

<i>Title</i>	<i>Publisher, Author, Source</i>	<i>Copyright</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>How this Informs Principal Preparation Project?</i>
Internship Portfolio Evidence Chart	State of Illinois/North Central Illinois College	2015	A rubric for internship assessment, based off of five different “Field Projects”, with three sub categories (Focus Area, Artifacts and Evaluation). Each “Field Project” focuses on one attribute of principalship; SIP (school improvement) & Data, Teacher Development, Management, ELL/Special Ed, and Residency. The three sub categories all have different rating systems, based off of subject matter and grade level.	It’s a good way to see how another example state is using assessment to judge the success of a Principal Candidate. As we do not yet, have a consistent model of pre-service principal assessment. Seeing how Illinois uses the model to vet out those will potentially make a good school building leader, gives our project extensive knowledge on different practices.
Delaware School Leader Prep Program Initial Meeting	Delaware Department of Education	2015	A PowerPoint presentation on new legislation passed by the Delaware State Senate. This legislation is in regards to changing policies on school leadership. The bulk of the PowerPoint goes over the new program qualifiers set-up by the Delaware State Education Department in educator preparation programs in Delaware. IHEs will now have to obtain satisfactory scores on a rubric designed by the Delaware Education Department in order to retain principal preparation programs at their institutions. The rubric has five domains that are rated per program; Recruitment/Selection, Placement, Retention, Graduate Performance and Perceptions. Each domain weighted differently in points; 15, 15, 10, 50 and N/A respectively. Between the five domains there are fifteen scoring metrics; Recruitment/Selection (Candidates teaching performance, diversity of candidate class, selectivity rate), Placement (Placement within 1 year, placement within 2 years, placement in DE high-Needs Schools), Retention (Retention in admin), Graduate Performance (school growth, student growth in HN, School level growth, observation scores, overall performance evaluation ratings, overall performance rating in HN schools) and Perceptions (Graduate’s perception of preparation experience and LEA’s perception of preparedness of program grads).	This PowerPoint gives an example on how it may be possible to gauge the success of a Principal Prep Program at any IHE. It also brings up the point of how involved should the state education department be in program approvals when it concerns state educators.

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs Principal Preparation Project?
Great Principals at Scale	Jacquelyn Davis, Benjamin Fenton, Gina Ikemoto, Lori Taliaferro	2014	A paper that goes along with the Great Principals Toolkit, listed later. New Leaders and the Bush Institute's Alliance to Reform Education (AREL), along with leaders in the field of education generated a framework outlining the conditions necessary for transformational school leaders to succeed. Four key strands of the framework; strand one: Alignment among goals, strategies, structures and resources. Strand two: Culture of collective responsibility, balanced autonomy and continuous learning and improvement. Strand three: effective management and support for principals with on-going opportunities for development and feedback and most notably, roles and responsibilities that are feasible. Strand four: systems and policies to effectively manage talent at the school-level, giving principals the authority to implement staffing models that meet school needs and to appropriately staff teaching and leadership positions.	This paper gives insight on what kind of conditions may be needed in order to present change within principal preparation. It gives us an opportunity to look at how Principal Preparation conditions may work and may not work in improving candidates and students.
Redesigning Principal preparation and Development for the Next Generation: Lessons from Illinois	Center for the Study of Education Policy: Illinois State University, Debra Baron, Alicia Haller	2014	This paper gives insight to the steps that the Illinois State Education Department undertook in order to strengthen principal preparation. Using the following six key elements Illinois has been able to reboot their principal preparation programs; targeted endorsement, formal program/school district partnerships, selective admission, P-12 licensure, performance-based internships, and collaborative support structures for candidates. The conclusion of the paper includes the Illinois state Education Department's plans to implement new policies and their "five year" plan of success; including models on quality assurance, mentor training and assessment of candidates/sitting principals. These new regulations were prompted from an initial statewide consortium in 2000, and still are in progress.	A lot of the new regulations passed by the State of Illinois bare striking resemblance to those ideas the Principal Preparation Project has already began research on. I think the most important element we can take from this paper is looking at the time-frame of work. What began in 2000 and is still an endeavor for the State Education department, informs our group that the likelihood of achieving our project speedily is naught.

<i>Title</i>	<i>Publisher, Author, Source</i>	<i>Copyright</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>How this Informs Principal Preparation Project?</i>
Operating in the Dark	Kerri Briggs, Gretchen Rhines Cheney, Jacquelyn Davis, Kerry Ann Moll	2013	The largest portion of this paper is snapshots of individual states, and the District of Columbia's policies and regulations on principal preparation and licensure. Authors took six months and came to this conclusion; States are ineffectively using their authority, in turn many states lack critical data to enable them to use their authority. The report categorizes the type of missing data as; "supply data"- basic information on their principal supply and this have no way of knowing whether they are producing the right numbers of new principals to step into SBL roles, and "performance data" – States have almost no information about how their newly prepared and licensed principals perform once they are on the job. This report claims that without this essential data it is difficult to distinguish successful principal prep programs from unsuccessful programs. This report also determines that in 2013 only 27 states adopted the 2008 ISLLC standards. This report offers five State policy recommendations; States must set standards to undergird their entire principal system, States should adopt and implement rigorous program-approval standards, move from in-put based requirements to performance-based requirements, license renewal based on job performance, and States need to develop or leverage their existing investment in statewide longitudinal data systems.	This report gives an excellent overview of how States are managing principal preparation programs using a few base elements as a guide. It is interesting to see where New York falls amongst other states and I think that a few things that the report brings up are topics that have been brought up in the Principal Preparation Project. Their policy suggestions are broad and vague, and I do not believe they would be an asset to our project, but the data within I think would help to guide our team on policy suggestions.

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs Principal Preparation Project?
The Research Base Supporting the ELCC Standards	University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), Authors: Dianne Taylor, Margaret Terry Orr, Diana Pounder, Gary Crow, Pamela Tucker, Michelle D. Young, Hanne Mawhinney,	2013	<p>The ELCC Standards were developed from the well-known 2008 ISLLC (Interstate Leaders Licensure Consortium) Standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Standard one, building-level leader collaboratively facilitates the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a shared school-vision.</li> <li>o Standard two, building-level leader create and evaluating a comprehensive rigorous and coherent curricular and instructional school program; developing and supervising the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff; and promoting the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning with a school environment.</li> <li>o Standard three, building-level leaders ensure the management of the school organization, operation and resources through monitoring and evaluating the school management and operational systems efficiently using human, fiscal and technological resources in a school environment; promoting and protecting the welfare and safety of school students and staff.</li> <li>o Standard four, building-level leaders collaborate with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources on behalf of the school by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to improvement of the school's educational environment; promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of the diverse cultural, social and intellectual resources with the school community; building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers; and cultivating productive school relationships with community partners.</li> <li>o Standard five, building-level leaders act with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manner to ensure a school system of accountability for every student's academic and social success by modeling school principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency and ethical behavior.</li> <li>o Standard six, building-level leaders understand, respond and influence the larger political, social, economic, legal and cultural context through advocating for school students, families and caregivers.</li> <li>o Standard seven, building-level leaders participates in a substantial and sustained educational leadership internship that has school-based field experiences and clinical internship practice within a school setting and is monitored by a qualified, on-site mentor.</li> </ul>	<p>These standards are reflective of many national standards put forth on school building leadership. This report gives excellent references to the research used to develop the standards for SBLs. We have included NCATE standards in many of the paperwork included with the Principal Preparation Project, but seeing the research behind the standards could prove to add more information.</p>

<i>Title</i>	<i>Publisher, Author, Source</i>	<i>Copyright</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>How this Informs Principal Preparation Project?</i>
School Building Leaders Study Guide Set B	New York State Education Department	2013	This is a sample exam with answers for part B of the revised SBL certification exam. The first section gives test takers three documents followed by seven multiple choice questions. The second section gives the test taker five documents followed by four tasks; address human capital issue (task 1), address a long-term human capital issue (task 2), and task 3 and 4 address approaches to take with specific teachers. The third section gives test takers information and asks test-takers to provide written responses to four different prompts. The information being tested in this sample exam relate to	Although this is just one part of the NYS SBL exam, it offers insight on what NYS expects their SBL candidates to be informed on before entering the field.
The Professional Pipeline for Educational Leadership	University Council for Educational Administration, Dallas Hambrick Hitt, Pamela D. Tucker & Michelle D. Young	2012	This paper seeks to outline the distinct phases of building the professional pipeline, share research concerning effective practices for each, and draw attention to the inter-related nature of the phases. The pipeline phases regard pre-service (preparation) and in-service (practice). Pre-service educational leadership pipeline has three bases from which recommendations are made; recruitment of candidates into preparation programs, selection of candidates for preparation programs, and structure and delivery of preparation programs. In-service educational leadership pipeline has three bases from which recommendations are made; recruitment and selection into professional positions, induction of novice leaders, and professional development for practicing educational leaders. Each base has anywhere between three to four recommendations focusing on enrichment and individualizing aspects of programs and in-service.	The professional pipeline gives excellent examples on how to create pipelines of success for candidates and sitting school building leaders. Highlighting what aspects would help to draw out, establish and promote the best of the best.

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs Principal Preparation Project?
Our Responsibility, Our Promise	The Council of Chief State School Officers, Tom Luna, Terry Holliday, Virginia Barry, Mitchell Chester, Judy Jeffrey, Christopher Koch, Rick Melmer, Jim Rex, Melody Schopp, David Archer, Jeanne Burns, Brenda Gullett, Steven Pound, Patrick A. Guida esq.	2012	<p>The report was composed by a task force made up of current and former chiefs who are members of the Council of Chief State School Officers, National Association of State Boards of Education, and the National Governors Association. The report attempts to focus on state policy levers chides can activate, it is clear that the work required by these recommendations is not easy and will require the leadership and collaboration of all stakeholders involved in P-20 education. The main focus of this task force is on teacher and principal preparation and entry into professional roles. The report gives ten specific actions that could be carried out by states; revise and enforce their licensure standards for teachers and principals to support the teaching of more demanding content aligned to college- and career- readiness and critical thinking skills to diverse range of students<sup>1</sup>, work together to influence the development of innovative licensure performance assessments that aligned to the revised licensure standards and include multiple measures of educators' ability to perform, including the potential to impact student achievement and growth<sup>2</sup>, create multi-tiered licensure systems aligned to a coherent developmental continuum that reflects new performance expectations for educators and their implementation in the learning environment and to assessments that are linked to evidence of student growth<sup>3</sup>, reform current state licensure systems so they are more efficient, have true reciprocity across states, and so that their credentialing structures support effective teaching and leading toward student college- and career- readiness<sup>4</sup>, hold preparation programs accountable by exercising authority to determine which programs should operate and recommend candidates for licensure in the state- including a clear and fair performance rating system to guide continuous improvement<sup>5</sup>, adopt and implement rigorous program approval standards to assure that educator preparation programs recruit candidates based on supply and demand data, highly selective admissions, high quality clinical practices<sup>6</sup>, alignment of preparation content standards to P-12 college- and career-ready standards for all licensure areas<sup>7</sup>, provide feedback, data , support, and resources to preparation programs to assist them with continuous improvement and to act on any program approval or national accreditation recommendations<sup>8</sup>, develop and support state-level governance structures to guide confidential and secure data collection, analysis and reporting of P-20 data and how it informs educator preparation programs, hiring practices and professional learning<sup>9</sup>,Use data collection, analysis, and reporting of multiple measures for continuous improvement and accountability of preparation programs<sup>10</sup>.</p>	The most significant piece that can be taken from this report is the state recommendations. It outlines what role the state needs to play in order to change principal preparation programs and the environment for principals to operate. As the authority, the state needs to have an active role, and the project needs to assist in addressing how the state can maintain and active role. This report gives those means.

<i>Title</i>	<i>Publisher, Author, Source</i>	<i>Copyright</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>How this Informs Principal Preparation Project?</i>
Six Districts Begin the Principal Pipeline Initiative	Brenda Turnbull, Derek Riley, Erikson Arcaira, Leslie Anderson, Jaclyn MacFarlane	2013	Leaders in all districts report wanting to enlarge their pools of strong applicants for principal positions and to identify and cultivate leadership talent as early as possible in educators' careers. There were six districts participating as grantees in the Principal Pipeline Initiative the following four initiatives were undertaken by the districts in order to establish the pipeline: (1)with stakeholder participation, they have developed standards and identified competencies for principals, which they plan to use to guide principal training, hiring, evaluation and support; (2)they are initiating or strengthening partnerships with university training programs; (3) for hiring, they have standard performance task and are developing systems to capture data of candidates' experience; (4)they have diagnostic evaluation tools and are working to build the capacity of principal supervisors and mentors to support principals' skill development. This is the first report, discussing the districts' plans on implements the initiatives and setting out an achievable timeline.	A fair amount of literature that has been dissected by the Principal Preparation Project discussed the important of building relationships between Principal Preparation, Institutions of Higher Education and School Districts. This article gives an example of how districts could be an actively creator of principal pipelines. Another key from
Making Sense of Higher Ed "Innovation"	Rick Hess	2013	This short article is a precursor to a larger brief "Beyond Retrofitting", written by Hess and Andrew Kelly. The paper reads like an introduction to the grander idea of retrofitting changes rather than producing innovations in the realm of higher education. Hess looks to the readers, the state, higher education and accrediting institutions to embrace four basic principles; (1) focus on outcomes rather than the act of delivery. (2) Openness to new providers. (3) Unbundling. (4) Portability.	Hess delivers a good point, that should be recognized by the project- Institutions of Higher Education and the State need to be open to new ideas and to innovation within education; "Change with the times" if you will.

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs Principal Preparation Project?
Beyond Retrofitting: Innovation in Higher Education	Hudson Institute Initiative on Future Innovation, Andrew Kelly, Frederick Hess	2013	This paper voices the opinion that with the advances in technology, we have the opportunity to develop innovations within Higher Education. Rather than embrace the possibility of innovation though, there has been a “cartelization” of higher education. States, accreditation, and institutions of higher education continue policymaking as protectionist, attempting to keep competitors out of the market. Current policy seemingly would rather retrofit old standards instead of innovating new practices. As mentioned in Article #13, Hess and Kelly suggest four basic principles; Compare providers based on the quality of the product rather than how they produce it levels the playing field between incumbents and challengers1. Transformative innovation typically springs from new market entrants2. Advances in technology have made it possible to unpack a bundle of goods and services into their component parts and sell them separately, enabling customization and lowering of prices3. An unbundled market requires that students have the freedom to procure discrete segments of learning from an array of providers and assemble them in useful ways4. Hess and Kelly also make the argument that technology is not the same as innovation and that; innovation is new directions, instructions, assessments and credentialing. The paper’s final point is that, we cannot simply look at the “supply side” but also pay attention to the “demand side”, to see what is needed in the field and innovate from there.	This paper says directly, something that many of the other papers allude to; the current practices prevent innovation for new practices. Having Hess and Kelly bring up the key points on how these institutions prevent innovation, even though change is necessary. The suggestions set forth by Hess and Kelly give excellent examples of how innovation could be curated in NYS or any state.
State Policies on Principal Evaluation: Trends in a Changing Landscape	National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, Catherine Jacques, Matthew Clifford, Katie Hornung	2012	This brief provides a snapshot of new state-level policy on principal evaluation and describes reasons for policy change as represented in state policy language and trends in policy content. Every state included in this brief had previously been winners of funding from Race to the Top (RTTT). Research and federal policy encourage states to redesign principal performance evaluation methods to reflect contemporary standards of professional practice and to use multiple measures- including student performance- to gauge principal effectiveness. Research on implementing principal evaluation policy suggests that the patchwork of systems is not serving principals well either. In the brief the reader can see that in 2012 NYS had passed legislation regarding a principal evaluation system. Included is also the timeline NYS had for implementation of the new legislation; 2011-2012, but NYS was lacking in providing any information on pilot, field testing or gradual implantation timeline. The review indicates that a majority of RTTT states include student growth data and community feedback as significant components of the evaluation system.	The most key feature to take from this brief in regards to the Principal Preparation Project is that out of the states who had won RTTT money, NYS comparably did the least amount with the funding in regards to principal evaluation. Reading through the brief, outside of being included in two graphs, NYS and their efforts were not used in any positive examples of making principal evaluation work. This cites a lack of implementation, and follow-up on assessment of sitting principals in regard to student and school success and growth.

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs Principal Preparation Project?
First-Year Principals in Urban School Districts	Susan Burkhauser, Susan M. Gates, Laura S. Hamilton, Gina Schuyler Ikemoto.	2012	This report uses research done on six school districts partnering with New Leaders on their first year principals; Memphis City Schools, Chicago Public Schools, New York City Public Schools, Washington D.C. Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, and the Oakland (California) Unified School District. Within their first year in position, new principals are expected to either maintain or improve student achievement of their school. This report answers questions on retention, achievement, principal function, time allocation, school environment, and future plans. The report discovers that first year principals in low performing schools are more likely to leave after the first year, as there is a desire to “trade-up”. There is no finding to denote the “secret to principal success” in their first year. Although there are findings that first year principal that immediately collaborate with staff, and create school cohesiveness have the best chance in their school. The writers of this report developed a survey to send out to review existing principals. There are tables on the gains of first-year principals in reading and mathematics, ratios of retention projections, and achievement outcomes for schools. The final tables are correlations and comparisons between results of the various survey results.	The best information we can gain from this report is that there is high turnover rates for under-served schools and the rates of turnover by race as well. It helps to inform our project that we need to develop practices to protect under-served schools to assist with performance. There are few suggestions, and the findings are based off of only six school districts, so it is difficult to see how the small variable pool relates to whole states or the nation.
Using Competencies to Improve School Turnaround Principal Success	University of Virginia: Partnership for Leaders in Education, Lucy Steiner, And Emily Ayscue Hassel	2011	This paper aims to shed light on one element of leaderships: the characteristics, or “competencies” of turnaround leaders who succeed in driving rapid dramatic change. Secondly, to recount the elements of support that districts must provide these leaders to enable and sustain a portfolio of successful school turnarounds. This paper describes how using competencies that predict performance can improve turnaround principal selection, evaluation and development and summarize prior research about how districts can create the right environment to increase school turnaround leader success. According to this paper, the nation must identify far more leaders to turn around persistently failing schools. Competency-based selection for critical leadership positions would enable selection from much wider labor pool-turnaround leaders from other sectors and emerging teach-leaders, for example. This paper lays out keys to developing competencies; determine performance criteria, collect data, develop model, competency training, self-development, stretch roles or assignments and mentoring.	This paper focuses primarily on just turnaround schools and not on principal prep programs or principals as a whole. A lot of the suggestions revolving around competencies make sense for our project to note, as to better understand what improving current expectations of Principals knowledge and abilities could do to change student outcome. I would hesitate to use much from this paper, as it has been made abundantly clear that using the term “turnaround” is not popular in New York State. Like the previous paper Article #15, this paper concentrates mainly on how to improve the quality of a sitting principal in order to improve student achievement, but there are no clear ways on gauging how to achieve this sentiment within the article.

<i>Title</i>	<i>Publisher, Author, Source</i>	<i>Copyright</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>How this Informs Principal Preparation Project?</i>
Importing Leaders for School Turnarounds	University of Virginia: Partnership for Leaders in Education, Julie Kowal and Emily Ayscue Hassel	2011	This report explores the of how schools and organizations in other sectors import leadership, including what it takes to tempt people away and how firms help make leaders successful in a new setting. The writers of this paper Use the challenges and critical next steps for applying those lessons to importing leaders for turnarounds of chronically failing schools. According to SIG and RTTT schools must replace top leadership in persistently low-achieving schools, and based off of the research conducted for this paper competencies of principals in turnaround schools differ from successful leaders in already high-performing organizations. A suggested action plan from this paper follows; focus on a few early wins, break organizational norms, push rapid-fire experimentation, get the right staff, right the remainder, drive decisions with open-air data, and lead a turnaround campaign. This paper makes the claim that there are potentially thousands of untapped talent pools for leadership outside of the education setting. There are three groups cited in this paper who import leadership for their schools; New Leaders for New Schools (NLNS), The Broad Residency, and Education Pioneers. Rather shuffling un-successful principals around districts, allowing new talent to enter gives opportunity for student achievement with fresh eyes. In education as in other sectors, the optimal approach to meeting a talent shortage will ideally use a combination of two approached: drawing high-potential turnaround leaders from among our current principal and teacher ranks, and importing high-potential turnaround leaders from outside the education sector.	This paper, gives excellent reasoning to expanding the traditional requirements for school building leaders in New York State. In NYS, all SBL's must have completed in-classroom time, but this paper suggests that perhaps education leadership should operate like many other sectors and allow for outside sectors to be SBLs. It draws most of its conclusions from successes in outside sectors or schools that are not convened with the same laws as public institutions. I think that the action plan set-forth in this paper is informative and could lead to excellent input on establishing norms for SBLs, but I think the research on hiring outside sectors for SBLs, is weak.
Accomplished Principal Standards	National Board for Professional Teaching Standards	2011	The national board gives nine prepositions for accomplished educational leaders, these propositions are broken up into three categories; skills, applications and dispositions. Skills; accomplished educational leaders continuously cultivate their understanding of leadership and the change process to meet high levels of performance (leadership), accomplished educational leaders have a clear vision and inspire and engage stakeholders in developing and realizing the mission (vision), and accomplished educational leaders manage and leverage systems and processes to achieve desired results (management). Applications; accomplished educational leaders are committed to student and adult learners and to their development (learners & learning), accomplished educational leaders drive, facilitate and monitor the teaching and learning process (instruction), accomplished educational leaders act with a sense of urgency to foster a cohesive culture of learning (culture). Dispositions; accomplished educational leaders model professional, ethical behavior and expect it from others (ethics), accomplished educational leaders ensure equitable learning opportunities and high expectations for all (equity), and accomplished educational leaders advocate on behalf of their schools, communities and profession (advocacy). After laying out the nine standards, the paper takes each standard into more detail, outlining why they chose the standard, how it can better school leaders, and benefit students.	As the long term goal of the project to improve student performance by improving school building leaders, recommendations and research on standards for high-performing principals is beneficial to our advisory team. This paper clearly lays out their suggested standards, which would be easy to compare against current standards and comment on what may be missing from NYS standards, or perhaps what this paper has overlooked as important. Being able to reference multiple scholarly articles with well researched standards will help to support any standard recommendations that may come from the Advisory Team in May.

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs Principal Preparation Project?
Closing the Talent Gap: Attracting and retaining top-third tier graduates to careers in teaching	McKinsey & Company, Byron Auguste, Paul Kihn, Matt Miller	2010	<p>The first point made by this analysis paper is that, most countries with well-performing academia has made school systems with great teaching their “north star”, creating strategic and systematic approaches to attract, develop and retain high-quality teachers- the United States have not taken this approach. The analytics of this paper focuses on the “top third+” strategy. Recruiting and retaining educators that come from the top third of the academic cohort, and then screened farther for important qualities. By contrast in the United States, only 23% of current teachers come from the top third of the academic cohorts, and 14% of those teachers working in high-needs school districts. How do countries like South Korea, Finland and Singapore create high achieving cohorts; by creating rigorous, highly selective training programs for their future teachers. All three countries offer competitive financial compensation, in order to attract the best and the brightest. There is also a feeling of social prestige for teachers in high performing countries, and teaching is a critical priority for the nation. In the US, most students do not see teaching as a prestigious career, or well-paying-which in turn, puts off many top third students from pursuing education as a field. The first suggestion laid out in this analytical paper for the US to improve teachers is to pay for their education, if they are in the top third. A second suggestion is increased compensation for teachers; wherein districts will base compensation on teacher performance and then increase student/teacher ratios for those educators deemed high-performing. A third suggestion was for districts to look to grant funding in order to increase budgets for hiring high-quality top third recruits for their turn-around efforts. The paper stresses the necessity for instructions of higher education, to no longer view teacher preparation programs as “cash cows”, as a means to fund more prestigious departments. Using, Teach for America as an example, of highly selective recruitment for education positions in high-needs areas, taking from the top third.</p>	<p>The biggest idea that we can take away from this paper, is their suggestion that the United States and subsequently individual State’s need to invest in education. In order to be on a level with countries that produce the best in academic cohorts, the US needs to put money and tighter regulations on the process of creating educators. This best informs our project because teaching experience is currently one of the standards required by NYS in order to become a school building leader. If we begin from the ground and move up, we can start a process which only success high-performing teachers teach, and then from that pool, principals can be recruited. They will seemingly be better prepared and more knowledgeable creating successful schools.</p>

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs Principal Preparation Project?
A New Approach to Principal Preparation	Rainwater Charitable Foundation, Gretchen Rhines Cheney, Jacquelyn Davis, Kelly Garrett, Jennifer Holleran	2010	<p>This paper makes the argument that school building leaders are not being prepared, vetted, mentored or trained to engage a school for success the way that they should be. The Rainwater Leadership Alliance (RLA) represents a portfolio of promising principal preparation programs that are on the forefront of innovation, exploring a new path forward. All of the programs working with the Rainwater Charitable Foundation's leadership alliance, adhere to the following six design elements; 1. RLA programs start by defining a Competency Framework—the set of skills, knowledge, and dispositions that a principal must have in order to drive high levels of student achievement for all children. This set of standards uses the school as the lens to identify the most 10 a new approach to principal preparation important things high-performing principals must know and be able to do. The program then takes responsibility for finding candidates who can master these competencies and preparing them to be effective school leaders. 2. RLA programs rely on strategic, proactive, and targeted recruiting strategies to ensure that they have strong candidate pools and pipeline programs from which they can select candidates most likely to thrive in the program and grow into effective principals. 3. RLA programs are highly selective and establish clear criteria and rigorous processes to evaluate applicants' disposition, skills and knowledge. RLA programs require candidates to demonstrate their skills and dispositions through experiential events to evaluate whether candidates' behaviors and actions match their stated beliefs. 4. RLA programs believe that training and development need to be experiential, giving trainees authentic opportunities to lead adults, make mistakes, and grow. The development sequences are intentionally coordinated and integrated and include coursework; school-based residencies that take into account trainees' strengths and weaknesses; meaningful assessments; and ongoing coaching and feedback. 5. RLA programs believe that ongoing support for graduates to help them transition and grow on the job is important. RLA programs are clear that their interest is not only serving the individual, but supporting the leader to drive change school-wide to improve student achievement results.</p>	<p>The RLA, has done a lot of work to determine quality of these pilot programs put on by two districts, three university based programs, and four nonprofit providers. I think the first thing we can take away from is the nonprofit providers; NYS currently retains the exclusive right to certify SBLs to Institutions of higher education, it might prove fruitful to continue research on the outcome of the nonprofit providers in creating high-quality SBLs. Elements four and five, are very reflective to responses we have garnered from survey's and the advisory team; speaking to the importance of high-quality internships pre-service and having a high-quality mentor/trainer in-service. It would be meaningful to our project to follow up with the RLA in order to see more recent outcomes from each of the programs they worked with, what had worked and what had not worked. The more research we can provide when final recommendations are made to the board, the better for our project's success and the success of students.</p>

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs Principal Preparation Project?
Expanding the Pipeline of Teachers and Principals in Urban Public Schools	Public impact, Julie Kowal, Bryan C. Hassel, Research assistants; Sarah Crittenden, Jacob Rosch.	2009	<p>This report presents findings from the foundations' third research inquiry; analyzing best practices in expanding the pipeline of outstanding teachers and principals who are prepared and committed to urban education. Their analysis outlines common lessons from across these organizations with regard to their design and context. Design Principles; recruitment- the majority of the nation's most promising pipeline programs take an aggressive approach to recruitment 1, selection- the organizations profiled in this report are strategic about selecting new teachers and principals, through carefully chosen selection criteria and a rigorous screening process 2, training- leading pipeline programs engage their participants in both coursework and an in-school practicum, flipping proportions of coursework and on-the-job training to provide extensive experience 3, retention- efforts are aimed at improving the quality of teachers' and principals' work environments, through continuous learning opportunities and intensive support during the first few years on the job 4. Conditions for Success; commitment to full program- leaders in most of the pipeline programs have found that it is critical to have buy-in to the program at the district level as well as among other community leaders 1, strong working relationship between the district and the local union 2, alignment with other reforms will produce a larger impact 3, robust data system- prioritize regular analysis of student achievement data as a major element of the program 4, flexibility with regard to state, local and district policies 5, specific fee arrangements and costs to assist districts with quality recruitment 6. Following the introduction of the principles and conditions the report gives multiple tables as examples to compare programs and what was being offered, redacted or changed. There is a useful checklist chart for each organization that informs locations, program participants, scope, training, and district relationship.</p>	<p>This work best informs our project by concentrating on Urban schools, and turn-around schools. It gives researched, tested examples regarding conditions of success and principles. The most important thing we can take from this report is the charts they offer in the appendix. These charts give a quick/simple picture of the state of principal pipelines by organization. The charts ask for; location, program participants, scope, coursework, practicum/residency, time period, university partner, credential/degree, change in job roles, change to assignment policies, changes to compensation, and fee arrangement. Using something similar with districts could help us assess needs, retention policies and training. Similarly with universities/colleges, a form could be used to assess internships/training, programs and graduates.</p>
Enhancing Leadership Quality	The National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality	2008	<p>This brief describes the educator career continuum to school leadership preparation; preparation/licensure, recruitment/hiring, induction/mentoring, professional development, working conditions, salaries/incentives, and performance management. And how, this continuum addresses the following growing issues with leadership; principalship has become more demanding, principal shortages threaten schools, teacher retention is greatly influence by school leader quality, stability of principals affect student learning and school improvement requires commitment from a team of outstanding principals and teachers. An example of some of the strategies suggested by the brief in order to improve teacher leaders; value and respect the role and work of teachers, provide technical support for teacher leaders, provide affirmation for teachers' leadership, promote and facilitate collaboration, provide opportunities to analyze student achievement data, encourage teachers to participate in professional networks.</p>	<p>The best information our project can gain from this paper is the idea that the training aspects of school building leaders is cyclical. There's no one part greater than the other and all levels of work need to be attained in order to perform well as a sitting SBL. The conclusion gives excellent examples of how to develop great SBL's from promising teachers, how districts can promote and support potential teacher leaders into larger roles.</p>

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs Principal Preparation Project?
ISLLC Standards 2008	Council of Chief State School Officers	2008	<p>The ISLLC 2008 standards have been designed to serve as a broad set of national guidelines that states can use as a model for developing or updating their own standards. The Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008 organizes the functions that help define strong school leadership under six standards. These standards represent the broad, high-priority themes that education leaders must address in order to promote the success of every student. These six standards call for; setting a widely shared vision for learning<sup>1</sup>; developing a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth<sup>2</sup>; ensuring effective management of the organization, operation and resources for a safe, efficient and effective learning environment<sup>3</sup>; collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, mobilizing community resources<sup>4</sup>; acting with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manner<sup>5</sup>; and understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, legal and cultural context<sup>6</sup>. Appendix 1 has a comparison between ISLLC 1996 and the ISLLC 2008 standards. Appendix 2 has the six standards listed and the functions of each standard.</p>	<p>These standards reflect the new information and lessons learned about education leadership, in 2008. NYSED adopted the 2008 standards in 2011, and now five years on there are new standards PSEL, meaning that even the standards adjust for changes in the education field. The CCSSO say the standards are meant to serve as a foundational piece for policymakers as they assess current goals. This article can help the project see specifics on the standards which have been adopted by NYSED, and give us the framework for what differences the 2015 PSEL standards offer-when considering adoption of new standards.</p>

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs Principal Preparation Project?
Key Issue: Improving the Preparation of School and District Leaders	National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality	2007	<p>The first example in this paper is a sitting principal who did well in her SBL program but did not feel prepared in real-world situations, and then the paper gives strategies on how to prepare successful principals. Strategy one is to establish state leadership standards, aligned to national standards, that clarify what leaders need to know and do to improve teaching and learning. Strategy two is to prepare and recruit diverse cohorts of highly qualified candidates, including men and women who can serve in urban and rural settings and lead low-performing schools. Strategy three is to use state financing strategies to support exemplary principal development programs. Strategy four is to create state-level infrastructure in order to best provide for ongoing principal professional development. Strategy five is coordinate state and district leadership training for a more cohesive approach to leadership improvement. Strategy six is to develop leadership preparation programs that integrate internships and coaching with academic coursework. Strategy seven is to design a comprehensive and coherent curriculum that is aligned with state and professional standards. Strategy eight through a cohort structure and formalized mentoring program, provide social and professional support. Strategy nine says to provide candidates with well-designed and supervised administrative internships. Strategy ten is to create innovative pathways to leadership certification using the following guidelines; encourage districts and universities to work together, develop criteria and screening processes to identify and recruit potential school leaders, move accomplished teachers into leadership positions, create alternative processes for principal licensure, set up screening procedures and award licenses to candidates who complete alternative routes to become principals, and establish support systems for candidates who go through alternate routes to become principals. Strategy eleven is to design in-service programs that offer a well-connected set of learning opportunities based on theory and practice. Strategy twelve is to provide executive training programs and ongoing support for school superintendents. Strategy thirteen is one strategy for hiring high-quality school superintendents is to recruit and train nontraditional candidates.</p>	<p>Part of our charge is to make suggestions or reflect on the current standards for preparing SBLs. This paper offers twelve strategies on how to better prepare principals for real-world situation. Our project can garner new perspectives from these strategies, and determining how we could use them as frameworks for creating competency based quality performance measurement.</p>

Title	Publisher, Author, Source	Copyright	Findings	How this Informs Principal Preparation Project?
Successful School Leadership – What it is and how it influence pupil learning	National College for School Leadership	2006	<p>It is clear that the field urgently needs research aimed at better understanding patterns of distribution, their relative consequences, how they develop and the challenges to their development. The four broad categories of practices identified in these research summaries include: Setting Directions; Developing People; Redesigning the Organization and Managing the Instructional (teaching and learning) Program. The distributed perspective also suggests ways of thinking about intervening to change leadership practice. It offers a frame to help researchers in the leadership field build evocative cases that can be used to assist practitioners in thinking about their ongoing leadership practice. It also provides a basis for investigating a more comprehensive and complex set of leadership practices that go beyond the checklists of characteristics, skills and strategies that remain prevalent in the leadership field. The majority of the evidence available about the internal antecedents of successful leadership has been collected in non-school contexts. Evidence about leaders' problem solving skills and values are the main exceptions to this claim; there is enough evidence about these internal states to draw moderately robust conclusions. Despite limited research about other cognitive and affective antecedents of school leaders, in particular, there seems little reason to doubt the validity, for school organizations, of evidence collected in non-school contexts. It is the best evidence we have and well worth taking into account when making decisions about the selection of potential future leaders, for example. Moving this research agenda forward in school contexts seems well worth encouraging, as well. Helping the staff develops an inspiring and shared sense of purpose enhances teachers' work, whereas holding (and expressing) unreasonable expectations has quite negative effects.</p>	<p>The most important piece to pull from this paper, is that in order to make influential changes to school leadership we need to vet better data, in order to answer the questions of improvement. The paper offers a frame to help build cases, which could be applicable to our project as well. Again, the biggest complaint is accurate data and how to produce more of it. Without evidence we will, much like the writers of this paper, have a tough time really keying into the most problematic issues with leader preparation.</p>
The Principal Internship: How Can We Get It Right?	Southern Regional Education Board	2005	<p>Responsibility for appropriate internships should lie across the leadership preparatory system. Barely a third of the universities require aspiring principals to lead activities that create a mission to improve student achievement and a vision of the elements of school, curriculum and instructional practices that make higher achievement possible. Preparing school reform leaders is not high priority. Principal interns are more likely to follow than to lead. Leadership departments and school districts are not working together to provide well-structured, well supervised internships for aspiring principals. Many interns are under-supported during internship. Current systems for developing and placing a qualified principal in every school are unreliable. Programs need to have collaboration between universities and local school districts and opportunities to work with diverse populations of students, teachers, parents and communities. Programs are not providing the quality of "hands-on" experiences that would prepare aspiring principals to lead the essential work of school improvement</p>	<p>This paper echoes a lot of the conversations that have taken place at the advisory team meetings, better/longer internships produce more qualified principals, and that student achievement should be the highest priority. This paper, also gives a point on how a tracking tool for hiring could help qualified principals find positions in school districts best suited for their aptitude. The paper suggests that programs should be looked at, and evaluated on whether they can provide hands-on experiences to students, in order to better prepare them for real-world situations.</p>

<i>Title</i>	<i>Publisher, Author, Source</i>	<i>Copyright</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>How this Informs Principal Preparation Project?</i>
The Accreditation Game: Can accreditation ensure quality teacher training?	Education Next Website, Sandra Vergari & Frederick Hess	2002	This paper gives a brief explanation of what NCATE is; The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) was launched in 1954 by a coalition of professional organizations from across the education community. Previously, teacher-training programs had been accredited by states, regional accrediting bodies, or an association of teacher colleges, each equipped with its own benchmarks and methods of evaluation. NCATE aimed to professionalize teaching by establishing national standards for accreditation. Although most states or education systems have deeply rooted reliance on NCATE accrediting university/college programs for teacher education. This paper argues that perhaps the standards NCATE uses are not a consensus or enforced for accreditation. Many different schools have registered complaints that the NCATE process is burdensome, and does not quantify the value of an education preparation program. Fourteen of the top twenty-five graduate schools of education are not accredited by NCATE. The report continues on to give an alternative to NCATE, like the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC).	This is an interesting article but no longer appropriate to our project as both NCATE and TEAC are now part of CAEP. This article does make a good point that the accrediting agencies need to be checked in on to be sure they are really holding IHEs to high levels of excellence.