

Learning-Centered Leadership:

*The Preparation and Support for the Next Generation of
Kentucky's School and District Leaders*

October 2007

2006 House Joint Resolution 14
A Report Prepared for the
Interim Joint Committee on Education



Education Leadership Redesign Task Force Membership

Executive Committee

Bradford L. Cowgill, Interim President of the Council on Postsecondary Education
Representative Jon Draud, Sponsor of House Joint Resolution 14
Kevin Noland, Interim Commissioner of the Kentucky Department of Education
Laura Owens, Secretary of the Education Cabinet
Phillip S. Rogers, Executive Director of the Education Professional Standards Board

School Districts

Diane Woods-Ayers, Superintendent, Campbellsville Independent
Cynthia Lawson, Principal, Second Street Middle/Elementary School, Frankfort Independent
Boyd Randolph, Principal, Southwestern Pulaski County High School
Frank Welch, Retired Superintendent, Pike County School District
Lynne Wheat, Director, Administrator Recruitment and Development/LEAD Jefferson County
Lorraine Williams, Principal, Millcreek Elementary, Fayette County; EPSB Board

Institutions of Higher Education

Debra Jo Baker, Bellarmine University
David Barnett, Morehead State University
Bob Biggin, Eastern Kentucky University
Jeanne Fiene, Western Kentucky University
Robert Lyons, Murray State University
Freda Merriweather, University of Louisville
Barry Pelphey, Kentucky State University
Jim Rinehart, University of Kentucky
Mark Wasicsko, Northern Kentucky University
Rosa Weaver, Northern Kentucky University
Lucian Yates, Kentucky State University

State Agencies

Ashley Abshire, Education Professional Standards Board
Jim Applegate, Council on Postsecondary Education
Linda Bowker, Education Professional Standards Board
Mike Carr, Education Professional Standards Board
Debbie Daniels, Kentucky Department of Education/SAELP Grant
John DeAtley, Council on Postsecondary Education
Cindy Owen, Education Professional Standards Board
Marcie Puckett, Education Professional Standards Board
Steve Schenck, Kentucky Department of Education
Orin Simmerman, Kentucky Department of Education
Pat Trotter, Kentucky Department of Education
Marilyn Troupe, Education Professional Standards Board

Educational Organizations

Blake Haselton, Kentucky Association of School Superintendents

Michael Kral, Kentucky Education Association

Shirley Lafavers, Kentucky Association of School Administrators

Jacqueline Pope-Tarrence, Kentucky School Board Association

Wayne Young, Kentucky Association of School Administrators

External Research Consultant

Kathy O'Neill, Southern Regional Education Board

Table of Contents

<u>Executive Summary</u>	7
<u>Introduction</u>	13
Selection and Preparation of Principals	15
Recommendation 1: Incorporate all principal preparation programs and principal support services within dynamic and documented district-university partnerships.	15
Recommendation 2: Require that all principal preparation programs adopt highly selective admission standards.	16
Recommendation 3: Redesign the principal preparation curriculum around the competencies shown by research to be necessary for raising student achievement.	17
Recommendation 4: Redesign all principal preparation courses around structured school-based learning experiences.....	18
<u>Induction of New Principals</u>	21
Recommendation 5: Redesign the principal induction program to include high quality mentoring and collegial support for new principals through a sequence of experiences and evaluations that are synchronized with the school calendar.	21
<u>Principals’ Working Conditions</u>	23
Recommendation 6: Conduct further study on principal working conditions, exploring resources, autonomy and professional development.	25
High Quality Professional Development	27
Recommendation 7: Improve standards for the approval and accountability process for professional development required to renew administrator certificates.....	27
Recommendation 8: Develop an electronic tracking system to approve and document high quality professional development for all principals.	28
Recommendation 9: Establish an interdisciplinary Professional Development Academy to offer high quality PD for principals.....	29
Recommendation 10: Require that all new principals pass both state and national tests for administrative licensure within the five-year period preceding the beginning of a principalship.....	30
Doctoral Programs in Education Administration	31
Recommendation 11: Require that all new and existing doctoral programs in education administration be designed (or redesigned) in conjunction with the redesign of master’s degrees for teacher rank change and principal preparation programs.....	32
<u>Conclusion</u>	39

<u>References</u>	41
<u>Appendix A: Education Leadership Redesign at a Glance</u>	45
<u>Appendix B: 2006 House Joint Resolution 14</u>	51
<u>Appendix C: Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards for School Leaders</u>	53
<u>Appendix D: Kentucky Cohesive Leadership System Continuum for Principal Preparation and Development</u>	55
<u>Appendix E: Providing Principals the Support to Improve Teaching and Learning</u>	63
<u>Appendix F: Survey of Employer Demand for Educational Leadership Ed.D Degrees</u>	66
<u>Appendix G: Survey of Potential Educational Leadership Ed.D. Applicants</u>	71

Executive Summary

Like the military, often accused of training soldiers to fight the last war instead of the next one, Kentucky's approach to principal preparation, emphasizing the management of resources, is no longer adequate. Granted, effective management of buses, budgets, and buildings is still necessary, but twenty-first century principals must focus on preparing children to live in a global society and work in a knowledge-based economy. In other words, the next generation principal must be able to increase student achievement by guiding and supporting teachers while capably managing the school organization.

Recognizing the changing responsibilities and expectations of principals, the 2006 General Assembly passed House Joint Resolution 14 (HJR14). This legislation called for the executive director of the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB), in collaboration with the president of the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) and the Commissioner of Education, to form a task force to present recommendations on the redesign of principal preparation and support. Thirty educational leaders representing local school districts, universities, state agencies and professional organizations served on the Education Leadership Redesign Task Force (ELR), the work of which was supported by federal funds supplied through the Appalachia Region Comprehensive Center via the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB).

The responsibilities of the Education Leadership Redesign (ELR) Task Force were divided into work groups facilitated by staff members of the EPSB. Four work groups were established for the redesign process:

- Preparation Programs;
- Induction & Working Conditions;
- Professional Development; and
- Doctoral Programs.

The task force met regularly for nearly a year. To ensure a timely and thorough final report, HJR14 was analyzed and the various components were divided among the work groups along with a timeline for the completion of the work. Each work group organized and convened separate meetings as the needs of the group dictated. The members of each group began its work with a review of the salient literature followed by in-depth discussions in which ideas were developed. The induction and working conditions group and the doctoral programs group both conducted online surveys to inform their recommendations (see Appendices E, F, and G respectively). As the work groups progressed, they shared ideas and tentative recommendations with the whole task force for feedback and discussion. Finally, prior to publication of this report, the entire task force reviewed and adopted these recommendations.

Recommendation 1: Incorporate all principal preparation programs and principal support services within dynamic and documented district-university partnerships.

The work of a principal is too important and too difficult to leave preparation to one institution and support to another. It is critical that the district and the university collaborate in the important work of principal preparation and support. This partnership should include the selection of candidates, the designing and delivery of courses, the selection and support of skilled mentors, and the development and delivery of high quality professional development.

Recommendation 2: Require that all principal preparation programs adopt highly selective admission standards.

Selecting only those candidates who are passionate about and proficient in helping all students to excel academically is the first step to having effective principals. Districts and universities should work together to select the very best principal candidates possible. Along with a variety of selection criteria on which the district and university collaborate, the preferred candidate must be able to provide evidence of his or her ability as a leader who can support student achievement.

Recommendation 3: Redesign the principal preparation curricula around the competencies shown by research to be necessary for raising student achievement.

Schools are dynamic, but too often principal preparation programs are static. The curricula of Kentucky's principal preparation programs must be built upon the competencies that are identified as supporting student achievement. The ELR Task Force strongly recommends that districts and universities co-design and co-deliver courses that are rooted in the research regarding what is necessary to lead a school toward academic proficiency.

Recommendation 4: Redesign all principal preparation courses around structured school-based learning experiences.

In recognition that we learn best by doing, the redesigned principal preparation programs must include the following practical in-school experiences:

- A practicum seminar for candidates conducted throughout the program;
- State-funded stipends for candidates and directing principals to participate in school-based mentoring activities for 20 days per year throughout the program;
- Joint selection by districts and universities of directing principals who display exemplary leadership skills to guide candidates; and
- Performance evaluations of candidates conducted during all field experiences.

Recommendation 5: Redesign the principal induction program to include high quality mentoring and collegial support for new principals through a sequence of experiences and evaluations that are synchronized with the school calendar.

The loneliest job in the school district is said to be the job of principal. Such a statement should be amended to say that the loneliest job in the school district is the job of the *new* principal. New

principals need support and encouragement—their success depends upon it. The ELR Task Force recommends that current internships be redesigned to include:

- Inductee cohorts that meet for collegial support and small group study;
- A Principal Support Team (PST);
- A reporting system whereby the PST and inductee provide the university a report that indicates programmatic strengths and weaknesses;
- Evidence that the inductee has demonstrated competency in supporting student achievement;
- Evidence that the inductee can build a functioning school leadership team; and
- Required completion of instructional modules aligned to the calendar of the school.

Recommendation 6: Conduct further study on principal working conditions, exploring resources, autonomy and professional development.

The difficult job of school principal is often made more difficult by flawed policies and inadequate resources. The ELR Task Force is concerned with the impact of policies and conditions not only on current principals but also on qualified candidates who may turn away from leadership positions. An ELR Task Force survey of Kentucky principals reveals that principals believe they are hampered by limited autonomy, inadequate resources, and poor professional development. The task force recommends further study of the impact of working conditions on principal effectiveness.

Recommendation 7: Improve standards for the approval and accountability process for professional development required to renew administrator certificates.

Given the changing expectations and responsibilities of the principal, the present system of professional development for Kentucky principals is inadequate. A survey of Kentucky principals indicates that many principals want more from their professional development experiences. In fact, nothing holds more short-term promise for helping principals support student achievement than focused, high quality professional development. The task force recommends establishing a Practitioner Advisory Board to provide oversight and guidance for what is accepted for professional development credit, revising the scholastic audit/review process to focus more on the professional growth of principals, and aligning professional development standards to known competencies for supporting student achievement.

Recommendation 8: Implement an electronic tracking system to approve and document high quality professional development for all principals.

It is true that what gets counted gets accomplished. A modern interactive data system to both approve and collect professional development should be created. The current model depends on the self-reporting of districts and provides no mechanism for auditing or review. The task force recommends that an electronic tracking system be designed and implemented as soon as possible.

Recommendation 9: Establish an interdisciplinary Professional Development Academy to offer high quality PD for principals.

Principals need help immediately. As a result of funds provided to the CPE through the 2006-08 biennium budget and the collaborative work of the task force, the PD academy will begin operation in the summer of 2008. Utilizing an interdisciplinary approach, the Principal's Academy will provide a high quality professional development experience focusing on the creation of a school culture that is supportive of student achievement.

Recommendation 10: Require that all new principals pass both state and national tests for administrative licensure within the five-year period preceding the beginning of a principalship.

New principals must provide evidence of basic knowledge of school leadership. Too often more than five years has elapsed since a new principal completed his or her preparation. The dynamic nature of learning environments within schools and the importance of having the best prepared principals leading schools require that each principal demonstrate competency by successfully passing all required tests within the last five years. The current option of taking six graduate hours in lieu of retaking the tests does not ensure that the new principal is up to date on the basics of school leadership.

Recommendation 11: Require that all new and existing doctoral programs in education administration be designed (or redesigned) in conjunction with the redesign of master's degrees for teacher leader rank change and the redesigned principal preparation programs.

Kentucky does not need to propagate more of the same outdated and frequently underfunded doctoral programs that are often disconnected from the rest of school leader preparation. However, coupled with the EPSB redesign of the Teacher Leader master's degrees for advanced rank change and the redesign of the principal preparation programs, the development of high quality education doctorates is a logical step. The task force recommends that all programs conferring Ed. D. degrees be aligned with the institution's approved teacher leader master's and principal and district administrator preparation programs. Among other academic and programmatic requirements, these doctoral programs should be built upon a strong district-university partnership and focused on how to support K-12 student achievement. Preparing education leaders for their jobs demands a truly interdisciplinary curriculum and faculty. An adequate education for such leaders demands access to the resources of the Commonwealth's programs in management, public policy, communication, social work and public health, among others. A systems approach to leadership is needed to provide the broad array of conceptual models and practical applications that adequately address the challenges faced by today's educational leaders.

Introduction

The urgency of the need may well be hidden in its simplicity: Kentucky only needs 1,243 highly effective principals—one for each of Kentucky’s public schools. An *effective* principal is one who can increase student achievement by guiding and supporting teachers while capably managing the school organization. This is easier said than accomplished, as the job of principal is incredibly complicated. Davis and colleagues (Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson, 2005) capture the complexity very well:

Principals are expected to be educational visionaries, instructional and curriculum leaders, assessment experts, disciplinarians, community builders, public relations and communication experts, budget analysts, facility managers, special programs administrators, as well as guardians of various legal, contractual, and policy mandates and initiatives. In addition, principals are expected to serve the often conflicting needs and interests of many stakeholders, including students, parents, teachers, district office officials, unions, and state and federal agencies. As a result, many scholars and practitioners argue that the job requirements far exceed the reasonable capacities of any one person. The demands of the job have changed so that traditional methods of preparing administrators are no longer adequate to meet the leadership challenges posed by public schools. (p. 3)

Research clearly shows that, within the school, only a student’s classroom teacher affects learning more than the principal (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). Nowhere is the impact of a principal more evident than in underperforming schools (Leithwood, 2004). Without a doubt, Kentucky’s ambitious goal of having all children reach proficiency by 2014 will not happen without highly effective principals leading schools.

The schools of the twenty-first century must prepare children to live in a global society and work in an information-based economy. Kentucky cannot continue to let 30 - 40 percent of its students leave high school unprepared for post-secondary education (Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education, 2007). Granted, the principals of the twenty-first century must still be able to manage buses, budgets, and buildings. It is imperative, however, that they also know how to lead their schools to high levels of student achievement. Kentucky’s current system of preparing and supporting principals, because it was designed to meet different expectations, is no longer adequate. Although there has been some movement to alter the framework of the existing system, changes have been inconsistent and infrequent. The task is too large unless everyone—legislators, state agencies, districts, and universities—works in a collaborative and coordinated effort. To this end, the 2006 General Assembly passed House Joint Resolution 14 (HJR14), creating the Education Leadership Redesign (ELR) Task Force (see Appendix B).

This legislation directed the executive director of the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB), in cooperation with the Commissioner of Education and the president of the Council on Postsecondary Education, to establish an interagency task force to exam-

ine the preparation and professional support of Kentucky's school and district leaders and to recommend changes. Thirty education leaders representing local school districts, universities, state agencies, and professional organizations served on the Education Leadership Redesign Task Force, the work of which was supported by federal funds supplied through the Appalachia Region Comprehensive Center via the Southern Region Education Board (SREB).

The responsibilities of the ELR Task Force were divided into work groups facilitated by staff members of the EPSB. Four work groups were established for the redesign process:

- Preparation Programs;
- Induction & Working Conditions;
- Professional Development; and
- Doctoral Programs.

In keeping with the guidelines of HJR14, the task force incorporated the ongoing leadership redesign work of the Commonwealth Collaborative for School Leadership Programs (CCSLP) and the initiatives of the Wallace Foundation's State Action for Education Leadership Project (Kentucky SAELP) to shape its recommendations.

The following report includes recommendations by representative teachers, principals, district administrators, and policy leaders for a comprehensive redesign effort that will result in a coherent system of preparing highly effective leaders for Kentucky schools. Based on evidence of successful practices, these recommendations are rooted in a solid knowledge base about how principals affect student achievement. The members of the ELR Task Force endorse these recommendations and propose that they be fully implemented without delay.

Selection and Preparation of Principals

Without question, the most critical component of ensuring that every school has an effective leader is the selection and preparation of principals. Currently, most principal preparation programs have a weak selection process that is too often used by teachers to gain a rank change based primarily on the availability and accessibility of the courses. There is strong anecdotal evidence that a significant percentage of these teachers have no intention of ever seeking a position as a principal. The EPSB reports that approximately five percent of the current teacher workforce of 43,000 holds administrative certificates and that annually about 175 teachers let their principal Statements of Eligibility lapse. The ELR work group on preparation presented to the task force clear recommendations regarding the importance of district-university partnerships, selective admissions for principal candidates, a retooled preparation program curriculum, and high quality practicum experiences.

Recommendation 1: Incorporate all principal preparation programs and principal support services within dynamic and documented district-university partnerships.

Ensuring that all schools have effective leadership begins with the principal selection and preparation process (Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, & Orr, 2007). Kentucky education leaders are currently selected and prepared primarily by a university. This process must be changed to a collaborative effort between universities and the school districts they serve. It is critical that universities and school districts work together to identify and secure candidates for the principalship based upon local needs identified from student achievement data and emerging research about the dispositions and characteristics of exemplary school leaders (Darling-Hammond et al., 2007; Leithwood et al., 2004; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Bottoms, O'Neill, 2001).

These district-university partnerships should be formalized to ensure collaboration with written memoranda of agreement signed by high-level administrators defining how the university and district(s) will work as partners in the preparation of school principals. The agreement will define how the partners will work to: a) create a shared vision and program design that meets the needs of the district; b) develop a process for recruiting, selecting and supporting the most promising candidates; and c) conduct high quality field experiences. Implementation of the partnership should be a priority in both organizations, as reflected in their missions, structures, regular practices, and budgets.

Additionally, the university and district partners will jointly establish and implement criteria and processes for screening and selecting promising candidates who demonstrate expertise in curriculum and instruction, have a track record of raising student achievement, and have experiences in leadership from prior work. The implementation of the screening and selection system will be continually monitored, evaluated, and improved by redesign teams and advisory councils who will meet on a regular basis.

The partnership between the district and university should also customize the leadership program in ways that prepare school leaders who can meet the needs of the district for improving student learning outcomes. Every course should be designed and delivered in such a way that it relates to the real world of the district's classrooms.

Finally, the university and district should allocate and pool resources to provide candidates the support and conditions necessary to succeed in the leadership program, such as release time for course work and field experiences, tuition assistance, learning materials, and extra coaching as needed to master essential competencies. (Fry, O'Neill, & Bottoms, 2006).

Recommendation 2: Require that all principal preparation programs adopt highly selective admission standards.

Although there was some ambivalence within the ELR task force regarding whether principal preparation should be post-baccalaureate or post-master's, the preparation workgroup settled on language that states a preference for a post-master's preparation program model requiring all new candidates to have a minimum of three (3) years of successful teaching experience and submit an application portfolio that contains the following:

- Evidence of ability to improve student achievement (The evidence or documentation shall be developed collaboratively between districts and university departments);
- Evidence of knowledge about curriculum, instruction, and assessment;
- Evidence of leadership and management potential, including evidence of most recent accomplishments in the area of education leadership;
- Letter(s) of recommendation from the applicant's principal or supervisor. Each local superintendent or designee, in collaboration with university departments, will establish requirements for recommendations from the principal and/or supervisor;
- Completed copy (all forms) of the most recent performance appraisal to include the professional development component, if available;
- A personal statement of career goals and how the preparation program would assist the principal candidate in reaching stated goals; and
- A letter from the superintendent pledging support for the principal candidate during the program.

The candidate will also have to pass an interview conducted by a program admission committee that includes both P-12 instructional leaders and higher education faculty.

District-university partnerships may choose to implement more rigorous selection and admissions procedures.

Recommendation 3: Redesign the principal preparation curriculum around the competencies shown by research to be necessary for raising student achievement.

Currently seven public institutions and four independent institutions in Kentucky have approved principal preparation programs. Since 1998, Kentucky principal preparation programs have been required to be aligned with the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards (see Appendix C). ISSLC standards provide a set of common expectations for the knowledge, skills and dispositions of school leaders which are grounded in principles of powerful teaching and learning. Ideally, alignment with ISLLC standards means that each university preparation program incorporates the intent of the standards into its curriculum, consistently aligns the curriculum with national standards, and uses performance-based assessments. In reality, this rarely happens because states have not created the performance criteria that adequately and equitably measure program implementation and candidate performance.

The most critical factors associated with principals who have succeeded in raising student achievement in schools have been identified through research by the Southern Regional Education Board. These factors, organized under three overarching competencies, should be the minimum driving force for university preparation program redesign. (Bottoms & O'Neill, 2001).

Competency I: Effective principals have a comprehensive understanding of school and classroom practices that contribute to student achievement through focusing on student achievement, developing a culture of high expectations, and designing a standards-based instructional system.

Competency II: Effective principals have the ability to work with teachers and others to design and implement continuous student improvement through creating a caring environment, implementing data-based improvement, communicating, and involving parents.

Competency III: Effective principals have the ability to provide the necessary support for staff to carry out sound school, curriculum, and instructional practices through initiating and managing change; understanding the change process and using leadership and facilitation skills to manage it effectively; providing professional development; using time and resources in innovative ways to meet the goals and objectives of school improvement; maximizing resources; acquiring and using resources wisely; building external support; and staying abreast of effective practices.

In addition to the SREB Critical Success Factors, the curriculum of the university educational leadership preparation programs will include the dimensions, functions, and indicators derived from the Kentucky Leadership Continuum, developed in cooperation with the Jefferson County Schools, KDE, the University of Louisville, and the Wallace Foundation (see Appendix D). These indicators identify the skills, practices, and behaviors aspiring leaders should demonstrate through performance assessments at a quality level before graduating or receiving an initial license as a school leader.

Recommendation 4: Redesign all principal preparation courses around structured school-based learning experiences.

School-based learning experiences are essential to preparing effective principals. Developing the competencies of an effective principal requires more than reading books and engaging in academic discourse and analysis of the key concepts and skills of educational leadership. Becoming a competent leader also requires observing and analyzing a variety of good models of practice and then learning from one's own trial and error in the workplace. It is crucial to put candidates to the test prior to credentialing by having them demonstrate mastery of essential competencies under the watchful eyes of practitioners who know and use effective practices.

According to Kolb and Boyatzis, leading experts in the field of adult professional learning, experiential learning that exposes aspiring leaders to concrete elements of real-world practice can increase their ability to think about, analyze, and systematically plan strategies for action (Boyatzis & Kolb, 1999). Quality field-based experiences, or practicums, must provide opportunities for students to translate professional standards into leadership skills to solve a range of school problems, first through observing, and participating, and then by actually leading teams of teachers in identifying needs and implementing and evaluating interventions that improve teaching and learning (Fry, O'Neill & Bottoms, 2005).

In response to this research, it is recommended that the preparation program practicums for Kentucky principal candidates be redesigned to include the following:

- Practical field experiences that are aligned with standards and course curricula and integrated throughout the entire program;
- A practicum seminar for candidates conducted throughout the program;
- State-funded stipends for candidates and directing principals to participate in school-based mentoring activities for 20 days per year throughout the program;
- Collaborative selection (by districts and universities) of directing principals who exhibit exemplary mentoring skills; and
- Performance evaluations conducted during all field experiences.

The minimum core features of an effective practicum for aspiring principals will include but not be limited to:

- School-based activities that provide opportunities to apply the knowledge, skills, and ways of thinking of a school leader, as identified in state standards and research on school leadership and incorporated in the preparation program's design.
- Learning experiences that progress from observing (shadowing and other forms of observation) to participating in (being a part of a team, etc.) to leading school-based activities (being in charge of a committee) related to the core responsibilities of school principals.
- Opportunities to work with diverse students, teachers, parents and communities.
- Handbooks or other guiding materials that clearly define the expectations, processes, and schedule of the practicum to candidates, faculty supervisors, directing principals and district personnel.
- Ongoing supervision by program faculty who have the expertise and time to provide frequent formative feedback on candidates' performance.
- Directing principals who share the program's articulated vision of effective leadership, model the key leadership behaviors and practices aligned with the vision, know how to provide the required activities and guide candidates through them, and shape accountability for bringing candidates' performance to established standards.
- Rigorous formative and summative standards-based evaluations of candidates' performance of core school leader responsibilities, using valid, reliable, and standardized instruments and procedures.
- Defense of a capstone project by candidates to a panel (faculty and/or faculty and district representatives). (Fry, O'Neill & Bottoms, 2005)

Induction of New Principals

The first one to three years of a new principal's career provide rich opportunities for decision-making and the first real consequences of those decisions. The new principal is faced with leading school-wide change, generating support from the central office and community, sidestepping potential political implications, reallocating resources, retraining professionals, and making midcourse corrections based on evaluation data. The principal sets the quality standard and the parameters for the work of the school leadership teams engaged in improvement efforts.

Since 1985, Kentucky has required that all new principals participate in the Kentucky Principal Internship Program (KPIP). The year-long KPIP model provides for a committee composed of a principal mentor, administrator educator from a principal preparation program, and the district superintendent (or designee) to both support and evaluate the new principal.

Kentucky's long history with an induction program is both a benefit and a problem. It is beneficial in that Kentucky has a strong internship knowledge base grounded in the belief that a positive induction experience is valuable for new principals. It is problematic because increased expectations for principals have made the current model untenable. It is time for a new principal induction model because the new paradigm requires principals to be instructional leaders.

The heart of the induction program must include training in the application of research-based practices that build leadership competencies designed to bring about improved student achievement. The induction program must include opportunities for beginning principals to participate in a cohort group with other beginning principals, to be mentored by other successful school leaders, and to be evaluated according to the local school district's individual growth and evaluation plans. A comprehensive induction program requires the cooperation and collaboration of school districts, the institutions that educate school leaders, and the agencies that regulate them.

Recommendation 5: Redesign the principal induction program to include high quality mentoring and collegial support for new principals through a sequence of experiences and evaluations that are synchronized with the school calendar.

The purpose of an induction program for Kentucky's school leaders is to build the capacity of new building-level administrators to provide both instructional and administrative leadership. Induction is designed to (1) accelerate the development of competency for new leaders and (2) provide the necessary resources and support to ensure success for new leaders to improve student achievement.

The Kentucky Principal Induction Program should align current state mandates and initiatives, research on leadership development, and the Kentucky standards for school principals. The major components of the program will focus on school improvement processes and school accountability while linking leadership proficiency and skills to productive schools and enhanced student achievement as demonstrated in the *Kentucky Leadership Continuum* (KLC). This work, funded by the Wallace Foundation, is currently underway in Kentucky (see Appendix D). It is recommended that the Kentucky induction program have the following components:

- Inductee cohorts that meet for collegial support and small group study;
- University and school district partnerships to identify professional growth needs and evaluate competencies for leadership standards of inductees;
- Professional growth plans for inductees to direct and document knowledge and skill acquisition for educational leadership standards;
- Effective school leaders who are specifically trained as skilled mentors to provide feedback and opportunities for reflection;
- A Principal Support Team (PST) that includes a district office administrator, a mentor approved by the district and university, and an administrator educator to assist the inductee in developing and implementing a Professional Growth Plan (PGP) that supports job-embedded professional learning experiences and promotes instructional leadership;
- A reporting system whereby the PST and inductee provide to the university a report that indicates programmatic strengths and weaknesses to the preparing institutions;
- Required completion of instructional modules aligned to the calendar of the school offered in a variety of media (e.g., online, face-to-face) that provide content and instruction based on the needs of the school; and
- Required completion of an inductee work sample that includes, but is not limited to, documentation of the following:
 - Successful implementation of the Critical Success Factors (CSFs) as evidenced through the KLC, including student performance data and efforts to close achievement gaps;
 - Effective work with school-based decision making councils, including council agendas, minutes, appropriate consultation during the hiring process, and committee structures;
 - Development and use of a School Improvement Plan (SIP);

- Teacher evaluations, including a description of how the evaluations are tied to the school improvement plan and data about students' needs and the teachers' professional development;
- Development of a school budget with clear links to the SIP;
- Samples of effective student disciplinary interventions;
- Evidence of collaboration with parents and teachers, especially those with exceptional students (e.g., students with special needs, students who are gifted and talented);
- Evidence of effective recruitment and hiring practices for school staff; and
- Evidence of partnerships with internal and external stakeholders.

Inductee Evaluation

A formative evaluation will be used by mentors to provide the inductee with feedback on performance. A summative evaluation will be used by the PST to provide input to the district's supervisory process and a recommendation to the Education Professional Standards Board for credentialing.

If a principal inductee does not demonstrate proficiency in meeting all the standards by the end of the first year of employment, the Provisional Certificate may be renewed for up to two years, and upon employment, a principal may continue in the induction program for up to three years. In such instances, the inductee will only be required to complete work related to the standards on which he or she did not demonstrate success in the previous year(s) and the PST will focus support only on those standards. At the end of year two (and year three when required), the PST will provide a summative report to the university and the EPSB.

If an assistant principal successfully completes the induction program and then seeks to become a principal, he or she may attend the principal inductee cohort sessions and shall be required to participate in a minimum of twenty-five (25) hours of inductee activities provided by a university- and district-approved mentor. In addition, the inductee, mentor, and district shall collaborate to identify at least twenty-one (21) hours of appropriate EILA training to support the principal's PGP.

Principals' Working Conditions

Examining the state policies, structures, and practices addressed by the work groups of the Education Leadership Redesign (ELR) Task Force—preparation, induction, professional development, and doctoral programs—will go a long way toward closing the gap between the state's school leaders who are successful in improving teaching and learning and those who are falling short.

Improving these components is not all that it takes, however, to have an effective leadership system that results in improved student achievement. Examining the conditions under which school leaders work to improve teaching and learning is essential to shed light on the state and district policies, structures, and programs that hamper leadership for school improvement.

The growing demands of the role of the principal are felt in nearly all schools and districts by both novice and seasoned principals. National surveys of practicing principals indicate that even the most successful principals perceive some state and local policies and practices as significant barriers to their ability to make the changes necessary for improving schools and increasing student achievement.

Several recent national reports have focused on this leadership dilemma, highlighting the importance of supportive working conditions in the hiring and sustaining of qualified leaders. In the 2001 Public Agenda report, *Trying to Stay Ahead of the Game: Superintendents and Principals Talk about School Leadership*, principals reported that while they believe they can improve public education, their effectiveness is hampered by politics and bureaucracy (Farkas p. 7). Principals also reported facing obstacles in their daily work and routinely contending with “a surfeit of pressures and battles that build up and can threaten to overwhelm them” (p. 8). A vast majority of the principals indicated that their districts have experienced increases in responsibilities and mandates without getting the resources necessary to fulfill them.

The ELR Task Force is concerned with the impact of policies and conditions not only on current principals but also on qualified candidates who may turn away from leadership positions. A study by The Wallace Foundation found that in certain schools and districts, typically those with large concentrations of poor and minority students, lower per pupil expenditures and lower salaries, working conditions are seen as stressful and forbidding (2003). Such difficult environments not only heighten burnout among current school leaders, but they also deter prospective principal candidates from entering the field.

During May 2007, the task force invited Kentucky school principals to respond to a SREB survey, *Providing Principals the Support to Improve Teaching and Learning* (see Appendix E). Nearly 650 current principals provided insight into the working conditions they felt were essential for effective leadership of Kentucky schools. The survey asked Kentucky principals to identify the need for improvements in six areas identified in national research studies as essential to effective leadership:

- Adequate resources to do the job;
- Autonomy while being held accountable for results;
- Opportunities for professional development throughout a principal's career;
- District-level support for improving student learning;

- Clearly defined roles and authority; and
- District-wide focus on improving student learning.

Within each of these areas, specific improvements were listed to generate responses regarding the principals' perceptions of Kentucky's needs. Kentucky principals who responded to the survey identified the following as important to improving their working conditions:

1. Ability to move and dismiss teachers (autonomy);
2. Incentives for teachers and administrators (resources);
3. Opportunities for collaboration and networking outside of the district (professional development);
4. Adequate support staff (resources);
5. Distribution of resources based on need (resources);
6. Time for leaders to reflect on practices (professional development);
7. Time for leaders to participate in opportunities (professional development);
8. Adequate facilities (resources);
9. Ability to distribute resources for school's needs and goals (autonomy); and
10. Ability to recruit, select and place teachers (autonomy).

Recommendation 6: Conduct further study on principal working conditions, exploring resources, autonomy and professional development.

The perceptions of what prevents principals from effecting changes that would increase student learning suggest that districts in Kentucky may not be providing adequate resources as well as autonomy to do the job of improving student achievement while being held accountable for results. Additionally, time and opportunities for professional development would contribute to providing the conditions for principals to improve teaching and learning.

High Quality Professional Development

Principals who are effective school leaders must be lifelong learners who have access to high quality professional development (PD). Like the preparation and induction of new principals, the present system of professional development for Kentucky's principals is inadequate, given the changing expectations and responsibilities of the role of principal

Professional development requirements for administrators in the Commonwealth are governed by the Effective Instructional Leadership Act (EILA), KRS156.101 and 704 KAR 3:325. According to the EILA handbook (p. 4), the purpose of this statute is to "encourage and require the maintenance and development of effective instructional leadership in the public schools of the Commonwealth and to recognize that principals with the assistance of assistant principals have the primary responsibility for instructional leadership in the schools to which they are assigned." However, the resources to monitor these requirements have been gradually reduced and seriously under funded. This lack of accountability has led to a culture that fails to see the connection between professional development, school improvement, and student achievement. Therefore, the recommendations will focus on the support for and monitoring of quality professional development as currently outlined in existing laws, regulations, and policies.

Recommendation 7: Improve standards for the approval and accountability process for professional development required to renew administrator certificates.

Currently education administrators in Kentucky must acquire 21 hours of EILA credit each year. Professional development providers are required in advance to complete an application for EILA credit approval from the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE). The provider proposal form includes a request for a short program description, identification of intended audience, appropriate stage(s) of professional development and the standard(s) addressed in the *KDE Standards and Indicators for School Improvement (SISI)*. The provider application does not, however, guarantee quality or provide evidence that the program being offered is based on research. Providers are not required to demonstrate how the training will be evaluated for effectiveness, nor are they required to show a method of on-going support. Sufficient staff has not been allocated to provide oversight in the approval process or monitor the outcomes.

While Kentucky must begin to redesign the preparation programs, nothing holds more short-term promise than to take immediate steps to improve the current quality of professional development offered to experienced principals. The task force recommends the following:

- Improve the oversight of the EILA approval process and ensure adequate monitoring by establishing a Practitioner Advisory Board (PAB) with representation from school districts, KDE, EPSB, and other appropriate agencies, which scruti-

nizes what is accepted for EILA credit to ensure that it meets best practice standards; assists in rewriting the EILA Technical Assistance Manual; and reviews data to inform the process.

- Randomly monitor a prescribed number of districts on an annual basis to evaluate the effectiveness of their professional development for leadership.
- Revise the scholastic audit/review process for low-performing schools and districts to include a more intentional focus on professional growth of administrators.
- Implement measures to ensure that professional development for principals is tied to the school/district improvement plan and/or district professional development plan and is reflected in the principal's Individual Growth Plan.
- Align professional development standards and the EILA approval process with the Kentucky Leadership Continuum (see Appendix D).
- Provide adequate human and fiscal resources to effectively monitor professional development and guarantee that it is linked to teacher effectiveness and student learning.
- Revamp the district professional development coordinator training to include characteristics of research-based PD practices; strategies to evaluate PD offerings; adult learning theory; and use of data to inform PD needs for both content and delivery.

Recommendation 8: Develop an electronic tracking system to approve and document high quality professional development for all principals.

Kentucky does not have a statewide data system for tracking professional development offerings for administrators and the subsequent effect on student learning. There is no accountability for making a connection between the administrator's professional growth and student learning. In many districts, professional development for administrators remains a compliance issue rather than a tool to meet the specific needs of the school or district and a means of implementing best practice. The task force recommends the following:

- Establish a statewide electronic data warehouse tracking system for professional development that can be used for reporting to state level agencies (e.g. KDE, EPSB, CPE).
- Track professional development and growth choices of school administrators with links to current individual growth plans, school/district improvement plans, and student achievement data.

Recommendation 9: Establish an interdisciplinary Professional Development Academy to offer high quality PD for principals.

The General Assembly included in the 2006-2008 budget for the Council on Postsecondary Education money in the second year of the biennium for a Kentucky Principals' Academy (KPA). The Council on Postsecondary Education, the University of Kentucky, and University of Louisville will work with partner agencies and postsecondary institutions to launch a successful program in summer 2008.

The KPA will be a collaborative enterprise among those Kentucky postsecondary institutions with education leadership programs. The primary goal of the academy will be to improve P-12 student learning through specialized professional development for public school principals.

Key Components

The Southern Regional Education Board has identified several characteristics of principal preparation programs that most effectively apply research-based knowledge to improve curriculum and instructional practices (Fry et al., 2006). In conjunction with preparation program redesign principles, the academy's design should:

- Require teaching and administrative experience for admission, engaging in a highly collaborative recruitment effort with districts to identify candidates best suited for the program;
- Be interdisciplinary and collaborative across institutions and agencies, calling on a wide variety of resources;
- Have rigorous curriculum standards, with identified competencies and cohort-based instructional methods that motivate and engage participants with a focus on dynamic instructional leadership, all with a flexible schedule to accommodate working professionals;
- Focus on real-world learning experiences and problem-solving;
- Blend theoretical and research knowledge with applied analytical skills (research knowledge should be used to improve school practice);
- Have realistically managing change as a priority in instruction;
- Help principals create a nurturing school environment and improve interpersonal relations and communication;
- Focus on data-based decision making, the efficient use of technology for management and instruction, and the establishment of virtual learning communities; and

- Help principals work collaboratively and inclusively with teachers, parents, students, and the community to create productive learning environments.

Recommendation 10: Require that all new principals pass both state and national tests for administrative licensure within the five-year period preceding the beginning of a principalship.

There is an inconsistent level of emphasis on the importance of having recently taken and passed the prerequisite tests for obtaining initial certification in school leadership and renewing that certification. Passing scores must be obtained on the prerequisite tests within five years of applying for initial certification. A score on a test completed more than five years prior to application for certification is not acceptable. However, after initial certification is awarded, if the applicant does not participate in an internship program within the five (5) year period, the applicant may reestablish eligibility by repeating and passing the assessments in effect at that time or by completing a minimum of six graduate hours. If the latter option is chosen, then the test scores could be over five years old. If scores over five years old are not acceptable for initial certification, then they should not be acceptable for renewal of certification for a candidate who has not yet been employed.

Doctoral Programs in Education Administration

Studies of education leadership programs across the nation agree that the current design of doctorates in education must radically change to align with the needs of practitioners in the P-12 school systems. Acknowledging the relevancy of these studies, this section of the report directly addresses demand, access, quality, design, content, capacity and delivery issues surrounding the education doctorate in Kentucky.

Understanding Demand

It is important to separate the need to redesign Ed.D. programs from the need, or demand, for such programs in Kentucky. The primary market for the education doctorate is the P-12 education community. Others may find the degree important (e.g., those training to be university faculty in education, community college faculty, selected groups in the non-education sector). The discussion of education doctorates in Kentucky should center, however, on their role in improving school leadership to raise student achievement in Kentucky's P-12 schools.

The education doctorate currently is offered in the Kentucky public sector by the University of Kentucky and the University of Louisville. Both institutions are involved in collaborative programs with other Kentucky institutions in the delivery of the doctorate. In the private sector, only Spalding University offers the doctorate in education. Together these programs have averaged an enrollment of approximately 375 students and over the last seven years have produced approximately 40 doctorates in education areas annually. Still, recent data from the Southern Regional Education Board indicate that Kentucky ranks comparatively low in the number of Ed.D.s. While no one doubts the need for quality education doctorates in Kentucky, an essential question must be posed: "Does the demand for Ed.D. programs warrant expansion of the availability of the doctorate through collaborative or joint degrees offered by multiple universities or the approval of additional free-standing degree programs?" An equally important question revolves around whether employers believe an increase in the number of education leaders with doctorates is essential to improving school performance.

To inform discussion of this question, the ELR Doctoral Program Workgroup conducted two surveys in January, 2007 (see Appendices F and G) to determine Kentucky's market demand. The first survey was sent to 7,049 potential applicants to Ed.D. programs (all those with active certifications in the principal leadership area) to gauge their interest in and expectations for an Ed.D. To determine the future market for Ed.D. graduates and the perceived value of the Ed.D. as a hiring criterion, a second survey was sent to 1,336 individuals (superintendents, school board members, and school-based council members) with responsibility for hiring educational leaders.

Approximately 23 percent (1,614) of potential applicants responded to the survey. Of these, 33 percent (533) indicated they were considering enrolling in an Ed.D. program in

the next three years. Reasons cited for seeking the degree include generic management skills (personnel management, strategic planning, desire to lead organizations more effectively, and “fostering a climate for success”) and education-specific management (ways to advance student achievement and instructional leadership).

Because few respondents expect to recoup the expense of the doctorate (78 percent expect to receive less than 10 percent of the cost of the degree from their employers), cost and inconvenient class schedules were ranked as the greatest obstacles to pursuing the degree. A majority of respondents (66 percent) favor flexible, competency-based courses that utilize a combination of online and face-to-face instruction. This interest in flexibility and access, coupled with the clustering of many of the positive respondents in the central, Louisville metropolitan, south central, and southeastern regions, raises questions about what program models and providers would best serve the needs of the potential participants.

Approximately 29 percent (384) of potential employers responded to the survey. Only eight percent of these respondents rated the degree as extremely important, against 15 criteria for administrative success (ability to foster a climate for success, interpersonal skills, instructional leadership skills, etc.). The Ed.D. was ranked last of seven hiring criteria (including master’s degree in educational leadership and/or academic content area, previous work experience, and professional development credentials). Even when combined with the number of responses rating the Ed.D. as “important,” it remains the least valued attribute selected by potential employers, with only 27 percent rating the Ed.D. as important or extremely important. Finally, administrators expect to offer only a small number of potential positions over the next five years (superintendent, central office administrator, principal, or assistant principal) for which an Ed.D. is appropriate. These results make clear that should policy makers decide to expand the number of doctoral degree holders, there must also be a parallel effort to convince employers of the added value of the degree.

An examination of the demand for, and perceived value of the Ed.D., evidenced in these surveys, must be factored into an analysis of current program capacity, flexibility, access, and cost to determine whether Kentucky’s current Ed.D. programs can meet the demands and expectations of the marketplace. The geographic distribution of those who responded positively also argues for careful consideration of how to expand the availability of the doctorate if expanded offerings are seen as warranted.

Recommendation 11: Require that all new and existing doctoral programs in education administration be designed (or redesigned) in conjunction with the redesign of master’s degrees for teacher rank change and principal preparation programs.

Whatever decisions are made regarding current or newly structured programs, all programs in Kentucky must respond to the criticisms of the traditional education doctorate.

The national debate clearly outlines a new set of quality criteria to which all programs must be held. As Shulman observes, colleges of education have been pulled in what have been viewed as competing directions of practice and research. Although the purpose of the Ed.D. is generally understood to prepare its graduates for “managerial and administrative leadership” in a variety of areas by using “existing knowledge to solve educational problems,” the degree is viewed by many as a “low-end Ph.D.” (“Reclaiming Education’s Doctorates,” 25-26) Twenty-first century education doctorates must move beyond such limitations.

The task force recommends a balanced approach, requiring all Ed.D. programs in the Commonwealth, whether they be redesigned, new, or joint, to align with the design, content, and capacity standards identified in this report. The process should parallel the approach being taken to redesign master’s programs in educational leadership: clear standards, timelines, utilization of outside reviewers to assess the quality of implementation, and consequences for programs if criteria are not met. The standards outlined here will help ensure the alignment of doctoral programs with the redesigned master’s programs that will be required by this task force. As in other states that have undertaken redesign of leadership programs, Kentucky’s master’s redesign will likely require significant changes in current doctoral programs and in proposals for new education doctorates.

Program Design

Universities should be expected to meet the following standards in their doctoral program designs. These standards are consistent with current literature on best practice, regional accreditation standards defined by the Southern Association Colleges and Schools (SACS) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and the demands placed on universities by Kentucky’s Public Agenda for Postsecondary Education adopted by the Council on Postsecondary Education.

- Rigorous and relevant prerequisites for admission;
- Policies defining how credits will transfer into the program, contributing to a seamless educational system;
- Cohort or open model of registration, including minimum requirements for viability of program;
- Consideration of value of a foreign language requirement and study abroad experience; and
- A program of study that includes the following:
 - Fields of emphasis;
 - Options within the program;

- Required courses;
 - Teaching requirements;
 - Recommended courses;
 - Requirements for certification, if applicable; and
 - Required technological competencies.
- Field examinations, written and oral;
 - Qualifying examinations, written and oral;
 - Description of residency requirements;
 - Description of culminating experience or dissertation appropriate to the needs of the constituencies served;
 - Demonstration of a fully aligned relationship between the redesigned master's and doctoral programs;
 - Sample program, including syllabi and learning outcomes;
 - Potential internship requirements;
 - Normative time from matriculation to degree;
 - Program tracks that acknowledge the diversity of applicants' background experiences and prior knowledge; and
 - Articulated agreements with local school districts, cooperatives, and other regional partners that ensure substantive field experience.

Program Content

These programs also will be expected to align their content with principles identified in this report. This includes, but is not limited to the following:

- Interdisciplinary content and collaboration across institutions, districts and agencies, calling on a wide variety of resources;
- Rigorous curriculum standards, with identified competencies, and cohort-based instructional methods that motivate and engage students, with a focus on dynamic instructional leadership;
- Flexible schedule to accommodate working professionals;
- Real-world learning experiences and problem-solving;

- Theoretical and research knowledge blended with applied analytical skills (research knowledge should be used to improve school practice);
- Managing change as a priority in instruction;
- Emphasis on interpersonal relations and communication skills;
- Data-based decision making, the efficient use of technology for management and instruction, and the establishment of virtual learning communities;
- Creation of productive learning environments through collaboration with teachers, parents, students, and the community; and
- Evaluation of outcomes for both candidates and programs.

Capacity

In addition, universities will be expected to address issues regarding capacity to offer the Ed.D. They will be asked to consider issues surrounding programmatic and institutional accreditation, as well as whether or not such programs align with their institutional mission as described in *Kentucky's Public Agenda for Postsecondary Education* adopted by the Council on Postsecondary Education. Issues of capacity will include:

- **Faculty**
 - Qualifications of present and pending faculty, including rank, degrees, experience, and relevant scholarship;
 - Appropriate balance between full- and part-time faculty in the program, ensuring quality and consistency for the students;
 - The impact of the new program on faculty workload, including scholarship;
 - The advising load of faculty in the programs; and
 - The support and resources that will be provided to aid in the inculcation of a doctoral education culture within the department and institution, and the preparation of faculty to chair student committees.
- **Resource Requirements**
 - Total costs for students, including options for student financing;
 - Start-up costs;
 - Financial impact on institution;
 - Minimum number of students required to make program viable, accounting for attrition;

- Full-time equivalent faculty;
- Library acquisition, resources, staffing, and support;
- Computing costs and technological capacity to support teaching and learning;
- Equipment;
- Space and facilities;
- Evidence of sufficient graduate student support, including availability of external funding; and
- Number of teaching assistantships available in the program.

Components Specific to Joint Programs

Finally, should a joint degree be developed to meet the need for high-quality Ed.D.s in Kentucky, the program should address the following criteria:

- Agreements must be clear regarding which entities have decision-making responsibilities in which areas and how differences will be resolved;
- Programs must have institutional co-directors;
- A set of criteria for faculty participation in the program must be developed jointly (criteria may differ for different levels of participation);
- Roles of deans and chairs must be clearly delineated;
- Admissions decisions must be made jointly and must be unified from a student perspective;
- Advisors must be located at all institutions;
- Residency must be clearly defined and may or may not involve physical presence at one or more institutions;
- Agreement must be clear on how tuition and fees are paid and allocated;
- Curricular requirements must be established jointly; procedures for adding courses or changing requirements must be clearly defined;
- The nature and consequences of qualifying exams must be delineated;
- Dissertation or culminating experience standards and procedures must be developed jointly, including the types of research deemed acceptable;
- Committee membership must be equitable, with procedures for exceptions; and

- A memorandum of agreement must be completed to guide administration of the program.

The Necessity of Collaboration: Access, Quality, and Efficiency

Graduate programs are costly, and it is the state's responsibility both to serve as a steward of public resources and to meet the needs of the Commonwealth. While geographical access to professional development opportunities for educational leaders is important, Kentucky may not be able to afford multiple doctoral programs in educational administration at its public universities. The Council on Postsecondary Education has set aggressive goals for the postsecondary system to double the numbers of baccalaureate degree holders in the state to achieve statutory goals set for the postsecondary system. Meeting these goals will require not only considerable reallocation and new investment in programs that improve undergraduate retention and graduation rates currently far below the national average but also more support for non-traditional and transfer students.

Both national and state-level data support the inadequacy of existing educational leadership curricula to prepare graduates of such programs for their jobs. Levine found "little connection between the course of studies [of doctoral programs in educational leadership] and the needs of school leaders or their schools." (Educating School Leaders, 47) Equally telling, the EPSB survey of potential district employers in Kentucky ranked holding an Ed.D. lowest among the skills and characteristics important to the success of administrative personnel. Preparing educational leaders for their jobs demands a truly interdisciplinary curriculum and faculty. In the twenty-first century it takes a university, not just a College of Education, to prepare an effective school leader. School and district leaders are instructional leaders, but they also are chief executive officers, strategic planners, community leaders, and policy-makers whose decisions directly affect the health and well-being of school children in myriad ways. An adequate education for such leaders demands access to the resources of the Commonwealth's programs in management, public policy, communication, social work, and public health, among others. A systems approach to leadership is needed to provide the broad array of conceptual models and practical applications that adequately address the challenges faced by today's educational leaders.

Kentucky does not need outdated and frequently underfunded doctoral programs that are often disjointed and disconnected from the rest of school leader preparation. New and redesigned doctoral programs must meet the ultimate test of necessity and quality - producing graduates who can lead all students toward greater academic achievement.

Conclusion

Henry David Thoreau once said, “Things do not change; we change.” Faced with an estimate by the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) that only 37% of Kentucky schools will meet the goal of proficiency by 2014 (June 2007 KBE meeting presentation), intractable achievement gaps among almost all grades and across multiple areas of student differences, and increasing awareness that a significant percentage of our high school graduates are not prepared for postsecondary education and work, Kentucky must recognize the need for change - and change we must.

The ELR Task Force does not claim that these recommendations are comprehensive, but certainly they give us a place to start. If forced to identify a key component of these recommendations, many task force members would choose the dynamic partnership between the district and the university. The hope for real change resides in the genuine partnership the districts and the universities can shape as they work and communicate with each other. Some members of the task force identified this district-university partnership as the missing link of the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA). If these partnerships evolve into the symbiotic relationship envisioned by the task force, the effects will extend beyond the preparation of principals to a broader and more encompassing association that will support the mission of both organizations.

That being said, we must stay laser focused on how the selection, preparation, induction, and professional development of principals affect student achievement. This commitment obviously underscores the need for a shared comprehensive data repository that includes student level data. These aggregated student data should be the substance of the conversations between principal candidates and their instructors; between the president of the university and the local superintendents; between the teachers and the principal. Such conversations hold the hope for increasing student achievement in Kentucky.

We must begin now. The need for change is too great and the hope that resides in the change too evident. The task force urges that these recommendations be implemented without delay.

References

- Bottoms, G. & O'Neill, K. (2001). *Preparing a new breed of school principals: It's time for action*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Boyatzis, R.E. and Kolb, D.A. (1999). Performance, learning, and development as modes of growth and adaptation throughout our lives and careers. In M. Peiperl, M.B. Arthur, R. Coffee, and T. Morris (eds.), *Career frontiers: New conceptions of working lives*. London: Oxford University Press. p. 76-98.
- Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). (1996). *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: Standards for school leaders*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., Meyerson, D., & Orr, M. (2007). *Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Executive summary*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.
- Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., & Meyerson, D. (2005). *School leadership study: Developing successful principals* (Review of Research). Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.
- Effective Instructional Leadership Act, KRS 156.101, Kentucky (2006).
- Farkas, S., Johnson, J., Duffett, A., & Foleno, T. (2001). *Trying to stay ahead of the game: Superintendents and principals talk about school leadership*. New York: Public Agenda.
- Fry, B., O'Neill, K., & Bottoms, G. (2006). *Schools can't wait: Accelerating the redesign of university principal preparation programs*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Fry, B., Bottoms, G., & O'Neill, K. (2005). *The principal internship: How can we get it right?* Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Hess, Frederick M., *A License to Lead? A New Leadership Agenda for America's Schools*, Progressive Policy Institute, January 2003 http://www.ppionline.org/ppi_ci.cfm?contentid=251239&knlgAreaID=110&subsecid=135
- House Joint Resolution 14, Kentucky (2006).
- Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education. (2007, February). *Securing Kentucky's future: A plan for improving college readiness and success* [Final Report of the Kentucky Developmental Education Task Force]. Frankfort, KY: Author.

- Kentucky Department of Education. (2004). *Effective Instructional Leadership Act: Technical assistance manual for instructional leaders, and training program providers*. Frankfort, KY: Author.
- Kentucky Department of Education. (2006). *School level performance descriptors for Kentucky's standards and indicators for school improvement*. Frankfort, KY: Author.
- Knapp, M., Copland, M., Ford, B., Markholt, A., McLaughlin, M., Miliken, M., & Talbert, J. (2003). *Leading for learning sourcebook: Concepts and examples*. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences learning*. New York: Wallace Foundation.
- Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders*. New York: The Education Schools Project.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Miller, K. (2004). *Creating conditions for leadership effectiveness: The district's role*. Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Robbins, P. & Alvy, H. (2004). *The new principal's fieldbook: strategies for success*. VA: ASCD.
- Shulman, L.S., Golde, C. M., Bueschel, A. C., & Garabedian, K. J. (2006). *Reclaiming education's doctorates: A critique and a proposal*. *Educational Researcher*, 35(3), 25-32.
- The Wallace Foundation. (2003). *Beyond the pipeline: Getting the principals we need, where they are needed most*. New York: Author.
- Waters, T., & Grubb, S. (2004). *The leadership we need: Using research to strengthen the use of standards for administrator preparation and licensure program*. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Waters, J. T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. A. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Education Leadership Redesign at a Glance

ELR Task Force Recommendation	Need for the Recommendation	Outcomes of the Recommendation
<p>Recommendation 1: Incorporate all principal preparation programs and principal support services within dynamic and documented district-university partnerships.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current partnerships are inconsistent and undocumented. • Partnerships include various levels of commitment on the part of both parties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redesigned programs will provide documentation of dynamic collaborations with districts that include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Signed agreements between the institution and the district; ➤ Joint screening of principal candidates by both district and university; ➤ Joint identification of potential leaders; and ➤ District and university co-design and co-delivery of courses.
<p>Recommendation 2: Require that all principal preparation programs adopt highly selective admission standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selection standards currently vary by program. • Most programs provide principal preparation at the post-baccalaureate level. • Few if any programs require documented evidence of the ability to improve student achievement. • Few if any programs have signed agreements pledging district support between the district and the university. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selection standards will be uniformly set at a high level. • A preference for a program that requires a master’s degree for admission. • Require three years of teaching experience. • All programs will require candidates to submit documentation of their skills and understandings in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ability to improve student achievement; ➤ Leadership; and ➤ Knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment • Every candidate will be accepted under a signed agreement pledging district support. • The preparation program will be customized to meet the needs of the local district.

ELR Task Force Recommendation	Need for the Recommendation	Outcomes of the Recommendation
<p>Recommendation 3: Redesign the principal preparation curriculum around the competencies shown by research to be necessary for raising student achievement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programs are aligned with ISLLC standards; however, these standards do not include performance criteria to measure candidate performance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programs will continue to use ISLLC standards but will supplement the standards with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The SREB Critical Success factors; and ➤ The Kentucky Leadership Continuum (currently under development) to identify skills, practices, and behaviors aspiring leaders should be able to demonstrate.
<p>Recommendation 4: Design all principal preparation courses around structured school-based learning experiences.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practicum experiences are undocumented and inconsistent across principal preparation programs. • Few if any programs have rigorous formative and summative standards-based evaluations of candidates' performance of core school leader responsibilities. • Few, if any, programs require candidates to defend a capstone project to demonstrate mastery of the standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All programs will have practicums that include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ High quality field experiences integrated throughout the entire program and aligned with the above standards and course curriculum; ➤ A practicum seminar for candidates conducted throughout the program to ensure the candidate a continuum of experiences from observing to participating to leading and the exposure to diverse populations and environments; ➤ State-funded stipends for candidates and Directing Principals to participate in school-based mentoring activities for 20 days per year throughout the program; ➤ Collaborative selection (by districts and universities) of Directing Principals who exhibit exemplary mentoring skills; and ➤ Performance evaluations conducted during all field experiences. • Defense by candidates of a capstone project to a panel (university faculty and/or faculty and district representatives). • Rigorous formative and summative standards-based evaluations of candidates' performance of core school leader responsibilities, using valid, reliable, and standardized instruments and procedures.

ELR Task Force Recommendation	Need for the Recommendation	Outcomes of the Recommendation
<p>Recommendation 5: Implement a redesigned principal induction program providing high quality mentoring and collegial support for new principals through a sequence of experiences and evaluations that are synchronized with the school calendar.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The present induction program focuses primarily on evaluation, measuring competency in managerial skills and not instructional leadership. • There is little collaboration between the university and the district. . • Inductee interactions are primarily with the mentors, not with new principals. • No training is provided for the inductee. • No training or assistance is provided for assistant principals who become principals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focus of the new induction program will be high quality mentoring and collegial support that will include an evaluation component to provide a more accurate picture of the candidate’s readiness to serve as a principal. • Strong district university partnerships are required because districts and universities must collaborate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Select mentors; ➤ Identify inductee training needs; and ➤ Jointly deliver training programs • Cohort groups of 4-6 new principals will be involved in training sessions and other collegial activities. • Training will be provided for the inductee in selected areas of need. The training will be co-designed and co-delivered by district and university staff. • Training and mentoring will be available for assistant principals who become principals. • The major components of the program focus on school improvement processes and school accountability while linking leadership proficiency and skills to productive schools and enhanced student achievement • A work sample that includes evidence of the new principal’s skills and knowledge to lead a school to high levels of student performance will be required.

ELR Task Force Recommendation	Need for the Recommendation	Outcomes of the Recommendation
<p>Recommendation 6: Continue to study principal working conditions, exploring resources, autonomy and professional development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principal working conditions have not been studied recently. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ELR survey of principal working conditions provided significant evidence that Kentucky principals believe their job is made more difficult by flawed policies and inadequate resources. Follow-up surveys and focus groups will provide additional information and recommendations for policy makers.
<p>Recommendation 7: Improve standards for the approval and accountability process for professional development required to renew administrator certificates.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principals must currently acquire 21 hours of EILA credit, but providers of that professional development are not required to demonstrate how the program will be evaluated for effectiveness or show a method of on-going support The provider application does not guarantee quality or provide evidence that the program being offered is based on research. Sufficient staff has not been allocated to provide oversight in the approval process or monitor the outcomes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a Practitioner Advisory Board to provide oversight of programs approved for EILA credit Randomly monitor annually a sample of districts to evaluate the effectiveness of their professional development for leadership. Revise the scholastic audit/review process for low-performing schools and districts to include a more intentional focus on professional growth of administrators. Implement measures to ensure that professional development for principals is tied to the school/district improvement plan and/or district professional development plan and is reflected in the principal's Individual Growth Plan. Align professional development standards and the EILA approval process with key principal behaviors. Provide adequate human and fiscal resources to monitor professional development in order to ensure that it is linked to teacher effectiveness and student learning Revamp the district professional development coordinator training to include characteristics of research-based PD practices, strategies to evaluate PD offerings, and adult learning theory.

ELR Task Force Recommendation	Need for the Recommendation	Outcomes of the Recommendation
<p>Recommendation 8: Develop an electronic tracking system to approve and document high quality professional development for all principals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kentucky does not have a statewide data system for tracking professional development offerings for administrators and the subsequent effect on student learning. • In many districts, professional development remains a compliance issue rather than a professional growth issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a statewide electronic data warehouse tracking system for professional development that can be used for reporting to state level agencies (e.g. KDE, EPSB, CPE). • Track professional development and growth choices of school administrators with links to current individual growth plans, school/district improvement plans, and student achievement data.
<p>Recommendation 9: Establish an interdisciplinary Professional Development Academy to offer high quality PD for principals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kentucky does not currently have a professional development academy for principals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PD Academy will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Require teaching and administrative experience for admission, engaging in a highly collaborative recruitment effort with districts to identify candidates best suited for the program; ➤ Be interdisciplinary and collaborative across institutions and agencies, calling on a wide variety of resources; ➤ Have rigorous curriculum standards, with identified competencies, and cohort-based instructional methods that motivate and engage participants; ➤ Focus on real-world learning experiences and problem-solving; ➤ Blend theoretical and research knowledge with applied analytical skills; ➤ Have managing change for school improvement as a priority in instruction; ➤ Help principals create a nurturing school environment and improve interpersonal relations and communication;

ELR Task Force Recommendation	Need for the Recommendation	Outcomes of the Recommendation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Focus on data-based decision making, the efficient use of technology for management and instruction, and the establishment of virtual learning communities; and ➤ Help principals work collaboratively and inclusively with teachers, parents, students, and the community to create productive learning environments. • Funds have been allocated by the General Assembly for a PD Academy. • CPE has selected the University of Kentucky and the University of Louisville to lead the academy. • The academy is scheduled to open summer 2008.
<p>Recommendation 10: Require that all new principals pass both state and national tests for administrative licensure within the five-year period preceding the beginning of a principalship.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Five-year Statement of Eligibility can now be renewed by either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Taking the assessments required for principal candidates ➤ Taking six graduate credit hours 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new principals will have successfully demonstrated content knowledge by having passed the new principal assessments within the last five years.
<p>Recommendation 11: Require that all new and existing doctoral programs in education administration be designed (or redesigned) in conjunction with the redesign of master's degrees for teacher rank change and principal preparation programs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently master's degree programs and principal preparation programs do not align with doctoral programs in education. • Doctoral programs in educational leadership are currently only at the University of Kentucky and the University of Louisville. Those programs are currently in a redesign process led by Carnegie. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data are now available from stakeholders regarding need for doctoral programs. • Current doctoral programs must be redesigned to align with the preparation programs and professional development programs. • Any new doctoral programs in educational leadership that may be offered by the comprehensive universities will be reviewed under criteria established by the Council on Postsecondary Education.

Appendix B: 2006 House Joint Resolution 14

(HJR 14)

A JOINT RESOLUTION directing the executive director of the Education Professional Standards Board with the cooperation of the commissioner of education and the president of the Council on Postsecondary Education to establish an interagency task force to collaborate with public and private postsecondary education institutions for the redesign of preparation programs and the professional development of educational leaders.

WHEREAS, there is a critical need for Kentucky schools to have leaders who are prepared to improve teaching and learning; and

WHEREAS, all Kentucky school leaders need to have a mastery of current knowledge and skills, and the dispositions to improve teaching and learning; and

WHEREAS, it is a goal of the General Assembly that every school have leadership that improves schools and increases the learning and development of all students; and

WHEREAS, there is a need for a seamless system of education leadership that includes the recruitment and selection of potential education leaders; and preparation and certification, induction, professional development, and supportive working conditions that focus on a vision of school leaders as instructional leaders; and

WHEREAS, activities to redesign education leadership preparation programs are underway among state regulatory agencies to create integrated and embedded programs addressing the school leadership needs of the Commonwealth;

NOW, THEREFORE,

Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

Section 1. The executive director of the Education Professional Standards Board, with the cooperation of the commissioner of education and the president of the Council on Postsecondary Education, shall organize an interagency task force to collaborate with private and public postsecondary education institutions for the redesign of programs for school and district leaders, including the preparation and certification of principals, assistant principals, superintendents, and 8 other central office and school-based administrators.

- (1) The size and make-up of the task force shall be determined by consensus of the executive director, commissioner, and president.
- (2) The work of the task force shall begin no later than August 15, 2006.
- (3) The redesigned programs for developing educational leaders shall have:
 - (a) Recruitment and selection policies that ensure that persons with high leadership potential and talent are being prepared to lead Kentucky schools;
 - (b) Strong emphasis on developing the essential competencies necessary for improving the safe and efficient management of schools and increasing student achievement;
 - (c) A standards and research base with coherent goals, learning activities, and assessment around a shared set of values, beliefs, and knowledge about effective administrative practices;
 - (d) Provisions for field-based internships that incorporate problem-based learning and utilize cohort groups and mentors whenever possible and appropriate;

- (e) Strong clinical training options throughout the programs that include extensive collaborations between postsecondary education institutions and school districts;
 - (f) Induction components for newly hired principals and other education leaders, which provide both collegial support and individual mentoring with documented evidence of the new principals' or other education leaders' abilities to focus on high levels of student learning, growth, and achievement;
 - (g) Provisions for high-quality professional development that strengthen current school leaders' capacity to work with faculty in changing school and classroom practices to increase student learning, growth, and achievement; and
 - (h) Support for working conditions that enable leaders to implement strong instructional leadership that improves opportunities for teaching and learning for all students.
- (4) The interagency task force in collaboration with postsecondary education institutions shall:
- (a) Ensure involvement of all appropriate education entities during all stages of the redesign processes;
 - (b) Identify postsecondary education institution and school district resources that can be utilized to make educational leadership programs as effective as possible;
 - (c) Identify the competencies, knowledge, skill sets, and dispositions that all instructional leaders must possess;
 - (d) Require instruction and the improvement of student learning, growth, and achievement;
 - (e) Require problem-based learning while addressing state and national leadership standards; and
 - (f) Require the relevant field-based experiences and internships that allow candidates to demonstrate leadership competencies in real-life situations.
- (5) The interagency task force shall:
- (a) Utilize regionally and nationally recognized experts in educational leadership to assess Kentucky's current needs and evaluate institutional redesign proposals to meet those needs;
 - (b) Study and determine best practices for implementing the redesign of educational leadership programs in Kentucky, including the use of institution-based redesign coordinators to spearhead, coordinate, and administer a multi-year development process and the establishment of an executive leadership academy with a clear focus on improving student learning, growth, and achievement by developing the instructional leadership and management expertise of Kentucky's principals; and
 - (c) Require alignment of doctoral programs in education with the redesigned masters' and other leadership programs to ensure rigor and relevance.

Section 2. The interagency task force shall provide a progress report to the Interim Joint Committee on Education by October 1, 2007, and as requested thereafter.

Appendix C: Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards for School Leaders

Standard 1

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

Standard 2

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

Standard 3

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Standard 4

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

Standard 5

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Standard 6

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

**The full version of the standards identifying the common core of knowledge, dispositions, and performances linking leadership to productive schools and enhanced educational outcomes can be found at: <http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/isllcstd.pdf>*

Appendix D: Kentucky Cohesive Leadership System Continuum for Principal Preparation and Development (DRAFT)

ISLLC Standards	Dimensions and Functions for School Leaders
<p>A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VISIONARY LEADER – facilitating the development, articulation, implementation and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community. • CURRICULAR LEADER – advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. • MANAGERIAL LEADER – ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. • CULTURAL LEADER – collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, mobilizing community resources. • ETHICAL LEADER – acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner. • POLITICAL LEADER – understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, legal, and cultural context. 	<p>Overarching Capacity:</p> <p>Principal Dispositions</p> <p>Dimension 1. Leading Teaching and Learning Function: 1.1 Curriculum Function: 1.2 Instruction and Learning Interventions</p> <p>Dimension 2. Assessing the Instructional Program and Monitoring Student Performance Function: 2.1 Assessment Function: 2.2 Data Informed Decision-Making, Monitoring Student Learning and Ensuring Accountability</p> <p>Dimension 3. Securing and Developing Staff Function: 3.1 Staff Selection Function: 3.2 Personnel Evaluation Function: 3.3 Work Conditions and Environment Function: 3.4 Professional Development (PD)</p> <p>Dimension 4. Building Culture and Community Function: 4.1 School Culture Function: 4.2 Learning Communities for Students and Staff Function: 4.3 Professional Ethics</p> <p>Dimension 5. Creating Organizational Structures and Operations Function: 5.1 Operational Vision and Mission Function: 5.2 School Improvement Planning and Implementation Function: 5.3 Functions and Procedures and Structures Function: 5.4 Legal Framework</p> <p>Dimension 6. Leveraging Community Systems and Resources Function: 6.1 Family and Community Function: 6.2 Districts Function: 6.3 Policy Environment</p>

Dimension 1. Leading Teaching and Learning	Aspiring Principal Indicators
Function: 1.1 Curriculum	1.1.a Knows the processes to align, audit, monitor, and evaluate curriculum.
	1.1.b Understands the design, purpose and analysis of curriculum maps and pacing guides that are aligned with Program of Studies, performance standards, and Core Content for Assessment.
	1.1.c Understands how to design course schedule(s) and sequences that provide rigorous programs accessible by all students.
	1.1.d Understands the strategies and structures to support improvements in literacy and numeracy as the priority in a well rounded curriculum.
	1.1.e Understands the importance of diversity in developing and implementing curriculum.
Function: 1.2 Instruction and Learning Interventions	1.2.a Understands learning interventions to address skill deficits and learning needs of students.
	1.2.b Understands the process of providing multiple opportunities to learn by modifying strategies based on formal and informal assessments.
	1.2.c Understands appropriate use of varied research-based instructional strategies.
	1.2.d Understands the appropriate use of technology in instructional settings.
Dimension 2. Assessing the Instructional Program and Monitoring Student Performance	Aspiring Principal Indicators
Function: 2.1 Assessment	2.1.a Understands the connection between national, state, district, school and classroom assessments and their impact on curriculum and instruction.
	2.1.b Understands how to use results of multiple assessments to provide meaningful feedback on learning.
	2.1.c Understands, analyzes and applies school data to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify learning and achievement gaps • Determine system, instructional, and student needs • Develop a monitoring and improvement process for curriculum, instruction, evaluation, and professional development.
	2.1.d Knows a variety of protocols to promote teacher collaboration in analyzing student work.

Function: 2.2 Data-Informed Decision Making, Monitoring Student Learning and Ensuring Accountability	2.2.a Understands how to use data to prioritize decisions and drive change.
	2.2.b Understands how to use data to determine and address curricular gaps.
	2.2.c Understands the importance of monitoring classroom assessments to inform instructional practice.
	2.2.d Understands how to conduct and interpret research to improve student performance.
	2.2.e Understands how to be a good consumer of research.
	2.2.f Understands the need to identify and remove barriers to student learning and achievement.
Dimension 3. Securing and Developing Staff	Aspiring Principal Indicators
Function: 3.1 Staff Selection	3.1.a Understands the dispositions, content knowledge and pedagogy of effective teachers.
	3.1.b Understands methods of assessing the dispositions, content knowledge and pedagogy of teaching applicants.
	3.1.c Understands the importance of aligning the staff recruitment and selection process with the diversity needs of the school, school mission, vision, and school improvement plan.
	3.1.d Understands how to apply legal requirements, state and district personnel policies and procedures.
Function: 3.2 Personnel Evaluation	3.2.a Understands how to evaluate staff performance and plan professional growth of staff.
	3.2.b Understands the Kentucky Teacher Standards and instructional best practices for use in personnel evaluation.
	3.2.c Understands the components and legal requirements of formative and summative staff evaluation.
	3.2.d Understands effective classroom observation techniques and teacher conferencing methods.
	3.2.e Understands how to collaboratively develop professional growth plans based on instructional needs identified through the evaluation process.
Function: 3.3	3.3.a Understands the effective use of instructional time and resources for effective learning.

Work Conditions and Environment	3.3.b Develops effective methods for open communications between staff and administrators.
	3.3.c Recognizes strategies of motivation, recognition, and rewards in sustaining and improving teacher performance.
	3.3.d Understands the importance of professional relationships with and among school staff.
Function: 3.4 Professional Development	3.4.a Knows theories and research underlying effective professional development.
	3.4.b Understands the significance of continual attention to effective teaching practices and discussions about current research and theory.
	3.4.c Understands the critical attributes of an effective professional development system.
	3.4.d Demonstrates a commitment to learning.
Dimension 4. Building Culture and Community	Aspiring Principal Indicators
Function: 4.1 School Culture	4.1.a Understands strategies to reinforce norms of behavior within a school culture conducive to student learning and achievement.
	4.1.b Understands strategies to promote effective change.
	4.1.c Understands the elements of and impact of formal and informal school culture.
	4.1.d Understands how data can be used to influence and inform school culture.
	4.1.e Understands that individuals, families, and communities need to be active partners in school success.
	4.1f Understands how to engage all stakeholders.
	4.1g Understands the importance of treating all individuals with fairness, dignity and respect.
	4.1.h Understands the importance of varied values and opinions.
	4.1.i Understands the need to use the influence of the office to enhance student learning and achievement rather than for personal gain.
	4.1.j Understands the elements of a safe and orderly learning environment.

Function: 4.2 Learning Communities for Students and Staff	4.2.a Understands how to create and sustain a school wide learning environment based on a shared sense of community and cooperation.
	4.2.b Understands characteristics of professional learning communities that focus on student learning and achievement.
	4.2.c Understands how to foster individual and collective accountability among staff members to improve student learning and achievement.
Function 4.3 Professional Ethics	4.3.a Understands the need to model beliefs, ideals, and professional ethics conducive to student learning and achievement.
	4.3.b Understands the importance of a commitment to equity and diversity.
	4.3c Understands the roles and responsibilities of all school administrative, departmental and support staff, leadership teams, committees, and school-based council.
	4.3d Understands the importance of modeling a personal and professional code of ethics.
Dimension 5. Creating Organizational Structures and Operations	Aspiring Principal Indicators
Function: 5.1 Operational Vision and Mission	5.1.a Understands the importance of vision and developing a personal vision for school leadership.
	5.1.b Understands the importance of a collaborative process to develop shared beliefs, vision and mission that supports student learning and achievement.
	5.1.c Knows a variety of strategies to align resources, operational procedures and organizational structures with the school vision and mission.
	5.1d Understands how modeling values, beliefs, and attitudes can inspire others to higher levels of performance.
Function: 5.2 School Improvement Planning and Implementation	5.2.a Understands systems thinking as related to student learning and achievement and designs appropriate strategies.
	5.2.b Understands the role of leadership and shared decision making in school improvement planning.
	5.2.c Understands the development, implementation and monitoring of a school improvement plan aligned with data, policy and regulation.
Function: 5.3	5.3.a Understands basic management skills to foster student learning and achievement.

Functions, Procedures, and Structures	5.3.b Understands problem-solving techniques for decision making purposes.
Function: 5.4 Legal Framework	5.4a Understands the laws, regulations, and policies under which the school must function.
Dimension 6. Leveraging Community Systems and Resources	Aspiring Principal Indicators
Function: 6.1 Family and Community	6.1.a Understands strategies to build learning relationships with families.
	6.1.b Understands strategies to build partnerships with community stakeholders.
	6.1.c Understands strategies to leverage multiple resources to improve student learning and achievement.
	6.1.d Understands and considers the prevailing values of the diverse community.
	6.1.e Understands the importance of community stakeholder involvement in student learning and achievement.
	6.1.f Understands how to assess family and community concerns, expectations and needs.
	6.1.g Understands how the community environment in which schools operate can be influenced on behalf of all students and their families.
	6.1.h Understands the need for ongoing dialogue with representatives of diverse community groups.
	6.1.i Understands the importance of being engaged in the larger community outside of the local school.
Function: 6.2 Function: 6.2 Districts	6.2a Understands the district protocol for accessing additional external resources
	6.2b Understands how to allocate and integrate district resources available for addressing all student needs.
	6.2c Understands how to leverage district resources for school improvement.
	6.2d Understands the importance of monitoring and evaluating district resources based on changing student needs.
Function: 6.3 Policy Environment	6.3a Understands how to influence public policy to provide quality education for all students.
	6.3b Understands how to operate within the political environment in which the school exists.

The Kentucky Cohesive Leadership System Continuum for Principal Preparation and Development (KLC) is funded by the Wallace Foundation under the State Action for Education Leadership (SAELP) for Kentucky. The KLA will ultimately address all leadership from aspiring to retiring and identify dimensions for all four areas. For more information or an updated version of this document please contact Debbie Daniels at the Kentucky Department of Education Office of Leadership & School Improvement at: Debbie.Daniels@education.ky.gov

Appendix E: Providing Principals the Support to Improve Teaching and Learning

1. Having adequate resources to do the job is essential to effective leadership. What improvement is needed in your state to provide school leaders these resources?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

	Significant improvement needed	Improvement needed	Minor improvement needed	No need to improve	No opinion
Adequate support staff					
Incentives for teachers and administrators	163 25%	291 45%	151 23%	34 5%	4 1%
Adequate facilities	231 36%	263 41%	102 16%	40 6%	7 1%
Distribution of resources based on need	126 20%	242 38%	189 29%	79 12%	7 1%
	186 29%	245 38%	149 23%	55 9%	8 1%

2. Having autonomy while being held accountable for results is essential to effective leadership. What improvement is needed in your state to give school leaders autonomy while holding them accountable?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

	Significant improvement needed	Improvement needed	Minor improvement needed	No need to improve	No opinion
Ability to recruit, select and place teachers					
Ability to move and dismiss teachers	151 23%	211 33%	178 28%	99 15%	4 1%
Ability to distribute resources for school's needs and goals	372 58%	166 26%	71 11%	33 5%	1 0%
Accountability for school performance	107 17%	257 40%	194 30%	82 13%	3 0%
	116 18%	214 33%	193 30%	110 17%	10 2%

3. Having opportunities for professional development throughout a principal's career is essential to effective leadership. What improvement is needed in your state to provide these opportunities?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

	Significant improvement needed	Improvement needed	Minor improvement needed	No need to improve	No opinion
School district commitment to professional learning					
Time for leaders to participate in opportunities	34 5%	143 22%	213 33%	251 39%	2 0%
Time for leaders to reflect on practices	157 24%	232 36%	154 24%	97 15%	3 0%
Opportunities for collaboration and networking outside of the district	163 25%	251 39%	164 26%	63 10%	2 0%
	172 27%	274 43%	130 20%	66 10%	1 0%

4. Having a district-wide focus on improving student learning is essential to effective leadership. What improvement is needed in your state for districts to provide this focus for their school leaders?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

	Significant improvement needed	Improvement needed	Minor improvement needed	No need to improve	No opinion
Clearly articulated mission and vision for the district					
Goals and objectives aligned to the district and tailored to the needs of each school	50 8%	133 21%	220 34%	236 37%	4 1%
School boards committed to high achievement for all children	70 11%	181 28%	222 35%	168 26%	2 0%
District superintendents knowledgeable of curriculum, instruction	94 15%	159 25%	175 27%	210 33%	5 1%
	90 14%	124 19%	167 26%	253 39%	9 1%

5. Having district-level support for improving student learning is essential to effective leadership. What improvement is needed in your state for districts to provide school leaders support for improving student learning?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

	Significant improvement needed	Improvement needed	Minor improvement needed	No need to improve	No opinion
School communities support improvement decisions made by school leaders.					
Boards of Education support improvement decisions made by school leaders.	103 16%	205 32%	246 38%	83 13%	6 1%
The central office supports improvement decisions made by school leaders.	99 15%	174 27%	213 33%	147 23%	10 2%
Teachers support improvement decisions made by school leaders.	119 19%	152 24%	212 33%	152 24%	8 1%
	85 13%	199 31%	261 41%	92 14%	6 1%

6. Having clearly defined roles and authority are essential to effective leadership. What improvement is needed in your state for districts to clearly define the role and authority of school leaders in improving teaching and learning?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

	Significant improvement needed	Improvement needed	I have no opinion	Minor improvement needed	No opinion
Clearly defined job expectations and instructional leader role					
Regular feedback on job performance	76 12%	199 31%	117 18%	232 36%	19 3%
Communication from the top down/bottom up	63 10%	192 30%	117 18%	247 38%	24 4%
School board and district personnel respect the authority of the school leader	117 18%	215 33%	97 15%	184 29%	30 5%
	143 22%	171 27%	104 16%	187 29%	38 6%

Appendix F: Survey of Employer Demand for Educational Leadership Ed.D Degrees

1. Which one of the following best describes you?

Superintendent		101	26%
School board member		43	11%
School-based council member		240	62%
Total		384	100%

2. In the next five years, approximately how many of the following types of positions do you expect to fill in your school/school system?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	0-1	2-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	17-20	21-25	>25
Superintendent	362 94%	12 3%	5 1%	1 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 0%	3 1%
Central office administrator	161 42%	133 35%	61 16%	17 4%	6 2%	1 0%	0 0%	5 1%
Principal, assistant principal	154 40%	110 29%	61 16%	27 7%	17 4%	4 1%	0 0%	11 3%

3. Approximately how many of these positions do you anticipate will require an Ed.D. as a part of the position requirements?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	0-1	2-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	17-20	21-25	>25
Superintendent	376 98%	4 1%	1 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	3 1%
Central office administrator	348 91%	18 5%	8 2%	8 2%	1 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 0%

Principal, assistant principal	358 93%	13 3%	4 1%	6 2%	1 0%	0 0%	0 0%	2 1%
--------------------------------	------------	----------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

4. In your opinion, how important are the following characteristics and skills to the success of administrative personnel?					
Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Extremely Unimportant	Unimportant	Neither Important/Unimportant	Important	Extremely Important
Fiscal management skills	18 5%	0 0%	3 1%	135 35%	228 59%
Personnel management skills	19 5%	0 0%	1 0%	50 13%	314 82%
Crisis management skills	14 4%	4 1%	9 2%	137 36%	220 57%
Strategic planning skills	14 4%	7 2%	7 2%	155 40%	201 52%
Data analysis skills	14 4%	6 2%	17 4%	157 41%	190 49%
Curriculum design skills	13 3%	7 2%	28 7%	178 46%	158 41%
Instructional leadership skills	16 4%	3 1%	3 1%	83 22%	279 73%
Understanding of current research	10 3%	9 2%	40 10%	209 54%	116 30%
Previous job experience	8 2%	19 5%	71 18%	210 55%	76 20%
Interpersonal skills	20 5%	2 1%	2 1%	84 22%	276 72%
Public speaking skills	7 2%	17 4%	29 8%	209 54%	122 32%
Ability to foster a climate for success	16 4%	3 1%	1 0%	64 17%	300 78%
Rank I classification	18 5%	15 4%	64 17%	148 39%	139 36%

Rank II classification	19 5%	27 7%	101 26%	125 33%	112 29%
Ed.D. degree	51 13%	41 11%	172 45%	89 23%	31 8%

5. Please describe the importance of the following criteria when hiring for an administrative position.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Extremely Unimportant	Unimportant	Neither Important/Unimportant	Important	Extremely Important
Previous work experience	9 2%	2 1%	27 7%	230 61%	110 29%
Professional development credentials	7 2%	15 4%	81 21%	226 60%	49 13%
Diversity considerations	10 3%	14 4%	131 35%	176 46%	48 13%
Familiarity with the geographic region	7 2%	19 5%	149 39%	175 46%	28 7%
Ed.D Degree	41 11%	49 13%	185 49%	85 22%	19 5%
Masters Degree in education leadership	14 4%	9 2%	44 12%	177 47%	135 36%
Masters Degree in academic content area	16 4%	11 3%	111 29%	184 49%	55 15%

6. In what region of Kentucky is your school system located?			
Northern		46	12%
Northeastern		32	8%
Southeastern		65	17%
Central		94	25%
South Central		53	14%
Western (I-65 to Breathitt Pkwy)		27	7%
Far Western (Breathitt Pkwy to Miss. River)		41	11%
Louisville Metropolitan area		24	6%
Total		382	100%

Appendix G: Survey of Potential Educational Leadership Ed.D. Applicants

1. Are you considering enrolling in an Ed.D program in the next three years?			
Yes		533	33%
No		1081	67%
Total		1614	100%

2. Please rank the following reasons you are not considering an Ed.D. Please select your top three (3) reasons.			
Already hold such a degree		121	11%
Not Interested/no need for the degree		428	40%
Time to degree completion		388	36%
Cost		454	42%
Distance to campus		185	17%
Inconvenient class schedules		111	10%
Lack of online learning opportunities		87	8%
Family commitments		367	34%
Other, please specify		273	25%

3. Please rank your motivations for pursuing this degree?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Not a motivation	Minor Motivating Factor	Major Motivating Factor
Career advancement in a school district or state department	71 13%	176 33%	282 53%
Career change into another field or occupation	251 48%	163 31%	106 20%
Professional growth in current position	45 9%	153 29%	329 62%
Desire to learn new ways to advance student achievement	20 4%	109 21%	398 76%
Desire to learn to lead organizations more effectively	17 3%	99 19%	412 78%

4. Educational leadership Ed.D. programs help develop several different types of skills. How important to you is learning each type of skill listed below?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Extremely Unimportant	Unimportant	Neither Important/Unimportant	Important	Extremely important
Fiscal management	5 1%	5 1%	38 7%	282 53%	203 38%
Personnel management	2 0%	2 0%	26 5%	180 34%	323 61%
Crisis management	4 1%	3 1%	68 13%	226 42%	232 44%
Strategic planning	2 0%	3 1%	29 5%	222 42%	277 52%
Data analysis	2 0%	7 1%	41 8%	224 42%	259 49%

Curriculum design	4 1%	6 1%	35 7%	206 39%	282 53%
Instructional leadership	3 1%	1 0%	11 2%	112 21%	406 76%
Evaluating and applying research studies	6 1%	23 4%	81 15%	261 49%	162 30%
Interpersonal skills	5 1%	11 2%	94 18%	204 38%	219 41%
Public speaking skills	9 2%	28 5%	116 22%	237 44%	143 27%
Fostering climate for success	4 1%	0 0%	11 2%	115 22%	403 76%

5. Please rank any of the following obstacles which may prevent you from pursuing your Ed.D.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Not an Obstacle	Minor Obstacle	Major Obstacle
Time to degree completion	63 12%	221 42%	246 46%
Cost	41 8%	143 27%	348 65%
Distance to campus	111 21%	184 35%	235 44%
Inconvenient class schedules	56 11%	196 37%	277 52%
Lack of online learning opportunities	99 19%	189 36%	239 45%
Family commitments	98 19%	203 39%	226 43%

6. Below are several different types of course delivery options. Please rank each option according to how likely you would be to use that method.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Unlikely to Use	May Be Likely to Use	Likely to Use
On-campus face-to-face classes during the day	477 89%	36 7%	20 4%
On-campus face-to-face classes during the evening	62 12%	250 47%	221 41%
On-campus face-to-face classes during the weekend	90 17%	238 45%	205 38%
On-campus concentrated during summer/other breaks	61 11%	205 38%	267 50%
Off-campus (extended campus)	452	57	24

classes during the day	85%	11%	5%
Off-campus (extended campus) classes during the evening	36 7%	207 39%	290 54%
Off-campus (extended campus) classes during the weekend	71 13%	204 38%	258 48%
Off-campus concentrated during summer/other breaks	53 10%	199 37%	281 53%
Online courses combined with some face-to-face classes	22 4%	157 29%	354 66%
Online courses only	80 15%	173 32%	280 53%

7. Below are several options for course duration. Please select the one you believe would be the most beneficial in the pursuit of your Ed.D.

Traditional semester (approximately 15 weeks)		52	10%
Nontraditional semester (approximately 7 weeks)		126	24%
Summer sessions only		45	8%
More flexible, competency-based model		310	58%
Total		533	100%

8. How long would you expect it to take to finish the degree?

One year		47	9%
Two years		234	44%
Three years		182	34%
Four years		35	7%
Five years		24	5%
More than 5 years		11	2%
Total		533	100%

9. What would you expect to pay for total tuition for an Ed.D degree (48-60 credit hours)?

less than \$15,000		204	38%
\$15,001-20,000		168	32%
\$20,001-25,000		73	14%
\$25,001-30,000		41	8%
\$30,001-35,000		24	5%
\$35,001-40,000		12	2%
>\$40,000		11	2%
Total		533	100%

10. What proportion of the total cost of your Ed.D. would you expect to come from each of the following source? (Please make sure your total responses to not exceed 100 %.)

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of	< 10%	10-30%	30-45%	45-60%	60-75%	75-90%	90-100%
---	-------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	---------

the total respondents selecting the option.								
Personal Finances	87 16%	72 14%	25 5%	55 10%	42 8%	57 11%	195 37%	
Student Loans	340 64%	55 10%	29 5%	27 5%	27 5%	29 5%	26 5%	
Conventional Loans	452 85%	33 6%	15 3%	15 3%	9 2%	3 1%	6 1%	
Grant Scholarship	302 57%	80 15%	39 7%	44 8%	30 6%	17 3%	21 4%	
Employer Subsidy	414 78%	44 8%	17 3%	22 4%	10 2%	6 1%	20 4%	

11. There are several types of institutions at which you may pursue and Ed.D. degree. Please select your top three choices.

Research university – in state		316	59%
Research university – out of state		25	5%
Regional university – in state		391	73%
Regional university – out of state		31	6%
Private university – in state		123	23%
Private university – out of state		21	4%
Online		321	60%
No Preference		55	10%

12. After obtaining your Ed.D. degree, would you plan on remaining in the state of Kentucky to work?			
Yes		525	98%
No		8	2%
Total		533	100%
13. Which of the following best describes your current position?			
Principal		198	37%
Superintendent		20	4%
Teacher		126	24%
Other, please specify		189	35%
Total		533	100%
14. In what region of Kentucky is your school system located?			
Northern		64	12%
Northeastern		45	8%
Southeastern		107	20%
Central		117	22%
South Central		67	13%
Western (I-65 west to Breathitt Pkwy)		44	8%
Far Western (Breathitt Pkwy to MS River)		35	7%
Louisville Metropolitan area		54	10%
Total		533	100%

Education Professional Standards Board
100 Airport Drive, 3rd Floor, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
Phone: (502) 564-4606, Fax (502) 564-7080
<http://www.kyepsb.net>

A copy of this report can be found online at:
<http://www.kyepsb.net/documents/ExecOffice/ELRReport.pdf>

Printed with state funds