

**Illinois Board of Higher Education
Commission on School Leader Preparation**

Date: November 30, 2005

Time: 11:00-5:00 p.m.

Place: Northeastern Illinois University

In attendance: Dianne Ashby and Dea Meyer (co-chairs), Gary Alexander, Debbie Meisner-Bertauski, Diane Dean, Randy Dunn, Norman Durlinger, John Haller, Lisa Hood, Erika Hunt, Jerryelyn Jones, Scott Jones, Cyndi Kuck, Della Montgomery, Dan Montgomery, Nick Osborne, Diane Rutledge (by phone), Christy England-Siegerdt, Bonnie Smith-Skripps, Nehemiah Thomas, Jenny Tripses, and Steve Tozer

Absent: Allen Ellington, Stu Fagan, Alice Hayes, Ross Hodel, Donna Manering, Jeff Mays, Vince Serritella, Fred Singleton, and Walt Warfield

Guests: Arthur Levine, Elliott Regenstein

I. 11:20 a.m. Welcome by Dianne Ashby and Dea Meyer

- The day was divided into two halves. In the first half of the day, Erika Hunt and Lisa Hood presented on data related to the administrative pipeline in Illinois.
- In the second half of the day, Arthur Levine from Teacher's College at Columbia University, presented his findings from *Educating Leaders*, a nationwide study of school leader preparation programs in schools of education. At 3:30, the commission was joined by a number of Illinois university administrators and deans and faculty from schools of education for a "fireside chat" with Arthur Levine.
- For these meetings, the commission's scope has been narrowed into three areas:
 1. How can we articulate and streamline the state review and approval process between the two state agencies, IBHE and ISBE?
 2. What is the state's role with the administrator pipeline (e.g., recruitment, selection, and retention)?
 3. How can the state support exemplary and innovative programs?
- The first question was the topic of the October meeting; the November 30 meeting addressed the topic of the administrative pipeline, and the last topic will be discussed in January.

II. The Illinois Administrative Pipeline (Erika Hunt and Lisa Hood)

Summary of Key Points:

- The purpose of this presentation was to present Illinois data on the administrative pipeline as reported in studies by IERC, Al Azinger from ISU, IL-SAELP, ISBE, and IGPA.
- IERC—a study of Type 75 certificate recipients in 1999-2000 about their reasons for pursuing the Type 75 and their ability to find a Type 75 position.
 - Over 2/3 said they pursued the Type 75 to affect organizational change, the quality of teaching, and curricular changes. Of those who obtained a job, about half said they were encouraged by others to pursue the Type 75, while the majority of non-applicants and applicants had pursued the Type 75 to move up the pay scale.

- Males were more likely to pursue a Type 75 position than females and were more successful than females in obtaining a position. Older applicants were more successful at obtaining a position, and whites were more successful at obtaining a position than African Americans.
- Two routes to Type 75 positions—1) Tapping (a candidate is recruited into the position, and 2) blanketing the field with applications and receiving a job offer. Tapping best serves older, white male candidates than it does women and African Americans.
- Recommendations: Consider more “grow-your-own” programs that tap into potential leaders within their own talent pool. These programs should promote diversity for female and minority candidates, and look for a diversity in leadership and educational philosophies as well.
- Azinger, 2005—a study of school administrators looking at their interest in pursuing the superintendency.
 - 78% said that there was a shortage of applicants for superintendents’ positions. Those who were interested said they were so because they felt they could make a difference in student learning, although many were beginning to lose faith in their ability to influence student achievement. This perceived gap between the position and students was major reason for dissuading some into pursuing the superintendency.
 - Only 10% of those not interested in the superintendency said they would pursue it if there was an alternative certification program.
 - Preparation programs must address how the superintendency can influence student achievement.
 - Increased mandates and micro-management makes the position less desirable. However, interested respondents understood the complexity of the job, and while pay is not the deciding factor to take the position, the pay must be right.
- IL-SAELP—surveys of principals, superintendents, and NBCTs.
 - Almost 90% of principals reported they were satisfied with their jobs. Their primary sources of satisfaction were working with students and teachers, performing instructional leadership roles and seeing an improvement in student learning.
 - Primary sources of dissatisfaction include: increasing pressure by state and federal mandates (e.g., NCLB, testing requirements, special education issues), working with uninvolved and disgruntled parents, staff issues (e.g, conflict, pettiness, contract issues, firing incompetent teachers), lack of time and resources, and student discipline.
 - Superintendents reported that the high school principal, special education administrator, business manager, and middle school principal positions were the most difficult administrative positions to fill. Only 9% of superintendents said that there’s a limited pool of qualified applicants for principal positions in their district.
 - About 1/3 of NBCTs said they would be interested in pursuing an alternative certification route to the principalship. In Illinois, there are

currently over 1,500 NBCTs in Illinois that could be tapped into the position.

- IGPA, Illinois Principals: Instructional Leaders or Endangered Species—study of prospective, current, and retired principals; superintendents, and other education stakeholders.
 - A majority of respondents believed that there will be a shortage of principal candidates in their region. Not only was there a concern about a shortage in terms of numbers of candidates, but also in terms of the quality of candidates as well as a shortage of female and minority candidates. Urban and rural areas outside of Chicago were in most need for attracting candidates.
 - Recommendations: Develop a systematic, statewide system for recruiting and retaining principals. ISBE and college departments of education should collaborate with local school districts to develop and implement high-quality professional development activities. Provide more structural and organizational resources to high need schools (high poverty rates) to improve student performance. Build communities of practice among practicing principals (face-to-face, and electronic communication systems). Recruit retired administrators in professional development activities.
- ISBE, Educator Supply and Demand in 2004—a compilation of data reported by school districts regarding administrator and teacher supply and demand in Illinois
 - Retention of administrators was high (91%), and there was an oversupply of Type 75 recipients (1,829 certificates issues and 709 new administrators hired).
 - About 1/3 of our school districts report a shortage of elementary, jr. high, and high school principals.
 - Elementary principals and other administrative positions are projected to be in high demand over the next 4 years.
 - Over the next 4 years, Illinois is projected to need over 2,700 new administrators.
- Erika Hunt gave a short presentation of the work of IL-SAELP and proposed changes to the principal certification system in Illinois. The proposed changes include: the development of an advanced certification system in which students earn a Type 75 standard certificate after completing a Type 75 certificate program and passing the state licensure exam. After receiving the standard certificate, new principals must participate in the New Principal Program that includes a 1-year mentoring experience and an induction program tailored to the needs of new principals. In the final tier, principals may voluntarily participate in the Master Principal program to earn a Master Principal Designation. The proposal also includes the development of a teacher leader endorsement for teachers who want to serve in instructional leadership roles, but not pursue Type 75 certification and become a principal. There is also provisions for the development of an alternative certification route for NBCTs.
- Comments/Questions from the Commission members:
 - Dea Meyer asked what essential points the commission should take from the Illinois data. The commission should encourage districts to implement grow your own programs that tap into local leadership potential. However,

districts should be deliberate in choosing a diversity of potential leaders, in terms of gender, race/ethnicity, and philosophies.

- There was some discussion surrounding the teacher leader endorsement and how it will add to the career pathways for teachers. Currently, Type 75 preparation programs are the only option for teachers who want leadership preparation, whether or not they wish to pursue the principalship. The teacher leader endorsement will allow teachers to receive leadership training without participating in a Type 75 program, which may lead to less people who enroll in these programs for purposes other than pursuing a principal position, allowing Type 75 programs to focus on those who aspire to the principalship.
- Should the Type 75 program meet the principals' needs for particular districts, or should they meet these needs at a broader, state level? Ultimately, we have to ask, how many principals do we have in Illinois that can significantly improve teaching and learning in our schools? In relation to this question, recruitment, selection, and certification are all issues that impact the state's leadership capacity to improve student achievement in Illinois' schools.

III. Presentation by Arthur Levine

Summary of Key Points:

- Due to economic, demographic, institutional, and political pressures, the job of principals has changed. Before principals had to be good managers, now we need leaders who can remake our schools by: a) employing an effective curriculum, b) improving pedagogy, c) aligning curricula with standards, d) effectively conducting and using assessments, e) recruiting and preparing staff to achieve learning goals, and f) building a strong sense of community within and around the school. Currently, we don't have these leaders and we don't prepare people to become these leaders.
- In response to criticisms of education schools, Levine conducted a 5 year study to repudiate or validate claims that schools of education were not effectively preparing the nation's educators. Data were collected from surveys of faculty, alumni, and principals, and in case studies of 28 schools of education.
- Conclusions from this study were worse than Levine thought. Currently, the US has few strong leadership programs, and he had 3 major findings. 1) The curricula do not provide the foundation principals need to do the job. 2) The standards of admission are too low. 3) Faculty members are spread too thin and there is not a good balance between academicians and practitioners leading to a disconnect between coursework and districts' needs.
- Levine and colleagues found 1 model school leader preparation program in England, the National College of School Leadership. This is a government agency that ties the quality of preparation to student achievement. The program is built around career stages of the school leader, has a practice-based curriculum, and blends faculty employing practitioners and academicians.

- Three recommendations came out of the Levine report.
 - Eliminate the incentives that promote low quality. This includes eliminating the pay structure that rewards teachers for accumulating credits and degrees; and stop using these programs as cash cows.
 - Set and enforce minimum standards for quality. Evaluate current programs to strengthen those that are mediocre. In Louisiana, they've been most aggressive in this area, some programs were strengthened and others were closed. A state has to ask itself, how many programs does the state need?
 - Redesign programs. Strengthen the master's degree, or maybe create a rigorous Master's of Educational Administration, similar to an MBA, taught by a blend of academicians and practitioners, includes an internship, and leads to a terminal degree.
- Educational leadership programs are under siege, and there is increasing competition from for-profit institutions to take our place. Voluntary efforts to reform school leadership programs have not been sufficient, and some states have been very active in reforming these programs such as Delaware, Louisiana, and Massachusetts. Authority to improve programs lies with the state. State agencies can improve programs through reauthorization, pushing university administrators, creating a program like the National College of School Leaders (the British agency), changing salary structures, and promoting districts to grow their own leadership pool.
- Questions to Levine from the Commission members:
 - What role do university presidents play in improving educational administration programs? How can we get presidents to move on this issue?
 - It has to get on their agenda. Stakeholders have to make this issue visible. Legislators, governors' offices, and state agencies can bring this issue to their attention. A question to consider is do you want to do this to yourself or have it done for you? (i.e., do you want to take the initiative to examine your school leadership programs and make the necessary changes, or do you want the state or some other agency to force changes upon you)?
 - What about accreditation?
 - Accreditation has not done the job. To get a job as a principal one does not have to be a graduate/completer from an accredited program. Less than half of all programs are accredited and schools of education are increasingly feeling competition from for-profit, non-traditional school leadership preparation providers.
 - The accreditation system is weak. Levine's work found that of the Top 10 Schools of Education, only 3 are accredited. Of the bottom top 10, a majority are accredited.
 - Accreditation leads to box-punching. The program checks off the boxes, but quality is not assured.
 - Only states have the power to drive higher level criteria to push forward quality in these programs.

- There was a comment regarding the weakness of leadership at all levels of the chain in the state.
 - State structure inhibits strong leadership at IBHE, ICCB, ISBE
 - Colleges/Schools of Education can make a difference in their programs if they take the initiative. But, change is often difficult because faculty often do not have the skills to facilitate change.
- What carrots can the state provide to promote higher quality programs?
 - Colleges/universities might earn a monetary reward for developing a high quality program.
 - They might earn extra support/resources for developing a strong program.
 - The state can highlight exemplary programs in the press.
- Arthur Levine urged the commission to take a very strong stand and make strong recommendations, otherwise the recommendations will be ignored.
- Steve Tozer made the comment that in our recommendations we should keep in mind that the clientele of school leadership programs is not the aspiring principals, but it is the schools and students who will be led by the principals we prepare. Ultimately, preparation of principals should be centered around gaining skills and knowledge needed to improve student achievement.

IV. V. After the presentations, members were asked to reflect on recommendations we should take forward, including the following:

There were several areas in which commission members felt there should be more investigation to target our recommendations.

- Commission members might consider looking at opening up principal preparation to more non-traditional providers. One example is the Massachusetts plan in which organizations submit a proposal to an RFP to provide a preparation program. Often these programs are a collaboration of school districts with at least one higher education institution.
- The commission should look into the state's process for reauthorizing programs.
- There should be a recommendation for more specific recruitment and selection criteria. Before admitting a student, faculty should get a clear view of what the student wants to achieve. If a student want to enhance their teaching skills, then they might go into another master's of education program. But, if they want to be a principal, then they would be a good candidate for a school leadership program.
- Commission members might consider examining the professional standards (e.g., ISLLC or ELCC) that drive school leadership programs. Are they on target? We may need to re-examine them, re-tool them, and then re-tool our programs to match the new standards.
- Clinical experiences is another area of recommendations. Good clinical experiences go hand-in-hand with good mentoring. We have a couple programs in Illinois (e.g., CPS and Springfield) that might server as models for recommended changes to internship experiences.

- Each program in the state should be evaluated collecting student achievement data from schools where graduates are employed. Principals' supervisors and teachers who are being led by the graduate could also give information about the principal's performance.
- Commission members should consider recommendation for hard-to-staff areas.
- There was a suggestion to convene a joint commission or task force with IBHE and ISBE joining forces to implement the recommendations set forth by this commission, and holding programs accountable to improve their effectiveness.

The meeting of the commission was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

3:30 Fireside Chat with Arthur Levine

RSVP Attendees of the Fireside Chat: Gary Alexander (IBHE), Dianne Ashby (ISU), Jay Braatz (DePaul), Martha Casazza (National-Louis), Elnora Daniel (Chicago State), Diane Dean (ISU), Maria Donovan (DePaul), Anthony Dosen (DePaul), Randy Dunn (ISBE), Sherry Eagle (Aurora), Patricia Elmore (SIUC), Christy England-Siegerdt (IBHE), Charles Evans (UIUC), Lawrence Frank (NEIU), Maureen Gillette (NEIU), Don Hackman (UIUC), Alison Hilsabeck (National Louis), Dennis Holtschneider (DePaul), Lisa Hood (ISU), Erika Hunt (ISU), Clara Jennings (DePaul), Scott Jones (William Penn Elementary), Daniel Julius (Benedictine), Andrea Kaufman (DePaul), Paul Keys (Governors State), Karen Lea (Olivet Nazarene), Arthur Levine (speaker, Teacher's College), Richard Magner (National-Louis), Andrew Manion (Aurora), Carol Maxson (Olivet Nazarene), Debbie Meisner-Bertauski (IBHE), Dea Meyer (IBHE), Wilma Miranda (NIU), Della Montgomery (Morrisonville Elementary), Michael Odell (ISU), Nick Osborne (EIU), Lee Patton (NIU), Peter Pereira (DePaul), Rebecca Sherrick (Aurora), Carolyn Shields (UIUC), Celina Sima (UIC), Bonnie Smith-Skripps (WIU), Gary Streit (Olivet Nazarene), Bill Summers (Olivet Nazarene), Kathryn Tooredman (National Louis), Steve Tozer (UIC), Jenny Tripses (Bradley), James Upchurch (Olivet Nazarene)