become a principal, I happened to be able to take off from work to do the internship. I was fortunate. But it shouldn’t have to be the case that a full-time, year-long internship is only available to those who can step away from a job for a year. So for me, the “luck of the draw” means that those who are fortunate can have what is needed but others who don’t have the family resources cannot. But “luck of the draw” means something else. The pairing of the candidate and mentor matters. How people are matched up (interns and mentors) is an important consideration.
17. I want to address coaching. In a sport like baseball, no one expects a talented and highly-skilled pitcher to become better without a coach to help perfect technique. Coaching is a necessary condition for success of the team. I think coaching should be viewed as an essential piece of this puzzle. We want to improve how principal effectiveness? Provide quality coaching.
18. I am a school building principal, but I am also on the board of our local college. So I have different perspectives. When it comes to college recruitment and college efforts to attract talented candidates to enroll, I see inconsistencies between how the Ed School and the Engineering School operate. I wish I could say that that the Ed School offered the kinds of incentives that the Engineering School can offer (in order to attract high-quality candidates). On my own, as a school principal, I reach out to talented teachers that I come across and I encourage them to sign on to become a principal. But of course that creates problems for me when my most-talented teachers leave the classroom. But I would still like to see more and better incentives within the field of education so Ed Schools draw the best possible talent into their principal prep programs.
19. I look at the PSELs and especially Standard #3 that addresses equity and cultural responsiveness. I think about how these ought to be woven throughout everything that we do. It should be manifestly evident in how we actualize the curriculum. It should be evident in the culture of the school. It should be clearly a part of our engagement with parents and community. It should pervade.
20. I think coaching and mentoring a vital here. In their university training, candidates may or may not have read a book [about cultural responsiveness] but through coaching and mentoring they can learn what is needed here.
21. A balance is needed between the inspirational aspects of principal preparation and the “nuts and bolts” aspect. It is always important to know how to organize people, time, and money. But how one inspires staff and motivates students and parents and teachers is hugely important. Those who want to become a principal must learn to do both well. It is a daily, moment-by-moment challenge to decide what to do next when faced with a wide range of needs.
22. Understanding change theory is important. Wherever you go as a principal, the reality is that change is imperative. It is here that mentoring can help. I retired from the principal-ship in July and I worked with my replacement to pass along the institutional memory. I didn’t have to force this arrangement into some set pattern. It arose naturally. I said “call me when you have a question or need a sounding board.” Mentoring of this sort is invaluable.
23. This “domino effect” is something I want to address. It can leave a gap whenever a stellar teacher leaves the classroom to become an administrator. I hope that as we do this work in NYS, we don’t think of leadership preparation for teachers as one silo and leadership preparation for principals as another silo. It is really one leadership continuum.

24. It can be an isolating thing if you become a principal and you are in one of our really small districts in NYS. Every day, every principal has to communicate with a variety of people who operate at a variety of levels. There are interactions with professional staff, with support staff, with students, with parents, and with community members. For this reason, the social intelligence factor is really important to the success and effectiveness of a school building leader. As they say, "you're only as good as your last telephone call." You have to be fluid and be able to easily switch gears. When an alarm goes off in the school, you have to be able to shift into the mode that is needed. Unfortunately, often in smaller communities, the district takes a paternalistic approach to recruitment and selection.
25. I think on some things (some of the standards in the PSELs) we can easily check off the box. But other things are not so quantitative. They are more about compassion, fairness, balance. Can we teach those things to a candidate?
26. What is most important in everyone's book is maybe lost in this conversation. I'm talking about safety. I happen to be both a principal and I am an EMT so I know what to do when an emergency incident arises. But how do others? I know there are different types of emergencies. But how do we encourage the system to take the time to prepare people to meet the risks they will face?
27. I think about the Assistant Principal role. Under our APPR system, they (APs) are not subject to the same accountability requirements that principals face. So it isn't surprising that we see fewer people pursuing the job of principal and more pursuing the job of assistant principal. Principals may earn a few more dollars but APs work fewer days and face less risk in terms of accountability under APPR. I wonder whether it would make a difference in the number of those applying to be principal in our schools that struggle most if people knew they could return to their previous position, without jeopardy, in the event that it doesn't work out for them as the principal at a challenging school.
28. I love my job (as principal) but I really miss teaching. My friends in higher education tell me that I sold my soul when I left teaching. They say "You can't go home again." If that's true, it is a shame. I wish we could. If I did, I'd be a better teacher today.
29. I think handling the emotional pressure that goes with being a principal is a real factor. Heck, the best part about being retired is that I don't have to deal with that anymore. But it would really benefit every principal if they had access to a support group of colleagues who were available 24x7. The unrealistic aspect of the principal's job is that it is constant. You are "on" when the busses arrive to greet every student. You are "on" for every meal. You are "on" for every sporting event and play and concert. The thing you can't delegate is the visible leadership, your presence. But there are times you need to confer with someone who gets it. It doesn't seem to be as universally available as it should be to every principal (a network like that).
30. A paid year-long internship would benefit the individual candidate and also presumably the district. I think it is the best of all worlds. The district gets someone that they can "train up" who will take on real tasks. I had the ideal situation when I was interning. I was paid. It was year-long. And I was matched up with a master mentor. But I get it. We all love being comfortable; every human does. But the reality of the principal's job is that we have to get comfortable with being uncomfortable. It is the nature of the job that you find yourself in uncomfortable situations more times than you'd like. I think that smaller rural districts could come together to form a mutual-aid consortium. By pooling, they can create a wider network of resources.
31. For me, the notion of cultural responsiveness is really an important shift for us. No longer are we going to try and fit a round kid into a square hole; instead we're going to alter the shape of the hole to match the shape of the kid. And to go that well, we can't work in siloes anymore.

32. That's big. It changes how we think about the skills we need to help aspiring principals acquire. It changes how we teach in the K12 school and it changes how we teach aspiring principals in the university classrooms. I find that as a principal I am stretched these days to reach and understand how the younger teachers on my staff learn and how they adapt to change. I have to be flexible to be successful in that. We should not lose sight of the importance of instructional leadership in all this. We need continued emphasis on the knowledge and skills related to instruction that is so needed "in the trenches." So many things get in the way of a good, solid clinically-rich experience. That is so crucial to the development of future school building leaders.