

Crosswalk of Members' Positions

*Based on members' position papers as presented to the task force
(Includes those strategies with 2 or more supporting organizations--listed in order of frequency)

Position/Strategy	Organization									
	CPS/OPPD	CLASS	IAASE (Special Education Administrators)	IADPCE/Public College Deans' Group	ICPEA	IEA	IFT	ISSMA/Alliance (IPA, IASA, IASB, IASBO)	LUDA	Council of Chicago Deans (Prasse)
Field-based Experiences/Internships (Rigorous and 1 year & course-embedded)		X	X	X			X	X	X	X
Selective admissions process/criteria	X			X	X		X	X		
Relevant/research-based curriculum	X		X				X	X		X
University-district partnerships			X	X	X		X		X	
Rigorous certification exam					X	X	X	X		
Align leader preparation and professional development			X				X	X		
Differentiate or reserve Type 75 for principals & create new endorsements for leaders/differentiate programs in response				X	X		X		X	
Keep Type 75 "as is"		X						X		
More teaching experience (at least 3-4 "effective" years— effective to be defined)		X					X			

Integrated Analysis of Members' Position Papers

This is a qualitative thematic analysis of members' position papers and the discussion during the January 8 meeting. This analysis attempts to integrate member statements as they are related to each other rather than an analysis based on frequency of responses.

1. A Continuum of School Leader Development.

Several members suggested that we identify a continuum of school leader development recognizing that what a beginning principal should be expected to know or do is different from a master principal. There was also an indication that school leadership should recognize diverse forms of school leadership that begins with teacher leaders (or teachers who assume leadership responsibilities), aspiring leaders and encompasses assistant principals, principals, master principals, and other forms of building leaders (e.g., special education directors, department chairs, deans, etc.). This continuum might also stretch out to include superintendents and other district-office leaders.

For the purposes of this task force, members agreed to remain within the realm of the principalship (or other areas of leadership closely affiliated with the principalship). We need to identify the leadership characteristics (i.e., knowledge, skills, and dispositions) of principals at varying stages of development on the continuum. Jason Leahy, representing the Alliance, suggested that we use the leadership characteristics of Master Principals (identified in the Illinois Distinguished Principal Leader Institute) and backward map the characteristics of principals at stages before the Master Principalship. These characteristics would be the outcomes, or benchmarks, by which the principal preparation and development system would be held accountable.

This continuum could then be used to articulate a system of preparation and professional development that would develop leaders with the skills needed at each stage. This continuum would inform:

- the admissions process and criteria to be admitted into preparation programs,
- the curriculum and field-based experiences/internships,
- assessments of candidate performance,
- the certification exam,
- induction supports,
- continuing professional development, and
- principal evaluation

John Murphy, representing ICPEA, said that our efforts to develop and support school leaders should be a systems approach and this continuum would inform this systemic approach. Several other members (including members of the Alliance, Carlene Lutz and Ed Geppert from IFT and Judith Hackett from IAASE) recommended that preparation programs and professional development programs should be aligned. Members from CPS' Office of Principal Preparation and Development provided this summary:

- What are the "look-for's"/attributes/competencies of high potential school leaders?

- What kind of curriculum grows these “look-for’s/attributes/competencies in potential school leaders?
- How does one structure internships that enhance these “look-for’s”/attributes/competencies in potential school leaders?
- How does one assess at the time of program completion for evidence of proficiency in the desired “look-for’s/attributes/competencies?”

At its very essence, this system would be focused on creating learning-centered leaders, and the attainment of high student performance for ALL Illinois students would be the ultimate test of the system’s efficacy.

2. University and School District Partnerships

In the position papers and in task force discussions, members generally agree that university and school district partnerships are integral to the effectiveness of the preparation principals receive. These quality and work of these partnerships should focus on each of the strategies listed above (e.g., admission policies, curriculum development and implementation, field-based experiences and internships, and assessing candidate performance). Universities and districts may work together in a variety of functions to form advisory groups and grow-your-own programs. These partnerships should be a win-win opportunity for both the preparation program and the school district. Diane Rutledge said that the ISU-Springfield program was invaluable to producing school leaders who “hit the ground” running. The district profits by helping develop a program that meets the districts’ needs for highly effective school leaders; and the program benefits by having access to district resources (e.g., clinical sites, school staff serving as adjunct faculty).

Many members, particularly deans and program faculty, have raised the point that creating university-school partnerships may be difficult in some areas due to the size and scope of the preparation program’s service, particularly for some programs that serve very small, rural districts. However, it may be possible through creative collaborations to form partnerships with these schools on a regional basis by recruiting the help of certain agencies to facilitate these partnerships (e.g., regional offices of education). There should also be guidelines and criteria for selecting school sites and for outlining the partner responsibilities and commitments.

3. A Selective Admissions Process

Five members’ position paper explicitly stated that preparation programs should develop a more rigorous admissions process that screens applicants for their potential to be highly effective school leaders. April Ervin described the New Leaders for New Schools process which uses a multi-phase approach in which applicants must provide evidence of demonstrated leadership performance.

Linda Shay emphasized screening for those applicants that show a willingness and capacity for adaptive leadership (vs. technical leadership) who recognize a broader purpose for schooling to engage all stakeholders and to be able to adapt to the conditions of the school and community. Several members stated that applicants should possess and demonstrate that they can identify what good instruction is.

4. A Relevant and Research-Based Curriculum

The Alliance stated that the curriculum in preparation programs should reflect the real work of principals. Judith Hackett from IAASE stated that this curriculum should include instruction on student data analysis, interpretation and use as well as emphasizing a shared responsibility for all students including recognizing and meeting the diverse needs of students (e.g., special education, ELL/bi-lingual, and at-risk). Ed Geppert and

Carlene Lutz (IFT) emphasized the importance of helping principals learn how to foster a shared school culture. They said “A respectful and supportive atmosphere must be established by the principal in collaboration with teachers and school-related personnel. The principal must recognize that the school extends beyond just classes—that it includes students’ continuing social education through numerous extra-curricular activities, along with open communication with parents and other community members.” Members said the curriculum should:

- Teach current research-based practices that result in greater student outcomes
- Emphasize visionary leadership that will foster a healthy and prosperous school climate
- Have PK-20 learning as their focus
- Be aligned to other preparation and professional development programs (e.g., teacher leader programs, the Illinois Mentoring Program, the IAA, and the Illinois Distinguished Principal Leader Institute)
- Incorporate meaningful and diverse field-based experiences that benchmark candidate development and performance
- Incorporate rigorous assessments that monitor candidate development, using this information to remediate or counsel out candidates and make programmatic improvements as necessary

Diane Rutledge, representing LUDA and reflecting on her experiences as superintendent of a LEAD district, stated that integrating the curriculum with course-embedded internships/field-based experiences allowed students to apply the knowledge they learned in the classroom into school settings. The candidates then used these experiences as a source of classroom discussion, personal reflection, and writing and research. The district and preparation program provided a diverse set of experiences for candidates to expand their knowledge and skills. Many other members stated the need to integrate field-based experiences into the curriculum to improve the curricula’s relevance to the real-world of the principalship.

5. Rigorous and Relevant Internship Experiences.

Seven of the ten organizations that presented position papers mentioned the importance of meaningful and sustained internship experiences. Several members said that ideally internships would be year long—much like a residency (CLASS, IAASE, IADPCE, LUDA, Prasse). In order that these internships are rigorous, members suggested that preparation programs:

- Employ clinical faculty to supervise interns and assess their performance
- Train mentors
- The state, university, and school districts pursue multiple sources to fund internships

Echoing the sentiments of fellow members, Faye Terrell-Perkins, representing CLASS stressed the importance of “rigorous year-long internships with standard benchmarks as a measure for evaluating candidates’ success.”

Diane Rutledge stated that these internships should provide authentic experiences in which interns “experience a school from beginning to end; build relationships with students, staff, and families; and have the time to develop their skills, values, and beliefs.”

6. A Rigorous Certification Exam

Several task force members suggested that the certification exam that principal candidates must pass in order to earn Type 75 certification (IEA, IFT, ICPEA, Alliance) must be rigorous and reflective of the principals’ duties. Jo Anderson, representing IEA, said that improving the rigor of the

Type 75 assessment exam is the intervention with the greatest leverage for improving principal preparation. Furthermore, doing so would allow the system to focus on outcomes rather than inputs and drive improvements in all other elements in the system. This certification exam should be aligned with agreed-upon standards. During the discussion, some members suggested that the exam may be more than just a paper-and-pencil test.

7. State-Wide Database

Several members suggested that the state develop a state-wide data system that tracks graduate performance linking multiple indicators of student performance outcomes (e.g., achievement test scores, attendance, mobility, graduation and drop out rates). These data will enable personnel from school districts, colleges, state agencies, and the legislature to evaluate the efficacy of the principal preparation system and make informed decisions to improve it as necessary.

Final Notes:

Many members, particularly our deans and preparation program faculty, strongly urged that the standards or requirements that are developed from this task force should be required of ALL preparation programs across the state regardless of their status as a private or public college program, as an online program, or as a program offered by an alternative provider.

It was also noted that the strategies identified by this task force should address the needs of schools and students in ALL regions of Illinois including students in Chicago, urban, suburban, and rural locations.

Finally, Diane Jackman, as a representative the IADPCE, alerted the task force to the fact that some of these strategies may necessitate additional resources. She noted that the state's Colleges of Education have not received a base budget increase in the last eight years. Therefore, with that in mind, the task force will need to think about the strategies they decide to undertake, the resources the changes will demand, and where these resources will come from. At this time, it is safe to assume that the majority of the load will be placed on the universities and school districts, but the task force is encouraged to press the state to provide the necessary resources to carry out these strategies.