Program Focus on Instructional Leadership: Preparing education leaders who can lead their schools to increased student learning and achievement by all, and to close the achievement gap.
Preparing Leaders for California’s Schools

The roles and responsibilities of K-12 administrators are ever changing and challenging. School principals and administrators are faced with diminishing resources, increased student enrollments, overwhelming workloads, and additional standards to meet. All of these demands take away from the ability of school principals to focus on student learning and achievement.

For these reasons, the CSU felt it was critical to look at ways to improve how we prepare educators to lead in the future. Last year, we formed the CSU Presidents Task Force on Education Leadership Programs to examine some of the obstacles facing educational leaders. The goals of the task force were to study the role, recruitment, and preparation of future educational leaders, and to provide recommendations to the CSU on how to improve.

The task force centered its recommendations on several core ideas. First, creating effective programs to prepare leaders needs to be a collaborative effort between organizations in education, government, business, and the community. With standards continuing to evolve, educational leaders also need a clearer roadmap to student achievement. Additionally, institutes of higher education have the responsibility to help develop public support for a statewide strategy to better prepare our educational leaders.

Much of the attention on K-12 public school leadership has been appropriately focused at the individual school level. We know that the quality of individual teachers is the greatest factor in student learning. That is why teacher education is such a critical part of the CSU’s overall mission. We believe there is an equal need to better prepare educational leaders.

This report was made possible thanks to the efforts of California State University, Fresno President John Welty, who guided the task force through its important process. Our sincere gratitude and appreciation also go to the work group participants who brought such diligence and commitment to the discussion and to the development of the task force recommendations. Their work provides a strong foundation for the California State University to build upon to ensure continued improvement in the preparation of our educational leaders. Well-prepared educational leaders are critical to the success of California’s students.
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“Thirty years ago, we had a strong educational system in California. It’s time we got back to that. It will take all of us getting behind the effort to make schools work better for every child. And the leaders of our schools are one key part – without strong leadership, our efforts will flounder.”

Work Group Member,
CSU Education Leadership Program Task Force
Introduction

Extraordinary public attention has been given to the improvement of K-12 education in recent years. States have established achievement standards for K-12 students and implemented testing systems designed to assess student progress toward meeting those standards. Federal legislation, No Child Left Behind, has established additional expectations for the achievement of all children and the closing of the achievement gap affecting our most vulnerable learners. It is no longer sufficient for the average achievement scores to rise. Rather, members from all segments of our society — English language learners, special education students, children growing up in poverty, those from various ethnic and racial groups — all must receive high quality teaching and have supportive environments that will enable them to achieve at the high levels expected for all.

Nationally, and in California, most attention has rightly centered on the individual K-12 school as the place where teaching and learning improvements must take place. The principal and other administrators stand squarely in the spotlight of efforts to produce high performing schools. However, California’s educational leaders face a daunting task.

School leaders face impossible expectations and have less than desired control over many factors that impact learning. For example, they often:

- Lack budget control, hemmed in by district and state policies;
- Are limited in their ability to select staff to meet unique school conditions;
- Are constrained by risk management, environmental, and health regulations from the state and federal levels;
- Are swamped by paperwork;
- Must respond to multiple and conflicting curricular requirements;
- Operate grossly inadequate and degraded physical plants; and
- Lack the ability to raise local funds to improve school conditions.

Additionally, the compensation for educational leaders has not kept pace with advances in teacher salaries, further reducing the incentive for potential leaders to aspire to administrative posts. The hours are long and the work load heavy. Tenure does not exist for most administrators, often making their continued employment dependent upon results over which they have little control. As a result of these pressures and poor working conditions, there appears to be a decline of individuals willing to become school site leaders.

California faces particular problems as it struggles to improve the education of all its children. Enrollments in the state’s K-12 schools have increased steadily over the last decade, with 6.2 million students enrolled in 2002-03. And they are diverse. Roughly a third of the state’s students are White; eight percent are African American. Forty-five percent of K-12 students are of Hispanic heritage, and they are expected to become the majority of students in K-12 schools by 2009-10. Twenty-five percent of all students are classified as English Language Learners (ELL), needing to learn English in order to succeed in school. A recent projection by the California Legislative Analyst’s Office estimates that it will take about six years before half of ELL children in kindergarten can be reclassified as fluent in English.

Ten percent of California’s K-12 students come from families that receive CalWORKS assistance (formerly AFDC). An additional 49% participate in the free/reduced price meals at their schools — another marker of family poverty. In sum, schools in urban and rural settings often serve communities with high poverty and immigration rates. Diverse student bodies, including many students who come to school speaking little English, require flexible approaches to instruction in an era when standards create pressures for standardization. The ethnic and racial diversity of our schools is a tremendous asset to the future of our State. The number of English learners and children from poverty challenges schools to offer an education of excellence to these children, without which their potential contributions to the State will be diminished.

Teachers make a difference in how well children learn. Research has confirmed that the quality of the teacher is the single greatest factor that impacts student achievement in the classroom. Teacher preparation program standards have been strengthened and statewide efforts have been directed toward providing an adequate supply of qualified teachers for K-12 schools. These efforts are beginning to pay off as student achievement has been rising on statewide assessments.

Over the years, researchers and policymakers have asserted that school leadership also significantly impacts children’s school learning. A recent study by the Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) Group examined more than 5,000 studies from the past 30 years, 70 of which met their criteria for rigor and high quality design. Their analysis concluded that the quality of leadership in schools is a factor in children’s school achievement. For example, an average school scoring at the 50th percentile could be
expected to achieve a score 10 percentile points higher if it had a competent leader at the helm. Attracting strong, competent leaders to our schools is essential to the improvement of instruction and subsequent learning by all.

As the difficulty in attracting strong educational leaders has grown, policymakers, public officials, and professional organizations have addressed this critical problem. A recent national report by the Broad Foundation (“A License to Lead?: A New Leadership Agenda for America’s Schools,” Frederick M. Hess, 2003) concluded that “our approach to educational leadership fails to secure enough of the leaders we need, forces effective teachers to forego their chosen work in order to lead, ghettoizes the field and study of educational leadership, and offers no accounting of benefits that result [from leadership preparation programs]” (p. 19).

In California there has been concern about the possible shortage of educational leaders, an apparent diminishing of interest in site leader jobs, and the type of preparation for potential site leaders. EdSource (“Help Wanted: Top Administrators to Lead California’s Schools,” 2001), The Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) (“Recruiting and Retention of School Leaders: A Critical State Need,” 2001), and the California Department of Education’s Professional Development Task Force (“Learning…Teaching…Leading,” 2002) are among the reports that have examined the status of education leadership in the States.

As these reports emerged, significant debate and some finger-pointing evolved with regard to what needs to be done and by whom to attract and retain strong, well-prepared education leaders for California. Some groups have advocated that non-educators should be hired to lead our schools. Others have suggested that preparation should occur in the schools and not in the universities. Yet others speak to providing more independence and authority at the school site level for controlling the conditions of teaching and learning that occur there, including significant budgetary and personnel decisions. In addition, there is some evidence that the quality of preparation has varied from program to program. The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) has revised standards for the preparation of school administrators three times since 1987 in efforts to make them more responsive to the needs of the State’s schools. Thus, while there are multiple views of how to improve the recruitment and preparation of educational leaders, little has been done to reconcile these views and forge a cohesive plan to address these critical issues.

The CSU is a major contributor to the education of K-12 school leaders in California, with 20 of the 23 CSU campuses offering education leadership programs. In the years 1999-2002, the CSUs awarded:

- 66% of the Preliminary Administrative Intern Credentials (643 credentials recommended);
- 53% of the non-intern Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (1,323);
- 49% of the Certificates of Eligibility (marking completion of a university-based Administrative Services Credential by a person not currently employed in an administrative position; 1,787); and
- 50% of the Professional Administrative Services Credentials (1,516).

Cognizant of the challenges faced by programs that prepare educational leaders, Chancellor Reed in the summer of 2001 convened CSU presidents and district superintendents from the communities of San Diego, Fresno, Long Beach, Sacramento, and Hayward and challenged them to explore better ways of preparing educational administrators for the future. The CSU provided financial resources for campuses and their K-12 partner districts to establish pilot collaborative programs that drew on the resources and strengths of the K-12 and university units. Much was learned from these successful efforts, including the need for a more systemic effort to address the complex issues of education leader preparation.

In early 2003, CSU Chancellor Charles Reed asked me to convene a task force of seven California State University Presidents to address the issue of preparing future educational leaders. The Task Force determined that the most important issues to be addressed were the role, recruitment, and preparation of the educational leader. It was also clear that a broad-based group needed to be involved in order to thoroughly identify problems and to propose possible solutions. The group would be asked to produce a document that would describe needed directions for California’s educational leadership
programs in general, at the CSUs and other public and private institutions. With this document as a base, it would then be possible for the Task Force to make subsequent recommendations to the CSU Board of Trustees for specific actions to be taken by the CSU system and its campuses.

In summer 2003, Chancellor Reed and the Task Force appointed a 39 member work group and asked them to examine the role of the K-12 administrator of the future, and to make recommendations to the CSU Presidents Task Force on the recruitment and preparation of K-12 educational administrators. These members included 17 administrators and faculty from CSU campuses and 22 K-12 leaders, including several who had recently graduated from CSU-based education leadership programs, representatives from administrator professional organizations, state education agencies, and business and community organizations. A number of the participants had been involved in the development of recent statewide reports such as noted above on the status of education leadership for K-12 schools in California. A list of the work group members is included in the Appendix.

This extraordinary group addressed its charge with a sense of urgency. All agreed that California faces a crisis in K-12 education leadership that needs addressing now. They also acknowledged that if the leadership problems are not solved, student achievement progress will be threatened. The work group was divided into three subcommittees, each of which focused their work on one of three areas that the Task Force had identified as being most important: the role that the education leader is being asked to play in this era of accountability, the recruitment of leaders who can play this role well, and the characteristics of preparation programs that would give them the knowledge and skills that would enable them to be successful. The entire work group met twice. The subcommittees met two to three additional times, in face-to-face meetings and through teleconferencing. The subcommittees’ written reports provided the basis upon which this final report was prepared.

At the final whole group meeting of the three subcommittees, I challenged the group to identify the important, audacious ideas that would fundamentally change the ways in which educational leaders would be prepared in this era of accountability for increased student learning and achievement, and for the closing of the achievement gap. As a result of these deliberations and subsequent collation of ideas from the subcommittee reports, the following sections of this report contain 12 recommendations. These recommendations are organized into four main sections: Program Focus on Instructional Leadership; Systemic Core Program Elements; Collaborative Partnerships; and Accountability. The Task Force and the subcommittees believe that the recommendations contained in this report are essential for preparing educational leaders of the future in any of the education leadership programs in the State.

During the deliberations and discussions of the work group, one of the members, a site leader who had recently completed her administrative credential, commented that she felt that going to work each day was traumatic. She felt overwhelmed by the expectations of her position, frustrated by being diverted by other demands from working to improve learning by the children in her school, and guilt-ridden about the impact of her demanding job on her own children. Even though she felt she had been well prepared in many areas, she struggled with the shortage of time and resources that prevented her from doing what she had been trained to do. We all have a shared responsibility to prepare administrators for the demands of their job and to work collectively to ensure that these demands are reasonable. Educational institutions must provide future educational leaders with the tools that will allow them to be successful in leading their schools to improved learning by all. Additionally, the partnerships between universities and K-12 units must also work to redefine the conditions of work under which education leaders can effectively lead. Only in this way can California produce and retain education leaders who can have a positive impact on children’s learning and achievement, close the achievement gap, and be prepared to meet the challenges they face on a daily basis.

John D. Welty
President
California State University, Fresno
Summary and Recommendations for Education Leadership Programs in California
The CSU Presidents Task Force on Education Leadership Programs appointed a 39 member work group to provide recommendations that would lead to improvements in the preparation of education leaders for California’s K-12 public schools. Three subcommittees were formed and each was asked to focus their recommendations in a specific area:

**Subcommittee 1:**
The role of education leaders of the future

**Subcommittee 2:**
The recruitment of future education leaders

**Subcommittee 3:**
The preparation of future education leaders

The subcommittees each recognized that these three focus areas were intertwined. The recommendations of each of the subcommittees dealt primarily with the issue that they had been asked to address, but also included recommendations that addressed related areas as they deemed appropriate. A set of understandings emerged during the discussions of the three subcommittees and in whole group sessions, providing the basis for the subsequent recommendations. These narrowed the scope of this report and provided direction for how the recommendations might be implemented. These central ideas are briefly summarized below:

**The Need for Comprehensive Reform:** The standards movement of the past decade has demonstrated the power of clearly identifying what students need to learn and be able to do as a result of their schooling. True, informed instructional leadership is the key to helping California’s students meet the state’s academic standards. Changes in education leadership preparation programs and in the conditions under which school leaders work are both needed to prepare and sustain effective instructional leaders.

**Evolving Standards:** California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL) currently are a firm foundation for education leadership programs in the State. These standards could be further elaborated so as to provide improved guidance for the design and implementation of programs, and to define the instructional leader role. As programs to prepare the education leaders of the future are collectively designed and evaluated, these standards are expected to evolve, providing more direction for the programs built upon them.

**Partnerships:** Powerful programs for educating education leaders can only arise with the full partnership of K-12, higher education, professional educator groups, governmental bodies, and business and community leaders. Today, no one group can educate leaders alone. The recommendations in this report contain multiple descriptions of where such partnerships are needed and how they might work.

**Involvement of Higher Education Systems:** The subcommittees clearly saw the need for development of education leadership programs that would create a cohesive system of education leadership preparation throughout the State. The higher education systems were identified as playing a central role in developing powerful and cohesive preparation programs, coordinating these efforts, and advocating for public support for the developing programs and the newly trained leaders.

**Focus on Site Leaders:** While the quantity and quality of all levels of education leadership need to improve, the subcommittees focused primarily on development of programs that prepare site leaders. The individual school is where improvements in student achievement will happen, and strong leadership at this level is essential if all of California’s children are to learn and achieve at the highest levels. The subcommittees noted the need for improvement in the conditions of work and the support provided for site leaders if they are to be effective in their work and are to be retained.

**All-University Responsibility:** At the CSU, teacher education has been increasingly acknowledged as an all-university responsibility. Likewise, the subcommittees saw the preparation of education leaders in this same way. Public policy, business, labor relations — these and other units should contribute to the development of programs that prepare administrators for their role in leading schools to higher achievement. Faculty and administrative leadership of the university, beginning with the President, must make decisions that support these efforts.

With these as the framework, the Presidents Task Force presents 12 recommendations clustered into four main sections: Program Focus on Instructional Leadership; Systemic Core Program Elements; Collaborative Partnerships; and Accountability. After some introductory remarks in each section, the 12 recommendations are presented, each followed by a short discussion.
Education leadership programs of the future should focus on preparing graduates who will function as effective instructional leaders.
Introduction

All three subcommittees of this Task Force came to a consensus that there is currently one predominant goal that education leaders must achieve: increasing the ability of their schools to improve the learning and achievement of each and every student, while decreasing the achievement gap between advantaged and disadvantaged children. Consequently, education leadership programs must focus on preparing school leaders to play the role of instructional leader effectively so that this goal may be reached.

Currently, administrators in many schools are distracted from the instructional leader role by a wide range of fiscal and managerial responsibilities, e.g., monitoring budget expenditures, creating the master schedule, handling student crises. They have a multitude of responsibilities both within the school (e.g., enforcement of school/district regulations) and external to the school (e.g., maintaining close working relationships with parents and other community members). Not surprisingly, current education leadership programs nationally and in California have sought to prepare their students with skills in all of these areas, too often leading to generic and piecemeal programs. These programs must change by putting instructional leadership at the core of the programs’ courses and activities. The recommendations in this report call for programs that provide a deep understanding of curriculum and instruction, leadership skills to activate others in communal efforts to improve learning and achievement, and relating the knowledge and skills of other areas (e.g., resource management) to those of the instructional leader role.

Education leader programs must also prepare their students to prioritize tasks and set appropriate limits for how they personally spend their time as a school leader. This means enabling others within the school to share essential parts of managing the school, nurturing strong relationships with external constituencies, and improving curriculum and instruction so that achievement rises for each and every student. Sharing these responsibilities increases the capacity of the school as a whole to recognize important problems that interfere with learning and achievement and to develop innovative solutions for those problems.

Recommendations and Discussion

1. **Education leadership programs should focus on preparing graduates who will function as effective instructional leaders.**

The focus on K-12 student learning mandates that the primary role of the school principal shift from that of a fiscal and operations manager to that of instructional leader. Effective education leaders of the future must have a clear vision of how to fulfill the primary purpose of their organization, i.e., to ensure learning at high levels for each and every student so as to prepare them for responsible citizenship in our democratic society. The knowledge and skills of an effective instructional leader include the following:

- A deep understanding of academic and teaching standards in core instructional areas;
- Familiarity with and ability to assess available curriculum resources and the instructional practices that teach the material effectively;
- The capability to observe and evaluate teachers, to identify their strengths and weaknesses, and to coach teachers, as necessary, to improve their instruction;
• The knowledge of how to gather and interpret K-12 student assessment data and the ability to guide teachers in using such data to meet individual student needs through informed, precise, and differentiated instruction;

• Modeling an openness to new practices that lead to improved achievement; and

• The ability to engage parents and community in the support of instructional goals.

California State University, Fresno

Fresno State is now beginning its third cohort of “Chancellor’s Fellows.” This program, with support from the CSU Chancellor’s Office, has been designed for exceptional candidates selected by local district superintendents. The program emphasizes a high degree of collaboration between local districts and the university, and on-site intensive fieldwork linked to course content and school needs, along with rigorous academic courses focused on preparing “learning leaders” to promote and implement effective instructional practices aimed at maximizing student learning. Students participate in reflective conversations as they learn to use the many tools for educational leaders developed throughout the program. Time spent by administrators working with teachers in classrooms is emphasized throughout all courses, preparing these future leaders with a strong background in instruction, curriculum, and leadership. The program has received accolades from local districts and has wide support in the Central Valley.

Education leadership programs must train candidates to improve learning in their schools by altering teaching practices, and by concurrently changing policies that interfere with instructional improvements. At the center of the work will be understanding and leading the change process. Changes need to take place both inside and outside the organization, requiring the leader to move easily back and forth between the school, the district, and the community. Instructional leadership requires forming and maintaining relationships that contribute positively to change.

California State University, San Marcos

Each student in the CSU San Marcos Educational Leadership program engages in assignments to further his or her skills as an instructional leader. For example, students observe three lessons, one of which must include English language learners, delivered by three different teachers. Students use a standards-based observation guide that requires them to identify a standard that they will focus on during the observation. They arrange for a post-observation conversation with each teacher, practicing the skill of identifying and discussing effective elements of a standards-based lesson, as well as discerning the difference between evidence and opinion. Students write a summary of each observation in which the standard of focus is identified and at least three pieces of evidence from the observation are described. A reflection on the feeling tone of the conversations is included, as well as a description of what the student would do differently during the next observation.

California State University, Bakersfield

The Education Leadership program at CSU Bakersfield emphasizes the role of the administrator as an instructional leader. For example, participants in the program learn how to conduct teacher evaluations that can lead to improved children’s learning. They learn strategies such as working with teachers to create matrices based on real student data that identify which subject matter standards students have and have not yet attained. This leads to options for guiding teachers in how to analyze this data and develop alternative teaching strategies to improve student achievement.

While emphasizing the development of processes to help students learn and achieve in a standards-based curriculum, the program has not lost sight of the role of administrators in providing “investigatory” education that supports development of students’ own academic interests. Participants recently created written resources that can be widely shared in how to accomplish the expository (standards-based) and investigatory curricula.
San Francisco State University

San Francisco State University offers a unique delivery system to its students in Educational Leadership through the use of the "Collaboratory," a technologically advanced "smart room" located in the College of Education. The room contains 20 laptop computers that allow students at each computer to display their work on a central screen. This technology allows for objective and comprehensive decision-making training for prospective school leaders. Specific case studies using interactive video of classroom practice allow program students to explore collectively various strategies for improving instruction. A descriptive promotional CD demonstrates the many applications for various university programs, including Educational Administration. The "Collaboratory" leads to a unique interactive leadership curriculum and was developed in collaboration with the campus Instructional Technology Department.

2. Education leadership programs should prepare graduates to distribute instructional leadership roles throughout their school.

There are too few hours in the day for the site leader to be personally responsible for all the changes needed to improve learning in the school. The effective leader will form a distributed leadership team to share this responsibility. The visionary site leader creates an environment in which teachers and other school staff contribute their expertise and assume responsibility for initiating and managing specific instructional improvements. The site leader must see to it that members of school improvement teams are trained to assume these responsibilities, e.g., to analyze and use relevant data to select actions, to implement data-driven decisions, and to assess their effectiveness. Strong leaders must be effective communicators, collaborate well, model their own career-long learning, demonstrate skill in the use of data, know and share the current research on effective teaching and learning, reflect thoughtfully, and be able to identify and implement effective practices. In short, they set the climate for all stakeholders to participate in a continually learning school in which student learning, achievement, and equity are the central goals.

In larger districts, teachers, administrators, professional development experts, evaluation and research staff, curriculum developers, counselors, psychologists, and fiscal officers can all play key roles in school-level innovation. For smaller districts, these same resources may be acquired through collaboration with county, regional, or state units and organizations. Leaders of the future who distribute leadership roles throughout their schools should learn to use local resources, including parents and community resources, for expanding the capacity of their school staffs to participate in instructional improvement efforts, e.g., forming a partnership with a local teacher education program that provides leadership training for teachers.

Sonoma State University

One key to being able to increase the capacity of a school to solve problems of teaching and learning is for site administrators to know how to engage others, especially teachers, in a problem-solving process. At Sonoma State, students in the Educational Leadership Program are introduced early in the program to strategies such as the Leadership Circle Collaborative Problem-Solving Process that becomes a part of their repertoire of distributive leadership skills. This process includes steps such as presentation of the problem to a group of collaborative problem-solvers, including an analysis of the related political, resource, and cultural issues, getting input from the group, generating options and suggestions, responding to the options, and debriefing the process. Program participants report that mastery of this strategy helps them to solve on-going problems that they face in their positions as educational leaders. Candidates have created “schools of inquiry” through the use of this protocol in their schools.
3. Education Leadership Programs, including graduate degree programs, should prepare education leaders for all levels of service and in sufficient numbers to meet the needs of California.

Education leadership programs in California provide initial (preliminary) and advanced (professional) certification for K-12 school site leaders, both of which should reflect the instructional leadership focus. Professional development should also be available within districts, especially for those previously trained without an instructional leader emphasis, to allow site leaders to continually advance their practice. However, the need for advanced training doesn’t stop there:

Graduate degree programs (master’s and doctoral levels) are essential for those who would investigate how to create strong learning environments in particularly difficult schools or who are charged with implementing such reforms throughout a district. The subcommittees recognized that without the appropriate support of the top leadership of the districts, site leaders will not be able to act decisively in the instructional leader role.

In truth, educators do not know everything that is required to create schools that work well for every child. The strategies for school improvement that work in one school may fail miserably in another. The top leadership in a district (e.g., superintendents, assessment and curriculum specialists) must possess diagnostic and problem-solving skills if they are to provide directed assistance for schools that fail to make progress, modify policies that expand and do not inhibit instructional improvements throughout the district, establish new expectations of site leader work that puts instructional leadership at the core, and build local coalitions that provide sufficient financial and public support for instructional leadership. Infusing applied research on school/district instructional improvements and instructional leader themes into master’s and doctoral degree programs can provide district and school leadership with many of these needed research skills.

The California legislature has noted the need to increase advanced degree training for K-12 and community college administrators by adopting a resolution in 2002 calling for joint CSU/UC Ed.D. programs. These programs need to be expanded to provide for a sufficient quantity of top school leaders (currently less than 40 students have been admitted to these programs). Access to programs must be provided in rural as well as in urban areas. The training of education leaders as practitioners has not been a priority for the University of California system; it currently prepares less than 2% of the credentialed school administrators in California per year. Thus, the subcommittees recommended that if the UC is unable to expand its participation in the applied school leadership arena, the CSU should seek authorization to offer an independent Ed.D., assuming responsibility along with its K-12 partners for preparing leaders who can initiate and sustain needed educational reform at the site and district levels.

---

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Cal Poly SLO’s Educational Leadership and Administration Program offers three distinct levels of professional preparation: the preliminary administrative services credential, an M.A. in Educational Leadership and, jointly with UC Santa Barbara, an Ed.D. in Educational Leadership. The goal of the Ed.D. program is to prepare and support the “exemplary educational leader” who will learn to engage in scholarly research and effectively use extant data to make sound, information-driven decisions; to critically examine current educational practices and policies from a variety of relevant theoretical perspectives; to formulate and implement effective leadership, managerial, and instructional practices that will improve student achievement and organizational productivity; and to engage in reflective practice to assess personal and professional leadership effectiveness. Students’ doctoral research is directed toward critical problems that have been identified by local non-urban school districts that are the partners in this program.
California State University, Fresno

Fresno State’s Joint Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership, instituted in conjunction with UC Davis, is preparing a host of educational leaders with advanced preparation to take on the challenges of schools in the Central Valley. Courses and research are focused on meeting the leadership needs of schools, school districts, and institutions of higher education. Graduates have performed research seeking effective practices in local schools, resulting in three manuscripts that have been widely disseminated and utilized throughout the Central Valley. Efforts are underway to expand the program to provide further diversification of course offerings to better meet the individual needs of educators and to provide linkage to the master’s degree program in Education Administration.

4. The university systems in California should advocate forcefully for increased public support for instructional leadership roles by school leaders.

The recommendations above, when implemented, will focus education leadership programs on providing the K-12 system with highly trained and capable instructional leaders for its schools. However, public support for such a shift in the work of the educational leader will require a simultaneous shift in expectations for how principals, superintendents, and other school and district leaders do their work. Local school boards and community members may believe that the new emphasis on instructional leadership is simply one more task that can be added to the current duties of most administrators. They may not recognize how instructional leaders should act, and what reasonable supports are needed for those who would do this job well. For example, principals in schools that need to greatly improve student achievement may not be able to spend the needed time and attention on these efforts unless they have the assistance of business personnel who can relieve them of much of the fiscal and physical managerial work.

The university systems should join with statewide governmental bodies (e.g., the California Department of Education), professional school administrator organizations (e.g., the California Association of School Administrators, ACSA; the California Association of Professors of Educational Administration, CAPEA), the California School Boards Association, Chambers of Commerce, and other local organizations to advocate for understanding, development, and acceptance of school reforms that place instructional leadership at the center of the site administrator’s duties. The general public needs to be able to recognize successful schools and successful school leadership, and to understand how California’s accountability system works to enhance school success. Because such a process will require resources that are currently in short supply at the K-12 and university levels, funding from private and governmental sources should be sought to support this work.

California State University, Fullerton

Effective leadership in today’s public schools will require a shift in the work of that leadership. The focus by site leaders on instructional leadership does not mean that the other managerial work of the leader can be ignored. In some cases, where there is a drastic need for instructional improvement and increased learning in a school, districts need to find ways to provide additional support for site leaders to free them to focus on instruction. In 2001, CSU Fullerton received a Wallace-Readers Digest Fund grant to develop a certificate program to train school site operations/classified managers. The managers can oversee functions such as school business functions, manage facilities, and supervise classified personnel. The CSU Fullerton Extended Education program has now implemented this program. Providing the public with evidence for the success of its graduates will contribute to the public support for this and other such programs.
Education leadership programs should prepare graduates to expand the instructional capacity of their school through distributed leadership.
Introduction

All education leadership programs that share a common focus, i.e., preparing instructional leaders, should be built around a common core. The subcommittees believed that it was the State’s university systems, rather than individual campuses acting alone, that should take the lead in identifying these common elements. Further, they believed that only the systems had the capacity and the responsibility to address the needed improvements in administrator training and support that would be built into the newly conceptualized programs. Leadership by the university systems does not mean that they work alone to develop the core, or ignore existing state standards for administrator preparation. Rather, they are charged with bringing together all educational levels—K-12, colleges, universities, and professional organizations—to accomplish this task.

Those participating in the development of the core must consider how to connect the content of the programs more directly to the actual work and needs of the instructional leader in the schools. Coaching and mentoring of candidates as they learn and practice their skills need to be established in a systematic way. A balance of research, theory, and practice; opportunities for application to actual administrator tasks; and creation of local, regional and statewide networks to provide a continuum of development and support—these are the components of a cohesive whole that must be built. Only if all of these components are present can we create programs that are grounded in the realities of the schools, yet equip the new and developing leaders with the skills to continually challenge and improve the dysfunctional parts of the status quo.

The subcommittees noted that California does not appear to have a shortage of those who have completed the initial credential programs for school administrators. For example, of the approximately 2,500 administrators credentialed at the preliminary level in California during 2001-02, only half received Preliminary Internship or Preliminary Administrative Services credentials that required them to be currently employed in an administrative capacity in a school or district. The remainder of those who had completed a university-based credential program were issued “Certificates of Eligibility” that would allow them to be hired subsequently by a school district. Some of these undoubtedly would eventually be hired as an administrator, but some clearly choose not to seek an administrative position or have left education entirely. This passive, self-selecting system often fails to identify and encourage potential instructional leaders who have the specific attributes needed by today’s schools. The development of systemic, proactive recruitment strategies has also been shown to lead to a more ethnically and racially representative class of potential administrators.

Although CAPEA, ACSA, and other education administrator groups meet several times per year, communications among specific programs are less common and do not happen routinely. This lack of communication perpetuates isolation and limits the sharing of innovative, effective practices in leadership preparation across the State. As a result, programs might often reinvent policies and strategies that have been already implemented successfully in other settings.

The presence of common elements does not imply that programs should be carbon copies of one another. Education leadership programs are found throughout the State, in urban, suburban, and rural areas, and in areas that are culturally diverse from one another. These areas often have varying needs for recruitment and training of education leaders and for building learning communities that sustain them over time. Thus, individual education leadership programs will need to go beyond the core to address the variability found in unique regional needs, e.g., in small, rural districts vs. larger suburban or urban settings. No single preparation program design can be adequate for programs throughout the State.

Recommendations and Discussion

5. Education Leadership Programs should contain common core elements that contain the key skills for instructional leaders.

The subcommittees did not intend to prescribe the specific core elements that should be common to all education leadership programs. Rather they wanted to make clear the necessary link between those core elements and the role of the administrator of the future as an instructional leader. This recommendation further calls on the university educational systems to provide the leadership that will...
bring together the university and K-12 systems, along with educational organization and community participants, to determine jointly the essential core elements. Establishing a common core will likely result in the restructuring of the role and responsibilities of the school principal so that the job is attractive and can be done by talented, accomplished, but not “superhuman” candidates. Only in this way can the programs create an environment that produces leaders with the appropriate dispositions of personal and professional ethics, reflective actions and self-evaluations, and the courage to do the “right thing” to improve learning and achievement by all. As the largest preparer of K-12 education leaders, the CSU system has a special opportunity to bring together the various professional and public communities to identify the core elements of programs on its campuses.

The concept of core elements for leadership programs is not new. The California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL), developed with the collaboration of ACSA, CAPEA, and others, can serve as the basis for these core concepts. In using the instructional leadership lens to implement these standards, the selected core elements are likely to encompass six key domains of knowledge and skills needed by instructional leaders: 1) supervising and evaluating staff; 2) using evidence to improve instruction that supports state standards and other locally important learning goals; 3) decision-making and managing change; 4) allocating resources appropriately; 5) communicating effectively with all constituencies; and 6) establishing internal and external accountability. Other topics traditionally within educational administrator preparation programs need to be integrated within the instructional leadership frame, so that it is clear how those topics relate to improving instruction. The associated skill and content sets should be adaptable to the particular needs of districts and schools that serve urban, rural, or suburban children, and children in a variety of socioeconomic, language, cognitive, and other circumstances.

Leaders who emerge from these programs must have strengths in the use of data to improve learning, building employee and community relations, and in the ability to solve persistent and important problems. They must be able to engage various public audiences and learn to balance their professional and personal lives, e.g., playing multiple roles simultaneously, prioritizing activities, negotiating decision-making with others, and finding the time to read and apply research to real problems. To achieve all of these desirable outcomes, the programs must consist of a continuum of coursework and fieldwork that is comprehensive, coherent, articulated, and connected to the world of real schools.

California State University, Hayward

An educational leadership partnership between CSU Hayward and the West Contra Costa School District has the mission of “preparing bold, socially responsible leaders who will transform the world of schooling.” The program defines five key areas for growth and learning, including Teaching and Learning for Equity and High Achievement; Systems Thinking and Strategic Approaches to Developing a Learning Community; Building Organizational Capacity Through Resource Coherence; Ethical, Caring and Reflective Practice; and Engaging and Influencing Forces within the Larger Community. The department’s recruiting and screening processes use these five areas that are aligned to the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders.

California State University, Los Angeles

The Educational Leadership Program at the Charter College of Education uses portfolio assessments to assess its students’ competence in the key skills of educational leadership. In summer 2004, a new option for the Professional Administrative Services (Tier II) Credential program will be offered for beginning school administrators. The Mastery Option, a response to recent CCTC initiatives, is designed after the assessment model used by the National Board of Professional Teacher Certification in which candidates are evaluated by multiple assessors on various measures (e.g., data-analysis reports, official memo writing, video clips of actual performance, PowerPoint presentations). Candidates must develop portfolios with a variety of artifacts to demonstrate competence in 43 elements that are clustered under six California Standards for Professional Educational Leaders. Each candidate must present his/her own portfolio to a mentor veteran administrator, a peer administrator, a teacher, peers, and faculty who determine the candidate’s competence. While this option requires intensive work from the candidate and faculty, the short length (11 weeks) of the program is greatly welcomed by school administrators who are pursuing Tier II credentials.
6. Education Leadership Programs should be designed to contain learning experiences that balance research, theory, and practice.

The research base on how to prepare effective school leaders is relatively weak. However, what research exists strongly suggests that certain components help make programs effective, e.g., development around a set of standards. It also supports inclusion of what are often called “best practices,” e.g., adult learning principles, problem-based learning, authentic assessments, coaching, and mentoring. Programs need to be designed so that candidates encounter the essential content in ways that lead to real mastery, i.e., by creating appropriate mixes of theory, research, and practice.

Traditional classroom instruction, even in applied programs, often begins with presentation of theoretical principles, e.g., the types and meaning of educational statistics. This may be followed by examples of data (e.g., on the performance of fourth grade pupils on a state assessment) that candidates would practice interpreting. The subcommittees proposed that even when topics are introduced traditionally, program students should have the opportunity to develop mastery of the concepts and skills by applying them in practical settings, ideally, in their own schools. So, in the example above, candidates might be challenged to design a short study to collect, analyze, and interpret student achievement data in a classroom at their school. The proposals went further, suggesting that the pattern of presentation periodically be reversed, i.e., that problems typically encountered in the candidate’s work in schools initiate the study of important topics. The program’s learning experiences should require active work by the students. Such activities, in which students identify problems, research solutions, and make decisions, make up much of the real world of school leadership.

Field experiences must be an essential part of the instructional leader programs. One example of a meaningful fieldwork assignment for instructional leaders would be to establish an instructional improvement team in their school. Program students would bring evidence of their work back to class, debrief their performance, receive input from peers, and plan to improve their success. Coaching and mentoring by program instructors (from the university and/or K-12) need to support the work in the field. As much as feasible, the work needs to take place during the school day and in the school setting. Released time for work under highly qualified leaders in other schools is another option. Internships, in which the student has been hired in a leadership capacity within a school district as she/he enrolls in a leadership program, provides a basis for...
an intensive program of classes and fieldwork that draws on university and district resources.

Action-focused instructional leader programs create learning communities of candidates and their instructors. Such relationships need to extend beyond the granting of the administrative credential. Education leaders need support and assistance at every career stage. Since no individual program can provide all the support needed by every newly trained or experienced administrator, and since leaders may change districts, universities should partner with local education units to develop a systemwide online network for administrator support that would effectively extend the face-to-face contacts with a “24/7” support network that would reach to the most isolated parts of the State.

7. Educational Leadership Programs should develop a systemic recruitment plan linked to the knowledge and skills needed for effective educational leaders.

Recruitment of future education leaders should reflect a tight link between the needs of the job and the training offered. Schools and districts are operating in a new era of accountability for results, a focus on K-12 pupil learning, and a renewed commitment to closing the achievement gap. Recruitment of future leaders must be tied to identification of those who are most likely to provide the instructional leadership needed to improve schools in these ways. For example, the programs might recruit as future leaders teachers who have played key roles in a distributive leadership team that has changed instruction to improve learning of previously failing students. School districts could also look for those who have demonstrated their commitment to equity, for example, mobilizing parents from diverse groups to use new strategies to support their children’s academic work. Programs and school district leaders may need to actively recruit candidates, since school leadership jobs are not universally viewed as attractive. Districts may encourage potential leaders to apply to the programs by committing adequate resources for leadership skill development and providing reasonable support for those already working as instructional leaders.

Many who are currently enrolled in education leadership programs have self-selected, a process that has led to a pool of administrators that does not reflect the diversity of the State’s population. Self-selection also fails to identify some candidates who have high leadership potential. Recruitment for the focused instructional leader programs should be conducted collaboratively and systematically, with admission decisions shared between university and district personnel. Programs ultimately need to determine if internship and district-based cohorts will become the predominant pattern of admission and to what extent self-selected applicants will continue to be admitted.

The extension of recruitment of potential school leaders from fields other than education should be considered. Universities, in close collaboration with K-12 and community colleges, should be active in promoting the critical role of public education in a democracy, the
need for social and academic equity, and the importance of effective school and district leadership in educating our youth. University and K-12 school partners may need to better explain and promote the importance of public schooling and of school leadership to the community at large, and to solicit leadership candidates from fields other than education who would bring unique expertise to the enterprise. Candidates from outside of education would need to be brought to an understanding of teaching and learning processes so that their expertise can contribute to the instructional improvement focus of the school.

8. Education Leadership Programs should be adapted to meet local needs in leadership knowledge, skills, recruitment, and support.

The development of a systemic core for education leadership programs reflects the overriding concern for the statewide needs of K-12 instructional leadership that can promote equity as it improves student learning and achievement. However, such consensus on core elements does not alleviate the need for campus programs to respond to regional and/or local needs. Program-specific components might address the special needs of local schools (e.g., school safety issues) and unique regional needs (e.g., filling a large number of superintendent vacancies), as well as other school and district size and location considerations.

The university systems should facilitate regional collaboration among campuses and districts to support economies of scale for some program elements and the sharing of expertise with respect to effective practices in program design, implementation, and assessment. Each campus should also develop a systematic and strategic local recruitment plan, in close partnership with the districts, county offices, and bargaining units in their locale.

For programs to be effective, they must reflect the dynamic, context-specific nature of local schools and the developmental needs of emerging and career leaders who work there. Each individual school and district has a unique and complex culture that determines its support for new instructional leaders. As districts evolve over time, the educational leadership programs must also evolve, as they strive to provide the leaders, their schools, and their districts with the support needed to sustain their growth in effectiveness.

California State University, San Bernardino

CSU San Bernardino works closely with the 54 K-12 districts that the campus serves in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, covering a 27,000 square mile service area. Advisory Council meetings that include educational and community leaders are conducted twice each year in the five areas where educational leadership classes are held to obtain input, suggestions, and new ideas for the program. Each quarter, fieldwork site supervisors are asked to complete an evaluation form that leads to program improvements. Human Resource administrators from districts also regularly are asked about their needs and to provide a review of the program graduates. In addition, school district administrative leaders often serve as part-time faculty in the program and participate in reviews of content with university partners to ensure program consistency.

California State University, Sacramento

CSU Sacramento has a long history of responding to the needs of districts in northern California to provide access to administrative preparation to a broad range of applicants, and to serve the needs for administrators in general and in specific districts. An example of such efforts include the Bilingual Leadership Cohort, in which graduates have been hired by both rural and urban school districts throughout California. This program began in 1977, providing over two decades of administrative instruction and service to the English Language students in the State.

A second example is that of the Urban Leadership Cohort, from which 90% of its administrative credential completers have been hired in urban school districts. Other available programs include the Administrative Internship Program (more than 400 bilingual educators have completed this program); and specific school district/county programs which meet in the districts/county offices (Elk Grove USD, Sacramento City USD, San Juan USD, Lodi/San Joaquin County; Placer County, and Yuba/Sutter Counties). In these latter off-campus programs, partner districts and offices of education participate in recruitment/selection of students and/or teaching courses, including supervision of fieldwork.
Educational leadership programs, including Ed.D. programs, should prepare educational leaders for all levels of service and in sufficient numbers to meet the needs of California.
Collaborative partnerships: Creating programs for initial preparation and career development of instructional leaders

Introduction

School districts, other local education agencies, professional administrator organizations, and universities must collaborate to create preparation programs that focus on instructional leadership development. Universities cannot effectively design and implement education master’s degrees and administrator credential programs without input from such partners. As an example, the CSU, in collaboration with K-12, could undertake a systematic evaluation of its recent pilots of joint CSU-school district education leadership programs, e.g., the Chancellor’s Fellowship Programs at CSU Fresno. Using the pilots as a base, the system would have direction for how campuses could build future programs whose scope and nature depend upon partnerships with districts and professional organizations. All aspects of program design, implementation, and evaluation will require such collaborative structure.

In creating these new programs, both the universities and K-12 stakeholders must embrace new roles. Higher education must increase its advocacy role with the public, joining with K-12 partners as these interdependent systems face difficult education policy issues at the local and state levels. Additionally, universities can join the K-12 efforts to improve the conditions for student learning in California classrooms. From the K-12 side, school boards and superintendents will likewise need to increase training opportunities for new and continuing leaders, including providing incentives for innovative, effective practice. Both systems must explore how to provide evidence for increased student learning and a renewed commitment to closing the achievement gap. Since all of these activities take place within a collective bargaining environment, teachers’ unions should also participate in the partnerships.

Such collaborative work will require new attitudes and work on the part of participants. Mutual trust must replace beliefs that each side alone knows best how to prepare educational leaders. For example, university faculty may need to decrease some theoretical course content in order to include additional practical experiences on which future-leader practice can be built. As they restructure their courses, they might find it necessary to investigate current trends in K-12 teaching, learning, and assessment, and the current status of school resources and achievement in the region. On the other hand, school-based practitioners may need to come to value the faculty’s knowledge of research, problem-based, and other alternative learning experiences, and education leadership scholarship and incorporate elements of these within the work in their districts. Leaders in school districts might examine current research on leadership, reflect on their own practices, and participate in jointly sponsored professional seminars and institutes. As these examples illustrate, both partners must teach and learn from the other. The university and district should formalize the partners’ duties and responsibilities so that faculty and K-12 practitioners, working together, can create and deliver programs that will best prepare future leaders.

Recommendations and Discussion

9. Programs will draw on multiple partners from within and without the university to design, implement, and build support for the collaborative education leadership programs.

In the universities, faculty from Colleges and Departments of Education will be the primary participants in education leadership programs. However, the programs should also draw upon the expertise of departments such as business, mathematics and statistics, psychology, sociology, and public administration to create a rigorous, interdisciplinary curriculum. This curriculum would address the increased needs of instructional leaders to diagnose specific school problems (based on analyses of complex data), and to improve learning in multiculturally rich schools. The curriculum would be linked with field experiences, perhaps in internships, and enhanced by the input of K-12 school and district personnel.

At the campus level, all participating college and department units should recognize and reward faculty participation in education leadership partnerships. Work within local schools/districts as part of education leadership programs should be added to more traditional teaching and scholarship as leading toward retention, tenure, and promotion throughout the university.

In addition to school boards and K-12 district and county administrators, K-12 professional organizations such as the ACSA, CAPEA, the California School Boards Association (CSBA), the California
San José State University

Work in educational leadership at San José State draws on multiple partners for the design and implementation of the program. The seven full-time faculty (all but one with school/district leadership experience) are supplemented with 28 adjunct faculty, 21 of whom are currently school principals, district administrators, or district/county superintendents. One of these is the former director of the Coalition of Essential Schools, connecting the program with the perspectives of that organization. The California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL), developed by statewide administrator organizations, are infused into every course. In the Urban High School Leadership program, district leaders from 10 urban high school districts nominate teams of potential school leaders. Business partners and the Santa Clara County Office of Education have been actively involved in the development and implementation of this partnership.

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Cal Poly Pomona is working with the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) in the design of an AB 75 program (modularized educational administration certification). Classes designed around the three required modules will be offered through this partnership on the Cal Poly Pomona campus during the summer, fall, and winter quarters. ACSA benefits from access to the campus’ conference facilities with their settings for large and small group instruction, and the outstanding technology facilities for video conferencing, production, and instruction. Cal Poly Pomona benefits from the close working relationship with ACSA’s resources and up-to-date knowledge from the field. Extending this partnership will be the creation of a joint Tier II credential program. This field-based program will be designed by an Advisory Committee composed of Cal Poly Pomona faculty and consultants from ACSA. The resources of local districts will be used in program implementation, although the program will be designed for access statewide. Further, ACSA and Cal Poly Pomona are exploring the creation of a center for the advancement of school administration on the campus.

California State University, Fresno

Fresno State has recently developed the Central Valley Educational Leadership Institute (CVELI) that was designed to: (a) initiate and implement systemic change in the schools in the Central Valley served by Fresno State, (b) improve instructional and leadership quality in the educational communities served, and (c) assist school districts in providing equal access to learning for all students. The CVELI has formed partnerships with the Fresno Business Council, the Association of California School Administrators, Just for the Kids, and the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative. The CVELI will work with its partners and Fresno State faculty to provide leadership development, capacity building, and courses to prepare current and future leaders to develop public school systems that will provide students with increased academic and professional choices, thereby improving the economic health of the Central Valley.
and maintain the system prevent leaders from reflecting, sharing, and learning. Work within these partnerships can reduce this isolation by establishing learning communities inside and outside the class setting for instructors and candidates alike, which itself may be an important reward for new and continuing leaders.

10. Education Leadership Programs should be designed, taught, and supported by all members of the partnership.

The range of education leadership program partners must collaborate on all aspects of program design, implementation, and assessment, including specific courses and experiences. This will help ensure the inclusion of content that contains an appropriate balance between the theoretical and practical. The partners also need to establish admission criteria that relate to the roles instructional leaders will play in the schools, provide for joint screening and selection of candidates, and devise systems to evaluate overall program and component effectiveness. The coaching and mentoring of future leaders should be done systematically and in close partnership among districts, county offices, and the university in order to ensure meaningful support in field portions of the program. Human resource sharing, e.g., establishing a “Distinguished-Principal-in-Residence” program that allows a K-12 partner administrator to teach in the formal coursework portion of the program, or placement of a faculty member as a co-principal of a school, provides professional development for the partners and helps them to understand the program from the perspectives of the other. Over time, a healthy partnership allows for partners from either side to participate fully in all aspects of teaching, coaching, and mentoring of students in the program.

The participation of K-12 personnel in the creation and delivery of university-based instructional leader programs changes the nature of these programs; conversely, university personnel have a role to play in affecting school-based practice, especially in schools where the instructional leadership candidates are working. For example, university faculty could collaborate with a district on the study of high-performing schools and identify how instructional leadership played a role in that success. University involvement at the school or district level may assist the K-12 partners in identifying ways to change the conditions under which education leaders work, identifying and removing barriers to their effectiveness.

In sum, professional learning opportunities should be provided for all members of the partnerships, and each partner needs to provide assistance to the other. The partnership is an opportunity for two-way coaching between the participants, with the skills and perspectives of all partners valued and shared with all.

San Diego State University

Now in its third year, San Diego State University’s school-university partnership (initially funded by the CSU Chancellor’s Office) has seen five cohorts finish their credential programs. Eleven districts and 119 students have participated in two regional sites. Courses are offered in district facilities. Superintendents pre-select applicants. Faculty and district administrators design and teach the classes, and district administrators serve as mentors/supervisors for student fieldwork. To date, program graduates are being promoted to more responsible positions in their districts. Districts wish to continue the program, and there are more applicants than can currently be accommodated.
The university systems in California should advocate forcefully for increased public support for the primacy of instructional leadership roles by school leaders.
Accountability: Sharing responsibility for program assessment and improvement

Introduction
The climate of accountability that is impacting the K-12 and higher education systems also affects the collaborative education leadership programs. The public will be looking for evidence that graduates of these programs are able to lead their schools and districts to improved student learning, and that the educational systems (K-12 and university) are willing to commit to continual program improvement. Clear goals should be established by each program to respond to the needs of the school districts within their region, and programs would then be held accountable for these goals.

Part of this assessment needs to be at the program graduate level, to determine whether the partnerships have created programs and learning cultures that support graduates’ initial and continued development. Similarly, the programs are accountable to the university systems and their K-12 partners for effectiveness in preparing leaders who are not only highly skilled, but who will stay in the profession. Ultimately, the programs are accountable to the students in schools where the graduates and partners work for improvements in learning and achievement by all students.

While most current education leadership programs have a method for assessing program outcomes, this assessment is neither systematic nor statewide, severely limiting the State’s ability to develop appropriate policy or support needed for improving the recruitment and preparation of education leaders. The CSU Chancellor’s Office, in cooperation with deans of the CSU Colleges of Education, has developed an annual systemwide survey of teacher education graduates and their performance in the classroom. Similar efforts for assessing the performance of educational leaders would provide the needed directives for systemic improvements in program activities and conditions of work, while assisting each program to continually improve.

Recommendations and Discussion

11. Education leadership programs should assess, initially and over time, graduates’ satisfaction with the effectiveness of their programs.

The collaborative instructional leadership programs need to be accountable to their students for the power and efficacy of their programs. Periodically throughout the program and at its end, students should formally assess the effectiveness of the program and its components. Part of this assessment should ascertain how successfully the program immersed the students in a learning community that gave them support as they worked through their courses and fieldwork, and through which the instructors (from the university and K-12) were successful in mentoring and coaching them through their initial experiences.
As required by CCTC education leadership program accreditation standards, programs are required to use this data as the basis for program change.

The collaborative instructional leadership programs also need to be accountable for supporting their students through their first year and career-long development. Programs might extend a “Principal Warranty” to their graduates, similar to the “Teacher Warranty” policies on some CSU campuses that offer assistance and support to graduates in their first year of service. University faculty and K-12 partners should serve as coaches or mentors for the novice administrator who realizes he/she is struggling in that first year.

There is an urgency to build these supportive networks, given the increased stress on leaders to meet the demands of the No Child Left Behind legislation and to eliminate the achievement gap that has the potential to impact severely the social and economic health of California. The learning community that was built into the initial program needs to extend throughout the instructional leader’s career. In addition to the online support recommended earlier (Recommendation 6), networks might be developed among campuses, K-12 districts and county offices, professional associations, and businesses to establish centers for ongoing reflection, relationship building, and learning among education leaders. If there is to be a continued effort to provide quality leaders for today’s and tomorrow’s schools, the isolation and lack of support identified as key reasons for the high attrition of administrators must be removed.

### California State University, Northridge

Annual program reviews were initiated in 2003; these reviews are completed by all students and address all major program areas. The results were shared with all faculty and other stakeholders. This openness has made public to those involved in the delivery of the program several strengths as well as challenges. Analysis of the reviews resulted in a number of significant changes to the program, for example: an improved process for the review of the work of part-time faculty, many of whom are school district partners; improved student advising; and better alignment of courses being taught by a larger number of both full-time and part-time faculty. The second review is planned for spring 2004, and will provide comparison data.

### 12. Education leadership programs should participate in regular statewide assessments of the effectiveness of graduates.

A critical component of every collaborative instructional leadership program will be regular assessment of program effectiveness. Graduates of the programs need to be followed to determine whether they enter administrator positions, how long they stay in formal leadership roles, how effective their training was (as evaluated by their supervisors), and whether the programs as implemented have produced the leaders that schools and districts need. K-12 districts must have periodic formal opportunities to give input into these assessments, for example, developing ways of capturing the range of administrator work that constitutes exemplary instructional leader practice.

The universities should institute system-wide data gathering and program accountability components that allow for specific data to be fed back to individual campuses in order to improve the effectiveness of the recruitment and instructional leader preparation programs. This accountability system should include a comprehensive systemwide survey of graduates of the programs, possibly modeled after the CSU Teacher Preparation Survey. Both graduates and their immediate supervisors should be surveyed at the end of the graduates’ first and fifth years of service in the schools. The survey should be thoughtfully composed to include a series of questions that covers the CCTC standards for the preliminary-level credential (first year of employment) and professional level credential (fifth year of employment). It should be done in a manner that will provide valid and reliable feedback to campuses, districts, and the systems on the effectiveness of the collaborative programs. It is also recommended that the universities work with other state agencies to develop ways to measure retention of program completers in educational leadership positions over time.

One final note: The goal of systemic summative assessments is to link the learning of students in K-12 schools to the performance of educational leaders in those schools, and ultimately to the recruitment and preparation programs that developed those leaders. No one at the state or national level yet knows how to make such a valid
The California State University System

As the CSU system looks to development of systemic assessments of program effectiveness in terms of graduate skills and their impact on student achievement, it will build on its own experiences in statewide assessments (e.g., assessing teacher success). It will also rely on the expertise of campuses that have begun to develop practices that provide the possibility of linking student success with leadership. Below are a few of these:

CSU Hayward: The Educational Leadership Department in partnership with the West Contra Costa School District has developed a new administrator's evaluation system based on the department's research and development of the "Bold, Socially Responsible Leadership" Rubric.

CSU Bakersfield: Current literature on methods of increasing student learning in a variety of settings is introduced in the supervision course as well as the curriculum class. The review of these skills is augmented by assignments to evaluate the student learning at their own school and to propose realistic steps for improvement.

San José State: Courses that teach leadership skills and have students produce case studies of problem-solving of real school problems now use as a resource the summary of 30 years of research on the leadership skills that most influence student learning.

Joint Ed.D. Programs: Thirteen CSUs are now involved in development or implementation of joint Ed.D. programs with University of California campuses. Many of these programs provide opportunities for participants to study how leadership activities affect school cultures and practices, and result in improved student learning.

and reliable connection. The number of factors affecting student achievement is too large and the preparation programs themselves have too many components to link student achievement directly with specific elements of administrator preparation in a meaningful way. Also, the numbers of administrators produced each year is so small that statistical methods of analysis lack power. Premature attempts to link instructional leader preparation to student achievement run the risk of discouraging graduates from seeking employment in low-performing schools, the place where their leadership is needed most.

However, some recent work has started to provide evidence of connections between principal leadership and student achievement as a function of factors such as culture, discipline, resources, curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Part of the systemic assessment plan for the collaborative education leadership programs should be to identify the data that can be collected that might eventually be used to connect preparation programs to student achievement. Ed.D. programs in the State could cluster doctoral dissertations around questions of the relationship between characteristics of schools and K-12 students, and the performance of school leaders, and between the performance of leaders and their preparation programs. These studies need to identify what the schools can expect in the way of knowledge and skills from the graduates of these programs and how the conditions of their work in the schools support their effectiveness. As a State, we should look forward to the time when the research linking administrator preparation and student achievement is strong enough to give direction to the preparation of new generations of instructional leaders.
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