



STATE POLICY FRAMEWORK TO DEVELOP HIGHLY QUALIFIED EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS

Nancy M. Sanders, Ph.D.
Director
Interstate Consortium on School Leadership

Joe Simpson, Ed.S.
Deputy Executive Director
Leadership and Professional Development

December, 2005

Funding to support development of this paper has come from member states of the
Interstate Consortium on School Leadership

© 2005 Council of Chief State School Officers
All rights reserved.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Recent research has drawn attention to the importance of strong leadership for district and school improvement, particularly to turn around low-performing districts and schools. Accountability requirements under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) are shining a spotlight on district and school-level achievement data, which in turn increases attention to administrators' responsibilities for student achievement. Even before the passage of NCLB, states were developing policies to improve district and school leadership as a key component of school improvement.

The policy framework described here was developed in response to requests from state constituents for data and assistance with improving administrator quality, particularly to meet the challenges of NCLB. The framework emerged from meetings of the Interstate Consortium on School Leadership (ICSL), convened by the Council of Chief State School Officers to address critical policy issues. State education agency (SEA) representatives have shared resources and experience about specific policy strategies and identified common needs to guide the Council's activities. (A list of SEA participants is provided at the end of the report.)

Across the country, a great deal of promising work has been done and is underway to develop and retain highly qualified educational administrators. State policy makers have pursued a wide array of policy strategies, reflecting differing policy contexts, but the common national theme is that accountability pressures increase administrators' responsibilities for school and student success. A basic principle underlying the framework is that because of the importance of local leaders for improving teaching and learning, states should be responsible and accountable for certifying that all districts and schools are served by highly qualified administrators. A second basic principle is that state leadership policies should realign and prioritize administrators' roles and responsibilities to focus on improving teaching and learning.

State policy strategies and options are categorized into five **key state policy levers**: *professional certification, professional standards and assessments, professional preparation, professional development, and state reporting and accountability for administrator quality*. For each policy lever, a set of indicators have been identified to describe and monitor trends and provide a checklist for state policy analysis. Part I of the report outlines the framework and indicators and provides a national snapshot of state policy data, with examples to illustrate current state leadership policies and needs. Recent national survey data collected by the Council provide this snapshot and identify topics for future data collection. The appendices provide state-by-state data and examples.

Since recent federal and state education reforms have increased the scope and complexity of administrators' roles and responsibilities, the framework has a **developmental dimension**. The qualifications needed by effective administrators in the current policy environment are too extensive to be attained in entry-level training and should be developed through a combination of initial preparation, early career induction and mentoring, and sustained support and career-long guidance from a coherent policy system. In order to define a developmental continuum, professional expectations and evidence of administrator quality should be performance-based and benchmarked at strategic points along an administrator's career continuum.

The career continuum begins with criteria to identify and recruit qualified aspirants into the field of administration (or other local leadership roles) and extends across progressively higher expectations and more challenging roles and responsibilities of administrators in districts and schools. Leaders who have demonstrated high levels of success can be identified to serve in specific expert roles, as mentors, coaches, and turn-around specialists. The matrix below lays out the concepts of the policy framework, with the five key state policy levers listed down the left column and major career stages listed across the top. The indicators and data in the report provide details for using and interpreting the framework.

Framework of State Policies to Develop Highly Qualified Administrators

| Key State Policy Levers | Highly Qualified Administrator Career Stages | | | | |
|--|--|-------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|
| | Aspiring | Entry level | Early career | Advanced career | Mentor, coach |
| 1. Certification requiring continuous improvement | | | | | |
| 2. Leadership standards and performance-based measures | | | | | |
| 3. Criteria for administrator preparation programs | | | | | |
| 4. Criteria for professional development | | | | | |
| 5. State accountability and reporting | | | | | |

Even within the array of strategies currently being used in states, the data indicate that most state activity has been focused on a limited set of policies and problems within the framework and primarily on entry level qualifications. The data and examples illustrate the components of a coordinated, systemic approach across all levers and career stages in relation to state needs and priorities. Roles and responsibilities should be coordinated among all partners who contribute to developing highly qualified administrators, not just SEAs.

Part II of the report provides background for users of the framework, relating the national policy context to state needs and describing major national efforts over the past two decades to improve administrator quality. Recent reviews of research literature help situate the framework in leadership research and begin to identify contributions and limitations of the research to inform policy.

PREFACE

For the past decade, the Council of Chief State School Officers has worked with state constituents in state education agencies (SEAs) to improve policies and practices of local administrators. As the convener of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) from 1994-1996, the Council published the original Standards for School Leaders that were developed through collaboration of member organizations in the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (described further in Part II). The ISLLC Standards for School Leaders have become national model standards for state policies and programs for educational administrators. The Council also oversaw contracts funded by states from 1997 – 2004 for development of leadership assessments.

In 2002, the Council commissioned a needs assessment of states to determine how to support and improve state policies and programs for educational administrators. The results of the needs assessment and recommendations of a focus group resulted in the decision to convene SEA representative in the Interstate Consortium on School Leadership (ICSL). The meetings would address critical issues in improving local leadership policies and practices.

The Council provides ICSL as a service to SEA constituents. The purposes are to (1) build state capacity for improving policies and practices of educational leaders by sharing expertise, experience, and resources; (2) create a professional network among SEA constituents who have major responsibilities for state policies of administrator certification, standards, testing, preparation, and professional development; and (3) collaborate on national projects and products. State participation has grown steadily from the original ten states in 2003 to the current twenty states in 2005-06. A number of other states have expressed interest in joining but report that they lack funds for the participation fees or travel.

STATE NEEDS TO DEVELOP HIGHLY QUALIFIED ADMINISTRATORS: FRAMEWORK AND DATA

As an outgrowth of national discussions focused on the major policy challenges facing states, ICSL participants identified the need for a coherent, systemic, state-level policy framework to develop highly qualified administrators. Although many states have made significant progress toward systemically-aligned policy structures, the urgency has been accelerated by recent federal policies of strong accountability in No Child Left Behind (NCLB). States need policies and strategies for developing educational administrators who can meet the challenges they face under NCLB, especially for improving low performing schools and increasing achievement of all students. In addition, states need systematic data and examples of the policy structures to inform policy analyses. Organizing this descriptive data provides a step toward better understanding the current status and trends in state policies and identifies strengths and gaps in state policy systems.

In order to provide a national snapshot and comparative state data, in 2004-05 the Council added an extended section on policies about educational administrators to the biennial Key State Policies Survey. The data are organized as indicators of each policy lever in the framework and

reported in Part I. As a first approximation, the data provide a broad snapshot in time that is continuously changing as policies are developed, enacted, changed, abandoned, and de-funded. Since early drafts of this report, a number of changes and corrections to the data have been reported. The Council plans to make the report and data available online so that they can be updated. The current information is limited by the first-time nature of this data collection and the moving target that the data represent.

THE KEY STATE POLICY LEVERS AND INDICATORS

State policy strategies and options are categorized into five **key state policy levers**: *professional certification, professional standards and assessments, professional preparation, professional development, and state reporting and accountability for administrator quality*. For each policy lever, a set of indicators have been identified to describe and monitor trends and provide a checklist for state policy analysis. Part I of the report outlines the framework and indicators and provides a national snapshot of state policy data, with examples to illustrate current state leadership policies and needs. Recent national survey data collected by the Council provide this snapshot and identify topics for future data collection. The appendices provide state-by-state data and examples.

The key state policy levers are identified as the critical components of a coherent state policy system.

- **Certification** emphasizes clarity of state-level responsibilities for administrator quality, including coordination and delegation of authority to districts and schools. The data indicate that all states have or are developing state-level certification requirements and programs or requirements for continuous improvement.
- **Professional standards and assessments** articulate expectations to guide policies, programs, and practices. Particularly when performance-based, standards and assessments establish the basis for quality assurance and evidence about effects of programs and practices.
- **Professional preparation programs** are responsible for the qualifications and success of entry-level candidates on the job. Programs and individual learners should be guided by clear expectations set out in performance-based standards and assessments, with continuity provided through early career support on the job.
- **Professional development programs** are used by states to determine recertification and continuation of administrators in jobs. Professional development, particularly to meet challenges of NCLB, is the critical means for attaining high levels of professional performance and for retaining effective leaders in administrative positions. Programs and individual learners should be guided by clear expectations set out in performance-based standards and assessments about increasing levels of leadership responsibility and kinds of roles needed to improve district and school performance.
- **State reporting and accountability for administrator quality** completes the system by providing data about numbers, quality, and effects of policies. States should monitor the qualifications of administrators across districts and schools, particularly those identified

as low performing. States should monitor and report on the use of professional standards and assessments in programs and the technical qualities of professional standards and assessments, particularly for certification decisions. States should monitor and report on effectiveness of preparation and professional development programs, and, as suggested in recent research and in some states, begin to investigate the relationships among indicators of administrator quality, program quality, and district or school outcomes.

A NATIONAL SNAPSHOT AND IMPLICATIONS

The framework and indicator data organize a vast amount of information for the first time to provide a national snapshot and begin to track national trends. There is a great deal of evidence that states have taken responsibility for providing qualified administrators for every district and school. A number of states have proceeded more or less strategically and systematically to develop systemic policies. For example, states have developed certification criteria tied or aligned to professional leadership standards such as the ISLLC Standards for School Leaders. They have developed assessments and strategies for overseeing and supporting preparation and professional development to align with the professional standards and certification processes.

However, the data also indicate that most states' policies are focused at the entry level, to assure that beginning practitioners have appropriate professional qualifications to be successful on the job or at least, as a minimum criterion for employment, demonstrate sufficient qualifications to do no harm. Increasingly, state policy makers recognize that entry-level expectations are not sufficient for success on the job and have developed policies and programs to improve qualifications along the career continuum. As accountability and expectations of administrators increases under state and federal reforms, preparation and ongoing professional development programs have to increase or refocus the time and content of professional training.

New approaches include differentiated leadership roles, distributed leadership responsibilities, emerging conceptions of leadership focused on teaching and learning. There is currently no evidence for a "one-size fits all" approach or simple solutions across states, but there is broad agreement that state leadership policies should realign and prioritize administrators' roles and responsibilities to focus on improving teaching and learning.

While the national data and examples provide a snapshot of promising state efforts, they mask fiscal cutbacks and other obstacles to new state efforts or even to maintain existing progress. The Council is responding to state needs by gathering systematic information, developing the National Educator Leadership and Training Center to make resources widely available on-line, and convening state agency personnel in ICSL to leverage existing products and experience.

PRINCIPLES GROUNDING THE FRAMEWORK

SEA representatives articulated a set of principles to ground the framework:

- States should be responsible and accountable for certifying that all districts, schools, teachers, and students are served by highly qualified administrators.

- State leadership policies should realign and prioritize administrators' roles and responsibilities to focus on improving teaching and learning rather than simply adding to existing expectations.
- State leadership policies should be performance-based, with continuous improvement required and assessed along the career continuum.

INTENDED USES FOR THE FRAMEWORK

In addition to providing a frame for a national snapshot of current state policies, the framework, indicators, and examples offer an array of options for strategic planning, examining system coherence, recruiting partners, and monitoring policy effectiveness. The state-level focus does not imply that the state should regulate or provide all policy levers. The framework is intended to help map and distribute roles and responsibilities among SEAs, districts, intermediary agencies, preparation and professional development providers, and other partners who contribute to developing highly qualified educational administrators.

It can serve as a policy heuristic or guide to:

- Assess state system coherence and completeness: Does the *system* (state, districts, program providers, and other partners) address and coordinate all the policy levers across the career continuum, clarifying responsibilities, roles, and expectations.
- Gauge state progress, identify state needs, and set priorities. What are areas of statewide policy strengths and gaps, based on data about highly qualified administrators? What resources and examples are available from other states?
- Identify gaps in state systems for research and collaborative projects. What are state policy gaps that need to be informed by research or development efforts? What resources are available nationally to support research and development efforts?

UPDATING THE ISLLC STANDARDS FOR SCHOOL LEADERS

As expectations of administrators are increased, policy makers have identified the need to update the ISLLC Standards for School Leaders (CCSSO, 1996). The ISLLC Standards serve as a common language, provide a model for state standards, and have become de facto national leadership standards. They were written a decade ago, prior to current state and federal educational reforms that emphasize importance and accountability of local leaders for teaching and learning. The Council has agreed to undertake the update and additions through a broadly inclusive process that draws on extensive experience and expertise of states with leadership standards and standards-related policies and programs. The updated ISLLC Standards will be performance-based and organized to guide design of performance-based assessment measures.

ICSL members have agreed to a broadly inclusive process that will engage state stakeholders to develop recommendations for updating the Standards. The updating process will be open to all states and coordinated at the national level with the National Policy Board for Educational Administration and its constituent members in professional organizations. The Council will also

coordinate new products with updating the Educational Leadership Constituent Council's program standards, based on ISLLC, that are currently used by the National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education to accredit administrator preparation programs. For more information about that work, consult the Council's website pages for the Interstate Consortium on School Leadership.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------------|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | i |
| PREFACE | iii |
| PART I: KEY STATE POLICY LEVERS AND INDICATORS OF HIGHLY QUALIFIED LEADERS | 1 |
| POLICY LEVER 1: THE STATE CERTIFIES HIGHLY QUALIFIED ADMINISTRATORS AND REQUIRES CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT ACROSS THE CAREER CONTINUUM | 3 |
| Indicator 1.1 | 3 |
| Indicator 1.2 | 4 |
| Indicator 1.3 | 6 |
| Indicator 1.4 | 6 |
| POLICY LEVER 2: THE STATE ESTABLISHES PROFESSIONAL ADMINISTRATOR STANDARDS AND USES PERFORMANCE-BASED INDICATORS AND MEASURES OF ADMINISTRATOR QUALITY, BENCHMARKED ALONG THE CAREER CONTINUUM | 8 |
| Indicator 2.1 | 8 |
| Indicator 2.2 | 9 |
| Indicator 2.3 | 11 |
| Indicator 2.4 | 12 |
| Indicator 2.5 | 13 |
| Indicator 2.6 | 13 |
| Indicator 2.7 | 13 |
| POLICY LEVER 3: THE STATE ESTABLISHES PERFORMANCE-BASED CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL OF ADMINISTRATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS AND POLICIES TO RECRUIT DIVERSE, QUALIFIED ASPIRANTS; PREPARE CANDIDATES TO MEET ENTRY-LEVEL BENCHMARKS; AND SUPPORT EARLY CAREER SUCCESS | 17 |
| Indicator 3.1 | 17 |
| Indicator 3.2 | 19 |
| Indicator 3.3 | 19 |
| Indicator 3.4 | 19 |
| Indicator 3.5 | 21 |
| Indicator 3.6 | 21 |
| Indicator 3.7 | 21 |
| POLICY LEVER 4: THE STATE REQUIRES PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR CERTIFICATION AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT OF LEADERSHIP PRACTICES AND TO SUPPORT AND RETAIN EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATORS ON-THE-JOB | 23 |
| Indicator 4.1 | 23 |
| Indicator 4.2 | 24 |
| Indicator 4.3 | 24 |
| Indicator 4.4 | 24 |
| Indicator 4.5 | 26 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| POLICY LEVER 5: STATES GATHER AND USE PERFORMANCE-BASED EVIDENCE OF ADMINISTRATOR QUALITY FOR STATE ACCOUNTABILITY AND PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT | 28 |
| Indicator 5.1 | 28 |
| Indicator 5.2 | 28 |
| Indicator 5.3 | 28 |
| Indicator 5.4 | 29 |
| Indicator 5.5 | 29 |
| Indicator 5.6 | 29 |
| | |
| PART II: BACKGROUND ON STATE POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR DEVELOPING HIGHLY QUALIFIED ADMINISTRATORS | 31 |
| Principle 1 | 39 |
| Principle 2 | 39 |
| Principle 3 | 40 |
| | |
| REFERENCES..... | 41 |
| | |
| APPENDICES..... | 43 |
| Appendix A: Key State Policy Levels and Indicators: A Checklist for States | 43 |
| Appendix B: 2004-05 State Data on Key State Policy Indicators for Improving Administrator Quality | 47 |
| Table 1: Indicator 1.1 | 47 |
| Table 2: Indicator 2.1 | 49 |
| Table 3: Indicator 2.2..... | 51 |
| Table 4: Indicator 2.4..... | 53 |
| Table 5: Indicator 4.1 | 55 |
| Table 6: Indicator 4.3..... | 57 |
| Appendix C: Sample Issues for State Policy Review..... | 59 |
| Appendix D: Selected Examples from State Agency Reports..... | 61 |
| Appendix E: Interstate Consortium on School Leadership 2004-05 Participants..... | 63 |

**PART I: KEY STATE POLICY LEVERS AND
INDICATORS OF HIGHLY QUALIFIED LEADERS**

Data Source: CCSSO 2004 Key State Policies Survey
(n = 51; 50 states + District of Columbia)

POLICY LEVER 1: THE STATE CERTIFIES HIGHLY QUALIFIED ADMINISTRATORS AND REQUIRES CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT ACROSS THE CAREER CONTINUUM.

- Indicator 1.1 The state regulates or provides oversight of administrator quality and qualifications.
- Indicator 1.2 The state has tiered certification and establishes expectations for continuous improvement along the career continuum of highly qualified administrators.
- Indicator 1.3 The state sets expectations for specialized certification or particular leadership roles.
- Indicator 1.4 The state provides alternative certification opportunities for candidates to meet state standards to address pressing state needs; for example, providing highly qualified administrators in hard-to-staff rural areas.

Indicator 1.1 The state regulates or provides oversight of administrator quality and qualifications.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirements for Certification of Employment as a Local Administrator (See Appendix B, Table 1) |
|------------------|--|
| 51 | Report some form of state-level regulation or oversight over administrator qualifications, through state certification, requirements for entry-level positions or continuing employment, or requiring local districts to exert oversight |
| 38 | Require completion of a preparation program |
| 38 | Require a master's degree |
| 26 | Require state teaching certification |
| 44 | Require teaching experience 3.00 = Average number of years of teaching experience required (range 2–7 years) |
| 25 | Require a supervised internship |
| 43 | Report <i>other</i> requirements |

Summary: All states take responsibility in some form for providing qualified administrators statewide through quality control at professional entry or continuation in local administrative positions. The definitions and vehicles for certification vary. State policies are wide-ranging, although the majority of states require completion of a preparation program and/or master's degree.

Examples of *other* requirements:

Arkansas: Graduate degree [certification] program must include an internship and portfolio development and review.

Iowa: Superintendent candidates must possess three years experience as building principal or other administrative position and possess a specialist's degree or its equivalent (master's plus at least 30 semester hours of graduate study in administration beyond master's degree).

Kentucky: For principals, successful completion of the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program (KTIP). Superintendent certification requires a master's degree, three years of teaching experience, completion of Level I and Level II preparation for Principal or Supervisor of Instruction, and two years of full time experience in an administrative position.

Louisiana: Achieve a score of 620 on the Educational Administration and Supervision Area Exam of the NTE, additional specific coursework. Superintendent candidates must also have five years of successful experience as a superintendent, assistant superintendent, supervisor of instruction, or principal.

Nebraska: Superintendent requires completion of specialist or doctorate program.

New Hampshire: Teaching experience is not required for superintendents, but candidates must complete a state-approved educational administration program at the certificate of advanced graduate study (CAGS) or doctoral level.

Oklahoma: Achieve a passing score on the required competency-based test. The state board requires that a first time superintendent and any superintendent from out of state take 11 days of training with the state department of education.

South Carolina: Minimum qualifying score on the approved area administrator's examination adopted by the state board of education. Superintendents must also have two years as a school or school district administrator, postsecondary administrator, or school business administration.

Vermont: Passing score on Praxis I test, demonstrated proficiency in 90 general competencies—either through coursework or experience. Superintendents must also have two years of successful educational leadership experience.

Indicator 1.2 The state has tiered certification and establishes expectations for continuous improvement along the career continuum of highly qualified administrators.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirements |
|------------------|---|
| n/a | Tiered certification |
| 38 | Require professional development and continuous improvement after initial certification to maintain or renew certification or specialized certification (See Appendix B, Table 4) |

Summary: The majority of states have requirements to renew certification of practicing administrators, usually consisting of university credit hours, professional development credits, or combinations. Most states recertify administrators on a five-year cycle. (More detail about types of requirements is provided with Policy Lever 4, Professional Development.)

Requirements for renewal of certification do not generally differentiate expectations at strategic points of a career continuum, although a few states have specific expectations after entry level. Leadership academies, induction programs, professional learning plans, and new evaluation tools are being developed in states to provide systematic guidance of professional development required for recertification.

Description of Requirements:

Indiana: [Candidates are] recommended by college or university for initial license. Candidates must also complete a two year administrative induction period and a standards-based assessment plan, which must show evidence of progress in each standard.

Mississippi: On employment, complete requirements of the School Executive Management Institute (SEMI).

North Carolina: School administrators will be required to complete five hours of continuing education each renewal cycle (of the 15 units required every five years) that are focused on the principal's role in teacher effectiveness, teacher evaluations, teacher support programs, teacher leadership, teacher empowerment, and teacher retention. This recommendation by the Teacher Retention Task Force is a strategy for improving teacher recruitment and retention, administrator support, and accountability.

Texas: Successfully complete required educator assessments. A principal employed for the first time as an administrator must participate in an at least one year induction period with mentoring support.

Wisconsin: In 2004, Wisconsin established tiered certification that specifies areas of proficiency for administrators to advance along the career continuum. The state will license nine administrator categories.

- The tiered license structure provides that the first administrator certification is a five year non-renewable Initial Administrator license. Entry-level administrators need mentors and create a professional development plan for growth that is tied to student learning.
- The sustaining certification level is the Professional Administrator license, which is renewed using a professional development plan based on improving proficiency in two or more of the seven administrator standards over a five year period of time.
- The highest certification level is the new Master Administrator license. Master administrators will complete a portfolio demonstrating mastery in all seven standards by completing five entries. The entries are the following: the administrator as

visionary leader, the administrator as an advocate for student learning, the administrator as a communicator and change agent, the administrator as a leader in the community, and the administrator as manager of the organization.

Indicator 1.3 The state sets expectations for specialized certification or particular leadership roles.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirement |
|------------------|--|
| n/a | Tiered or differentiated administrator certification |

Summary: The survey did not gather data about policies for specific roles of differentiated leadership, but it will be important in the future to track work that states are doing in areas such as teacher leadership and distributed leadership. See, for example, IEL’s 2001 report, *Leadership for Student Learning: Redefining the Teacher as Leader*, and other reports on restructuring district and school leadership roles.

Indicator 1.4 The state provides alternative certification opportunities for candidates to meet state standards to address pressing state needs; for example, providing highly qualified administrators in hard-to-staff rural areas.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirements |
|------------------|--|
| 16 | Alternative routes to administrator certification n/a Types of needs addressed by alternative routes n/a Types of routes provided |
| 8 | Alternative routes specifically for superintendent certification n/a Types of needs addressed by alternative routes n/a Types of routes provided |

Summary: Although alternative certification can provide an important policy option to meet specific state needs, such as hard-to-staff areas, states have different approaches and purposes for their alternative routes. About a third of the states offer alternative routes to certification, but more information is needed about the purposes and effectiveness of the alternatives. Some states described alternative routes to recruit candidates with business or managerial expertise outside of the field of education or a market-based approach with few, if any, requirements. Eight states have alternative routes specifically for superintendent certification, including specifying that certain urban districts are responsible for establishing qualifications for superintendents.

State policy needs related to Policy Lever 1:

- models of tiered certification for continuous improvement on state standards along the career continuum

- differentiated expectations for specific leadership roles, such as teacher leaders, turn-around specialists, mentors, and coaches
- effective, alternative routes to certification for specified state needs and purposes

National data needed for Policy Lever 1:

- number of certification tiers or career stages for recertification
- years required and allowed in each tier
- specific requirements in each tier
- specific expectations for differentiated local leadership roles
- examples of effective alternative certification for specific state needs

POLICY LEVER 2: THE STATE ESTABLISHES PROFESSIONAL ADMINISTRATOR STANDARDS AND USES PERFORMANCE-BASED INDICATORS AND MEASURES OF ADMINISTRATOR QUALITY, BENCHMARKED ALONG THE CAREER CONTINUUM.

- Indicator 2.1 The state establishes professional expectations or standards for administrators that are benchmarked along the career continuum.
- Indicator 2.2 The state regularly reviews and updates professional expectations or standards for highly qualified administrators, benchmarked across the career continuum.
- Indicator 2.3 The state defines specific expectations along the career continuum and for differentiated local leadership roles, such as teacher-leaders, instructional leaders, district leaders, or highly qualified leaders for low-performing districts and schools.
- Indicator 2.4 The state has standards and performance-based measures of administrator quality.
- Indicator 2.5 Performance-based measures of administrator quality provide diagnostic information on standards and benchmarks to guide continuous improvement along the career continuum.
- Indicator 2.6 The state monitors technical quality of tests, including validating performance assessments and confirming alignment with state standards.
- Indicator 2.7 Performance measures are linked to other indicators of performance, including school quality and student learning indicators.

Indicator 2.1 The state establishes professional expectations or standards for administrators that are benchmarked along the career continuum.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirement |
|------------------|--|
| n/a | Professional expectations or standards for administrators benchmarked along the career continuum |

| Number of States | Characteristics of State Standards for Administrators (See Appendix B Table 2) |
|------------------|---|
| 46 | Administrator or leadership standards |
| 41 | Standards reported to be the same as, based-on, or aligned with the ISLLC Standards for School Leaders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8 Standards same as the ISLLC Standards 26 Standards based on the ISLLC Standards with additions or modifications 9 Standards developed separately, are different from, but are aligned with the ISLLC Standards |

Summary: Most states have established professional expectations or leadership standards. Most states report that their leadership standards are aligned with the ISLLC Standards, demonstrating

attention to the importance of leadership for teaching and learning and establishing a common language across states. (See Appendix B, Table 3)

Eight states have adopted the ISLLC Standards. Twenty-three states have based leadership standards on the ISLLC Standards with additions or modifications. For example, **Kentucky** has added the National Educational Technology Standards for Administrators, published by the International Society for Technology in Education, to state adoption of the ISLLC Standards. Some states have adopted or adapted the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) program standards used for National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) review of administrator preparation programs (see Indicator 3.1 Preparation Program Accreditation). The ELCC program standards are based on the ISLLC Standards for School Leadership and specify program components and expectations for candidates to meet the ISLLC Standards, including requiring a practicum experience. **Oregon** adopted the ELCC standards and requires preparation programs to define and embed cultural competencies necessary for effective local leadership.

Ten states have leadership standards that were developed separately but have been analyzed for alignment with the ISLLC Standards. For example, **Connecticut's** Standards for School Leaders were developed prior to the ISLLC Standards and based on a state-commissioned monograph, *Defining Effective Leadership in Connecticut's Schools*, by K. Leithwood and D. Duke, (1998), available on the state's website. The two sets of standards were subsequently reviewed and found to be closely aligned.

Although some state standards were developed separately and were not reported as aligned with the ISLLC Standards, they show important similarities, especially in strong emphasis on leadership for teaching and learning. For example, the **Massachusetts** standards were revised in 2003 and represent state consensus about core functions of administrators. Although not reported as having been aligned to ISLLC, the Massachusetts standards specify teaching and learning responsibilities and define responsibilities for administration, equity, and community relationships very similarly to the structure and content of the ISLLC Standards.

Indicator 2.2 The state regularly reviews and updates professional expectations or standards for highly qualified administrators, benchmarked across the career continuum.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirement |
|------------------|--|
| 26 | Leadership standards developed or updated since 2000. (See Appendix B, Table 3) |

Summary: Almost half of the states have developed or updated their leadership standards in the past five years, citing the need to include recent policy changes, experience with state standards, and emerging research. States have asked the Council to update the ISLLC Standards to coordinate and assist in regular review and updating of state standards. The following examples

begin to illustrate the significance of state efforts to conduct broadly-inclusive processes; engage practitioners, policy makers, and researchers; examine current research and literature; and address critical issues in current state and federal policies. Other examples of state efforts to update and improve standards are described throughout the paper, as they relate to related policy levers.

State Examples:

Ohio is drafting new administrator standards.

Recent legislation established the Educator Standards Board (ESB) that will be charged with bringing standards-based reform to the educator level by defining standards for teachers and principals at all stages of their careers. The State Board will formulate standards for educator professional development and recommend policies to close achievement gaps among groups of students. A process of reviewing existing ISLLC-based Standards invited input from leadership and policy researchers, practitioners, and consultants to integrate recent leadership research and create a direct link between the academic content standards for students and the standards for teachers and principals. To ensure this, a significant part of teacher and principal preparation will be the understanding of Ohio's K-12 academic content standards. The educator standards also will take into account cultural competency, mental health issues, closing achievement gaps, as well as the education of gifted students.

Georgia is conducting research and a broad public process to define leadership expectations and roles.

The state's Leadership Institute for School Improvement has identified eight leadership roles in the research literature, validated against other national educational and business standards. The eight roles are Data Analysis Leader; Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment; Performance Leadership; Professional Learning and Development Leader; Process Improvement Leader; Relationship Development Leader; Change Leader; and Operations Leader. By offering differentiated leadership roles, with a variety of career paths and preparation options, teachers can choose to remain in the classroom and specialize within the teaching craft; or they can serve in distributed leadership roles which give them agency within the school for improvement of conditions of practice and teaching. Participating in distributed leadership allows leadership potential to be developed and recognized for the array of roles.

Georgia is also conducting task analyses to reconsider the traditional continuum of leadership preparation, with role or task hierarchy and curriculum maps about the order in which knowledge and skills should be acquired, including contextual adaptation. By analyzing the tasks that effective school leaders do in their schools to improve organizational effectiveness and student achievement, state expectations will identify what leaders must know and be able to do when they assume a leadership position. State expectations will identify the common,

critical, and core leadership competencies which are necessary to successfully lead teachers and stakeholders, determining the optimal sequence of the learning and performance practice to reduce time to competency.

Indicator 2.3 The state defines specific expectations along the career continuum and for differentiated local leadership roles, such as teacher leaders, instructional leaders, district leaders, or highly qualified leaders for low-performing districts and schools.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirement |
|------------------|---|
| n/a | Define specific expectations or standards for differentiated leadership roles |

State Examples:

Maryland’s Instructional Leadership Framework was recently released (2005) with an extensive review of research and literature to describe outcomes expected of principals in instructional leadership.

For each outcome identified, there are evidences in practice that delineate the minimum of what we expect principals to know and be able to do if the respective leadership outcome is to be realized. The framework is not intended to include all of the various responsibilities of a quality principal, and focuses, instead, on the content knowledge needed for school principals to be the leader of teaching-learning in the school. It represents the most commonly accepted instructional leadership responsibilities according to respected practitioners, researchers, and theorists in the field of instructional leadership and continuous improvement. It also provides a foundation for the alignment of professional development opportunities offered at the state and local levels as well as coursework offered at institutions of higher education.

Massachusetts: The Massachusetts Department of Education developed a discussion paper on Strategies for Distributed Leadership (2004) for consideration by schools and districts.

The strategies for distributed leadership are based on the major functions, tasks, and competencies required for successful fulfillment of all school building responsibilities in a school district. Because of the magnitude of these functions, and the sensitivities associated with many of them, they cannot and should not be accomplished by the principal alone. Rather, they are led, supervised, and coordinated by the principal, who, in a distributed leadership model, works with staff at all levels to provide opportunities for leadership and skills development while ensuring the best possible outcomes for student achievement.

Distributed leadership, a key human resources development strategy, is not an additional duty of district and school leaders, but a fundamental approach to work and staff development that achieves superior results by matching the right people

with the right tasks based on need, interest level, and opportunity. The focus is on doing all of the required work more effectively including those functions such as public relations and strategic planning that might not currently receive the appropriate attention.

Indicator 2.4 The state has standards and performance-based measures of administrator quality.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirement |
|-------------------------|--|
| n/a | Have standards and performance-based measures of administrator quality |

| Number of States | Testing for Initial Certification of Principals or Superintendents |
|-------------------------|--|
| 40 | Require tests for initial certification of principals or superintendents (See Appendix B, Table 4) |
| 16 | Use the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (ETF) |
| 8 | Use the Administrator section of the PRAXIS test (ETF) |
| 26 | Use another test (state or university designed, NASSP, NTE, subject area tests) |
| 8 | Require basic skills test |
| 7 | Plan to adopt or use an administrator assessment for certification |

Examples of *other* measures reported:

Alabama: University designed

Arizona: Arizona Administrator Proficiency Assessment

Connecticut: Connecticut Administrator Test (CAT)

Florida: Florida Educational Leadership Examination

Hawaii: Completion of the Administrator Certification for Excellence (ACE) Program involves numerous assessments including the Ventures Interview; portfolio, group interaction and performance assessment on the job.

Illinois: Illinois Certification Testing System

Kentucky: Kentucky Specialty Test of Instructional and Administrative Practices and a written test of applied knowledge approved by the Education Professional Standards Board

Texas: TExES for Superintendents and Principals

Wisconsin: Portfolio assessment of proficiency on all seven standards required for program completion

Summary: The 2004–05 survey asked which assessments the state requires for initial certification, not specifically whether they were performance-based assessments. Future data collection should gather the types and characteristics of measures including benchmarks, whether the tests provide diagnostic information, etc.

State Example:

Missouri reports developing a Performance Based Superintendent Evaluation, adding rubrics to the Performance Based Principal Evaluation, determining what a high-quality school leader is under NCLB, and working with all 17 administrator preparation institutions to collaboratively develop an instrument that assesses the quality of principal that is being turned out by each institution.

Indicator 2.5 Performance-based measures of administrator quality provide diagnostic information on standards and benchmarks to guide continuous improvement along the career continuum.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirement |
|------------------|--|
| n/a | Have performance-based measures of administrator quality that provide diagnostic information |

Indicator 2.6 The state monitors technical quality of tests, including validating performance assessments and confirming alignment with state standards.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirement |
|------------------|--|
| n/a | Monitors technical quality of performance measures |

Indicator 2.7 Performance measures are linked to other indicators of performance, including school quality and student learning indicators.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirement |
|------------------|--|
| n/a | Have performance measures linked to other indicators |

State Example:

Connecticut provides an extended description and example of long-term planning and sustained implementation of a certification assessment designed to provide guidance for preparation programs and feedback to the system.

The state’s Intermediate Administrator Certificate covers a range of K-12 administrator roles other than the position of superintendent (e.g., assistant

superintendent, principal, assistant/associate principal, department heads, and other supervisory positions). Within this broad certification area, Connecticut designed a licensure test appropriate to intermediate administrator roles with a focus on the knowledge and skills of the Connecticut Standards for School Leaders.

Assessment Development and Validation. Over a three-year period the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) and committees of educators worked with Education Testing Service (ETS) to develop and validate a licensure test that could be used for licensure and by education leadership programs to examine education leadership program effectiveness. During the initial phases of development, school leaders identified two critical responsibilities of principals and other supervisors, instructional analysis/teacher support and school improvement planning and implementation. These two areas of responsibility served as the framework for which multiple forms of the Connecticut Administrator Test (CAT) were developed. During development and standard setting, state educators including administrators and university faculty carefully considered the experience level of beginners and consequently held high yet reasonable expectations for education leadership graduates.

Assessment Structure and Prompts. The CAT consists of two Instructional Analysis and Teacher Support Modules in which candidates have a total of three and one-half hours to complete and two School Improvement Case Study modules, a total of three hours in length. Since the CAT administration requires six and one-half hours of testing time, students are encouraged to take no more than two modules at any one administration. A brief summary of the CAT follows. (A complete study guide with sample modules and scoring samples is available at <http://www.eastconn.org/CAT.htm>.)

Instructional Analysis and Teacher Support Modules. Each test module presents a simulation that places the candidate in the role of a supervisor asked by a teacher to help improve teaching and learning. One module always uses an elementary school context and the other a secondary school setting, either high school or middle school. The candidate reads information about a teacher's unit/lesson plan, teacher commentaries, analyses, views a brief video clip of a lesson segment, and examines samples of student work. Candidates are then asked to respond in writing to a standard set of questions/prompts. Note that most of the Instructional Analysis Module materials come from actual classroom instruction and student work adapted and released as part of Connecticut's Beginning Educator Support and Training (BEST) "portfolio" induction process. Although modified for purposes of testing, these materials provide candidates with a highly authentic representation of teaching and learning.

School Improvement Case Study Modules. Each of two School Improvement modules presents a set of school-based problems or issues. One case always takes place within an elementary school setting and the other within a secondary school setting, either high school or middle school. In each instance, the candidate is placed in the role of a principal new to the school. Candidates review a brief

overview of the case study along with documents or issues which provide background and data. Each module includes a Strategic School Profile (SSP). SSPs are Connecticut's vehicle for the public reporting of school, district and state based school and student achievement data. Like the Instructional Analysis Module, the SSPs come from actual Connecticut schools and are modified for testing purposes.

Preparation Program Feedback. Universities are evaluated in part based on the performance of their students the first time a module is taken. First-time passing rates provide useful information about how well candidates are prepared in the areas of supervision, evaluation, instruction and school improvement. Institutions with a first-time pass rate of less than 80 percent meet with CSDE and discuss modifications of courses other student experiences that can be used to help students better understand the Connecticut School Leader Standards. An institution whose students continue to fall below the 80 percent requirement is subject to full external program review leading to possible program probation or suspension. To date, preparation programs have used the information to improve outcomes, and no preparation program has been suspended.

Impact of the CAT. Although the CAT has only been in existence for three years, there are some indicators of impact. The primary source of impact information currently comes from candidate and scorer feedback.

Candidate Feedback. Candidates provide feedback on the CAT each time the test is administered. Candidates consistently evaluate the CAT modules as fair and highly authentic to the challenges faced by educators. Test takers also frequently request the opportunity to respond to the CAT prompts using a computer. CSDE is currently investigating the feasibility of providing such an option. Future surveys will be conducted to examine new administrator perceptions of education leadership programs and the extent to which they feel they have been prepared to meet the demands of school leadership.

Impact on the practice of veteran administrators and university faculty. The CAT scoring process which involves Connecticut administrators and university faculty has expanded considerably since the beginning of the program. Scorers who participate in training and scoring proficiency processes have evaluated scoring as a unique professional development opportunity to critically discuss and analyze instruction, learning and school improvement practices with colleagues; and university faculty participation in scoring has grown considerably since the inception of the CAT program. Faculty members are eligible to participate as long as they are not directly involved in offering CAT test taking preparation. Participating faculty from higher education have found the scoring process to provide excellent professional development and frequently report that they particularly enjoy the opportunity to interact with education administrators to discuss teaching, learning and school improvement practices.

Impact on Administrator Supply. Despite initial concerns regarding the use of a certification test and the supply of future administrators, education leadership

programs have been reporting record enrollments over the last two years; based on a comparison of Connecticut's Fall Hiring Data Report for 2001 (the year prior to implementation of the CAT requirement) and Fall 2004 (three years after implementation the CAT examination process), there is evidence that the pool of administrator applicants has increased. In 2001 there were 208 open intermediate administrator job openings with an average of 19 applications per opening. In 2004 there were 220 administrator openings with an average of 220 applications per opening. While there are likely to be multiple reasons for the growth of administrator applicants, it appears that the testing requirement has not limited the supply of prospective school leaders.

Summary: The Connecticut Administrator Test (CAT) was designed for multiple purposes, initial licensure and as an external tool to assist Connecticut's universities evaluate their education leadership program effectiveness. Although the CAT is only the first step in the educational leadership professional continuum, there is growing evidence that the testing process is having an important impact on the practice of veteran education administrators and university programs and faculty.

State policy needs related to Policy Lever 2:

- updates to the ISLLC Standards for School Leaders as common language across states, to incorporate state standards, federal policies, a decade of research, NCLB, greater emphasis on equity and diversity issues, and technology innovations
- models such as ISLLC performance standards, to provide a common referent for states to use in developing state performance standards and to gather national data for comparisons across differences in state performance standards
- benchmarked performance measures along the career continuum of highly qualified administrators, with technical evidence about concurrent and predictive validity and alignment with state leadership performance standards
- models of performance-based evaluation and diagnostic information to guide continuous improvement along the career continuum
- models linking administrator performance data with other indicators of school and student performance

National data needed for Policy Lever 2:

- number of states with professional expectations or standards for administrators benchmarked along the career continuum
- number of states defining specific expectations or standards for differentiated leadership roles
- number of states with standards and performance-based measures of administrator quality that provide diagnostic information

- number of states that monitor technical quality of performance measures
- state has performance measures linked to other indicators

POLICY LEVER 3: THE STATE ESTABLISHES PERFORMANCE-BASED CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL OF ADMINISTRATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS AND POLICIES TO RECRUIT DIVERSE, QUALIFIED ASPIRANTS; PREPARE CANDIDATES TO MEET ENTRY-LEVEL BENCHMARKS; AND SUPPORT EARLY CAREER SUCCESS.

- Indicator 3.1 The state has preparation program standards and approval processes aligned with administrator performance standards and entry-level benchmarks.
- Indicator 3.2 State policies and preparation programs have strategies to recruit qualified, diverse aspirants.
- Indicator 3.3 State policies and programs provide support and incentives for qualified, diverse aspirants to complete preparation programs and apply for leadership positions.
- Indicator 3.4 Preparation programs prepare candidates to meet entry-level benchmarks, providing standards-based curriculum, supervised internships, and field-based learning.
- Indicator 3.5 Preparation programs provide continuing support or induction programs to graduates for early career success.
- Indicator 3.6 Highly qualified, expert leaders are identified through standards-based performance measures to serve as instructors, internship and field supervisors, and induction program mentors and coaches.
- Indicator 3.7 Preparation program approval requires performance-based evidence of value-added and success of graduates on the job.

Indicator 3.1 The state has preparation program standards and approval processes aligned with administrator performance standards and entry-level benchmarks.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirements |
|-------------------------|---|
| n/a | Have preparation program standards and approval processes aligned with administrator performance standards and entry-level benchmarks |
| 20 | Have processes and criteria for approval of administrator preparation programs |
| 11 | Require National Commission for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) accreditation of administrator preparation programs |

Examples of state accreditation processes and criteria:

- **Delaware:** NCATE, NASDTEC (National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification), or DE approved program

- **Georgia:** All preparation programs must be approved by the Professional Standards Commission, which conducts continuing reviews on a five year cycle. All public institutions of higher education are required to be NCATE accredited as well
- **Idaho:** Institutional decision about being an NCATE partner institution; not required by state. State approval process based on state-approved preparation standards (administrator, teacher, and pupil personnel standards)
- **Indiana:** The Indiana Professional Standards Board has adopted the NCATE standards and process for state-only accreditation. Thus, a program must meet NCATE standards but not be NCATE approved or member
- **Mississippi:** NCATE accreditation is the reference point utilized by the annual Process and Performance Reviews which evaluate leadership programs according to five state standards that supplement the NCATE standards and ensure that all standards are fully incorporated into the leadership programs
- **New Jersey:** The state requires colleges to seek national accreditation either from NCATE or TEAC (Teacher Education Advisory Council)
- **North Carolina:** Administrator programs must be approved by the State. Institutions offering the programs must be NCATE or TEAC accredited
- **Pennsylvania:** Pennsylvania Department of Education reviews and approves all administrator programs of study
- **Virginia:** NCATE is voluntary in Virginia. Virginia has a state review process (five year review cycle) for the approval of programs
- **West Virginia:** NCATE accreditation is required for all public institutions; private institutions that are not NCATE-accredited must be reviewed and approved by the WV Board of Education

Summary: Most states vest responsibility for implementing and operationalizing the state's administrator standards in administrator preparation programs and the higher education institutions that provide them. States generally rely on preparation program completion to certify entry-level administrator quality. Most states informally report limited oversight of programs and slow implementation of state expectations at the program level. A few states have developed collaborations with higher education institutions and professional development providers to provide systemic coherence and improve programs and implement state standards in programs.

States exert indirect control over preparation programs through accreditation criteria or processes for approval of administrator preparation programs, using state criteria and one or more of the three accreditation associations that provide criteria and processes for state approval:

- National Commission for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)
- Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC)
- National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC)

The NCATE Standards for administrator preparation programs were developed by the Education Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) from the ISLLC Standards for School Leaders, providing a link to common expectations of administrators across states. Preparation programs desiring NCATE accreditation must demonstrate attention to 1) developing a shared school vision focused on teaching and learning; 2) understanding assessment and the role of data in decision-making; and 3) grounding leaders in a strong understanding of curriculum and instructional practices. In addition, students in accredited educational-administration programs must demonstrate that they can 1) implement useful professional development for teachers and administrators; 2) manage school resources and obtain additional support; 3) use technology to enrich curriculum and instruction; 4) create and implement strategies for harnessing community support; and 5) communicate goals via the media (Educational Leadership Constituent Council, 1995).

Indicator 3.2 State policies and preparation programs have strategies to recruit qualified, diverse aspirants.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirement |
|------------------|--|
| n/a | Have policies for programs to recruit qualified, diverse aspirants |

Indicator 3.3 State policies and programs provide support and incentives for qualified, diverse aspirants to complete preparation programs and apply for leadership positions.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirement |
|------------------|--|
| n/a | Have policies for programs to provide support and incentives |

Indicator 3.4 Preparation programs prepare candidates to meet entry-level benchmarks, providing standards-based curriculum, supervised internships, and field-based learning.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirement |
|------------------|---|
| n/a | Have policies for programs that prepare candidates to meet entry-level benchmarks, providing standards-based curriculum, supervised internships, and field-based learning |

State Examples:

Missouri provides an example of early adoption of the Standards and a decade of sustained, coherent policy approaches, using systemic strategies to implement the standards in state policies along the career continuum.

The Missouri Professors of Educational Administration (MPEA) Instructional Materials Project was created and funded by the state. Curriculum materials and syllabi for administrator preparation courses were developed by instructors and distributed to all fourteen approved educational administration programs, including problem based learning modules each dealing with one of the ISLLC Standards; a half-day workshop for adjuncts with training for trainers; access to materials through the MPEA website; and workshops on guidelines for scoring portfolios.

The SEA collaborates with preparation programs for standards-based curriculum, providing a Leadership Academy and standards-based professional development, and standards-based professional assessments for certification. The state is developing a Performance Based Superintendent Evaluation, adding rubrics to the Performance Based Principal Evaluation, determining what a high quality school leader looks like for NCLB, and working with all 17 preparation institutions to collaboratively develop an instrument that assesses the quality of principal that is being trained by each institution.

The Urban School Leadership Consortium brought the leadership of Missouri's two largest districts, St. Louis and Kansas City, to discuss the specific needs of the urban school leader, sharing those needs with the preparation institutions. The second meeting held in St. Louis at the Black Leadership Roundtable conference spoke to the commonalities and the development of a network of urban school leaders.

Kentucky is working with program providers to improve administrator preparation.

The Commonwealth Collaborative of School Leadership Programs (CCSLP), composed of eleven institutions that are involved in administration preparation, on recommendations about how to improve leadership program design and instruction at each of the institutions. The group is considering nine elements of effective preparation programs:

1. co-design of lessons/activities with partner school districts
2. co-delivery of lessons with partner school districts
3. practicum and/or student performance requirements
4. cohort model (learning communities)
5. selection of participants
6. master's or postmaster's program for principal preparation; level one and level two requirements

7. content/curriculum design
8. assessment of program graduates and follow-up
9. involvement with districts in EILA professional development

The Kentucky Principal Internship Program has proposed redesign components provide a mentor at the school level and develop a cohort approach for networking among new and experienced principals and university faculty members.

Indicator 3.5 Preparation programs provide continuing support or induction programs to graduates for early career success.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirement |
|------------------|---|
| n/a | Have policies for programs to provide continuing support to graduates for success in entry-level position |

Some states have established induction and mentoring programs separate from initial preparation programs. (See Policy Lever 4, Professional Development, Indicator 4.4)

Indicator 3.6 Highly-qualified, expert leaders are identified through standards-based performance measures to serve as instructors, internship and field supervisors, and induction program mentors and coaches.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirement |
|------------------|---|
| n/a | Have policies for programs to use standards-based performance measures to identify instructors, internship and field supervisors, and induction program mentors and coaches |

Indicator 3.7 Preparation program approval requires performance-based evidence of value-added and success of graduates on the job.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirement |
|------------------|--|
| n/a | Have policies requiring preparation program approval using performance-based evidence of value-added and success of graduates on the job |

State Example:

As described under Indicator 2, **Connecticut** uses data on candidate performance to evaluate preparation programs for accreditation. An institution whose students continue to fall below the

80 percent requirement is subject to full external program review leading to possible program probation or suspension.

State Policy Needs Related to Policy Lever 3:

- criteria and strategies to identify and recruit promising, diverse aspirants into leadership programs (e.g., teacher leadership)
- models of effective support and incentives to encourage promising aspirants to complete programs and apply for leadership positions
- updated NCATE/ELCC Program Standards
- models and measures of effective field-based learning and internships
- programs that support graduate on the job and measures of success
- highly qualified, expert leaders identified through performance assessments to serve as field supervisors, mentors, and coaches
- performance-based, value-added measures of program effectiveness

National Data Needed for Policy Lever 3:

- number of states with aspirant programs, recruitment strategies, completion and application incentives
- number of states with continuing program support through induction programs for early career success
- number of states identifying highly qualified leaders to serve as supervisors, mentors, and coaches
- number of states requiring performance-based evidence of value-added for preparation program approval

POLICY LEVER 4: THE STATE REQUIRES PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR CERTIFICATION AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT OF LEADERSHIP PRACTICES AND TO SUPPORT AND RETAIN EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATORS ON-THE-JOB.

- Indicator 4.1 States require professional development for recertification and continuous improvement of leadership practices.
- Indicator 4.2 The state uses standards and performance-based approval criteria for approving professional development programs, university programs for recertification or advancement, and continuing educational units for certification.
- Indicator 4.3 The state requires performance-based evaluation linked to state standards and benchmarks of administrator quality.
- Indicator 4.4 The state requires or provides supervised induction, performance-based professional development, and highly qualified mentors and coaches to support continuous improvement and retention of qualified administrators on the job.
- Indicator 4.5 Performance-based criteria are used to identify highly qualified administrators for instructors, supervisors, mentors, and coaches.

Indicator 4.1 States require professional development for recertification and continuous improvement of leadership practices (See Appendix B, Table 5).

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirements |
|-------------------------|---|
| 38 | Require university credit hours, professional development credits, or other requirements for practicing administrators to renew their state certification or license (note: most states accept combinations of options) |
| 4 | Require a specific program or leadership academy |
| 5 | Require (or offer as an alternative) a professional leadership plan or professional growth plan |
| 1 | Delegate responsibility to local districts, based on continuing successful service |

| Number of Years (Mode) | Requirement |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 5 | Administrators must complete recertification requirements |

State Example:

By statute in Connecticut, all districts conduct annual evaluations linked to professional development for administrators and teachers. The Guidelines for Teacher and School Leader Professional Development are used as a standards-based framework for district and school plans and embed the state vision and student, teaching and school leadership standards. Districts

submit evaluation and professional development plans for peer review and feedback regarding the extent to which their plans aligned to the Guidelines.

Indicator 4.2 The state uses standards and performance-based approval criteria for approving professional development programs, university programs for recertification or advancement, and continuing educational units for certification.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirements |
|------------------|--|
| n/a | Have standards and performance-based approval criteria |
| 18 | State agencies provide professional development for principals and superintendents |

Indicator 4.3 The state requires performance-based evaluation linked to state standards and benchmarks of administrator quality.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirements |
|------------------|---|
| n/a | Requires performance-based evaluation linked to state standards and benchmarks of administrator quality (See Appendix B, Table 6) |
| 18 | State agencies provide professional development for principals and superintendents |
| 8 | Have performance assessments (including portfolios) for evaluation on the job |
| 27 | Administrator evaluation is a district decision or responsibility |
| 15 | Have state evaluation process |

Indicator 4.4 The state requires or provides performance-based professional development, supervised induction and highly qualified mentors and coaches to support continuous improvement and retention of qualified administrators on the job.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirements |
|------------------|--|
| n/a | Require or provide supervised induction and highly qualified mentors and coaches |

State Example:

Ohio’s Department of Education reports issuing an RfP and collaborating with the state elementary and secondary principals associations for a two-year required induction program for new principals.

The Department contracted with the associations to develop, implement and sustain a unified Entry Year Entry-Year Principal (EYP) Program. EYPs are defined as principals or assistant principals who hold two-year provisional principal licenses and are employed full-time in their area of licensure for at least 120 days. EYPs must successfully complete the program to advance to five-year professional principal licensure. Requirements include attendance at workshops and seminars followed by implementation of an action plan to improve student achievement, as part of the EYP's Personal Learning Plan. EYPs document professional development and growth in professional practice portfolios which are submitted for review in the second year of the program.

EYPs select a content track for performance-based professional development instruction and activities, based on the ISLLC Standards. The content tracks are sponsored by the state elementary and secondary principals' associations. The Department assists district and school superintendents in identifying and assigning mentors for the EYPs. The Department also provides regional mentor training sessions.

Mentor responsibilities are to conduct self-appraisal activities and feedback opportunities; assist EYPs in completion of their content program requirements; assist them in completion of their portfolios; and participate in EYP program evaluation. Mentor qualifications are current or recently retired administrator with experience as a principal; not directly responsible for evaluation of the EYP; familiar with ISLLC Standards; and having completed EYP mentor training. Mentor training content is the mentor roles and responsibilities; critical issues in leadership and management; and professional development and support in the ISLLC Standards. Mentors receive a stipend of \$500 per EYP for the first year and \$250 for the second year.

A state committee developed the criteria for program approval of programs and an evaluation rubric with a description of each component. The Professional Practice Portfolio is the culminating product and includes professional development content, mentoring support, and job-embedded responsibilities. The focus of the portfolio is on developing instructional leadership knowledge and skills to improve teacher effectiveness and student achievement. It includes a Pre-Assessment and Post-Assessment (ISLLC School Leadership Self-Inventory) and the Personal Learning Plan.

The EYP and mentor collaboratively develop three to five goals based on pre-assessment data, school achievement data and school improvement plan. There are Performance Products for the six ISLLC Standards, and each reflection, action plan and artifact is labeled with the appropriate ISLLC Standard(s). Additional job-embedded products or work may be included and an End of Program Self-Reflection.

EYPs submit completed Professional Practice Portfolios to mentors by March 31 of the second year of the program. The Mentor validates that EYP has completed all requirements and submits portfolio to the principal association that provided

the program content. The EYP candidates receive an assessment form with feedback and notification of successful completion or the need to complete or rework identified sections of the portfolio. The EYP applies for five-year professional principal license following notification of successful program completion or they may renew their two-year provisional principal licenses if they need additional time to successfully complete the program.

Indicator 4.5 Performance-based criteria are used to identify highly qualified administrators for instructors, supervisors, mentors, and coaches.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirement |
|------------------|--|
| n/a | Use performance-based criteria to identify highly qualified administrators as instructors, supervisors, mentors, and coaches |

State Example:

Missouri reports on identifying mentors for induction and support of new school leaders.

The Administrator Mentoring Program (AMP) for new administrators is designed to meet the state requirements of a two-year mentoring program as partial fulfillment for a Career Continuous Professional Certificate. AMP is a comprehensive program for new school leaders. Year One is a total of 40 contact hours with 24 hours of direct mentoring, 8 hours orientation, and an 8 hour year-end follow-up. Year Two is total 26 hours including 20 hours of additional mentoring which provides direct, one to one contact, and 6 hours (two half-day) meetings with a Year-Two Cohort group.

Mentors will visit on a monthly basis throughout the year, observing new administrators on-the-job to provide feedback related to their performance and areas requiring further development, and assess progress in the development of their Professional Development Plan (PDP), School Improvement Plan, and Performance Based Administrator Evaluation. New school leaders are assigned to regional Year- Two cohort groups, peer study groups that meet regularly and communicate in person and on-line to discuss their work and support each other.

The new administrator’s knowledge and skills are assessed with the ISLLC (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium) School Leadership Self Inventory at the start of AMP and assistance is provided by the mentor to develop a Professional Development Plan. One hundred and fifty mentors were trained in spring, 2005, to work with principals, assistants, career education directors, special directors, superintendents, and assistants. Additional training is planned with a waiting list for practitioners and recently retired administrators wanting to be a part of the program. Fifty superintendents are matched with a mentor and almost 150 new school leaders have or are being matched with a mentor.

State needs related to Policy Lever 4:

- performance-based criteria for approval of professional development programs, university programs for recertification or advancement, and continuing educational units for certification approval and credit toward advanced certification
- models of performance-based administrator evaluation with performance standards, performance assessments, and data to diagnose needs and guide professional learning plans
- models of effective performance-based professional development, supervised induction, effective use of mentors and coaches for early career success.
- criteria to identify highly qualified administrators as supervisors, mentors, and coaches
- performance-based data to diagnose needs and guide professional learning plans for continuous improvement across the career continuum

National Data Needed for Policy Lever 4:

- number of states with standards and performance-based approval criteria
- number of states requiring performance-based evaluation linked to state standards and benchmarks of administrator quality
- number of states that require or provide supervised induction and highly qualified mentors and coaches
- number of states using performance-based criteria to identify highly qualified administrators as instructors, supervisors, mentors, and coaches

POLICY LEVER 5: STATES GATHER AND USE PERFORMANCE-BASED EVIDENCE OF ADMINISTRATOR QUALITY FOR STATE ACCOUNTABILITY AND PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT.

- Indicator 5.1 States have comprehensive accountability and reporting systems about administrator quality.
- Indicator 5.2 States report quality indicators of district and state administrators and link indicator data with indicators of teaching and learning (e.g., student achievement and school climate).
- Indicator 5.3 States monitor and report on technical quality of assessments used to certify and evaluate administrators, including alignment with performance standards and benchmarks, studies of validity for specific purposes (both predictive and concurrent validity), reliability, and fairness.
- Indicator 5.4 States monitor and report value-added measures of preparation programs, with follow-up data on performance of graduates.
- Indicator 5.5 States monitor and report value-added measures of professional development programs, university courses, and leadership academies for advanced certification.
- Indicator 5.6 States use data and value-added evidence to continuously review and improve policies, programs, and indicators of highly qualified educational leadership.

Indicator 5.1 States have comprehensive accountability and reporting systems about administrator quality.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirements |
|------------------|---|
| n/a | Have comprehensive accountability and reporting systems about administrator quality |

Indicator 5.2 States report quality indicators of district and state administrators and link indicator data with indicators of teaching and learning (e.g., student achievement and school climate).

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirements |
|------------------|--|
| n/a | Report quality indicators of district and state administrators and link indicator data with indicators of teaching and learning (e.g., student achievement and school climate) |

Indicator 5.3 States monitor and report on technical quality of assessments used to certify and evaluate administrators, including alignment with performance

standards and benchmarks, studies of validity for specific purposes (both predictive and concurrent validity), reliability, and fairness.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirements |
|-------------------------|--|
| n/a | Monitor and report on technical quality of assessments |

Indicator 5.4 States monitor and report value-added measures of preparation programs, with follow-up data on performance of graduates.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirements |
|-------------------------|--|
| n/a | Monitor and report value-added measures of preparation programs, with follow-up data on performance of graduates |

Indicator 5.5 States monitor and report value-added measures of professional development programs, university courses, and leadership academies for advanced certification.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirements |
|-------------------------|---|
| n/a | Monitor and report value-added measures of professional development programs, university courses, and leadership academies for advanced certification |

Indicator 5.6 States use data and value-added evidence to continuously review and improve policies, programs, and indicators of highly qualified educational leadership.

| Number of States | State-Specific Requirements |
|-------------------------|--|
| n/a | Use data and value-added evidence to continuously review and improve policies, programs, and indicators of highly qualified educational leadership |

Summary: Some examples of state-level accountability systems are provided earlier. As described for Policy Lever 3, preparation of highly qualified administrators, Delaware has systematically developed administrator assessments and data for feedback to and reporting on preparation programs. A number of states, such as Kentucky, conduct technical reviews and studies, in particular on the characteristics of certification assessments, to insure that the measures, scoring, and cut scores are valid, reliable, and fair. However, the lack of performance measures and benchmarks along the career continuum largely limits the psychometric and evaluative research to entry-level certification measures.

As work continues on portfolios and performance measures for certification and evaluation, additional data will become available and can be used for state accountability and policy planning. Leithwood and Riehl forecast increased capacity for research on effective leadership because measures of school improvement and student learning will be more available for research. “Now, however, educational institutions and systems have much greater technological capacity for assessing outcomes, reporting them at the school and student level and disaggregating them to show the performance of specific groups of students. . . . This makes it more possible to tie student learning outcomes more directly to teachers’ and school leaders’ performance.” (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003 p. 4.)

National data needed for Policy Lever 5:

- Number of states with comprehensive accountability and reporting systems about administrator quality
- Number of states that report quality indicators of district and state administrators and link indicator data with indicators of teaching and learning (e.g., student achievement and school climate)
- Number of states that monitor and report on technical quality of assessments
- Number of states that monitor and report value-added measures of preparation programs, with follow-up data on performance of graduates
- Number of states that monitor and report value-added measures of professional development programs, university courses, and leadership academies for advanced certification
- Number of states that use data and value-added evidence to continuously review and improve policies, programs, and indicators of highly qualified educational leadership

State needs related to Policy Lever 5:

- Models of state accountability for administrator quality

PART II

BACKGROUND ON STATE POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR DEVELOPING HIGHLY QUALIFIED ADMINISTRATORS

Recent research has drawn attention to the importance of strong leadership for district and school improvement, particularly to turn around low-performing districts and schools. Accountability requirements under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) are shining a spotlight on district and school-level achievement data, which in turn increases attention to administrators' responsibilities for student achievement. Research provides encouragement about the importance of local leadership for student learning but offers no simple solutions for policy or practice.

In an extensive review of the literature commissioned by the Wallace Foundation, Leithwood, Seashore Lewis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom (2004) drew on over 300 studies, reports, and articles to investigate *How Leadership Influences Student Learning*.

Our review of the evidence suggests that successful leadership can play a highly significant – and frequently underestimated – role in improving student learning. Specifically, the available evidence about the size and nature of the effects of successful leadership on student learning justifies two important claims:

1. Leadership is second only to classroom instruction among all school-related factors that contribute to what students learn at school. While evidence about leadership effects on student learning can be confusing to interpret, much of the existing research actually underestimates its effects. The total (direct and indirect) effects of leadership on student learning account for about a quarter of total school effects.

This evidence supports the present widespread interest in improving leadership as a key to the successful implementation of large-scale reform.

2. Leadership effects are usually largest where and when they are needed most. Especially when we think of leaders in formal administrative roles, the greater the challenge the greater the impact of their actions on learning. While the evidence shows small but significant effects of leadership actions on student learning across the spectrum of schools, existing research also shows that demonstrated effects of successful leadership are considerably greater in schools that are in more difficult circumstances. Indeed, there are virtually no documented instances of troubled schools being turned around without intervention by a powerful leader. Many other factors may contribute to such turnarounds, but leadership is the catalyst (Leithwood et al, 2004, p5).

Federal Policy Emphasis on Accountability: Increasing Pressures on Administrators. State-level policies for reporting and accountability are the primary tools of federal policy and education reform under NCLB. The federal approach requires states to develop coherent, cumulative student assessment systems and report on indicators of student achievement and teacher quality at school, district, and state levels. The requirements are being implemented through federal funding to states in programs for disadvantaged students, formerly the Elementary and

Secondary Education Acts, now NCLB, and Title II programs to improve teacher preparation. According to Leithwood & Riehl (2003),

Schools and school systems are under increasing pressure to perform. State and national achievement standards focused on ambitious learning for all children have changed the landscape of educational accountability. While the real intentions or likely results of such accountability systems may be questioned, their impact is unarguable. Pressure is being placed on actors at all levels, from students themselves to teachers, principals, and district leaders, to produce documented evidence of successful performance.

Educational leaders have always been held accountable for key indicators of their school's or system's health, including fiscal and political matters as well as the instructional program. In these times of heightened concern for student learning, educational leaders are being held accountable not only for the structures and processes they establish, but also for the performance of those under their charge. This includes teachers as well as students. It has not always been easy to measure student outcomes, and especially not to connect those outcomes to teacher or school leader performance. Now, however, educational institutions and systems have much greater technological capacity for assessing outcomes, reporting them at the school and student level and disaggregating them to show the performance of specific groups of students (Marsh, 2000). This makes it more possible to tie student learning outcomes more directly to teachers' and school leaders' performance (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003 p. 4.).

Major Efforts to Improve Local Administrator Practices: Professionals, Researchers, and Policy Makers. Political momentum for strong educational accountability policies has been building for the past two decades. Professional organizations, foundations, and policy makers have contributed extensive recommendations and proposals for how to improve local administrative practices. A review of the literature on leading school improvement for the Southern Regional Education Board (Hoachlander, Alt, & Beltranena, 2001) describes some of the intense activity.

If improving educational leadership is a major obstacle to accelerating the pace of school improvement in the United States, it is not because the issue has been neglected in the last decade or two. There has been no shortage of national commissions, critical scholarship or demonstration programs.

In 1987, the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (NCEEAA) published *Leaders for America's Schools*, widely acknowledged as a pivotal document that called for reform in preparing educational leaders (McCarthy 1999; Murphy and Forsyth 1999). The report blasted recruitment practices, inattention to instructional leadership, shoddy professional development, low licensure standards and inattention to real-world problems and experience. The commission called for shutting down 300 of the approximately 500 educational leadership programs in colleges and universities nationwide, saying that they lacked the "resources or commitment to provide the excellence called for by the commission."

The NCEEAA report sparked creation of the National Policy Board for Education Administration (NPBEA), which published two reports of its own: *Improving the Preparation of School Administration: An Agenda for Reform* (1989) and *Alternative*

Certification for School Leaders (1990). These, too, recommended revising core curricula to emphasize instructional practice and ethics, raising standards for licensure and certification, and relying more heavily on clinical experience and other forms of field-based preparation. In the early 1990s, NPBEA developed accreditation standards that addressed four major areas: strategic leadership, organizational leadership, instructional leadership, and political and community leadership (Educational Leadership Constituent Council 1995).

Building further on these efforts, NPBEA — in collaboration with the Council of Chief State School Officers and with support from the Pew Charitable Trusts and the Danforth Foundation — established the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC). ISLLC promulgated standards to underscore the centrality of student learning in leadership preparation programs (Hoachlander et al., 2001, pp. 4-5).

Professional Administrator Organizations. Professional administrator associations have engaged in extensive work to improve leadership practices by developing standards for specific administrative roles; professional assessments and evaluation tools; research and policy reports; and professional learning opportunities. The professional organizations that are members of the NPBEA have made extensive contributions to improving administrator quality. They represent members at all organizational levels and career stages for elementary and secondary school administrators, district superintendents, and providers of administrator preparation and improvement programs.

- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE)
- Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)
- National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP)
- National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP)
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)
- National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA)
- University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA)

The range and contributions of professional organizations goes even further, including National Educational Technology Standards for Administrators, published by the International Society for Technology in Education, and the National Staff Development Council's Standards for Staff Development about and applied to leaders.

Finding Common Ground in the ISLLC Standards for School Leaders. The ISLLC Standards for School Leaders (CCSSO, 1996), developed by state and professional organizational representatives, have become de facto national standards and a common referent for the profession, primarily because of their wide adoption in state policies. According to the most recent data collected in the Council's 2004 Key State Policies survey, 41 states have leadership standards that are the same as, based-on, or aligned with the ISLLC Standards. Forty-five states have leadership standards, and eight report that state standards that are the same as the ISLLC Standards, 23 states report standards that are based on the ISLLC Standards with additions or modifications, and 10 states have standards that were developed separately but have been determined to be aligned with the ISLLC Standards.

The ISLLC Standards are frequently used as a common language for comparing content in professional administrator standards, tests, products, professional learning opportunities, and services. Several characteristics facilitate their use as a common language. First, they focus leadership responsibilities on improving teaching and learning, which is central to current federal and state policies. Second, they were written to encompass differences rather than to be prescriptive for states, using broad statements and building in redundancy to emphasize that expectations of administrators are complex, interdependent, and can be organized in a variety of ways.

In a review of the expectations set out in five sets of leadership standards for the Education Commission of the States, Anthes (2005) found significant similarities and overlap among the expectations. States leadership standards are based on a variety of sources, including reviews of research, professional consensus, and state studies, but most states report that their standards are aligned with the ISLLC Standards, making them a useful national resources and common language across states.

Given the multiple versions of leader standards, and the fact that states are trying to align preparation-program accreditation, professional development and evaluations with these standards, this document compares the multiple versions so policymakers and education staffers can see how they align, and ensure there are no gaps in their teacher and leader standards. ECS' did an analysis of the five different leadership standards (ISLLC, ELCC, NAESP, SREB and McREL) and found all the standards generally fit within the following categories:

- strategic decision making and implementation
- promoting community engagement
- creating a culture of learning
- using data appropriately
- understanding curriculum and instruction
- seeking engagement from all staff
- understanding effective management
- providing high-quality professional growth opportunities to staff
- communicating effectively and honestly with staff, students and community members (Anthes, 2005)

Various approaches to cataloging, categorizing, and aligning sets of administrator expectations and standards find broad comparability at a very general level, but two major challenges face state policy makers: prioritizing and defining mastery level expectations for each point of the career continuum, and making them performance-based and measurable, to diagnose and guide practice of highly qualified administrators.

Hoachlander, et al. (2001), note that primary attention for states has been on entry level qualifications of administrators, but “it is clear that concern about educational leadership has as much — if not more — to do with the quality of mature principals, superintendents and policy-makers. Relatively little attention has been paid to strategies for further developing educational leaders once they have met the requirements for initial licensure or certification” (Hoachlander et

al., 2001, p. 7). Defining leadership performance expectations and standards, developing and validating performance measures, and implementing the expectations and measures throughout state policy systems constitute the next generation of state-level policy needs.

Leadership Research to Inform Policy and Practice. Although the field of educational administration produces a consistently significant body of research literature, the importance of leadership for school improvement has galvanized efforts in the university research communities to consolidate and coordinate recommendations for policy and practice. One of the most broadly-based research efforts is a Joint Research Taskforce on Educational Leadership Preparation, sponsored by the University Council on Educational Administration (UCEA), the American Educational Research Association (AERA), Division A, Administration and Policy, the AERA Special Interest Group on Teaching in Educational Administration, and the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA). The Taskforce was developed to make widely available the conceptual and research base on leadership education.

The field must base preparation and professional development on what is currently known about leadership education, in order to implement a reform agenda that is informed, consistent, and forward thinking. Until we have an opportunity to “bring it all together” and build on those identified constructs and research findings, leadership education will continue primarily as a cult practice, with wide differences among schools of education, professors, and professional developers, unable to evaluate or replicate specific practice. Taskforce researchers will search the literature and cite research findings, primarily from the last decade, as well as identify gaps in the leadership preparation knowledge base, and discuss the implications of what is known and changing contexts for the future of educational leadership preparation and research (Joint Taskforce, 2005).

The Taskforce identified a set of research domains and commissioned reviews of the literature by experts that will help states connect policies with the research base:

- leadership education as a field of study
- the context of leadership education
- models and theories of leadership education
- recruitment, selection and development of leadership candidates
- providers of leadership education
- curriculum and pedagogy in leadership education
- the delivery of leadership preparation
- student assessment and program evaluation
- professional learning
- leadership education around the globe

Reports are emerging to help bridge research, policy, and practice, but not without controversy about differences in perspectives and conclusions within the research community. For example, a recent paper by Levine (2005) (not part of the Taskforce series) strongly criticized university-based administrator preparation programs and set off a flurry of responses from educational researchers and leadership professors. Levine’s conclusion was

that “While there is a good deal of research showing that principals make a difference in the success of students, there is no systematic research documenting the impact of school leadership programs on the achievement of children in the schools and school systems that graduates of these programs lead” (2005, p. 12). He compares his report with earlier critiques.

Since 1987, when the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration recommended closing three-fifths of the nation’s graduate programs in school leadership, the number of programs appears to have actually increased. ...This study found the overall quality of educational administration programs in the United States to be poor. The majority of programs range from inadequate to appalling, even at some of the country’s leading universities (Pp. 22-23) ...

The present study does not argue that a specific number of programs need to be closed. However, most of the programs examined in the course of this study were in fact inadequate. Some of them have the capacity for substantial improvement; many do not. Every leadership program should be evaluated to determine whether it is viable. The nine criteria used throughout this report—covering program purpose, curriculum content and balance, admission and graduation standards, faculty, research, resources, and degrees offered—provide a potential template for such evaluation.

In turn, it is the responsibility of leadership programs and education schools, their home universities, and the states to ensure that all leadership programs achieve minimum acceptable standards in each area. If leadership programs and education schools fail to act, then universities must step in. If universities do not carry out this assignment, then the states have the responsibility to do so (P. 65).

Responses to Levine included rebuttals of from the UCEA by Young, M.; Crow, G.; Orr, M.T.; Ogawa, R; and Creighton, T., (2005), entitled *An Educative Look at “Educating School Leaders.”* Their response pointed out methodological shortcomings in the Levine report, lack of mention of UCEA program standards to improve the field and significant efforts underway to improve programs.

Hoyle (2005) responded with *The good news about the preparation of school leaders: A professor’s view*. From his review of research on preparation programs, Hoyle finds:

University preparation of school principals and superintendents has never been better. Based on indicators of academic achievement, such as entrance examinations, grade point averages, and ethnic and gender diversity, the talent pool of graduate students in educational administration improves each decade. While critics abound, most recently Arthur Levine (2005), much remains to be done to increase the number of innovative programs that each year generate higher levels of satisfaction and positive perceptions among current and former students. Positive support of reforms in leadership preparation by both practicing administrators and professors themselves continues to grow in the research literature (Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2000; Hatley, Arrendondo, Donaldson, Short, & Updike, 1996; Hoyle, Bjork, Collier, & Glass, 2005; Hoyle & Oates, 2000; Leithwood, Jantzi, Coffin, & Wilson 1996; Pounder, 1995; Lin, 2005; McCarthy, 1999; Pauls, 2005). The majority of graduates from these successful programs choose careers as

public school administrators, while others turn to careers in higher education to conduct research which contributes to improving leadership preparation in departments of educational leadership (Hoyle, J., 2005).

A different response from a Wallace Foundation funded study of preparation programs underscores the complexity of relationships among policy, research, leadership programs, and practice.

Research on principal preparation and development programs suggests that certain program features are essential in the development of effective school leaders. There is also little discrepancy between guidelines for pre- and in-service programs. Evidence indicates that effective programs are research-based, have curricular coherence, provide experience in authentic contexts, use cohort groupings and mentors, and are structured to enable collaborative activity between the program and area schools. Despite existing consensus, empirical evidence for the impact of these features is currently minimal (Davis, S.; Darling-Hammond, L.; LaPointe, M.; and Meyerson, D., 2005, p. 3).

State Policies: Setting Standards, Guiding Practice, Using Research. A fundamental question facing policy makers is, what are the qualifications of highly qualified administrators? In Leithwood & Riehl's (2003) paper for the AERA Division A Task Force on Developing Research in Educational Leadership, "What do we already know about successful school leadership?" the authors suggest that research provides some guidance for policy choices.

Efforts to improve educational leadership should build upon the foundation of well-documented and well-accepted knowledge about leadership that already exists. We know that school leadership is most successful when it is focused on goals related to teaching and learning, and that leadership is necessary but not sufficient for school improvement. We understand that leadership can take different forms in different contexts. We understand some of the mechanisms through which educational leadership has its effects.

There are still many gaps in our knowledge about effective educational leadership. For example, how can educational leaders balance their leadership and managerial responsibilities in ways that move their schools forward? If leadership functions are indeed distributed across many formal and informal roles in a school, how are these roles coordinated and who takes responsibility for what? How can diversity in educational leadership be fostered, so that persons with appropriately rich backgrounds, values, and community connections lead our schools? Do educational leaders need answers to enduring questions about schooling, or are they most in need of provisional answers to immediate local concerns; in either case, how are those answers most likely to be developed and conveyed to potential users of the knowledge (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003, p. 36)?

CCSSO Assistance for State Policy Roles and Responsibilities. Policy makers increasingly recognize that improving education—and educational leadership--on a large scale requires multiple, coordinated, and systemic strategies. For the past three years, the Council has convened state education agency (SEA) representatives to share resources and network about improving local leadership as members of the Interstate Consortium on School Leadership (ICSL). The Council provides ICSL as a service to support SEA constituents, share resources among states,

and collaborate on national projects and products. This draft white paper builds on work at ICSL meetings to define and assist with state policy problems; uses data from a national CCSSO survey; and provides examples from states to develop a coherent, systemic leadership policy framework. ICSL representatives developed a set of basic principles and contributed comments to this draft.

The policy framework is intended to be used as a flexible tool for statewide strategic planning, to expand state policy options, recruit partners in the work of developing highly qualified administrators, and encompass important differences in state policy contexts. Since states vary widely in their policy structures, relative degree of centralization, and capacity to monitor and deliver services, this framework is intended to be flexible enough for use in different state contexts. State agencies can use it to help identify and prioritize policy alternatives, locate strategic partners and resources, and benefit from successful experience and reconsidered strategies in other states.

In particular, the framework is intended to help map roles and responsibilities among states, districts, intermediary agencies, and other partners engaged in improving educational leadership across the career continuum, with differentiated areas of expertise. The framework is not intended to vest all responsibility in state policies but suggests strategic partnering and coordination with local education agencies (LEAs), program providers, and others who contribute to developing highly qualified educational administrators.

ICSL participants have extensive experience and direct responsibilities for state administrator certification policies, professional standards and assessments, preparation and professional development programs, and other key state policy levers. For example, at an ICSL meeting to address problems of administrator supply, participants agreed with recent research reports indicating that overall supply of licensed applicants is not the real issue, since the current number of licensed professionals is adequate to fill vacancies. They concluded that the main problems in relation to recruitment and retention are:

1. applicant quality, meaning that although there are adequate numbers of people with required administrative certification in some areas, most applicants are not well prepared to meet professional standards or the requirements of NCLB
2. applicant distribution, that numbers of certified and qualified applicants are not adequate to fill vacancies in specific geographic areas or in specific positions, such as secondary principals, principals in rural areas and high-needs schools, and superintendents in rural and urban districts
3. adequate data for planning, that data need to be more specific about quality, location, reasons for turnover, and the impact of state efforts to recruit and retain qualified administrators

Strategies that states are using to improve quality and distribution of applicants include implementing state professional standards in preparation programs, outreach efforts to identify highly qualified aspirants, paying or buying time for highly qualified candidates to enter administrator preparation programs (or internships), and providing preparation and professional

development programs in leadership academies, through distance-learning technology, or on-site in school or district settings.

Basic Principles. The framework rests on the following three basic principles that were discussed and developed by SEA representatives to ICSL.

Principle 1: States should be responsible and accountable for certifying that all districts, schools, teachers, and students are served by highly qualified administrators.

The first principle emphasizes clarity of state-level responsibilities for administrator quality, including coordination and delegation of authority to districts and schools. This principle is not intended to suggest that policy levers and indicators should be centralized or can all be carried out by the state education agency. Using the policy framework can help identify which state and local agencies are responsible for specific areas; coordinate across education system levels (schools, districts, and intermediary agencies); and work with partners that are best equipped to carry out specific responsibilities and be held accountable for results.

The rationale for this principle rests on the constitutional delegation of responsibility for education to states, commitment to the premise that all children have equal right to free and appropriate education, and the state's responsibility for ensuring equity across vastly differing local educational jurisdictions. National data indicate that all states have or are developing state-level certification requirements and programs or requirements for continuous improvement. (For a description of overall state-level roles and responsibilities for improving public education, see *Leadership for student learning: Recognizing the state's role in public education (IEL, 5/2001).*)

There seems little doubt that both district and school leadership provides a critical bridge between most educational-reform initiatives, and having those reforms make a genuine difference for all students. Such leadership comes from many sources, not just superintendents and principals. But those in formal positions of authority in school systems are likely still the most influential. Efforts to improve their recruitment, training, evaluation and ongoing development should be considered highly cost-effective approaches to successful school improvement. (Leithwood, et al., 2004, p. 12)

Principle 2: State leadership policies should realign and prioritize administrators' roles and responsibilities to focus on improving teaching and learning.

The second principle recognizes current state and national priorities about educators' responsibilities and high-stakes accountability for improved student learning. State policies should realign and prioritize current expectations of administrators rather than simply adding to the already extensive list of leadership and managerial responsibilities.

The call for strong leadership in education is unmistakable—leadership that brings about significant improvement in learning and a narrowing of achievement gaps. Yet many school and district administrators report their time is consumed by matters unrelated to learning improvement. Even with enough time to focus, the leaders' task is complex, and

it is not always clear to them what they should be doing to contribute to that goal. (Knapp et al, 2003, p. 7)

Leaders contribute to student learning indirectly, primarily by deciding “what parts of their organizations to spend time and attention on” (Leithwood, et al., 2004, p. 11). Leithwood and Riehl (2003) explain the shift in expectations of administrators from earlier conceptions of instructional leadership toward goal orientation in schools that guide policies and practices:

Leadership as focused on and accountable for learning is the genesis of such phrases as “leading for learning,” “learning-focused leadership,” or “learner-centered” accountability (e.g., Darling-Hammond, 1997; DuFour, 2002; Knapp et al., 2002). This explicitly learning-focused goal for leadership does not narrow school leaders’ purview to the instructional system per se (as did older notions of instructional leadership). Rather it assumes that leaders will direct their attention to ensuring that all components and actions within the educational system support the learning of students (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003, p. 8).

Principle 3: State leadership policies should be performance-based, with continuous improvement required and assessed along the career continuum.

The final principle emphasizes the need to operationalize state expectations of highly qualified administrators. Policies should be performance based so they can be implemented consistently across policy levels and measured along the career continuum of highly qualified administrators.

Within the broader federal context of standards-based accountability, policy makers want evidence of performance, and in particular, evidence of leadership performance that can be demonstrated to improve schools and student outcomes. Performance expectations (or standards) are a key component of implementing professional standards of practice into professional practices.

A system of performance standards operationalizes and further defines content standards by connecting them to information that describes how well students are doing in learning the knowledge and skills contained in the content standards. Performance standards answer the question, “How good is good enough?” (Hansche, 1998, p. 4)

References

- Anthes, K. (2005). *Leader standards*. Denver: Education Commission of the States, on line at www.ecs.org.
- Davis, S.; Darling-Hammond, L.; LaPointe, M.; and Meyerson, D. (2005). *School leadership study: Developing successful principals*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Educational Leadership Institute, 27 pp.
- Hansche, L. (1998). *Handbook for the development of performance standards: Meeting the requirements of Title I*. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers, 115 pp.
- Hoachlander, G.; Alt, M.; and Beltranena, R. (2001). *Leading school improvement: What research says*. Atlanta: Southern Regional Educational Board, 48 pp. On line at www.sreb.org.
- Hoyle, J. (2005). *The good news about the preparation of school leaders: A professor's view*. Texas A&M University.
- Joint Taskforce. (n.d.) *Joint Research Taskforce on Educational Leadership Preparation*. Sponsored by UCEA, AERA-Division A, AERA Teaching in Educational Administration Sig, and NCPEA. On line at www.ucea.org.
- Knapp, M.; Copeland, M.; and Talbert, J. (2003). *Leading for learning: Reflective tools for school and district leaders*. Seattle: University of Washington, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy. On line at www.ctpweb.org.
- Leithwood, K. & Riehl, C. (2003). *What Do We Already Know About Successful School Leadership?* Chicago, IL: Paper for the AERA Division A Task Force on Developing Research in Educational Leadership, 60 pp.
- Leithwood, K.; Seashore Lewis, K.; Anderson, S.; & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *Review of research: How leadership influences student learning*. University of Minnesota: Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement,
- Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders*. Washington, D.C.: The education schools project.
- Young, M., Creighton, T., Crow, G., Orr, T., & Ogawa, R. (May, 2005). *An educative look at "educating school leaders."* Position paper in response to "Educating school leaders." University Council for Educational Administration, National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, and Division One of the American Educational Research Association. On line at <http://www.ucea.org/>

APPENDIX A
KEY STATE POLICY LEVERS AND INDICATORS:
A CHECKLIST FOR STATES

POLICY LEVER 1: THE STATE CERTIFIES HIGHLY QUALIFIED ADMINISTRATORS AND REQUIRES CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT ACROSS THE CAREER CONTINUUM.

- Indicator 1.1 The state regulates or provides oversight of administrator quality and qualifications.
- Indicator 1.2 The state has tiered certification and establishes expectations for continuous improvement along the career continuum of highly qualified administrators.
- Indicator 1.3 The state sets expectations for specialized certification or particular leadership roles.
- Indicator 1.4 The state provides alternative certification opportunities for candidates to meet state standards to address pressing state needs; for example, providing highly qualified administrators in hard-to-staff rural areas.

POLICY LEVER 2: THE STATE ESTABLISHES PROFESSIONAL ADMINISTRATOR STANDARDS AND USES PERFORMANCE-BASED INDICATORS AND MEASURES OF ADMINISTRATOR QUALITY, BENCHMARKED ALONG THE CAREER CONTINUUM.

- Indicator 2.1 The state establishes professional expectations or standards for administrators that are benchmarked along the career continuum.
- Indicator 2.2 The state regularly reviews and updates professional expectations or standards for highly qualified administrators, benchmarked across the career continuum.
- Indicator 2.3 The state defines specific expectations along the career continuum and for differentiated local leadership roles, such as teacher-leaders, instructional leaders, district leaders, or highly qualified leaders for low-performing districts and schools.
- Indicator 2.4 The state has standards and performance-based measures of administrator quality.
- Indicator 2.5 Performance-based measures of administrator quality provide diagnostic information on standards and benchmarks to guide continuous improvement along the career continuum.
- Indicator 2.6 The state monitors technical quality of tests, including validating performance assessments and confirming alignment with state standards.
- Indicator 2.7 Performance measures are linked to other indicators of performance, including school quality and student learning indicators.

POLICY LEVER 3: THE STATE ESTABLISHES PERFORMANCE-BASED CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL OF ADMINISTRATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS AND POLICIES TO RECRUIT DIVERSE, QUALIFIED ASPIRANTS; PREPARE CANDIDATES TO MEET ENTRY-LEVEL BENCHMARKS; AND SUPPORT EARLY CAREER SUCCESS.

- Indicator 3.1 The state has preparation program standards and approval processes aligned with administrator performance standards and entry-level benchmarks.
- Indicator 3.2 State policies and preparation programs have strategies to recruit qualified, diverse aspirants.
- Indicator 3.3 State policies and programs provide support and incentives for qualified, diverse aspirants to complete preparation programs and apply for leadership positions.
- Indicator 3.4 Preparation programs prepare candidates to meet entry-level benchmarks, providing standards-based curriculum, supervised internships, and field-based learning.
- Indicator 3.5 Preparation programs provide continuing support or induction programs to graduates for early career success.
- Indicator 3.6 Highly qualified, expert leaders are identified through standards-based performance measures to serve as instructors, internship and field supervisors, and induction program mentors and coaches.
- Indicator 3.7 Preparation program approval requires performance-based evidence of value-added and success of graduates on the job.

POLICY LEVER 4: THE STATE REQUIRES PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR CERTIFICATION AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT OF LEADERSHIP PRACTICES AND TO SUPPORT AND RETAIN EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATORS ON-THE-JOB.

- Indicator 4.1 States require professional development for recertification and continuous improvement of leadership practices.
- Indicator 4.2 The state uses standards and performance-based approval criteria for approving professional development programs, university programs for recertification or advancement, and continuing educational units for certification.
- Indicator 4.3 The state requires performance-based evaluation linked to state standards and benchmarks of administrator quality.
- Indicator 4.4 The state requires or provides supervised induction, performance-based professional development, and highly qualified mentors and coaches to support continuous improvement and retention of qualified administrators on the job.
- Indicator 4.5 Performance-based criteria are used to identify highly qualified administrators for instructors, supervisors, mentors, and coaches.

POLICY LEVER 5: STATES GATHER AND USE PERFORMANCE-BASED EVIDENCE OF ADMINISTRATOR QUALITY FOR STATE ACCOUNTABILITY AND PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT.

- Indicator 5.1 States have comprehensive accountability and reporting systems about administrator quality.

- Indicator 5.2 States report quality indicators of district and state administrators and link indicator data with indicators of teaching and learning (e.g., student achievement and school climate).
- Indicator 5.3 States monitor and report on technical quality of assessments used to certify and evaluate administrators, including alignment with performance standards and benchmarks, studies of validity for specific purposes (both predictive and concurrent validity), reliability, and fairness.
- Indicator 5.4 States monitor and report value-added measures of preparation programs, with follow-up data on performance of graduates.
- Indicator 5.5 States monitor and report value-added measures of professional development programs, university courses, and leadership academies for advanced certification.
- Indicator 5.6 States use data and value-added evidence to continuously review and improve policies, programs, and indicators of highly qualified educational leadership.

APPENDIX B
2004-05 STATE DATA ON KEY STATE POLICY INDICATORS
FOR IMPROVING ADMINISTRATOR QUALITY

Table 1

Indicator 1.1 The state regulates or provides oversight of administrator quality and qualifications.

| State | Administrator Preparation Program Required | Master's degree Required | State Teaching License Required | Teaching Experience Required | Years of Teaching Experience Required | State Requires Supervised Adm. Internship | Other |
|--------------|---|---------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|--------------|
| AL | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 | Yes | Yes |
| AK | Yes | Yes | | Yes | 3 | | |
| AZ | Yes | Yes | | Yes | 3 | Yes | Yes |
| AR | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 4 | Yes | Yes |
| CA | Yes | | Yes | Yes | 3 | Yes | |
| CO | Yes | | Yes | Yes | 3 | Yes | Yes |
| CT | Yes | Yes | | Yes | 4.1 | | Yes |
| DC | | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 | | Yes |
| DE | | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 | | Yes |
| FL | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 | | Yes |
| GA | Yes | Yes | | Yes | 3 | | Yes |
| HI | | | Yes | Yes | 4 | Yes | Yes |
| ID | Yes | | | Yes | 4 | | Yes |
| IL | Yes | | | Yes | 2 | | Yes |
| IN | | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | Yes | Yes |
| IA | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 | | Yes |
| KS | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 | Yes | Yes |
| KY | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 | Yes | Yes |
| LA | | Yes | Yes | Yes | 5 | Yes | Yes |
| ME | Yes | Yes | | Yes | 3 | Yes | Yes |
| MD | Yes | Yes | | Yes | 2.1 | Yes | |
| MA | | | | | | Yes | Yes |
| MI | | | | | | | |
| MN | | Yes | | Yes | 3 | Yes | Yes |
| MS | | Yes | | | | | Yes |
| MO | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | Yes |
| MT | Yes | Yes | | Yes | 3 | | Yes |
| NE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes |
| NV | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 | | Yes |
| NH | Yes | | | Yes | 3 | | Yes |
| NJ | | Yes | | | | Yes | |
| NM | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 7 | Yes | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------------|-----|-----|
| NY | Yes | | | Yes | 3 | | Yes |
| NC | Yes | Yes | | | | | Yes |
| ND | | | Yes | Yes | 3 | | |
| OH | Yes | Yes | | Yes | 2 | Yes | Yes |
| OK | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | | Yes |
| OR | Yes | Yes | | Yes | 3 | | Yes |
| PA | Yes | | | Yes | 5 | | Yes |
| RI | Yes | Yes | | Yes | 3 | | Yes |
| SC | Yes | | Yes | Yes | 3 | | Yes |
| SD | | Yes | | Yes | 4 | Yes | Yes |
| TN | Yes | | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes |
| TX | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | | Yes |
| UT | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | Yes | Yes |
| VT | | Yes | | Yes | 3 | | Yes |
| VA | Yes | Yes | | Yes | 3 | Yes | Yes |
| WA | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | Yes |
| WV | Yes | Yes | | | | Yes | Yes |
| WI | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 | Yes | Yes |
| WY | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3 | Yes | |
| | | | | | 3.00 | | |
| AVERAGE | | | | | 3.00 years | | |

Table 2

Indicator 2.1 The state establishes professional expectations or standards for highly qualified administrators: Characteristics of state standards for administrators.

| State | State Administrator or Leadership Standards | State Standards Same as ISLLC Standards | State Standards Based on ISLLC with Additions or Modifications | State Standards Aligned with ISLLC | Additional Standards or Expectations | Explain |
|-------|---|---|--|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| AL | Yes | | Yes | Yes | Yes | State developed |
| AK | Yes | | | Yes | | |
| AZ | Yes | | | Yes | | |
| AR | Yes | | Yes | | | |
| CT | Yes | | | Yes | | |
| CO | Yes | | | | | State developed |
| CT | Yes | | Yes | | | |
| DC | Yes | | Yes | | | |
| DE | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| FL | Yes | | | Yes | Yes | New standards in 2004 |
| GA | Yes | | Yes | | Yes | New standards underway |
| HI | Yes | | | Yes | | |
| ID | Yes | | Yes | | | |
| IL | Yes | | Yes | | | |
| IA | Yes | | Yes | | | |
| IA | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| KS | Yes | | Yes | | | |
| KY | Yes | Yes | | | Yes | ISTE/NETS |
| LA | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| ME | Yes | | | | | |
| MD | Yes | Yes | | | Yes | Instructional Leadership |
| MA | Yes | | | | | State developed |
| MI | | | | | | |
| MN | Yes | | | | | |
| MS | Yes | | Yes | | | |
| MO | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| MT | Yes | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------------------------|
| NE | Yes | | Yes | | | |
| NV | | | | | | |
| NH | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| NJ | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| NM | Yes | | Yes | | | |
| NY | | | | | | |
| NC | Yes | | Yes | | | |
| ND | Yes | | Yes | | | |
| OH | Yes | | Yes | | Yes | New draft standards in 2005 |
| OK | Yes | | Yes | | | |
| OR | Yes | | Yes | | Yes | Cultural competencies |
| PA | Yes | | | Yes | | |
| RI | | | | | | |
| SC | Yes | | Yes | | Yes | Principal Evaluation |
| SD | | | | | | |
| TN | Yes | | Yes | | | |
| TX | Yes | | Yes | | | |
| UT | Yes | | Yes | | | ELCC |
| VT | Yes | | | | | |
| VA | Yes | | Yes | | Yes | Preparation Program Standards |
| WA | Yes | | Yes | | | |
| WV | Yes | | Yes | | | |
| WI | Yes | | Yes | | | |
| WY | Yes | | Yes | | | |

Table 3
Indicator 2.2 The state regularly reviews and updates professional expectations or standards.

| State | Year Leadership Standards Were Developed or Updated |
|--------------|--|
| AL | 2005 |
| AK | 1999 |
| AZ | 1998 |
| AR | 2003 |
| CA | 2003 |
| CO | 2004 |
| CT | 2003 |
| DC | |
| DE | 2002 |
| FL | 1986 |
| GA | 2001 |
| HI | 1992 |
| ID | 2001 |
| IL | 1998 |
| IN | 1999 |
| IA | 2001 |
| KS | 2001 |
| KY | 1998 |
| LA | 2003 |
| ME | |
| MD | 1998 |
| MA | 2003 |
| MI | |
| MN | 1996 |
| MS | 1998 |
| MO | 1996 |
| MT | 2001 |
| NE | 2000 |
| NV | 2002 |
| NH | |
| NJ | 2003 |
| NM | 2002 |
| NY | |
| NC | 2002 |
| ND | 1999 |
| OH | 2005 |
| OK | 1997 |
| OR | 2005 |
| PA | 2000 |

| | |
|----|------|
| RI | 1996 |
| SC | 2002 |
| SD | |
| TN | 1999 |
| TX | 1998 |
| UT | 2001 |
| VT | 1999 |
| VA | 1998 |
| WA | 2002 |
| WV | 2000 |
| WI | 2004 |
| WY | 1992 |

Table 4
Indicator 2.4 The state has standards- and performance-based measures of administrator quality.

| State | SLLA | Praxis | Other Test | Basic Skills Administrator Test | Planning a New Test |
|--------------|-------------|---------------|-------------------|--|----------------------------|
| AL | | | Yes | | Yes |
| AK | | | | | Yes |
| AZ | | | Yes | | |
| AR | Yes | | | | |
| CA | Yes | | Yes | | |
| CO | | | Yes | | |
| CT | Yes | | Yes | | |
| DC | Yes | | Yes | | |
| DE | | | | Yes | |
| FL | | | Yes | Yes | |
| GA | Yes | Yes | Yes | | |
| HI | | | Yes | | |
| ID | | | | | Yes |
| IL | | | Yes | Yes | |
| IN | Yes | | | | |
| IA | | | Yes | Yes | |
| KS | Yes | | | | |
| KY | Yes | | Yes | | |
| LA | | Yes | Yes | | |
| ME | | | | | |
| MD | Yes | | Yes | | |
| MA | | | Yes | Yes | |
| MI | | | | | |
| MN | | | | | Yes |
| MS | Yes | | | | |
| MO | Yes | | Yes | | |
| MT | | | | | Yes |
| NE | | | | Yes | |
| NV | | Yes | | | |
| NH | | | Yes | | |
| NJ | Yes | | | | |
| NM | | | | | |
| NY | | | | | |
| NC | Yes | | | | |
| ND | | | Yes | | |
| OH | Yes | Yes | | | |
| OK | | | Yes | | |
| OR | | Yes | | Yes | |

| | | | | | |
|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| PA | | Yes | | | |
| RI | | | Yes | | |
| SC | | | Yes | | |
| SD | | | | | |
| TN | Yes | | Yes | | |
| TX | | | Yes | | |
| UT | | | | | Yes |
| VT | | Yes | | | |
| VA | Yes | | Yes | Yes | |
| WA | | | | | Yes |
| WV | | Yes | | | |
| WI | | | Yes | | |
| WY | | | Yes | | |

Table 5

Indicator 4.1 The state requires professional development and continuous improvement after initial certification to maintain or renew certification or specialized certification.

| State | State requires university credits, professional development credits or other evidence | Years to complete recertification requirements | State requires specific program or leadership academy | State requires professional leadership plan | State delegates responsibility to local districts for recertification |
|--------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| AL | | 5 | | Yes | |
| AK | Yes | 5 | | | |
| AZ | Yes | 5 | | | Yes |
| AR | Yes | Yes | | | |
| CA | Yes | | | Yes | |
| CO | Yes | 5 | | | |
| CT | Yes | | | | |
| DC | | | | | |
| DE | Yes | | Yes | | |
| FL | Yes | 5 | | | |
| GA | Yes | 5 | Yes | | |
| HI | | | | | |
| ID | Yes | 5 | | | |
| IL | Yes | | Yes | | |
| IN | Yes | 5 | | Yes | |
| IA | Yes | | | | |
| KS | Yes | | | | |
| KY | Yes | 2 | | Yes | |
| LA | Yes | | | | |
| ME | Yes | | | | |
| MD | Yes | 5 | | | |
| MA | | | | | |
| MI | | | | | |
| MN | Yes | 5 | | | |
| MS | Yes | | | | |
| MO | Yes | 5 | | | |
| MT | Yes | 5 | | | |
| NE | Yes | | | | |
| NV | Yes | 6 | | | |
| NH | | | | | |
| NJ | Yes | | | | |
| NM | | | | | |
| NY | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| NC | Yes | 5 | | | |
| ND | | | | | |
| OH | Yes | 5 | | | Yes |
| OK | Yes | 5 | | | |
| OR | Yes | 3 | | | |
| PA | Yes | 5 | | | |
| RI | | | | | |
| SC | Yes | | | | |
| SD | | 5 | | | |
| TN | Yes | | Yes | | |
| TX | Yes | 5 | | | |
| UT | Yes | 5 | | | |
| VT | | | | | |
| VA | Yes | | | | |
| WA | | | | | |
| WV | Yes | | | | |
| WI | Yes | 5 | | Yes | |
| WY | Yes | Yes | | | |

Table 6
Indicator 4.3 The state requires performance-based evaluation linked to state standards and benchmarks of administrator quality.

| State | State has performance-based assessments for evaluation | Evaluation is a district decision | State has a required process for evaluation |
|--------------|---|--|--|
| AL | Yes | | Yes |
| AK | | Yes | |
| AZ | | Yes | |
| AR | | Yes | |
| CA | | Yes | |
| CO | | Yes | |
| CT | | Yes | |
| DC | | | |
| DE | | | Yes |
| FL | | Yes | |
| GA | | Yes | |
| HI | Yes | | |
| ID | | Yes | |
| IL | | | |
| IN | Yes | Yes | |
| IA | | Yes | |
| KS | | Yes | |
| KY | | | Yes |
| LA | | Yes | |
| ME | | Yes | |
| MD | | Yes | |
| MA | | Yes | |
| MI | | | |
| MN | | Yes | |
| MS | | Yes | Yes |
| MO | Yes | Yes | |
| MT | | Yes | |
| NE | | Yes | |
| NV | | Yes | |
| NH | | | |
| NJ | | | Yes |
| NM | | | Yes |
| NY | | | |
| NC | Yes | | |
| ND | | | Yes |
| OH | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| OK | | | Yes |
| OR | | Yes | |

| | | | |
|----|-----|-----|-----|
| PA | | Yes | |
| RI | | | Yes |
| SC | | | Yes |
| SD | | | |
| TN | Yes | | Yes |
| TX | | | Yes |
| UT | | | |
| VT | | Yes | |
| VA | Yes | | Yes |
| WA | | | |
| WV | | Yes | |
| WI | | | |
| WY | | | Yes |

APPENDIX C
SAMPLE ISSUES FOR STATE POLICY REVIEW

| Key State Policy Levers | Highly Qualified Administrator Career Continuum | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| | Aspiring | Job Entry | Early Career | Advanced Career | Mentor, Coach |
| 1. Tiered certification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • continuous improvement on standards • address differentiated and distributed leadership (teacher leaders) • alternative routes for specific needs | identify and recruit promising teacher leaders | guide induction, mentors, professional development plans | guide professional development programs and plans, evaluation, recertification | guide professional development programs and plans, evaluation, recertification | identify supervisors, mentors, coaches |
| 2. Performance-based standards and indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • define highly qualified leadership • provide policy coherence • continuously updated with research • focus on teaching and learning | recruit teacher leaders based on performance | prepare for success on the job | diagnostic information for continuous improvement | diagnostic information for continuous improvement | identify through performance-based criteria |
| 3. Preparation programs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • program planning to meet standards and entry-level expectations • field-based learning for performance • internships and induction for continuity and success on the job | performance standards and benchmarks to identify and recruit promising, diverse candidates | standards-based assessment and diagnostic information, induction, mentors, coaches | programs continue coaching and feedback, monitor graduates' performance | programs continue standards-based advanced degree programs for certification, monitor graduates' performance | criteria for instructors, supervisors, mentors, coaches |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| <p>4. Professional development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specific to standards and expectations for tiered certification • diagnostic data for professional development plans | | <p>diagnostic information, induction programs with mentors, coaches</p> | <p>diagnostic evaluation for professional learning plans</p> | <p>diagnostic evaluation for professional learning plans</p> | <p>training as mentors, coaches</p> |
| <p>5. Accountability and reporting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • administrator quality measures and indicators • program quality • links to school and student data | <p>data on aspirants, candidate pool</p> | <p>data on candidate performance</p> | <p>data on professional development programs and performance</p> | <p>data on professional development programs and performance</p> | <p>data on quality criteria and effectiveness</p> |

APPENDIX D
SELECTED EXAMPLES FROM STATE AGENCY REPORTS

| Key State Policy Levers | Highly Qualified Administrator Career Continuum | | | | |
|---|--|------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| | Aspirants | Job entry | Early career | Advanced career | Mentor, coach |
| 1. Tiered certification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • continuous improvement on standards • address differentiated and distributed leadership (teacher leaders) • alternative routes for specific needs | | AR KY | MO MS OH WI | WI | |
| 2. Performance-based standards and indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • define highly qualified leadership • provide policy coherence • continuously updated with research • focus on teaching and learning | | GA OH | CT DE MD NC SC | MO | |
| 3. Preparation programs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • program planning to meet standards and entry-level expectations • field-based learning for performance • internships and induction for continuity and success on the job | | CT KY MO | | | |
| 4. Professional development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specific to standards and expectations for tiered certification • diagnostic data for professional development plans | | | KY MO OH | | MO OH |
| 5. Accountability and reporting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • administrator quality measures and indicators • program quality • links to school and student data | | CT KY | | | |

APPENDIX E
INTERSTATE CONSORTIUM ON SCHOOL LEADERSHIP
2004 - 05 PARTICIPANTS

Alabama

Ruth Ash
Deputy State Superintendent of Education
Alabama Department of Education
50 N. Ripley Street
Montgomery, AL 36104
Phone: 334-242-8154
Fax: 334-242-9708
rcash@alsde.edu

Arkansas

Donna Zornes Hill
Coordinator, Office of Teacher Quality
Arkansas Department of Education
501 Woodlane
Little Rock, AR 72201
Phone: 501-682-4346
Fax: 501-682-5118
dzornes@arkedu.k12.ar.us

California

Susan Stickel
Deputy Superintendent
California Department of Education
1430 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: 916-319-0806
Fax: 916-319-0103
sstickel@cde.ca.gov

Delaware

Wayne Barton
Acting Director of Professional
Accountability
Delaware Department of Education
Post Office Box 1402
Townsend Building
Dover, DE 19903-1402
302.739.4686, xt3266 -- fax 302.739.5894
wbarton@doe.k12.de.us

Arizona

Kathleen Wiebke
Deputy Associate Superintendent
Arizona Department of Education
1535 West Jefferson Street, Bin 31
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602.364.2294 -- fax 602.542.1141
kwiebke@ade.az.gov

Arkansas

Kristi Pugh
Administrator Program Advisor
Arkansas Department of Education
Four Capitol Mall, Rm 405-B
Little Rock, AR 72201
501.682.9850 -- fax 501.682.5118
kpugh@arkedu.k12.ar.us

Connecticut

Larry Jacobson
Education Consultant
Bureau of Educator Assessment
Connecticut Department of Education
165 Capitol Avenue, Rm 222
Hartford, CT 6145
860.713.6819 -- fax 860.713.7027
larry.jacobson@po.state.ct.us

Georgia

Ann Duffy
Director of Policy Development
Georgia Leadership Trust
760 Spring Street
Atlanta, GA 30308
404.385.4090 -- fax 404.385.4151
ann.duffy@galeaders.org

Idaho

Sally Tiel
Supervisor, Curriculum, Instruction,
Assessment
Idaho Department of Education
650 West State Street
Boise, ID 83720
Phone: 208-332-6946
Fax: 208-332-6965
srtiel@sde.idaho.gov

Kentucky

Robert Brown
Division Director
Kentucky Education Professional Standards
Board
100 Airport Road, 3rd Flr
Frankfort, KY 40601
Phone: 502-564-4606
Fax: 502-564-9484
e-mail: robertl.brown@ky.gov

Massachusetts

Elizabeth Pauley
Director, Leadership Initiatives
Massachusetts Department of Education
350 Main Street
Malden, MA 2148
Phone: 781-338-3267
Fax: 781-338-3392
Epauley@doe.mass.edu

New Jersey

Wendi Webster-O'Dell
New Jersey Department of Education
100 Riverview Executive Plaza
Trenton, NJ 08625-0500
609.633.3965 -- fax 609.292.7276
wendi.webster-o'dell@doe.state.nj.us

Kansas

Larry Wheelles
Director
Kansas Department of Education
120 SE 10th Avenue
Topeka, KS 66612
785.296.3050 -- fax 785.296.1413
lwheelles@ksde.org

Louisiana

Nicole Honore
Assistant Director
Leadership & Online Learning
Louisiana Department of Education
2758 - D Brightside Lane
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064
225.763.5575 -- fax 225.763.5461
nicole.honore@la.gov

Missouri

Douglas Miller
Coordinator, Professional Development
Missouri Department of Elementary &
Secondary Education
200 Jefferson
Post Office Box 480
Jefferson City, MO 65102
573.751.2200 -- fax 573.682.5118
dmiller@mail.dese.state.mo.us

North Carolina

Danny Holloman
Manager, Center for Recruitment &
Retention
North Carolina Department of Public
Instruction
6330 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-6330
919.807.3375 -- fax 919.807.3362
dholloma@dpi.state.nc.us

Ohio

Deborah Miller
Ohio SAELP Project Manager
Office of Educator Quality
Center for the Teaching Profession
Ohio Department of Education
25 South Front Street
Mail Stop 504
Columbus, OH 43215-4183
614.728.6914 -- fax 614.995.1987
deborah.miller@ode.state.oh.us

Oregon

Robert Larson
Federal Liaison Representative
Oregon Department of Education
255 Capitol Street., N.E.
Salem, OR 97310
Phone: 503-278-3600
Fax: 503-378-5156
rob.larson@state.or.us

Rhode Island

Mary Canole
Director, Progressive Support & Intervention
Rhode Island Department of Education
255 Westminster Street
Providence, RI 2903
Phone: 401-222-8400
Fax: 401-222-2734
mary.canole@ride.ri.gov

South Carolina

Kathy Tuten
Director
Office of School Leadership
South Carolina Department of Education
1429 Senate Street, Rm 1112
Columbia, SC 29201
803.734.8562 -- fax 803.734.5486
ktuten@sde.state.sc.us

Ohio

Lucy Ozvat
Director
Ohio Department of Education
23 South Front Street
Columbus, OH 43215
Phone: 614-466-5795
Fax: 614-728-3058
lucy.ozvat@ode.state.oh.us

Rhode Island

Todd Flaherty
Deputy Commissioner
Rhode Island Department of Education
255 Westminster Street, Rm 500
Providence, RI 02903
401.222.4600, xt 2011 -- fax 401.222.6178
ride1545@ride.ri.net

South Carolina

Janice Poda
Deputy Superintendent
South Carolina Department of Education
3700 Forest Drive
Columbia, SC 29204
Phone: 803-737-3150
Fax: 803-734-0312
jpoda@sctechners.org

Utah

Raymond Timothy
Associate Superintendent
Utah State Office of Education
250 East 500 South
Salt Lake City, UT 84114
Phone: 801-538-7762
Fax: 801-538-7768
ray.timothy@schools.utah.gov

Wisconsin

M.J.Best
Coordinator, License Stages
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
125 S. Webster Street
Post Office Box 7841
Madison, WI 53707-7841
608.266.3089 -- fax 608.264.9558
Maryjane.best-louther@dpi.state.wi.us

American Samoa

Lisa Mapu
Program Director-School Leadership
American Samoa Department of Education
P.O. Box
American Samoa Department of Education
Pago Pago, AS 96799
Phone: 684-633-5237
Fax: 684-633-4240
lvmapu@hotmail.com

Virginia

Douglas Fiore
School Leadership Specialist
Virginia Department of Education
Division of Teacher Education Licensure
Richmond, VA 23114
Phone: 804-225-2803
Fax: 804-786-6759
Doug.Fiore@doe.virginia.gov

District of Columbia

Ken Bungert
Director, Office of Academic Credentials
District of Columbia Public Schools
825 North Capitol Street, NE, 6th Flr
Washington, DC 20002
202.442.5353 -- fax 202.442.5311
kenneth.bungert@k12.dc.us