

**LEADERSHIP FOR LEARNING: STRENGTHENING POLICIES
ON EDUCATION LEADERSHIP ON BEHALF
OF ILLINOIS SCHOOLS**

State Action for Education Leadership Project
Center for the Study of Education Policy
Illinois State University

March, 2004

Acknowledgement

As part of its public service, Illinois State University seeks to promote a systematic and thorough discussion of all issues of public policy and supports research that contributes to that end.

All participants in the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership (ICEL) were asked to present this final report to their respective organizations. Organizations that were unable to support this report were to write a dissenting opinion. To date, no organization are no dissenting opinions. It is recognized that not every policy issue is acceptable to every individual or organization member of the ICEL, but the report as a whole stands as written.

This report is published by the Center for the Study of Education Policy at Illinois State University. The Center is located in the College of Education at Illinois State University. Policy researchers in the College, the Department of Educational Administration and Foundations and in other units of the University conduct policy research studies, surveys, workshops and seminars dealing with a wide variety of policy issues and problems in education. Matters of fact or opinion contained herein as well as the recommendations made in this report are solely the responsibility of the SAELP staff and in no way reflect the official policy of Illinois State University or the Wallace Foundation, whose funding and support made this report possible. The Center for the Study of Education Policy and the faculty and staff wish to thank all those involved in this very important project. The following Center staff members served as consultants for the project, designed and implemented project activities, compiled and analyzed project information, wrote project reports, and provided support for the project:

Abdenour Boukamhi
Norman Durlinger
Kelly S. Hall
Edward Hines
D. Michele Maki
Sally Bulkley Pancrazio
Linda Vogel
Linda Wall
Rick Wiggall
John Wilson

For more information, call (309) 438-5422, Center for the Study of Education Policy at Illinois State University.

*Illinois State University is an
Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	i
The Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership	xv
Chapters	
1. Purpose, Vision, and Sponsorship of the State Action for Education Leadership Project	1
2. Recognizing School Superintendents as Leaders for Learning	7
3. Strengthening Principals as Leaders for Learning	16
4. Refocusing Illinois Principal Preparation Programs to Enhance Leadership for Learning	27
5. Increasing the Diversity of Education Leaders in Illinois	38
6. Establishing Pathways for Teachers to Provide Leadership for Learning	44
7. Creating School and University Partnerships to Enhance School Learning	50
8. Changing Other Systems to Support Leadership for Learning	53
9. Methods and Procedures for Conducting the Policy Study	58
Appendices	
A. SAELP Resolution	
B. Fact Sheet on What We Know about Illinois Superintendents	
C. Fact Sheet on What We Know about Illinois Principals	
D. Course Requirements of Principal Preparation Programs in Illinois	

February 5, 2004

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

LEADERSHIP FOR LEARNING: STRENGTHENING POLICIES ON EDUCATION LEADERSHIP ON BEHALF OF ILLINOIS SCHOOLS

In 2001, Illinois was one of fifteen states across America selected and funded by the Wallace Foundation, in cooperation with the National Council for State Legislatures, National Governors' Association, Education Commission of the States, Council of Chief State School Officers, and the National Association of State Boards of Education, to plan, conduct, and implement recommendations to strengthen education leadership that had the potential for improving student learning within the state. This national project is called "State Action for Education Leadership Project."

For the past decade or more, the public policy agenda has focused on teacher quality. It was now time to give attention to those policies that affect the quality of education leadership in Illinois schools and elsewhere and build on past state initiatives to further strengthen the entire education personnel system in ways that can impact student learning.

Strong education leadership is essential to improving student learning in Illinois schools and supporting quality in teaching. Education leadership was defined as the ability to shape organizational conditions necessary for the development of shared goals, collaborative work structures and climates, and procedures for monitoring results that build the sufficient capacity of schools to accomplish the core tasks of education (Michael Fullan, *Leading in a Culture of Change*, 2001).

Primarily, education leadership includes the work of local school boards, superintendents, principals, and teacher leaders. It is the responsibility of all educators to support and enhance the learning of school children in Illinois' public schools. The education leadership of the state must stay committed to attending to students' learning if Illinois is to improve its record of achievement and close the achievement gap among the diverse groups of students enrolled in Illinois public schools. Broadly, this local responsibility and state commitment is referred to as providing **Leadership for Learning**.

From July 2001 through December 2003, the IL-SAELP completed a comprehensive study of education policy designed to strengthen leadership for learning by local school boards, superintendents, principals, and teacher leaders. Advised by the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership, a statewide representative group of leaders from education stakeholders, business and demonstration districts, the IL-SAELP recommends sharpening or enacting statutes, regulations, and advisories that, when implemented, focus a renewed attention by education leaders on learning. These recommendations are grounded in a set of eleven principles that provide a vision of leadership for learning.

The study culminated in nearly three dozen recommendations for state action to strengthen leadership for learning. These recommendations and report will be submitted to Governor Rod Blagojevich, the Illinois General Assembly and its Education Committees, the Joint Education Committee, State Board of Education, Illinois Board of Higher Education, and the Illinois Community College Board for their respective consideration.

While the recommendations reflect a majority consensus of the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership, they, of course, do not reflect total unanimity. The recommendations also do not necessarily reflect the official position of the board, association, or group being represented by a member of the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership. Official dissenting views from various groups may be found in the last chapter of the Report.

All but a few recommendations would cost the state of Illinois nothing but will and time to implement. All recommendations promote leadership for learning. All deserve deliberation and action.

State Actions to Strengthen Leadership for Learning

A. Recognizing School Superintendents as Leaders for Learning

The school superintendent's leadership on behalf of student learning is an essential bridge between the community of residents for whom the district operates and the community of educators employed in the school by the board. School boards should have access to a larger talent pool of superintendents in order to meet the complexity of Illinois schools. Some state requirements act as barriers to obtaining a larger pool of superintendents and other educators for Illinois schools. Preparation programs for superintendents should be examined relative to the role of the superintendent that programs give in preparing leaders for learning. Continuing professional development is essential for superintendents and other school leaders. For further detail, see Chapter 2. To recognize school superintendents as leaders for learning, the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership recommends the following:

- 1) To increase the supply of educators by removing unnecessary barriers to out-of-state administrators and teachers who wish to serve in Illinois public schools, the General Assembly should amend the *School Code* to waive the requirement for passage for all tests (basic skills, content-area, and assessment of professional teaching) for experienced educators seeking employment in Illinois. The law should provide that:
 - a) A superintendent who holds a valid certificate from another state or, in states that do not issue a superintendent certificate, has completed an administrative preparation program reasonably comparable to that required in Illinois, may receive a comparable certificate in Illinois if he or she has at least 2 years of successful experience as a superintendent. Successful experience must be documented by at least one letter from a previous employer.
 - b) A principal who holds a valid certificate from another state may receive a comparable certificate in Illinois if he or she has at least 4 years of teaching experience and at least 2 years of successful experience as a principal. Successful experience must be documented by at least one letter from a previous employer.
 - c) A teacher who holds a valid certificate from another state may receive a comparable certificate in Illinois if he or she has completed an approved teacher preparation program and has at least 2 years of successful experience as a teacher. Successful experience must be documented by at least one letter from a previous employer for each area of certification/endorsement.
- 2) The State Board of Education, in cooperation with the Illinois Association of School Administrators and the Illinois Council of Professors of Educational Administration, should convene a task force to study and make recommendations regarding the quality of preparation programs, including alternative route programs, for school superintendents. Particular attention should be given to the role of the superintendent as a leader for learning.
- 3) The General Assembly should retain the statute to permit an alternative route to administrative certification for *superintendents*. The General Assembly should know, however, that the numbers produced in these programs do not significantly add to the supply of school superintendents available across the state. Reducing the barriers to entering Illinois schools from out-of-state positions of superintendent may in fact be a better strategy to increase the supply of potential school superintendents for leadership for learning in Illinois schools.

- 4) The State Board of Education should develop and implement a plan to strengthen the focus of the Illinois Administrators' Academy to provide for an intense, high quality program that has as its core the intent to assure leadership for learning in Illinois public schools.
- 5) The State Board of Education should periodically analyze state data on the continuing professional development for administrators, determine, and report the extent to which plans have been submitted, together with recommendations to ensure participation as necessary. After an appropriate length of time—after the first year and before the third year—following the implementation of the statute, the State Board of Education should conduct an audit or analysis of a representative sample of plans to *ascertain the quality of the plans and the likelihood of their achieving the desired overall goal for improving the knowledge and skills of administrators relative to leadership for learning*, making such results known to the public and recommending any changes as necessary.

B. Strengthening Principals as Leaders for Learning

Strong leadership is essential to improving student learning in Illinois public schools and supporting quality in teaching. Principals are expected to be the instructional leader in their schools and the primary person charged with establishing a culture of learning within their schools consistent with high expectations for children achieving the state learning standards. Principals must have the training and experience as teachers to perform their instructional responsibilities, and they must have the time and resources to focus on school learning. Further, principals should be evaluated relative to their responsibilities as leaders for learning. For further detail, see Chapter 3. The Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership recommends the following:

- 1) The Illinois General Assembly should change the *School Code* eligibility criteria stated in 5/21-7.1 to require candidates for principals to have attained the Standard Teaching Certificate.
- 2) In order to emphasize the importance of learning and instruction in leadership, the General Assembly should also remove the provision in the Code that equates student personnel experience with teaching performance.
- 3) The Illinois General Assembly should amend Section 10-21.4a of the statute regarding the roles of principals to state that principals in Illinois public schools shall not be employed simultaneously in other administrative roles such as superintendent while serving as principal in order that principals have sufficient time to provide instructional leadership. In instances where the local school board is planning or implementing school district dissolution, consolidation, or unification, or experiencing other fiscal exigency, the local school board may petition the State Board of Education for a waiver of the requirement in accordance with Section 5/2-3.25g, "Waiver or modification of mandates within the School Code and administrative rules and regulations."
- 4) The Illinois General Assembly should retain Section 105 ILCS 5/21-5d, the alternative route to administrative certification provisions, **exclusively** for superintendents and school business officials.
- 5) The Illinois General Assembly should amend Article 24A, "Evaluation of Certified Employees" by adding to it the requirement that the school superintendent or his or her designee shall annually evaluate school principals based on evidence provided by the principal and other sources identified by the superintendent, based on and aligned with the at least the Illinois Professional School Leader Standards, and including interpersonal effectiveness.
- 6) The Illinois General Assembly should amend and add to Article 24A: The school superintendent shall file the standards-based instrument and statement of procedures for

the evaluation of principals with the respective regional superintendent by a certain date. Should the regional superintendent determine that the evaluation instrument is not aligned with the state standards for principals as instructional leaders, the regional superintendent shall request a revised instrument from the district superintendent.

C. Refocusing Illinois Principal Preparation Programs to Enhance Leadership for Learning

The Illinois statute clearly defines the role of principal as an instructional leader. Illinois' principal preparation programs must strengthen the adequacy of their programs to assure both school management competency and instructional leadership for learning. For further detail, see Chapter 4. The Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership recommends the following:

- 1) The State Board of Education, in cooperation with the Illinois Principals Association and the Illinois Council of Professors of Educational Administration, should convene a task force with representatives from practicing principals and other groups to develop a standards-based *core curriculum* that focuses on leadership for learning in schools for the preparation of beginning principals in Illinois. The core curriculum should reflect at least the following criteria:
 - a) Has at its foundation the Illinois Professional School Leaders Standards;
 - b) Provides a stronger balance between the roles principals play relative to providing instructional leadership for the school and managing the resources (personnel, time, finance, facilities, equipment, data) of the school that has greater probability of enhancing school learning and achievement of school children;
 - c) Provides a program of studies for principal candidates connected to the real work of principals in schools;
 - d) Addresses skills and competency in analysis of annual and longitudinal school achievement data and translation of the data into feasible school improvement actions;
 - e) Emphasizes effective interpersonal communication and respect for and with school children, teachers and their professional associations and unions, parents, and support staff and emphasizes collaboration and partnerships;
 - f) Eliminates coursework more applicable to the superintendent's preparation program and recognizes the position of principal as an important terminating career goal and not just a stepping stone to another position;
 - g) Recognizes the different sociological challenges presented to principals in rural, suburban, and urban schools;
 - h) Emphasizes the establishment of schools as cultural centers for learning and how to reinforce, support, and enhance those settings;
 - i) Emphasizes identifiable performance indicators relative to the curriculum and accountability of specific courses within the standards-based core curriculum to achieve those outcomes; and
 - j) Includes **clinical practice experiences throughout the preparation program** in accordance with the state standards for professional leadership.
- 1) Simultaneously, the State Board of Education, in cooperation with the Illinois Principals Association, the Illinois Council of Professors of Educational Administration, and other

groups should convene a task force to design a **culminating** internship of supervised practical experiences for principal candidates that meets at least the following criteria:

- a) Provides principal candidates with an intensive, diverse, supervised, and substantive internship following the completion of a program of studies with an established core curriculum that emphasizes real, day-to-day leadership, management, and continuing professional education by the practicing principal which has as its goal the improvement of student achievement;
 - b) Provides a broad range of experiences in more than one school;
 - c) Is of sufficient duration that permits the candidate to participate as an intern principal to receive both intensive and extensive experience in instructional leadership and school management;
 - c) Permits the principal candidate to be paid at a rate of no less than what he or she made as a teacher if the internship is within the same district or region or at an equivalent rate if the intern comes from outside the region of the state;
 - e) Connects to the intern's university program of studies, generates additional graduate credit hours beyond the 30 associated with the standards-based core curriculum, and permits university supervision of the intern similar to that provided for student teachers; and
 - f) Establishes a network of internship delivery throughout Illinois that permits principal internships in home districts or in home regions in collaboration with the state approved principal programs in higher education coordinated by the offices of the regional superintendent.
- 3) At the conclusion of the first two recommendations, the State Board of Education, in cooperation with the Illinois Board of Higher Education and the State Teacher Certification Board, should seek to amend the Illinois School Code (Section 21-7.1, on Administrative Certificate,) to reflect the above recommendations for a core curriculum for beginning principals and the culminating principal internship and revise the state regulations for program approval accordingly.
- 4) The State Board of Education, in cooperation with the Illinois Board of Higher Education, should establish a state system of support for full-time internship experiences for future principals. Initial steps toward this end include:
- a) Creating a scholarship pool to which candidates with both need and talent may apply to support full-time internships for up to one semester;
 - b) Encouraging district-university partnerships for district-based preparation programs; and
 - c) Making recommendations to policymakers, universities, and districts based on what is learned in a) and b) above.
- 5) The Illinois State Board of Education, in cooperation with other groups, should identify and disseminate models for delivery of principal preparation programs that meet at least the following criteria:
- a) Are comprised of principal candidates from the same school district and/or region;
 - b) Reflect the needs of the region for preparing future principals;

- c) Involve the participating school district and/or region in the delivery of the core curriculum, including the identification of appropriate instructors;
- d) Use the instructional and school achievement data of the district and/or region as part of the instructional resources;
- e) Illustrate racial, ethnic, and gender diversity in both the delivery of the programs as well as the demographics of the principal candidates; and
- f) Are delivered on site in the school district or region on calendars established by the school district or education region.

D. Increasing the Diversity of Education Leaders in Illinois

Diversity is a hallmark of the State of Illinois—from its peoples' languages and ethnicity as well as its economy and geography. It is essential that education leaders promote the success of all Illinois students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the cultural context in which our students learn and live. The talent pool of education leaders should reflect the demographics of Illinois, relative to both race/ethnicity and gender proportions, and it must begin with increasing the numbers of students from minority racial/ethnic backgrounds to enter teaching. For further detail, see Chapter 5 of the Report. The Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership recommends the following:

- 1) Since education leadership emerges from the teaching force, the Illinois Board of Higher Education should assess the number of universities in Illinois that operate “grow your own programs” that are designed to enhance the supply of ethnic/racial minorities as teachers for Illinois schools, including recruiting more males for elementary schools, and evaluate the extent to which the current state disparity is likely to be affected by such programs. The IBHE should then determine whether these programs should be supported by state resources and strengthened in other ways.
- 2) The Illinois Board of Higher Education, in cooperation with the Illinois Scholarship Commission, should establish tuition-based scholarships to support women and minority educators as they enter and complete graduate programs in education leadership. As a condition of accepting such support, candidates must agree to seek and accept positions of education leadership within Illinois for a reasonable number of years.
- 3) The Illinois Board of Higher Education and the State Board of Education should cooperatively release and bid a competitive RFP to the state universities to support expanding the principal preparation program for at least 50 racial/ethnic minority individuals to attend full-time study, including stipends, tuition, fees, and internship stipends for those individuals.
- 4) As part of the state process for approving graduate principal programs, the Illinois State Board of Education should require universities to show good faith efforts that the leadership faculty and administrators are working with Illinois school districts to recruit, tap, and prepare women and minorities for leadership in Illinois schools.
- 5) As part of the state process for approving graduate programs for the superintendent's certificate, the Illinois State Board of Education should require universities to demonstrate that the knowledge and/or skills attained at the completion of the program include tapping and mentoring, including that for women and minorities, as a part of their expectation for leadership.
- 6) The Illinois State Board of Education should continue to annually assess the racial compositions of the state's teachers, leaders, and paraprofessionals in public schools and make annual recommendations, in cooperation with the Joint Education Committee,

Illinois Community College Board, and the Illinois Board of Higher Education, about how diversity of the education workforce should be enhanced.

- 7) The State Board of Education, in cooperation with the Illinois Principals Association and others, should collectively plan and provide annual professional development opportunities and within-district opportunities relative to mentoring, recruiting, and tapping of women and minorities in education leadership until the point that diversity representation in education leadership is proportional to the presence of females and minorities in Illinois public schools.

E. Establishing Pathways for Teachers to Provide Leadership for Learning

There are at least two different pathways that would provide opportunities for teachers to provide leadership for learning. The first pathway is to establish Teacher Coaches as a professional career step commensurate with an endorsement of their certificate. Teacher coaches are identified as outstanding teachers who retain their classroom assignment and also provide coaching assistance to other teachers in matters of instruction. The second pathway is to develop special programs for Illinois' master teachers (those obtaining their National Board Certification) whereby they receive non-traditional leadership preparation and a new endorsement of their certificate. These pathways, formally recognized through the state's certification process, would provide teachers with additional career options and reinforce the importance of improving instruction as leadership for learning. For further detail, see Chapter 6. The Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership recommends the following:

- 1) The State Board of Education should develop and grant an administrative endorsement so that National-Board Certified Teachers **who have completed a specially-designed principal preparation program and passed the state certification test for the principal** are permitted to serve as principal, assistant principal, or co-principal.
- 2) The State Board of Education should convene a panel consisting of National-Board Certified Teachers, teacher education/administrator preparation faculty, practicing principals, and others to do the following:
 - a) Consider and recommend the standards for an endorsement of Teacher Leader Endorsement to Type 73, 75, or current certificate that would permit National-Board Certified Teachers to serve as assistant principals, principals, or co-principals and supervise and evaluate other certificated educators;
 - b) Consider and recommend the criteria by which National-Board Certified Teachers demonstrate or have demonstrated their capacity to lead other teachers in positive school change that should be used in selecting such teachers for the Teacher Leader Endorsement program;
 - c) Consider and recommend to the deans/department chairs of state-approved principal preparation programs (or other post-masters' degree programs for teachers) the criteria for recruiting, assessing and preparing an individualized graduate-level program that leads to the granting of the Teacher Leader endorsement. The programs should be performance based, individualized, and based on skills and knowledge associated with instructional leadership and permit candidates to pass the state test for principals. The programs should not represent only the traditionally-approved curriculum. The programs should include individually-designed performance assessments and school-based internships; and

- d) Consider and recommend standards for approving such endorsement programs within the state's universities, consulting with the State Teachers Certification Board as required.
- 3) In order to provide teachers with additional career ladders as teacher coaches as well as to recognize teacher coaches as professional educators, and assist other teachers in improving instruction to enhance student learning, the State Board of Education should convene a panel of teachers, teacher educators, practicing principals, and others to do the following:
- a) Consider and recommend the standards for the endorsement of a current certificate that would permit Teacher Coaches to be professionally recognized in Illinois public schools in order to assist other teachers in improving instruction to enhance student learning; and
 - b) Consider and recommend to the deans/department chairs of state-approved teacher education programs the criteria and standards for a state-approved endorsement program for Teacher Coaches within the state's universities, consulting with the State Teacher Certification Board as required.

F. Creating School and University Partnerships to Enhance School Learning

Illinois' twelve state universities offer important resources that schools can use on behalf of student learning. The work of faculty who partner with teachers and administrators in schools also benefits from such real world experiences. Universities must recognize the importance of such service within their internal reward systems in order to assure that partnerships will continue. For further detail, see Chapter 7. The Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership recommends the following:

- 1) The Illinois Board of Higher Education, in cooperation with the Illinois Council of Professors of Educational Administration, should communicate to Illinois university presidents, deans, and education leadership chairs about the value of school service for university faculty, and in particular, that:
 - a) School service provides one acceptable basis for faculty rewards;
 - b) School service offers another means by which the missions of universities are achieved;
 - c) For educators, schools are the venues by which research is translated into practice and the laboratories for generating important research; and
 - d) School service provides opportunities for important collaboration between universities and Illinois public schools.
- 2) As part of the "Results Reports" submitted annually by public universities to the Illinois Board of Higher Education, each university should be required to indicate how it is addressing the value of school service as part of its promotion and tenure policies for faculty. The Illinois Board of Higher Education should then publicize those activities that represent "best practice" in rewarding service for work in the public schools.

G. Changing Other Systems to Support Leadership for Learning

Other policy issues influence or relate to the importance of strengthening leadership for learning in Illinois. These policy issues require changing aspects of other systems within public education, including the role of local school boards in leadership for learning, when and how

school board members are elected, and the pension plans that can be a factor in attracting additional educators to Illinois. For further detail, see Chapter 8. The Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership recommends the following for changing other systems to support leadership for learning in Illinois schools:

- 1) Illinois' public boards of education are required by law to provide leadership and governance for their public schools. The Illinois School Code states that boards have the responsibility "to adopt and enforce all necessary rules for the management and government of the public schools of their district." (105 ILCS 5/10-20.5) The Illinois Association of School Boards should encourage and train local boards of education to most effectively exercise this charge and provide leadership for learning by:
 - a) Clearly articulating the school district's ends—that is the underlying values and beliefs that support the educational process; the mission or overarching purpose of the district; a statement of vision, or direction for the district; and high-level, long and short-term systemic goals for achieving the vision;
 - b) Connecting regularly and intentionally with the community to determine the community's educational aspirations for its school(s) and to report progress toward the district's goals and compliance with board policies including its fiduciary responsibility toward efficient use and distribution of public monies in pursuit of district goals;
 - c) Employing a qualified superintendent and delegating authority to the superintendent for developing and implementing action plans to achieve the district's goals and comply with district policies; then holding the superintendent accountable for the district's performance;
 - d) Regularly and purposefully monitoring district performance—progress toward goals and compliance with board policy; and
 - e) Taking full responsibility—collectively and individually—for the work the board chooses to do and how it chooses to do the work by focusing deliberations and decision-making on prioritized district goals and conducting its business in a prudent, ethical and civil manner.
- 2) Illinois public school board members voluntarily attend, in large numbers, formal training programs and workshops relative to their leadership for learning and governance roles at their district's expense, yet are often criticized for using district funds for this purpose. District superintendents, staff, and community should encourage board members to continue their board service-related education and recognize their commitment to their own and board professional development.
- 3) In order to recognize the importance of the principal as the instructional leader in schools, the Illinois State Board of Education, in collaboration with the Illinois Principals Association, Illinois Association of School Administrators, and the Illinois Association of School Boards, should disseminate information to local school boards in Illinois to underscore and highlight the following:
 - a) Changing roles and expectations of school principals to give primary attention to the analysis and improvement of student learning;
 - b) Identifying resources to support the roles of principals; and
 - c) Providing additional recognition and appreciation to their school principals relative to their essential contribution to children and society in light of the intense work load during the school year.

- 4) In order to increase the number of individuals willing to serve on the local school board, and increase the public's attention and responsiveness to local school board elections, the General Assembly should change the statute regarding a four-year election term for school board members to a three-year term, and the terms should be staggered so that the community elects two members one year, two members in the second year, and three members in the third year. The date for the election for school board members should be changed from April to the November election calendar to move the costs of board elections to state expenditures and increase the probability of greater voter participation in school board elections.

- 5) In order to increase the supply of talented educators for Illinois schools and remove the barriers posed by the Illinois pension system for educators to consider employment in Illinois public schools, the General Assembly should revise the educator pension laws to permit out-of-state educators to transfer previous pension plans to either IRAs or TIAA-CREF systems. Further, the General Assembly should revise pension laws to permit new Illinois educators to have a choice of pension plans, IRAs, TIAA-CREF, or the Illinois Teachers Retirement System.

* * *

Strengthening Leadership for Learning in Illinois

* * *

ILLINOIS CONSORTIUM FOR EDUCATION LEADERSHIP

Gary Alexander
Illinois Board of Higher Education,
Springfield

Dianne E. Ashby
College of Education
Center for the Study of Education
Policy, Normal

Lee Bartolini
Illinois State Board of Education,
Springfield

Michael Boer
Springfield Chamber of Commerce,
Springfield

Christy Coleman
Illinois Association of School
Boards, Geneseo

P.J. Cross
Illinois Association of Regional
Superintendents, Mt. Vernon

Anne Davis
Illinois Education Association,
Springfield

Bruce Dennison
Illinois Association of Regional
Superintendents, Atkinson

James Dougherty
Illinois Federation of Teachers, Oak
Brook

Bill DuBois
Elgin School District, U-46,
Administrative Offices, Elgin

Sherry R. Eagle
Large Unit District Association,
Aurora

Chris Everson
House Democratic Staff, Springfield

Harold E. Ford
Illinois Association of School
Administrators, Geneseo

Roberta Hendee
Springfield School District #186,
LEAD District in Illinois, Springfield

William Kling
Ancil, Glink, Diamond, Bush,
DiCianni & Rolek, P. C., Chicago

Lanita Koster
Illinois Federation of Teachers,
Homewood

Hazel Loucks
Formerly, Office of the Governor,
Edwardsville

Elmer (Mac) McPherson
Decatur Public Schools # 61,
Decatur

Peter Martinez
Center for School Leadership
University of Illinois at Chicago

Jeff Mays
Illinois Business Roundtable,
Chicago

Connie Neale
Elgin School District, U-46,
Administrative Offices, Elgin

Margaret Noe
University of Illinois at Springfield

Lee Patton
Illinois State Board of Education,
Springfield

Sallie Penman
Chicago Public Schools, Chicago

Jennifer Presley
Illinois Education Research Council
Southern Illinois University at
Edwardsville

Kay Royster
Peoria Public Schools, #150, Peoria

Diane Rutledge
Springfield School District #186,
LEAD District in Illinois, Springfield

Tom Ryder
Illinois Community College Board,
Springfield

Robert E. Schiller
State Board of Education,
Springfield

Dan Taylor
House Republican Staff, Springfield

Jenny Tripses
Illinois Council of Professors of
Educational Administration
Bradley University, Peoria

Bev Turkal
State Board of Education, Robinson

David Turner
Illinois Principals Association,
Springfield

Sarah Williamson
Illinois Congress of Parents and
Teachers, Chillicothe

Jonathan Wolff
Senate Democratic Staff, Springfield

Project Staff

Abdenour Boukhami
Center for the Study of
Education Policy
Illinois State University

Sally Bulkley Pancrazio
Pancrazio Education &
Development, Inc.

Norman D. Durflinger
Center for the Study of
Education Policy
Illinois State University

Edward R. Hines
Center for the Study of
Education Policy
Illinois State University

D. Michele Maki
Center for the Study of
Education Policy
Illinois State University

Linda Vogel
Center for the Study of
Education Policy
Illinois State University

Richard Wiggall
Center for the Study of
Education Policy
Illinois State University

John Wilson
Center for the Study of
Education Policy
Illinois State University

Dane Linn
National Project Advisor for
Illinois
National Governors Association,
Washington, D.C.

CHAPTER 1

PURPOSE, VISION, AND SPONSORSHIP OF THE STATE ACTION FOR EDUCATION LEADERSHIP PROJECT (SAELP)

Purpose

Illinois is one of 15 states awarded a national grant from the Wallace Foundation to strengthen education leadership in the states. The purpose of the grant was to increase student achievement across all student groups and to support previous teacher quality initiatives across the nation.

The National Partners with the Wallace Foundation included the Council of Chief State School Officers, the Education Commission of the States, the National Association of State Boards of Education, the National Conference of State Legislators, and the National Governors Association. SAELP was designed to “prepare, support and sustain a leadership cadre in each state that can transform schools and school systems to improve academic performance for low-income youth” (CCSSO, 2002). SAELP has six major goals:

- 1) States will establish an overall vision and expectation for the practice of education leadership focused on improved teaching and learning at the district and school level throughout the state;
- 2) States will design and enact laws that establish the terms and conditions of practice as principal and superintendent, including criteria for licensure of individuals and accreditation of post secondary programs that prepare education leaders;
- 3) States will enact laws that establish governance, structures, and roles and responsibilities of education leaders, including local boards of education, school councils, and others;
- 4) States will design an infrastructure that will connect education leaders to other areas of public and private endeavor, including business, research institutes, community based organizations, and others;
- 5) States will design and implement legislative and/or administrative policies that are informed by local schools and districts, especially those in high poverty areas; and
- 6) States will support Demonstration Districts where new policies are transformed into practice.

The purpose of this report is to provide the Office of the Governor, the Education Committees of the General Assembly, the Illinois State Board of Education, the Board of Higher Education, the Joint Education Committee, and the Illinois Community College Board with recommendations that will strengthen education leadership for learning on behalf of Illinois schools. (See Appendix A for proposed resolution to the Education Committees of the General Assembly.) These recommendations emerged from two years of study at the Center for the Study of Education Policy at Illinois State University in cooperation with a statewide representative

advisory group, the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership. The recommendations focus on statutes, regulations, and advisories that increase the likelihood that the learning of school children in Illinois can be enhanced by improving and strengthening the quality of education leadership.

Vision

One of the six goals of the SAELP project is that “states will establish an overall vision and expectation for the practice of educational leadership focused on improved teaching and learning at the district and school level throughout the state.” In June 2000, with widespread comment from educators and other public bodies into their articulation and design, the State Board of Education in Illinois adopted “Content-Area Standards for Educators,” including standards for principals and school superintendents. These standards provide a “framework for the improvement of teaching and learning,” as well as a basis for “the design and approval of preparation programs, the basis for developing assessments for educators, the foundation for continuing professional development and the basis for ensuring the preparation of quality educators.”

The standards for principals and school superintendents are referred to as “Illinois Professional School Leader Standards” (IPSLs), and they are aligned with the national standards promoted by the Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISSLC), National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), and National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). For each of the six goal statements of the IPSLs, knowledge and performance indicators are articulated. In addition, there are specific statements relative to what education leaders must know and be able to do.

Taken collectively, the statements give recognition to education leadership that begins with and is dependent upon teachers in schools, parents in homes, and business and other entities in the community. Also, the statements provide a vision and expectation of educational leadership focused on improved teaching and learning in Illinois public schools and districts. To emphasize the connection, the specific state-adopted standards are highlighted.

Strong education leadership is essential to improving student learning in Illinois public schools and supporting quality in teaching. Effective principals and school superintendents recognize the value of distributive leadership while simultaneously taking the responsibility for roles that focus on improved teaching and learning in schools and districts.

Education leaders in Illinois public schools and districts promote 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**

- **Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth**
- **Ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment**
- **Collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources**
- **Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner**
- **Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.**

Education leadership and leaders in education are not limited to school administrators. Within the context of SAELP, however, the primary focus is education leadership as a part of the governance and administration of districts and schools. Therefore, within this focus the fundamental work of the Project will involve school principals, school superintendents, and teachers as leaders.

For the purposes of SAELP work in Illinois, the following definition of education leadership was adapted:

Education leadership is the ability to shape organizational conditions necessary for the development of shared goals, collaborative work structures and climates, and procedures for monitoring results that build the sufficient capacity of schools to accomplish the core tasks of education.

(Michael Fullan, 2001)

The Statewide Consortium

When the SAELP work began, it was evident that the thrust of the Project was balanced between state actions to improve education leadership and activities in local school districts that informed state actions as well as local initiatives that would become the impetus for state-level recommendations. In order for SAELP to be successful, active involvement in the Project would be needed by the State's key actors in education.

Thirty-five education leaders were identified, including people in the public sector, and representatives of the business community. All of those asked to serve on the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership (ICEL), the name chosen for this statewide SAELP Consortium, agreed to serve with many taking the time to note that there was a clear need for visionary leadership in education in Illinois. Staff to the Illinois General Assembly are included, the business community (both state and local levels), teacher unions, education associations, and four school districts. The ICEL has met every six weeks since September, 2001, in various parts of the state, for a total of 12 meetings.

Principles of Action

The Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership recognized that improvement in student achievement across the state required the collective efforts of and commitments from parents, teachers, administrators, business and industry, local communities, as well as colleges and universities across the state, state education boards, and entities of state government, including the General Assembly and Office of the Governor. In the past several years, the state of Illinois has focused on issues of teacher quality as the major means for improving student learning. For the purpose of this particular policy initiative, the focus of the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership was on the preparation, work, and licensure of school principals and superintendents, the systems that affect them as professionals, and the policies that shape their influence.

Any inquiry is grounded in either explicit or implicit principles that provide a foundation for operation. The Illinois SAELP Project relied upon eleven principles:

1. Strong education leadership is essential to improving student learning in Illinois public schools and supporting quality in teaching.
2. Closing the achievement gap between groups of Illinois students requires excellence in school leadership.
3. University programs that prepare education leaders for their initial roles and responsibilities must be rigorous, meet state and national accreditation standards, and provide for standards-based clinical practice.
4. School leaders must be recruited, supported, and sustained as they enter and are retained in their roles.
5. The talent supply of potential qualified education leaders must be increased and diversified.
6. School leaders must have sufficient and continuous professional development to focus on conditions supporting enhanced student learning and quality teaching.
7. School leaders need flexibility and support to exercise their authority commensurate with their responsibility.
8. Knowledge about school leaders and education leadership is essential for timely and informed decision making.
9. Local and state governance structures should function to support quality teaching and learning in Illinois public schools.
10. Education leadership includes but is broader than school administrative leadership; education leadership includes teacher leaders, staff leadership, and board and community leaders.
11. Partnerships are important to education leaders as they involve collaboration, teamwork, and design; these partnerships include those across school districts, school-community and school-business relationships, and partnerships between schools and universities.

Demonstration Districts

A vital part of the SAELP Project has been the participation by the four demonstration school districts. Illinois was selected as a state having a "LEAD" District, which is Springfield District #186. The acronym, LEAD, refers to **Leadership for Educational Achievement in Districts**. Nationally, there are 12 LEAD districts, and each was funded by the Wallace Foundation for five years. In general, LEAD districts are those where education leaders have been identified for their exemplary practices in such areas as mentoring new staff, evaluating teachers and administrators, building strong relationships between education leaders and school boards, and creating ways to improve student learning and achievement.

During Summer 2002, the SAELP Project and Springfield, the LEAD District, developed common interests and a positive foundation for collaboration. The cornerstone of this relationship has been the design of a master's degree in educational administration that has been offered within the school district. But, far more than simply offering a master's degree off-campus (which Illinois State University has done actively for decades), the current Springfield-ISU collaboration has involved Springfield education leaders in the design of the master's program, teaching, and internship supervision in the program. Those Springfield education leaders who have been involved are fully qualified, both in terms of academic credentials (master's or doctoral degrees), and their leadership experience. Springfield education leaders have taught and team-taught ISU graduate courses with ISU professors. As internship supervisors, Springfield education leaders have provided on-site, experienced mentoring to interns who are completing two full semesters of internship as part of the master's program.

In addition to Springfield District #186, three other school districts have been participants in SAELP as demonstration districts: Decatur # 61, Elgin U-46, and Peoria #150. Their superintendents and chief staff have met independently with SAELP staff in order to provide input to the Consortium about policy issues that should be considered and about both problems and opportunities confronting school districts. Chief staff from Chicago Public Schools are also members of the Consortium. Meetings have been held in Chicago involving SAELP staff and CPS staff, and Chicago education leaders have shared information and experiences in such areas as assessing principals, recruiting education leaders, and working with local school councils.

The SAELP Project has offered Illinois a unique opportunity for involvement in a national project of significance, collaboration with school districts and education leaders, and establishing a statewide Consortium to address education issues. Strengthening education leadership to enhance student learning is a key step toward enhancing student learning across Illinois.

References

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a Culture of Change*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.

CHAPTER 2

RECOGNIZING SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS AS LEADERS FOR LEARNING

One of the chief responsibilities of the elected or appointed school board is to select the school superintendent. The superintendent must work directly with the local board and community, advocate for and distribute resources to the schools, and meet the intellectual and social needs of the students at the macro level. The school district is the primary management and fiscal arena for visioning, priority setting, community outreach, and resource distribution.

The school superintendent selects the principals to provide the primary leadership for learning at the school level. The superintendent's role is to assure that all his or her appointed staff work together to meet the achievement and other learning goals of the district as approved by the school board. The superintendent's leadership on behalf of student learning is an essential bridge position between the community of residents for whom the district operates and the community of educators employed in the school by the board.

Illinois' Superintendents

What do we know about Illinois superintendents? In 2001, there were 852 district superintendents employed in Illinois public schools and 407 assistant superintendents (ISBE, 2001). The average age of a first-time Illinois public school superintendent was 42 (Pierson and Hall, 2002) while the average age of all public school superintendents in the state was 54 years. (See Appendix B for more detail.) The year a superintendent is eligible for retirement is 55. Only seven percent of the Illinois superintendents were under 46. Clearly, Illinois will need to increase the supply of eligible school superintendents in the near future. More than half, 56.7%, of the superintendents had been in the superintendent leadership position for less than a decade (Wiggall, Chaudhari, and Pifer, 2002).

Slightly more than half (51%) had held their current position for six or more years and 17% had had the same position for more than 11 years (Wiggall, Chaudhari, and Pifer, 2002), all showing that superintendents have significant experience within the district. Annual turnover for superintendents ran about 9% (ISBE, 2001). National data suggest that half of the superintendents leave their districts in less than six years (Cooper, 2002); such longitudinal data were not available to the ICEL staff but there is no reason to suggest that there is less overall turnover in Illinois, a highly diverse state with multiple challenges. In fact, the IASA (Pierson and Hall, 2002) reported that a majority of public school superintendents in Illinois had been appointed to jobs in districts in which they had not been currently employed. This means that superintendents in Illinois tend to be hired from other school districts, causing inter-school district turnover, and some would argue, district instability, relative to the attainment of learning and other goals. In 1999, the average tenure of superintendents in large urban districts was from 2-3 years,

according to the Institute for Education Leadership (Usdan, McCloud, Podmostko, and Cuban, 2001).

Sixty-four percent of the Illinois superintendents hold doctorates as compared to forty-five percent across the nation (Cooper, Fusarelli, and Carella, 2000), suggesting that Illinois has an extremely well prepared group of superintendents. Of the 57 universities in Illinois approved by the ISBE to prepare teachers, 14 of them (8 are public universities) offer programs to prepare school superintendents (ISBE 2001).

The American Association of School Administrators estimates that nearly 8,000 new superintendents will need to be hired by 2008, replacing half of the superintendents in the nation (Cooper, Fusarelli, and Carella, 2000). The AASA (2000) also estimates that 87.3% of superintendents in its study remained in one state for their entire career. It is not known whether this retention within a state is a preference or a function of individual state pension systems and other barriers to having a national talent pool from which boards might select the right superintendent. (See Chapter 8 on Changing Other Systems to Support Leadership for Learning.)

There are, of course, individuals who receive the superintendent's endorsement through additional graduate studies but choose not to pursue the position of superintendent. Reasons for this include satisfaction with present position, being place bound, the politics of administration, stress, job location, low pay differential from current position, school board relationships, lack of job security, size of district, and the spouse's job (Wolverton, Rawls, and MacDonald, 2000).

Some of the other issues relative to the position of school superintendent included the absence of clear delineation of superintendent and board member roles. The IEL (Usdan, McCloud, Podmostko, and Cuban, 2001) reported that the overlap of board/superintendent roles creates and compounds confusion and there is an increasing shift from educational trustee to politician by board members. More than half of Illinois superintendents agreed that training for board of education members should be mandatory (Pierson and Hall, 2002).

In the same NREL study (Wolverton, Rawls, and McDonald, 2000), superintendents identified higher pay and better benefits, increased help and support, and better perks as incentives to bring more candidates into the talent pool. Superintendents express concerns about the working conditions and relative pay differential for greater responsibility. More than a third (37%) of superintendent leaders reported having too many insignificant, yet time-consuming, demands that limited their effectiveness (Glass, 2001).

Nearly 80% of Illinois superintendents reported spending more than 50 hours each week in work related activities (Pierson and Hall, 2002). Nevertheless, over half of the Illinois school superintendents reported being "very satisfied" or "satisfied" with their position as superintendents (Pierson and Hall, 2002), a remarkable degree of satisfaction, given the

demands of their job. The employment of superintendents, even those with multi-year contracts, can be terminated at the will of their boards.

Where do Illinois school superintendents come from? More than half of Illinois school superintendents began their careers in elementary or social studies teaching positions, according to the IASA survey (Pierson and Hall, 2002). Nearly half of the current superintendents decided to pursue the superintendent position while serving as building-level principals (Pierson and Hall, 2002).

When a vacancy for a superintendent's position exists, the average timeline to fill the vacancy, according to the IEL (Usdan, McCloud, Podmostko, and Cuban, 2001) study, has more than doubled from four months to eleven months within the last decade. Boards also report that the number of applicants for the superintendent's position has declined. As school districts become more diversified, school boards also seek minority or female superintendents. (See Chapter 5 on Diversity.) In 2002, 17% of Illinois' public school superintendents were female and 4% were minority (minority pupil enrollment is 40% statewide) (ISBE 2002).

Policy Issues

The Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership addressed the following policy questions regarding the quality of the supply of school superintendents for Illinois schools: Should the Illinois statute allowing for alternative routes to certification for superintendents be continued? Do the state tests for superintendents' endorsement—and other requirements for out of state superintendents to be hired in Illinois schools—act as barriers to opening up the talent pool for Illinois schools? How well is the statute working that requires continuing professional development for all school administrators, including school superintendents? What policies need to be changed or strengthened to improve district level leadership for learning?

Alternative Routes to Certification for School Superintendents

Some policy makers within the state and across the nation have argued that the superintendent of a school district need not have to emerge from the ranks of professional educators. Their belief is that there ought to be alternative routes to certification for superintendents or that some districts, especially those with large student populations, such as in Chicago #299, could benefit from having leadership bifurcated into executive management responsibilities and chief education leadership. Illinois statute allows the latter strategy for Chicago #299.

The General Assembly in 1999 also passed legislation permitting an alternative route to receiving the administrative certificate. The law defined "administrator" as meaning the superintendent or chief school business official. Principals and assistant principals were excluded from this provision. Only Western Illinois University has been approved to offer an

Alternative Route to Administrator Certification program. State staff (Long, 2002) indicated that the program is small, with about ten annual graduates who primarily come from school business positions, not industrial or military or other management occupations.

The prescribed course of study for the alternative programs calls for work in education management, governance, organization, and planning. Illinois school districts enroll students in numbers along a very small to very large continuum. Because of this diversity—and the number of schools represented within larger districts—a non-educator may successfully act as the chief executive officer along with a chief education officer. Current legislation permitting these arrangements provides sufficient flexibility for such districts and the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership believes they should be retained.

The public should not be misled, however, about the numbers of non-educators who actually seek or hold these important positions in education leadership. As Gene Bottoms points out (SREB, 21.):

Many aspects of educational leadership make it unappealing to leaders in other careers. The work is difficult, the hours are long and the compensation is relatively modest. In addition, the media often paint schools as out-of-control environments that lack purpose or focus. It also may be that those who have achieved in other occupations know that much of it was the result of the skills and knowledge they developed during many years in their chosen fields.

There appears to be a reasonable argument for alternative routes to certification for superintendents as a means to increase supply—although the number produced for Illinois schools may be less than the numbers of superintendents gained for Illinois schools if the state were to remove more barriers to out-of-state educators. Nevertheless, the ICEL recommends that the language of the statute permitting alternative routes to certification for school superintendents be retained as written.

School Code References

Article 21 of the Illinois School Code (2002), (beginning on page 381) addresses the certification of teachers and other educators. 105 ILCS 5/21-5b provides alternative certification for teachers and 105 ILCS 5/21-5c prescribes the provisions of alternative route to teacher certification programs. In 105 ILCS 5/21-5d, alternative route to administrative certification is prescribed.

Continuing Professional Development of School Leaders

States have within their authority the control of three major mechanisms for influencing the quality of the school leaders who are recruited, prepared, and retained. These mechanisms

of leverage include “how principals are certified or licensed, prepared for practice, and provided additional training to improve their skills” (Mazzeo, 2003).

The three-part system—preparation, licensure, continuing professional development—for influencing the quality of teachers was implemented in Illinois several years ago. With the advice of the Illinois Principals Association, the Continuing Improvement Program Committee which advises the State Board of Education, and other major education leadership associations, the General Assembly passed a statute in 2002 that would become P. A. 92-796. This law applies to all public school administrators serving in positions that require administrative certification (Type 75) and went into effect July 1, 2003. It mandates that district superintendents, principals, and regional superintendents must satisfy new continuing professional development requirements as a condition of renewing their certification (Bartolini, 2003).

Regarding continuing professional development for school administrators, including superintendents, the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership addressed these policy questions: With the passage of P. A. 92-796, what refinements, if any, can be anticipated? What recommendations should be made?

Each practicing administrator, as a function of having his or her administrative certificate renewed by the state, must prepare an individual continuing professional development plan, complete the activities enumerated in the plan, and present evidence of completion of the activities (Bartolini, 2003). Further, the plan must include at least three improvement goals, include at least five professional development activities totaling at least 100 hours, and ensure annual completion of Administrators’ Academy courses totaling at least 36 hours over the five year certificate registration period (Bartolini, 2003).

The plans from school administrators within a district, including principals, are submitted to the district superintendent or his or her designee for review for compliance with the mandate. The district superintendent submits his or her plan to a Peer Review Panel established by the Regional Superintendent. An Assistant Regional Superintendent submits his or her plan to the Regional Superintendent, and the Regional Superintendent submits his or her plan to the Peer Review Panel. All review decisions on whether the plan conforms to requirements may be appealed. Failure to submit satisfactory evidence of continuing professional education would result in loss of the administrative certificate.

In the year since the passage of the statute, the State Board of Education, Illinois Principals Association, Illinois Association of School Administrators, and others have made considerable progress in informing Illinois public school administrators of the requirements of the law. Further, the Illinois Association of School Administrators has held regional workshops throughout the state for the dissemination of information regarding P. A. 92-796, developed a CD, “ABC’s of Administrative Recertification” to assist education leaders, and designed a website for providing professional development literature.

Plans must have been filed with the respective reviewers no later than October 28, 2003, and the review process of those plans followed. While no systematic survey has been undertaken to ascertain compliance—or quality of the professional goals and activities identified in the plans—discussions with state, region, and local administrators suggest strongly that awareness and compliance is high. A great deal appears to have been accomplished in a relatively short period of time. All educators in Illinois must now engage in meaningful continuing professional development as a condition of renewing their certificate to work in Illinois' public schools.

When the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership first began its study of education policy relative to leadership for learning, little was known about the extent to which education leaders were aware of and were in compliance with the new statute. It remains too early to tell what refinements, if any, are needed in the new statute to assure that continuing professional development is indeed connected with school improvement efforts, and, over time, results in enhanced student learning. However, there is information that could be helpful to ascertaining the extent to which this statute will achieve the purpose for which it was designed.

The School Code Reference for this requirement is Section 5/21-7.1 (c) regarding administrative certificate renewal (p. 390, ILCS, 2002).

Certification Requirements of Out-of-State Superintendents and Other Educators

In its review of possible barriers to attracting the best superintendents (and other educators) into the talent pool for Illinois public schools, the following policy questions were addressed by the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership:

Should there be legislation to allow for reasonable criteria for equating teacher and administrator preparation programs in other states, implementing a system for reciprocal approval of educators from those states, entering into agreements with those states, and publishing the results of the reciprocity agreements on an annual basis? Should the criteria for equating teacher and administrator preparation programs in other states be stated in rules and subject to public comment? Is two years of successful experience in teaching or administration reasonable and appropriate to be eligible for reciprocal certificates?

While the ICEL first focused on examining the barriers to sitting school superintendents being selected for Illinois school leadership positions, the issue and policy solutions moved from solely examining the initial state tests for certification (basic skills and superintendents' tests) to developing systems of certification reciprocity for all educators with other similar states, especially those that border Illinois.

ICEL members raised the issue of reciprocity of license or certificates with other states and questioned why experienced teachers, principals, and superintendents from other states with comparable rigorous requirements as exist in Illinois should be required to take the basic skills

test and subject matter test. If these tests are not essential to experienced and successful educators, then barriers to entering Illinois schools could be lessened.

The basic skills test is designed to assess the acquisition of basic skills as a condition of entering teacher education (generally at the junior year of college). The subject matter tests assure that the beginning educator has mastered sufficient knowledge of the state required content to practice successfully in Illinois schools. Neither test is an appropriate measure for successful, experienced educators who wish to practice in Illinois public schools. These tests serve as barriers to the state attracting educators from a national pool.

The *Illinois School Code* (p. 381), 105 ILCS 5/21-0.01, (3) permits the State Board of Education, in consultation with the State Teacher Certification Board, to “enter into agreements with other states relative to reciprocal approval of teacher and administrator preparation programs.” State staff reports that there is no “automatic reciprocity between Illinois and other states.” (National-board certified teachers from any state may now transfer into Illinois without taking the Illinois tests.) Reciprocity of certificates is feasible now that many states have implemented the reforms that Illinois has already taken. These reforms include the following and can constitute criteria for determining equivalence or reciprocity of teaching and administrative certificates:

- Use of national standards for program approval (NCATE and Associated Learning Societies)
- Multi-tier licensure/certification process
- Assessment of basic skills and subject matter specialty on entrance to the profession
- Inclusion of Master Teacher Certificate (National Board-Certified Teacher) within certification process.

In order to remove unnecessary burdens for experienced, successful educators to assume positions in Illinois public schools, a general system for state reciprocity of certificates should be developed and implemented. As a beginning, the ICEL believes that the requirement to pass the basic skills test and content knowledge test for out of state educators wishing to work in Illinois public schools be waived for those already holding valid certification for the position being sought and who have at least two years of successful experiences. In these instances, the out of state educator should be granted a comparable Illinois certificate for the position being sought.

School Code Reference

105 ILCS 5/21-0.01, section (3) permits the state to enter into agreements with other states relative to reciprocal approval of teacher and administrator preparation programs. Section

21-1a prescribes the requirement for educators to pass tests of basic skills and subject matter knowledge.

Policy Recommendations Regarding the Superintendent as Education Leader

- 2) To increase the supply of educators by removing unnecessary barriers to out-of-state administrators and teachers who wish to serve in Illinois public schools, the General Assembly should amend the *School Code* to waive the requirement for passage for all tests (basic skills, content-area, and assessment of professional teaching) for experienced educators seeking employment in Illinois. The law should provide that:
 - a) A superintendent who holds a valid certificate from another state or, in states that do not issue a superintendent certificate, has completed an administrative preparation program reasonably comparable to that required in Illinois, may receive a comparable certificate in Illinois if he or she has at least 2 years of successful experience as a superintendent. Successful experience must be documented by at least one letter from a previous employer.
 - b) A principal who holds a valid certificate from another state may receive a comparable certificate in Illinois if he or she has at least 4 years of teaching experience and at least 2 years of successful experience as a principal. Successful experience must be documented by at least one letter from a previous employer.
 - d) A teacher who holds a valid certificate from another state may receive a comparable certificate in Illinois if he or she has completed an approved teacher preparation program and has at least 2 years of successful experience as a teacher. Successful experience must be documented by at least one letter from a previous employer for each area of certification/endorsement.
- 2) The State Board of Education, in cooperation with the Illinois Association of School Administrators and the Illinois Council of Professors of Educational Administration, should convene a task force to study and make recommendations regarding the quality of preparation programs, including alternative route programs, for school superintendents. Particular attention should be given to the role of the superintendent as a leader for learning.
- 3) The General Assembly should retain the statute to permit an alternative route to administrative certification for *superintendents*. The General Assembly should know, however, that the numbers produced in these programs do not significantly add to the supply of school superintendents available across the state. Reducing the barriers to entering Illinois schools from out-of-state positions of superintendent may in fact be a better strategy to increase the supply of potential school superintendents for leadership for learning in Illinois schools.
- 4) The State Board of Education should develop and implement a plan to strengthen the focus of the Illinois Administrators' Academy to provide for an intense, high quality program that has as its core the intent to assure leadership for learning in Illinois public schools.
- 5) The State Board of Education should periodically analyze state data on the continuing professional development for administrators, determine, and report the extent to which plans have been submitted, together with recommendations to ensure participation as necessary. After an appropriate length of time—after the first year and before the third year—following the implementation of the statute, the State Board of Education should conduct an audit or analysis of a representative sample of plans to *ascertain the quality of the plans and the likelihood of their achieving the desired overall goal for improving the knowledge and skills of*

administrators relative to leadership for learning, making such results known to the public and recommending any changes as necessary.

References

- Bartolini, L. (2003). Oral presentation to ICEL and email. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.
- Bottoms, G., O'Neill, K., Fry, B. & Hill, D. (2003) *Good Principals Are the Key to Successful Schools: Six Strategies to Prepare More Good Principals*. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Cooper, B., Fusarelli, L., and Carella, V. (2002). *Career crisis in the superintendency. The results of a national survey*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Glass, G. (2001). *Superintendent leaders look at the superintendency, school boards and reform*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Illinois Association of School Administrators (2000). *Annual Survey of Members*. Springfield, IL: Illinois Association of School Administrators.
- Illinois School Code (2002). 105 ILCS 5/21-7.1. Springfield, IL: Illinois Association of School Boards.
- Illinois State Board of Education (2001). *2002 Directory: Approved Programs for the Preparation of Educational Personnel in Illinois Institutions of Higher Education*. Volume XXIV, Springfield, IL.
- Illinois State Board of Education (2001). *Technical Report: Educator supply and demand in Illinois*. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.
- Long, M. (2002). Personal Interview, Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.
- Mazzeo, C. (2003). *Improving Teaching and Learning by Improving School Leadership*. Washington, D.C.: National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Educational Policy Studies Division.
- Patton, L. et al. (2003) E-mail response to questions, Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.
- Pierson, M.E. and Hall, R.F. (2002). *Performance Excellence for the New Millenium, A Summary Report of the 2000 Survey of Illinois Superintendents*. Springfield, IL: Illinois Association of School Administrators.
- Usdan, M., McCloud, B., Podmostko, M. and Cuban, L. (2001). *Leadership for student learning: Restructuring school district leadership*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Wiggall, R., Chadhari, R., and Pifer, D. (2002). *Statewide Survey of Superintendents: Report and Analysis, School Finance*. Normal, IL: Illinois State University.
- Wolverton, M., Rowls, S. and McDonald, R. (2000). *The superintendent pool: Realities in the northwest*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Education Laboratory.

CHAPTER 3

STRENGTHENING PRINCIPALS AS LEADERS FOR LEARNING

The Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership (ICEL) believes that strong leadership is essential to improving student learning in Illinois public schools and supporting quality in teaching. Principals are expected to be the instructional leader in their schools. They are the primary person charged with establishing a culture of learning within their schools consistent with high expectations for children achieving the state learning standards. In addition, principals are also expected to provide, support, and facilitate professional development of teachers in their schools in ways that enhance the meeting and exceeding of learning goals.

Principals in Illinois Public Schools

What do we know about principals in Illinois public schools? As part of the work for this policy study of education leadership, ICEL staff prepared a Fact Sheet on “What We Know About Principals in Illinois and the Nation.” See Appendix C for a complete copy. In summary, however, we know that there were 3,603 public school principals in our schools in 2001 (ISBE, 2001). Of that number, 2,284 were in elementary schools, 586 led in junior high schools, and 733 principals worked in high schools. All principals held Master’s degrees and 11% also held doctorates or other advanced certificates (ISBE, 2001). The average age for principals was 50 years (ISBE, 2001).

Relative to diversity, 48% of Illinois’ public school principals are female although 76% of Illinois’ teachers are female. Nineteen (19%) percent of the principal workforce is minority although 40% of the school children are minority (Strand and Ashy, 2001). In Illinois, women tend to enter the principal’s position with more instructional and curriculum experience than their male counterparts but their salaries continue to lag, particularly outside of Cook, DuPage, and Lake counties (Strand and Ashby, 2001).

Nationally, a principal in American public schools supervises an average of 13.5 staff members, whereas manufacturing industry supervisors oversee the work of 6.2 staff members and public administrators supervise 3.5 staff members (Bagin, 1999). Clearly, the principal has a heavier supervision load than industry supervisors and the outcomes of the work in schools are extremely important to the future economic well being of the state and nation.

Is the state preparing too few principals to meet the present and future demand for principals? According to the Illinois State Board of Education (2002), 1,552 administrative certificates were issued in Illinois during 2001 and 3,500 new administrators are expected to be needed in Illinois schools during the years of 2002-2005.

Most (67%) of the new certificants came from the teaching force while only 2% were from educators re-entering the profession (ISBE, 2001). During the year 2000, 115 administrative

positions remained vacant; of these 72 were elementary or secondary principal positions or assistant positions. This number represents an increase of more than 500% since 1996 (ISBE, 2001). While there are these regional vacancies, for the most part, the number of persons receiving certification as an administrator exceeds the demand. Interviews with officials from Chicago #299 and university leaders preparing principals in Chicago also support the belief that there are sufficient numbers of individuals with state certification applying for principal positions in Chicago schools (Juarez, Tozer, and Martinez, 2002). The issue, according to members of the ICEL and these individuals in Chicago, is that the overall quality of the individuals applying for principals has declined and there are fewer applicants for available positions. According to ICEL members, working conditions for the principal have also changed considerably, making the position far less attractive to candidates. Fenwick, in *Education Week* (March 29, 2000) stated that the “school leader is expected simultaneously to be a servant-leader, an organizational and social architect, an educator, a moral agent, a child advocate and social worker, a community activist, and a crisis-negotiator—all while raising students’ standardized-test performance.” Indeed, the question debated nationally has been, “Can principals do it all?”

The issue of quality of applicants is compounded by the number of principals planning to retire in the near future. Since 1996, the attrition rate for Illinois administrators increased 80%, from 3.4% to 6.2%, with 518 of them leaving education. More than half (300) had more than 31 years of education experience. In Illinois, according to the IPA (Strand and Ashby, 2001) study, 37% of the principals in Illinois planned to retire and 58% planned to leave the principalship by 2007.

According to a national study by the Public Agenda Online (2001), 47% of elementary principals in 2001 were considering leaving education because of politics and bureaucracy, 34% cited unreasonable demands brought about by higher standards and accountability, and 14% cited lower pay.

Nationally, elementary principals reported the following reasons for leaving their jobs: long hours (60-80 per week), workload and complexity of the job, supervision of evening activities, minimal pay difference between top teacher and administrator salaries, overwhelming expectations, paperwork required by state and district mandates, and increasing complex social problems (NAESP, 2000). Also, one tenth of principals reported being involved in a work-related civil lawsuit with all cases being dropped, settled out of court, or settled in the principals’ favor (NAESP, 1998).

Clearly, the work of the principal is absolutely essential to assuring that the school culture, personnel, budget, time, and other resources succeed in providing the instructional environment where all school children learn and where local and state goals for educating the most vulnerable of our population can be met. Clearly, too, the work of the principal is no picnic.

Policy Issues Under Review by ICEL

For the purpose of this policy review, the ICEL identified the following issues relative to Illinois' principals as areas that could strengthen leadership for learning. These were areas where changes in statutes and regulations have a strong likelihood of making differences to strengthen instruction, supervision, and learning for Illinois' school children.

The study areas were the adequacy of university preparation programs for Illinois principals (See Chapter 4 on Refocusing Illinois Principal Preparation Programs to Enhance Leadership for Learning), years of teaching experience required of principals as a condition of certification, principals in Illinois who serve simultaneously as superintendents in their school districts, alternative routes for certification for principals and teachers as leaders (See Chapter 6), and standards-based evaluation of school principals. The remainder of this chapter identifies these issues in more detail and presents policy recommendations by the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership regarding the principal that can strengthen leadership for learning.

Years of Teaching Experience

The ICEL addressed the following policy questions: Should candidates for school principals be required to serve a specified number of years as teachers before being eligible to serve as principals? If yes, how many years? Further, is it reasonable that teachers must have four years experience to become eligible to obtain the standard teaching certificate but principals must have only two years and an initial teaching certificate? These questions relate to the extent to which principal candidates have sufficient range and depth of experience about the instructional process to make the connection between teaching and learning, become effective instructional leaders, and enhance student learning in their schools.

The Illinois School Code, Section 105, ILCS 5/21-7.1, states the requirements for obtaining an Administrative Certificate and general administration endorsement (needed for the principal, assistant or associate superintendent, junior college dean and related or similar positions). In brief, the *Code* (2002 edition, p. 389-391) stipulates that persons obtaining the endorsement shall meet the following requirements for an administrative certificate and general administrative endorsement:

- Graduated from a regionally accredited institution of higher learning with a master's degree
- Earn at least 20 semester hours of graduate credit in educational administration and supervision
- Have at least *2 years of full time teaching experience or school service personnel experience in public schools, et al.* (italics added).

The Code further stipulates additional requirements for teachers in Chicago seeking administrative certificates. Thus, the statute for candidates for certification for principals in all districts except Chicago does not require candidates to have teaching experience at all, but for

those that do, only two years is judged sufficient. While teachers must hold a standard certificate in order to continue teaching after four years, principals may have two or three years of teaching experience and not have attained the second level teaching certificate, that of a standard certificate, that implies proficiency in the classroom.

The certification system in Illinois was significantly changed several years ago. The system now requires teachers to be issued an initial certificate, followed by a standard certificate after *four* years experience, meeting specified local and state requirements, and attaining a master's teachers' certificate as a consequence of passing the National Board for the Professional Standards of Teaching. At the time of making major changes in teacher certificates, there was no commensurate change made in the teaching experience for those candidates who are expected to provide school leadership in the instruction of students and in the professional development and supervision of teachers.

In recognition of this lower standard for principals, the ISBE is considering as a new rule, an "accommodation that allows the Initial Certificate to be renewed indefinitely." (Williams, 2003). In this case, according to state officials, the "administrator would never be automatically granted a standard teaching certificate, but neither would he or she be denied the teaching credential if needed or wanted." In other words, the administrator would be continually granted an Initial Certificate, one that is in substance less than that of the experienced teachers he or she is charged to supervise. The ICEL has judged this action to be insufficient to assuring that principals have sufficient and comparable teaching experience to assure their credibility in leading teachers.

The 2000 NCES Staffing Report (2002) states that nationally, principals have 10.6 years of experience before assuming the position of principal. Those entering their first principal's position at 50 and older typically have 11.3 years of teaching experience; those under 40 years typically have 8 years of teaching experience. It is not known exactly what the usual length of teaching experience is for beginning principals in Illinois public schools but the sense is that principals are even younger now and bring to the position even less teaching experience (Williams, 2003). Clearly, Illinois principals should have sufficient teaching experience to assure that they are competent to provide the necessary instructional leadership.

Principals Serving Dual Roles as Superintendents

The issue of persons in Illinois serving in "dual leadership roles" as both superintendent and principal in a school district is concerned with whether sufficient leadership, supervision, and attention can be directed to the issues of student learning and achievement when roles and responsibilities are so diffused. Conversations early in the study with officials of the Illinois Principals Association suggested that there had been at least 40 individuals serving as both

principals and superintendents in Illinois school districts and that this was an area worth examining.

The major policy question addressed by the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership was: Should persons in Illinois be permitted to serve in a “dual” role as a superintendent and a principal in a school district? When the work of principals is spread thinly among multiple roles and responsibilities for leadership, can such administrators hope to succeed at providing the intensity of instructional leadership that the public in Illinois has come to expect for its children? Is there a reasonable likelihood of increased student performance if principals could focus their attention to the instructional needs of school children and not to other multiple administrative tasks required of the superintendent?

The State Board of Education (2001) provided the most recent statistical data for the number of principals who also serve as district superintendent. For the year 2002, 852 district superintendents were employed in regular public school districts. Of those, 93 persons serve as both superintendent and principal in their district, *and* one person served as **both** superintendent and principal in **two** school districts. Therefore, 10.5% of Illinois school districts were led by a superintendent also serving as a school principal. (Except for the one above referenced anomaly, the ICEL did not address the issue of the number of persons hired by two or more school boards in Illinois to serve as superintendent nor persons serving as principal for two schools.)

Interestingly, of the 94 individuals serving in dual roles as both principal and superintendent, 26 or nearly 28% were female (ascertained by using names as indicators of gender). The presence of women administrators in this subset of school leaders is twice the presence of women superintendents generally in Illinois (28% hired in dual roles; 14% statewide).

What is known about the school children within these 94 school districts in Illinois relative to enrollment, proportion of low-income children, and achievement on state tests? According to the 2002 School Report Cards displayed on the State Board of Education’s website, 21,251 pupils are enrolled in these districts, for an average pupil enrollment of 226. Full-time teachers number 1,608, an average of 17 teachers per district. These districts are generally small, with the two smallest districts being Otter Creek-Hyatt School District 56 in Streator with 27 pupils and 6 teachers and Nelson Elementary School District 8 in Rock Falls with 30 students and 6 teachers. But, by no means are they all small districts. The largest school districts among the 94 include Oak Park and River Forest District 200 with 2,921 students and 167 teachers, Lake Forest Community H. S. District 115 with 1,676 students and 118 teachers, and Rantoul Township H. S. District 193 with 800 students and 59 teachers.

Another useful descriptor in knowing about the school children is the percent of students defined as coming from low income families, as defined by ISBE and reported on its website for the annual Fall Enrollment Reports. The state average for Illinois public school children is 37.5%. Of the 94 school districts, 63 or 67% have a proportion of low income students *lower* (ranging

from 0 to 29% low income) than the state average. Only five districts show that low income students account for 50% or more of their student body: North Wamac 186 in Centralia at 59.3%, Bethel School District 82 in Mount Vernon at 59.7, and Pleasant Hill 69 in Peoria with 75%, Ludlow C. C. School District 134 with 81.4% low income. For the most part, children in these school districts are not defined as being from low income families.

Relative to geographic placement, these 94 districts are dispersed in 35 (1/3 of the state's 102 counties) counties. Jefferson County has a cluster of 9 districts, Clinton has 8, and LaSalle has 7.

How are they measuring up on the state tests for learning? Using the composite test score for all the state tests indicating the percentages of students who meet or exceed the Illinois learning standards as reported on their 2002 School Report Cards, we find that *one* of the 94 school districts scores below 50%, Buncombe C. S. District 43, with 45.5% and two score above 90%. The distribution for all others is:

- 10.6% (10) score between 50-59%
- 23.4% (22) score between 60-69%
- 37.2% (35) score between 70-79%
- 25.5% (24) score between 80-89%, and
- 2.1% (2) score above 90%.

The top two performers among the 95 districts are Nettle Creek 246 with 90.4% of its students meeting or exceeding the Illinois learning standards and Kenilworth School District 35 with a composite score of 93.3%. There remains room for improvement in student learning in all these districts.

Although the districts vary in student performance, education leadership in all the districts must focus their attention on student achievement so that all students meet state standards for learning. The state expectation as well as the federal requirement of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) applies to all school districts. The likelihood of students in these school districts being able to meet the expectations associated with state standards and the NCLB is very strong if the principals are able to focus their energies and commitment 100% to the instructional needs of the school children.

The Illinois School Code is very specific about the statutory responsibilities of principals. Section 10-21.4a (page 196, 2002 *School Code*), defines the duties of school principals. The major relevant provisions state:

- The principal shall assume administrative responsibilities and instructional leadership, *under the supervision of the superintendent* (italics added), and in accordance with reasonable rules and regulations of the board, for the planning, operation and evaluation of the educational program of the attendance area to which he or she is assigned.

- School boards shall specify in their formal job description for principals that his or her primary responsibility is in the improvement of instruction.
- *A majority of the time* (italics added) spent by a principal shall be spent on curriculum and staff development through both formal and informal activities, establishing clear lines of communication regarding school goals, accomplishments, practices and policies with parents and teachers.
- School boards shall ensure that their principals are evaluated on their instructional leadership ability and their ability to maintain a positive education and learning climate.
- The principal shall submit recommendations *to the superintendent* (italics added) concerning the appointment, retention, promotion and assignment of all personnel assigned to the attendance center.
- If a principal is absent due to extended illness or level of absence, an assistant principal may be assigned as acting principal for a period not to exceed 60 school days.

In addition, Article 34 of the *School Code* identifies further responsibilities for principals within Illinois cities of over 500,000 inhabitants (Chicago). All of the 94 school districts included in this examination are outside of Chicago.

The roles and responsibilities of principals designated in the above referenced *School Code* define the primary function of the principal: instructional leadership. Further, the reference to the relationship of the superintendent implies that the intent of the legislation or the understanding of the drafters is that the positions are separate. For example, one does not supervise oneself in the schools and one does not make formal recommendations to oneself. Further, the importance of the principal is emphasized in the statute by limiting the time to two months when an acting principal may be hired. The statute regarding “a majority of the time” does not presuppose that one person is serving in both roles. It also could be argued that the requirement as presently stated in the School Code cannot be monitored nor enforced and needs clarification.

In order that all students reach the learning targets, principals must be free and be able to attend to the learning of their students. There is a reasonable likelihood that the learning of students can be increased when instructional leadership in a school is focused on that mission.

Alternative Routes for Certification for Principals

For at least the past 4-5 years, state legislators, including those in Illinois, have debated the efficacy of offering alternative routes for certification for teachers and other educators, including superintendents and principals. In 1999, the Illinois General Assembly passed laws that prescribed and permitted alternative routes to certification programs for teachers. Though the law did not require state universities to develop such programs, during university budget hearings,

presidents and provosts were routinely asked whether such programs existed on their campuses and if so, how many students were being served, and if not, why not.

According to the ISBE (2002), 10 of the 57 approved programs in Illinois offer various alternative routes to teacher certification programs. Six are state universities and four are private. These programs tend to be small and are focused on either secondary education or elementary science, music, or math. Five other universities in Illinois (four private and one public) offer additional alternative programs characterized as “additional pathways to teacher certification.”

The Illinois General Assembly also passed legislation permitting an alternative route to the administrative certificate. The law defined “administrator” as meaning the superintendent or chief school business official. Principals and assistant principals were excluded from this provision. The policy question for the ICEL was: Should the state begin to approve university graduate programs that provide alternative routes to certification for school *principals*?

The prescribed course of study for the alternative programs for superintendent and school business officials calls for work in education management, governance, organization, and planning. No mention is made of instructional leadership, an expectation which appears frequently in the *School Code* relative to the role of the principal. While the roles and responsibilities of the superintendent and principal clearly overlap in that both must address the teaching and learning of students within their school district, the two roles are distinctly different in their focus.

The principal is the chief instructional leader of the school where teaching and learning more directly affects children. It is in the school where educators must address curriculum and instruction relative to the needs of particular school children as well as exercise their secondary management roles for efficiency, fairness, and outreach. The school is the learning arena for students, teachers, and parents.

Principals must collaborate with and supervise teachers, assess and address the educational progress of students assigned to the school, and work with parents and other community services to bridge any gaps among home, community, and the school. For credibility with parents and teachers, principals must have a breadth of experience and knowledge of instructional processes that comes only from being a classroom teacher themselves.

When all is said, there was no compelling argument to permit non-educators to be certified as *principals* in Illinois schools although there were strong arguments for alternative routes to traditional principal certification (see Chapter 7 on Teachers as Leaders). Leadership makes a difference. The schools must have leaders who understand and value teaching and learning, have had experience as successful teachers, and have sufficient opportunity to focus on instruction and student learning in their schools.

Standards-Based Evaluation of School Principals

An essential component of continuing improvement in education is assessing the status of professional behavior relative to selected criteria or system expectations which should, ultimately, improve performance. Assessing performance and reporting on that performance assures that those in charge of the education system are properly accountable to the public for its support of the schools.

The Illinois School Code (Article 24A-1, page 426, edition 2002) requires “that all certified school district employees be evaluated on a periodic basis and that the evaluations result in remedial action being taken when deemed necessary.” As certified employees, principals are therefore required to be evaluated “periodically” but the statute does not prescribe by whom, how often, or the character of the evaluation.

The Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership addressed the following policy questions: Should public school principals in Illinois be required to be evaluated by their superintendents? If yes, how often? Should the character of the evaluation be prescribed by statute?

In stark contrast, the content and character of evaluation plans for Illinois public school teachers is prescribed in considerable detail (see pages 426-428 of the ILSC, 2002 edition). Further, several years ago, the Illinois State Board of Education, with advice and counsel from the education community and the public, approved content standards for all educators, including school leaders. The Illinois Professional School Leader Standards identify performance indicators assumed to be directly related to appropriate and expected educational practice. It is reasonable to expect that these standards and indicators should be aligned or connected with the required evaluation of principals so as to ensure a coherent system of principal preparation, continuing professional development, assessment, and school improvement. Thus, the evaluation for school leaders should be connected to and aligned with the Illinois Professional School Leader Standards.

The Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership heard several presenters discuss the administrator evaluation model used by the Chicago public schools, #299, particularly in reference to its school principals. The model is based on state and national standards for school leaders with an additional standard, that of “interpersonal effectiveness.” The model and its use have gained significant attention within the state and with national policy groups. The standards-based model in Chicago provides other Illinois school districts with a valid instrument and protocol. There are undoubtedly other standards-based evaluation instruments that could be used as models.

The issues of how often should principals be evaluated and by whom are also relevant to the overall issue of school leader accountability. The statute is silent on these topics. There is increasing attention to the reporting of *annual* school achievement and the determination by the

state as to whether the school has successfully met the state expectations. Therefore, an *annual* performance evaluation of school principals according to the expected School Leader Standards (as well as any other performance expectations that have been identified) seems the least that should be required.

Further, the person who has the ultimate responsibility for the hiring, firing, or retention of the principal—usually the district superintendent—should be the person who evaluates the principal annually. While the school board or public or other groups can have input into the compiling of “evidence” relative to performance indicators, the evaluation of principals is ultimately the responsibility of the district superintendent or his or her designee.

In discussions about principalship evaluation, some ICEL members pointed out that the statute on principal (and superintendent) evaluation needed to be as clear as that for teachers. Others argued for an evaluation period of two years rather than an annual evaluation, particularly if the principal was performing well and to expectations. Given the new federal requirements that schools be annually evaluated and judged as succeeding or failing, the prevailing view was that principals need and would benefit from annual evaluations according to professional standards.

Policy Recommendations Regarding the Principal as Education Leader:

- 1) The Illinois General Assembly should change the *School Code* eligibility criteria stated in 5/21-7.1 to require candidates for principals to have attained the Standard Teaching Certificate.
- 2) In order to emphasize the importance of learning and instruction in leadership, the General Assembly should also remove the provision in the Code that equates student personnel experience with teaching performance.
- 3) The Illinois General Assembly should amend Section 10-21.4a of the statute regarding the roles of principals to state that principals in Illinois public schools shall not be employed simultaneously in other administrative roles such as superintendent while serving as principal in order that principals have sufficient time to provide instructional leadership. In instances where the local school board is planning or implementing school district dissolution, consolidation, or unification, or experiencing other fiscal exigency, the local school board may petition the State Board of Education for a waiver of the requirement in accordance with Section 5/2-3.25g, “Waiver or modification of mandates within the School Code and administrative rules and regulations.”
- 4) The Illinois General Assembly should retain Section 105 ILCS 5/21-5d, the alternative route to administrative certification provisions, **exclusively** for superintendents and school business officials.
- 5) The Illinois General Assembly should amend Article 24A, “Evaluation of Certified Employees” by adding to it the requirement that the school superintendents or his or her designee shall annually evaluate school principals based on evidence provided by the principal and other sources identified by the superintendent, based on and aligned with the at least the Illinois Professional School Leader Standards, and including interpersonal effectiveness.

- 6) The Illinois General Assembly should amend and add to Article 24A: The school superintendent shall file the standards-based instrument and statement of procedures for the evaluation of principals with the respective regional superintendent by a certain date. Should the regional superintendent determine that the evaluation instrument is not aligned with the state standards for principals as instructional leaders, the regional superintendent shall request a revised instrument from the district superintendent.

References

- Bagin, R. (1999, January). What is right with our schools. *Principal*, pgs. 5-10.
- Educational Writer's Association (2000). *Searching for a Superhero: Can Principals Do it All?* Washington, D.C.: Educational Writer's Association.
- Illinois State Board of Education (2001). *Illinois Public Schools by County with region, county, district I.D. codes included*. Retrieved 2/1/2003 from <http://www.isbe.state.il.us/research/htmls/reports.htm#statistics>.
- Illinois State Board of Education (2002). *Approved Programs for the Preparation of Educational Personnel in Illinois Institutions of Higher Education*. Volume XXIV, October, Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.
- Illinois State Board of Education (2001). *Technical Report: Educator supply and demand in Illinois*. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.
- Illinois School Code (2002). Section 105, 5/212.1 p. 389-391, Springfield, IL: Illinois Association of School Boards.
- Juarez, A., Tozer, S., and Martinez, P. (2002). Personal Interviews and emails. Chicago.
- Long, M. (2002, July). Personal Interview. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.
- National Association of Elementary School Principals (1998). *Is There a Shortage of Qualified Candidates for Openings in the Principalship?* Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.
- National Association of Elementary School Principals (2000). *The Principal, Keystone of a High-Achieving School: Attracting and Keeping the Leaders We Need*. Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.
- National Center for Education Statistics (2000). *Schools and Staffing Survey 1999-2000: Overview of the Data for Public, Private, and Bureau of Indian Affairs, Elementary and Secondary Schools*. p. 27-28. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Education Research and Improvement.
- Public Agenda Online (2001). *Trying to stay ahead of the game: Superintendents and principals talk about school leadership*. New York: Public Agenda Online.
- Strand, K. and Ashby, D. (2001). *Building leadership, a practitioner bulletin: 2001-2002 IPA Salary and Fringe Benefit Study*. Vol. 9, No. 4. Springfield, IL: Illinois Principal Association.
- Williams, D. (2003, Feb.). E-mail response. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.

CHAPTER 4

REFOCUSING ILLINOIS PRINCIPAL PREPARATION PROGRAMS TO ENHANCE LEADERSHIP FOR LEARNING

The Illinois State Board of Education approved 27 General Administrative programs in Illinois colleges and universities (ISBE, 2002). These programs include principal preparation programs that lead to the Type 75 certificate and the endorsement of the certificate that enables candidates to serve as principals. Of the 27 universities, 12 are public universities and 15 are private. All programs must now meet state standards for the preparation of principals. These programs prepare school leaders for their first key instructional leadership role in Illinois schools and are extremely important.

The Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership adopted the following as one of its principles of action: University programs that prepare education leaders for their initial roles and responsibilities must be rigorous, meet state and national accreditation standards, and provide for standards-based clinical practice. Norton (2002) stated that standards-based redesign is too often "a paper-and-pencil game that requires players to match course titles and content with the adopted higher standards." The major policy issue addressed by the ICEL was whether principal programs were adequately preparing school leaders for their key roles as instructional leaders, and if not, what should be done to strengthen the adequacy of principal preparation? Further, the ICEL examined the internship requirement of Illinois' principal preparation programs relative to its capacity as the primary mechanism for providing clinical practice for principal candidates.

Criticisms of Principal Preparation Programs

Standards-based reform initiatives have changed the definition of successful educational leadership and what preparation programs should do to encourage it (Usdan, 2002). Preparation programs, however, are said to have a reputation for resistance to change and show few signs of major reforms in the face of new realities for principals (Young, Petersen, and Short, 2002). The ICEL concern is whether adequate attention has been paid to the instructional roles of the principal in Illinois preparation programs relative to the interpretation of standards in the curriculum of programs.

Criticism of principal preparation programs has been common for decades. In 1960, the American Association of School Administrators called the preparation of school leaders a "dismal montage" (Creighton, 2002). In 1987, the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (NCEEAA) noted the flaws in preparation programs and recommended better candidates, collaboration with school districts, and more coherent and high-quality content relevant to job demands of school administrations. The National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2002) warned, "course content is often irrelevant, outdated and unchallenging."

The National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation found that current preparation programs are disjointed, sporadic, interest focused, provider driven, and poorly aligned, with only pockets of excellence (Young, 2002).

Cambron-McCabe and Cunningham (2002) described the “grave concerns about the lack of relevancy leadership preparation programs have for the crisis conditions facing many school administrators in this country.” Tirozzi (2001) argued for the need to “transform principal preparation programs in higher education—which are generally woefully lacking and often staffed by individuals who have very little, if any, experience in school leadership.”

While the denunciations of university preparation programs may have more hyperbole than research to support their claims, it is clear that preparation programs cannot afford to continue past practices. A Public Agenda survey found that 69 percent of principals and 80 percent of superintendents believe leadership programs “are out of touch with the realities of what it takes to run today’s school district” and 85 percent of school leaders believe that overhauling preparation programs would improve leadership (Public Agenda, 2001). However, among elementary principals, 44% reported that graduate education was of much value to them, while 49% reported it was of some value (Drake and Roe, 1999).

Excellent principal preparation programs select good candidates who can lead instructional improvement, teach these candidates skills linked to practice, develop strong linkages with districts and their reform efforts, and build curriculum and instruction around the problems of practice (Mazzeo and Groff, 2002). These programs include coherent program design, ongoing evaluation and enrichment of the program, alignment to best practices, professional development of faculty, involvement of practitioners in program planning and evaluation, and planned recruitment and selection of students (Kochan, 2002).

Illinois Principal Preparation Programs

In attempts to analyze the adequacy of Illinois preparation programs, ICEL staff examined the courses required for principal preparation programs at 20 out of 27 universities in Illinois that are approved to offer Type 75 certification endorsement and master’s degrees in education leadership. The information came from a survey of the institutions or from the university websites. The respective deans and department chairs of the institutions were asked to verify the survey data. See Appendix D.

The Illinois School Code requires a minimum of 20 hours of graduate-level instruction for a principal. The School Code also gives the State Board of Education authority to determine more specific requirements for principal preparation. ISBE regulations require a minimum of 25 hours of coursework: 12 hours in instructional leadership; 9 hours in management of public schools; and 4-6 hours in schools and public policy. Clinical experience, two years of teaching, and completion of the state test for the principalship are also required for certification.

No study of course titles can show what is actually being taught in any course. Even courses with the same title may differ at different universities, over time, or when taught by different instructors (Bottoms, 2003). ICEL members made the strong point that principal preparation programs should be judged by the outcomes they produce. However, outcomes-based evaluation of education programs is still in its infancy, and even now, reasonable people must make some judgments about adequacy based on what is expected to be learned in a course given the title of the course.

The types of courses required for educational leaders provide the best information we have available about what is valued for the preparation of future school leaders in Illinois. This study found a great range of course titles for preparing principals. Courses on law and finance are the most common in Illinois programs. Courses on curriculum, administration, and supervision were also common, as were required classes on research. Several institutions require community relations, while a few others require interpersonal communications.

Instructional leadership has become the major criterion for success in school administration (Usdan and Cuban, 2002). However, principal preparation programs, including those in Illinois, do not focus on instructional leadership. Some may be slow to adapt to changes in expectations for the roles of principals away from managerial tasks. To be most effective, new standards should lead to a fundamental rethinking of content, delivery, and assessment, and performance results.

In Illinois, instructional leadership is the title of a course at only five institutions. Although instructional leadership may be the focus of courses with other names (such as curriculum, school supervision, or educational leadership), the lack of an explicit allocation to instructional leadership in the program of studies for the preparation of principals could signal a problem. There is also a disconnect between what the Illinois statutes require and what Illinois principal programs offer.

Specifically, these findings emerged from the study of the course requirements of Illinois principal programs:

First, in general, the program of studies for educating principals, as inferred from the examination of the course requirements in 20 institutions of higher education with approved programs, does not reflect the references to instructional leadership in the Illinois School Code and state regulations.

Second, some of the state and national standards did not appear to be addressed by the course requirements in Illinois principal preparation programs. Standards, such as those relating to the need to establish a vision of learning for a school and practicing professional ethics, seem to be largely missing from state regulations and the formal curriculum for principal preparation programs. Further, the statute mandates and defines such expectations as productive parent school relationships, promoting good classroom organization and management, and high quality

school climate that are essential to instructional leadership. These expectations are not clearly observable in the Illinois principal programs of study.

Third, a major emphasis in the Illinois statutes as well as the state and national leadership standards is the principals' role in instructional leadership; instructional leadership plays a secondary role to training as a manager, as indicated by the titles of courses required at most preparation programs. Courses titled "instructional leadership" are rare.

Fourth, courses on finance, law, and research are most commonly required, but some of these courses are not suitable to the primary work of principals as instructional leaders. Principals have little discretion over their assigned school budgets and a three-hour course in school finance is more the purview of the school superintendent. While it is reasonable to expect principals to be schooled in methods of inquiry, time spent in courses in traditional research and statistical methodologies could be better spent in problem solving strategies regarding the understanding and use of student achievement data for the purposes of overall school improvement.

Fifth, course requirements for Illinois principal preparation programs show little consistency across institutions. This variability across institutions strongly suggests that the profession has not clearly defined a quality core curriculum that most likely would lead to more effective principal preparation. What is not needed, of course, is a cookie cutter approach to curriculum—but the lack of uniformity as to what content is absolutely essential to the new principal implies that Illinois universities don't know what principals must know and be able to do as beginners in their profession.

Clinical Internships for Principals

The importance of the internship in principal preparation programs is critical. The internship provides hands-on, supervised, real school practice to the issues confronting today's principal. During the internship, candidates for the principal's position learn how to become reflective and purposeful instead of arbitrary and rote.

In 1989, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) expressed concern about the declining quality of administrator preparation programs and recommended enhancing clinical activities (Hackmann, Schmitt-Oliver, and Tracy, 2002). In addition to the six ISLLC standards, NCATE added a seventh to focus attention on internships to provide "substantial, sustained, standards-based experiences in real settings that are planned and guided cooperatively by university and school district personnel" (Hackmann, Schmitt-Oliver, and Tracy, 2002).

The internship is the bridge from theory to practice (Taylor, 2001). However, studies raised questions about the value of existing internships as currently defined. In one survey of elementary principals, 66% had participated in an internship program; 38% said it was of much

value, while 39% said it was of some value (Drake & Roe, 1999). Sometimes, the internship is merely the acquisition of a set number of “experiences” (e.g. sitting through a school board meeting, observing a parent-teacher conference) generally expressed as a total of number of hours to be completed on one’s own.

What are the components of a quality internship for principals? Numerous researchers concluded that preparation programs should contain an intense, year-long, paid, mentored internship for both aspiring principals and aspiring superintendents in diverse settings (Grogan and Andrews, 2002; Tucker & Tschannen-Moran, 2002; Creighton, 2002; Bottoms and O’Neill, 2001). A year-long paid internship is the ideal for both an intern and a district, which can pay a reduced salary for a skilled leader (Hackmann, Schmitt-Oliver, and Tracy, 2002). But, because most internships are unpaid, many interns seek to complete them on a part-time basis while employed full-time in the same schools (Capasso and Daresh, 2001; Edmundson, 2002).

Clinical experiences should occur in a variety of economic or multicultural schools, not just the same school where the intern teaches (Hackmann, Schmitt-Oliver, and Tracy, 2002). Full-time paid internships may be ideal, but they are often not feasible for working students and underfunded districts. Students can also learn a great deal in part-time internships that are well designed (Bradshaw and Buckner, 2000).

Internship programs should be well-planned and integrated throughout the preparation program, and allow for mentoring (Bottoms, 2002). Good mentors are a key to a quality internship. Internships need to involve high-performing administrators and mentors; otherwise, interns will not be modeling best practices (Taylor, 2001). Capasso and Daresh (2001) worry that some interns learn from less competent mentors, and there are not enough good role models. Careful selection of a mentor and site is important (Hackmann, Schmitt-Oliver, and Tracy, 2002), because of the danger that interns may be placed to meet district needs rather than educational goals (Bradshaw and Buckner, 2000).

Principal interns need “substantive, authentic, and real activities” rather than busy work (Hackmann, Schmitt-Oliver, and Tracy, 2002). A poorly designed internship is only marginally better than no experience at all (Hackmann, Schmitt-Oliver, and Tracy, 2002). Field experience alone is not sufficient for an internship, which also requires reflection utilizing group seminars and mentor conversations (Taylor, 2001; Capasso and Daresh, 2001; Edmundson, 2002).

The trend in principal preparation programs is a design that rests almost entirely on full-time internships (with on-site coaches) and often requires limited classroom-type instruction (Lauder, 2000). “Clinical activities should be integrated throughout the program,” not limited to an internship (Hackmann, Schmitt-Oliver, and Tracy, 2002). Contrary to the emphasis of the above experts and advocates on field-based internships throughout the curriculum, nearly all Illinois preparation programs use internships as a capstone experience after all courses are taken rather than an integration during and at the end of the program.

The internship can provide a bridge between schools and principal preparation programs, since well-designed internships require a close relationship between the schools providing the internship and the universities providing the program (Taylor, 2001). However, full-time faculty are typically not involved in supervising administrative internships, which is usually done by a clinical instructor (Capasso and Daresh, 2001), sometimes with “less status” than the other faculty in the department.

Clinical work must have sufficient duration and intensity (Hackmann, Schmitt-Oliver, and Tracy, 2002). Many administrative interns, however, receive few true responsibilities, and experienced administrators may be too overwhelmed with administrative work to assist in the education of interns (Edmundson, 2002). The key is not a minimum number of clock hours, but the quality of the experience (Hackmann, Schmitt-Oliver, and Tracy, 2002).

One problem is that university preparation programs in Illinois serve educators with diverse career goals rather than solely that of the principal. Some people seeking degrees (and therefore serving in internships) may have little desire to immediately seek administrative positions (Capasso and Daresh, 2001). In fact, given the predominance of the number of principal programs in Illinois, teachers may opt for an administrative certificate because no other graduate degrees are offered in the proximity of their homes or schools. For some, the internship is a test run to determine if they wish to continue in administration. For others, the internship may be little different from their existing administrative positions.

The internship provides opportunities for sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided by the program and school district (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2002). Valentine (2001) found that in a restructured preparation program that was cohort-based, mentored, and with year-long, full-time, intensive, on-site internships, students scored higher on Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) assessments and employer evaluations than those that did not. Internships for principal candidates in Illinois must be redesigned if we are to expect that principals in training will be able to perform well as leaders for learning.

Internships for principal candidates should provide substantive and diverse experiences with high-quality mentors, and full-time, paid internships are the ideal. In Illinois, the requirement for an internship is nearly universal, but the internship appears to be given little emphasis. Most programs in Illinois provide the equivalent of three hours of credit, roughly one course among 10-12 in the program. Thus, the internship is neither an experience that links academic knowledge with meaningful field experiences throughout a candidate's preparation nor is it an intensive, culminating transition into the real work for a beginning principal.

Cohort Programs

A cohort program links adults who are graduate students together in a common group of people taking the same classes at the same time and completing a preparation program over a similar period of time. Cohort programs develop stronger interpersonal relationships, increase contact with faculty, and lead to higher completion rates and greater cohesiveness (Grogan and Andrews, 2002) than individual programs. Exemplary educational leader preparation programs are “virtually all cohort-based” (Jackson and Kelley, 2002). The post-program benefits of cohort programs leads to established collegial networks that enrich principals who can share and assist others rather than compete with them.

The data gathered on Illinois preparation programs do not indicate the extent to which cohorts are utilized, but the Illinois State University cohort program with the Springfield School District—the Illinois LEAD district—offers a model for district-based cohorts which extend the advantages of cohorts by making preparation programs more convenient to time-challenged educators and directly linked to the educational needs and experiences of a particular district. The benefits of offering a preparation program for one district are numerous: Principal candidates are being primed for education leadership in their district. They already know and understand the education needs across the district and they have learned to work together on behalf of their school children. Their preparation is real and focused.

Other types of cohort programs, which may be geographically-based or simply a group of students entering the program at the same time, also provide benefits to students, but they do not match the potential of district-based cohort programs to provide a program directly linked to a specific district. Regional programs in areas of the state where there are insufficient numbers of principal candidates in small districts may offer the same benefits as district cohort programs. Principals (and superintendents) in Illinois may move around within their region and can capitalize on the collegial network and school information obtained in a regional cohort program.

In sum, preparation programs that prepare principal candidates for specific districts or regions on site should become the norm rather than the exception. Most courses continue to be offered on campus which may be too far removed from schools. A core curriculum should be developed that emphasizes leadership for learning. Universities should develop cohort-based, off-campus programs as well as partnerships with schools on program planning, delivery, faculty-practitioner teams, internship development, and supervision.

Policy Recommendations

- 1) The State Board of Education, in cooperation with the Illinois Principals Association and the Illinois Council of Professors of Educational Administration, should convene a task force with representatives from practicing principals and other groups to develop a standards-based *core curriculum* that focuses on leadership for learning in schools for the preparation of beginning principals in Illinois. The core curriculum should reflect at least the following criteria:

- a) Has at its foundation the Illinois Professional School Leaders Standards;
 - b) Provides a stronger balance between the roles principals play relative to providing instructional leadership for the school and managing the resources (personnel, time, finance, facilities, equipment, data) of the school that has greater probability of enhancing school learning and achievement of school children;
 - c) Provides a program of studies for principal candidates connected to the real work of principals in schools;
 - d) Addresses skills and competency in analysis of annual and longitudinal school achievement data and translation of the data into feasible school improvement actions;
 - e) Emphasizes effective interpersonal communication and respect for and with school children, teachers and their professional associations and unions, parents, and support staff and emphasizes collaboration and partnerships;
 - f) Eliminates coursework more applicable to the superintendent's preparation program and recognizes the position of principal as an important terminating career goal and not just a stepping stone to another position;
 - g) Recognizes the different sociological challenges presented to principals in rural, suburban, and urban schools;
 - h) Emphasizes the establishment of schools as cultural centers for learning and how to reinforce, support, and enhance those settings;
 - i) Emphasizes identifiable performance indicators relative to the curriculum and accountability of specific courses within the standards-based core curriculum to achieve those outcomes; and
 - j) Includes **clinical practice experiences throughout the preparation program** in accordance with the state standards for professional leadership.
- 2) Simultaneously, the State Board of Education, in cooperation with the Illinois Principals Association, the Illinois Council of Professors of Educational Administration, and other groups should convene a task force to design a **culminating** internship of supervised practical experiences for principal candidates that meets at least the following criteria:
- a) Provides principal candidates with an intensive, diverse, supervised, and substantive internship following the completion of a program of studies with an established core curriculum that emphasizes real, day-to-day leadership, management, and continuing professional education by the practicing principal which has as its goal the improvement of student achievement;
 - b) Provides a broad range of experiences in more than one school;
 - c) Is of sufficient duration that permits the candidate to participate as an intern principal to receive both intensive and extensive experience in instructional leadership and school management;

- d) Permits the principal candidate to be paid at a rate of no less than what he or she made as a teacher if the internship is within the same district or region or at an equivalent rate if the intern comes from outside the region of the state;
 - e) Connects to the intern's university program of studies, generates additional graduate credit hours beyond the 30 associated with the standards-based core curriculum, and permits university supervision of the intern similar to that provided for student teachers; and
 - f) Establishes a network of internship delivery throughout Illinois that permits principal internships in home districts or in home regions in collaboration with the state approved principal programs in higher education coordinated by the offices of the regional superintendent.
- 3) At the conclusion of the first two recommendations, the State Board of Education, in cooperation with the Illinois Board of Higher Education, and the State Teacher Certification Board, should seek to amend the Illinois School Code (Section 21-7.1, on Administrative Certificate,) to reflect the above recommendations for a core curriculum for beginning principals and the culminating principal internship and revise the state regulations for program approval accordingly.
- 4) The State Board of Education, in cooperation with the Illinois Board of Higher Education, should establish a state system of support for full-time internship experiences for future principals. Initial steps toward this end include:
- a) Creating a scholarship pool to which candidates with both need and talent may apply to support full time internships for up to one semester;
 - b) Encouraging district-university partnerships for district-based preparation programs; and
 - c) Making recommendations to policymakers, universities, and districts based on what is learned in a) and b) above.
- 5) The Illinois State Board of Education, in cooperation with other groups, should identify and disseminate models for delivery of principal preparation programs that meet at least the following criteria:
- a) Are comprised of principal candidates from the same school district and/or region;
 - b) Reflect the needs of the region for preparing future principals;
 - c) Involve the participating school district and/or region in the delivery of the core curriculum, including the identification of appropriate instructors;
 - d) Use the instructional and school achievement data of the district and/or region as part of the instructional resources;
 - e) Illustrate racial, ethnic, and gender diversity in both the delivery of the programs as well as the demographics of the principal candidates;
 - f) Are delivered on site in the school district or region on calendars established by the school district or education region;

References

- Bottoms, G., & O'Neill, K. (2001). *Preparing a New Breed of School Principals: It's Time for Action*. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Bottoms, G. (2002). *Leading School Improvement: What Successful School Leaders Need To Know and Be Able to Do*. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Bottoms, G. (2003). *Good Principals Are the Key to Successful Schools: Six Strategies to Prepare More Good Principals*. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Bradshaw, L., & Buckner, K. (2000). A Comparison of Full- and Part-Time Internships in an Administrator Preparation Program. In Patrick Jenlink, ed., *Marching into a New Millennium: Challenges to Educational Leadership*. Lanham, MD: ScarecrowEducation.
- Cambron-McCabe, N. & Cunningham, L. (2002). *Educational Administration Quarterly* 38:2, pp. 289-299.
- Capasso, R., & Daresh, J. (2001). *The School Administrator Internship Handbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Creighton, T. (2002). "Toward a Leadership Practice Field: An Antidote to an Ailing Internship Experience." *AASA Professor* 25:3, pp. 3-9.
- Drake, T.L., & Roe, W.H. (1999). *The Principalship*. 5th Edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a Culture of Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Glasman, N., Cibulka, J., & Ashby, D. (2002). Program self-evaluation for continuous improvement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38:2, pp. 257-288.
- Grogan, M., & Andrews, R. (2002). Defining preparation and professional development for the future. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 38:2, pp. 233-256.
- Hackmann, D.; Schmitt-Oliver, D.; & Tracy, J. (2002). *The Standards-Based Administrative Internship: Putting the ISLLC Standards into Practice*. Lanham, MD: ScarecrowEducation.
- Horn, R. A. (2001). Same old path, familiar bumps: Educational administration's response to the challenges of the 21 st century. *Educational Leadership Review*, 2:2, pp. 1-9.
- Jackson, B. L., & Kelley, C. (2002). Exceptional and innovative programs in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38:2, pp. 192-212.
- Kochan, F. (2002). National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation conference, Feb. 7-8, 2002, Racine, WI.
- Illinois State Board of Education (2002). 2002 Directory: Approved Programs for the Preparation of Education Personnel in Illinois Institutions of Higher Education, Vol. XXIV, Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.
- Lashway, L. (2003). *Transforming Principal Preparation* ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management: Eugene, OR.

- Lauder, A. (2000). The New Look in Principal Preparation Programs." *NASSP Bulletin* 84 no. 617, pp. 23-28.
- Mazzeo, C., & Groff, F. (2002). *Design Principles Principal Preparation*. SAELP Focused Forum: Educational Leadership Preparation, April 24-25, 2002.
- McKerrow, K., Dunn, R., & Killian, J. (2003). "Beyond the Turf Wars: Collaboration in Preparing School Leaders." *NCPEA Education Leadership Review* 4:1, pp. 1-10.
- Mitchel, C. (2001). "The Quest for Better Preparation Programs." *AASA Professor* 24:4, pp. 10-14.
- Murphy, J., & Forsyth, P. B. (1999). *Educational administration: A decade of reform*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration (1989). *Improving Preparation of School Administrators: An Agenda for Reform*. Charlottesville, VA: NPBEA.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (2002). *Standards for advanced programs in educational leadership for principals, superintendents, curriculum directors, and supervisors*.
- Norton, J. (2002). *Preparing School Leaders: It's Time to Face the Facts*. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Public Agenda (2001). *Trying to Stay Ahead of the Game: Superintendents and Principals Talk About School Leadership*. New York: Public Agenda.
- Taylor, R. (2001, Spring). Administrator Internship: Responding to New Accountability. *AASA Professor*, 24(3), pp. 8-11.
- National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration Report. (1987). *Leaders for America's Schools*. Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.
- Tirozzi, G. (2001). The Artistry of Leadership: The Evolving Role of the Secondary School Principal. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82, pp. 434-439.
- Tucker, P., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2002). *School Leadership in an Era of Accountability*. Richmond, VA: Commonwealth Educational Policy Institute.
- Usdan, M. and Cuban, L. (2002). *Powerful Reforms with Shallow Roots: Improving American's Urban Schools*. Columbia University, New York. Teacher's College.
- Valentine, J. (2001). *Goals 2000 Principal Leadership Development Project: Final Report*. Columbia, MO.
- Young, Michelle, ed. (2002). *Ensuring the University's Capacity to Prepare Learning-Focused Leadership*. A draft report of the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation (Wingspread Report). Columbia, MO: NCAELP.
- Young, M. D., Petersen, G. J., & Short, P. M. (2002). The complexity of substantive reform: A Call for Interdependence among Key Stakeholders. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38, pp. 137-175.

CHAPTER 5

INCREASING THE DIVERSITY OF EDUCATION LEADERS IN ILLINOIS

Strong education leadership is essential to improving student learning in Illinois public schools and supporting quality in teaching. It is essential that education leaders promote the success of all Illinois students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context in which our students learn and live. Diversity is a hallmark of the state of Illinois—from its peoples' languages and ethnicity to as its economy and geography.

As one of its “Principles of Action,” the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership (ICEL) adopted the principle that “the talent supply of potential qualified education leaders must be increased and diversified.” (See Chapter 1, Purpose, Vision, and Sponsorship of the State Action for Education Leadership Project (SAELP). The ICEL analyzed demographic information about superintendents and principals based on Supply and Demand reports released by the Illinois State Board of Education. Consequently, the ICEL identified increasing diversity in the supply of school leaders as a high priority for action.

The major policy questions addressed by the ICEL were: To what extent does the diversity of the pipeline of potential and actual school leaders reflect the diversity of Illinois public schools? What needs to be done? School leaders in this context were defined as primarily school superintendents and school principals in Illinois public schools. The primary source of talent for education leaders is the teacher work force. The expected or desired percentage for this analysis of diversity of school leaders is the percent of minority teachers to students in Illinois public schools and the gender ratio of Illinois teachers and administrators.

Demographic Conclusion

After all the analyses, the bottom line is: The diversity of school leaders in Illinois does not reflect either the diversity of public school students or teachers.

Relative to gender diversity, while 76% of Illinois public school teachers are female, only 48% of public school principals and 14% of public school superintendents in the state are female (ISBE, 2001). Women who are successful in their application and hired as school leaders, frequently with more preparation in instruction and curriculum, are paid less than men, particularly in downstate school districts (Strand & Ashby, 2001).

Minority student population in Illinois public schools is 40%, but only 19% of principals and 4% of superintendents in Illinois public schools are racial/ethnic minorities (ISBE, 2001). The need for minority education leaders is greatest in urban cities having minority populations higher than the state average. Across the nation, 67% of urban elementary superintendents see increasing the diversity of school leadership as an area of ever increasing concern (ERS, 1998).

Suburban elementary superintendents are also increasingly concerned about minority representation in school leadership as these districts become more racially diverse (ERS, 1998).

School boards in rural districts or suburban cities that are not racially diverse may believe that they do not have an immediate need for diversity in school leaders, unless they are an area with large migrant or immigrant populations and students whose primary language is not English. However, Illinois school children become mobile as teens and adults and the larger world they live in requires an understanding and appreciation for cultural and ethnic differences beyond their own. White school children can and do benefit from being taught by others racially different from them. Diversity in teaching and education leadership is important for all Illinois schools to transcend homogeneity of experience and bring about appreciation for and value of cultural differences.

Some may argue that the issue of diversity is beyond the boundaries of Illinois. This is true, in some regard. The problem of school leader diversity in Illinois is closely reflected by similar percentages across the nation. Nevertheless, the lack of educational leader diversity magnifies the need for diverse student role models and instructional leaders that both reflect and possess an intimate understanding of gender and racial issues. If diversity does not increase among Illinois school leaders, and once again, the will to enhance the talent pool for the state is not realized, Illinois will miss a valuable and substantive opportunity to engage minority students in the educational process and to inspire such students to reach their full potential.

According to DeAngelis (2003), minority educators were less likely to be “tapped” –that is, sought out or encouraged by those in positions of authority, for positions of principal than were white educators. Since minority educators must first emerge from the ranks of students, investing in actions to increase the minority supply of teachers will pay social dividends beyond the initial cost. Many communities are likely to support investing in “grow- your- own- programs- for – minority educators,” which tap minority students already in their communities to enter teaching and return to their communities as professional educators. This strategy will be more effective than attempting to recruit minorities from other regions of the state or nation, a practice tantamount to piracy that does not expand the talent pool of minority educators.

While federal and state Equal Opportunity laws provide safeguards or appeals regarding overt discriminatory employment practices, supporting measures must also be put in place to compensate for social inequities of opportunity. In the area of educational leadership, this means active recruitment and mentoring of minority individuals who might not fit the traditional view of a school leader as viewed by the majority population or who may be reluctant to enter an arena where they are visibly a minority. This situation includes women who, as the *Title IX at 30: Report Card on Gender Equity* explains, are still suffering from a discriminatory learning environment that limits aspirations and their career advancement.

As the diversity of Illinois increases, particularly outside of the Chicago metropolitan area, this issue becomes paramount as schools struggle to implement the expectations of No Child Left Behind as defined by federal statutes and regulations. Too, we have a state commitment to ensuring that all Illinois' school children become productive and contributing citizens as they graduate from our high schools. An important strategy in these efforts is to assure that both minority children and majority children see teachers and education leaders who look like them and appreciate and understand their cultural origins.

Why Diversity of Leadership is Important

Research into how women and minority administrators do succeed in educational leadership and the barriers faced on the road to success has increased in the last decade. Female administrators have noted a lack of preparation in the areas of budgeting, personnel administration (such as hiring and professional development), legal, and student discipline issues. Female principals and superintendents felt that they received more scrutiny on these areas of their job performance (Gardiner et al., 2000). They said, "women leaders are often more highly criticized than their male peers, and leaders of color are also under more scrutiny with less support than whites. Women leaders...say they sometimes feel as if people are watching them with a 'wait-and-see if they can prove themselves' attitude" (Gardiner et al., 2000).

Additionally, the present structures within schools, districts, and many professional associations "reinforce the traditional, competitive, manipulative approaches to leaders" which may run counter to the more collaborative, facilitative, and cooperative leadership styles of many women (Grogan 1996). Research has shown women to prefer "servant leadership" (meaning, "I work for you.") to more rigid and authoritarian and confrontational styles (meaning, "You work for me.").

Literature also suggests that servant leadership is more conducive to the formation of professional learning communities that focus and accelerate student learning (Fullan, 2001a,; Fullan, 2001b, O'Toole 1995, Senge 2000).

The Need for Mentors

The tapping and mentoring process of women and minority education leaders is perhaps the most significant deficit in what has often been called the "good old boys network" of white male promotion. Edson (1995) found that 42% of women aspiring to be school administrators who had mentors achieved their goal within 10 years, whereas only 17% of women who lacked mentors became administrators in that time period. Having a mentor matters.

A study in Illinois involving a random sample of 300 individuals who earned their administrative certificates in 1999-2000 (necessary for school principal positions in Illinois) showed that 19% of white certificants seeking administrative positions obtained a position without applying while no African American certificants were hired without first going through the

application process (De Angeles, 2003). The present system for selection and encouragement of minorities to aspire to administrative positions is weak. It can be strengthened through focused tapping and mentoring. While the role of mentor can span being an advisor, teacher guide, parent, spiritual advisor, gatekeeper, public role model, friend or peer, the hallmarks of quality mentoring include the following: (1) open communication and personal connection, (2) reflection on leadership thought and action, (3) acting as a sounding board, (4) encouragement of risk taking, (5) buffering from criticism and (6) providing advocacy (Gardiner et al.,2000).

Research suggests that protégés need support throughout the initiation, establishment, and maintenance of their administrative careers. As Gardiner, et al.(2000) explain, “There are tremendous tensions and conflicts being a minority in a white majority organization as well as being a female in a male-dominated network. To combat these challenges,...findings suggest that prospective mentors and women of color who seek to be educational leaders attend to the following: (a) gaining political savvy, (b) accessing networks, (c) finding mentors who are different from their proteges, (d) having more than one mentor, (e) and securing alternative support systems” (p. 180-1).

Taking Action Now

Over time, when women or minorities have made progress, “the conditions that made that progress possible have all too frequently been transitory” (Astin and Leland, 1991). Although the diversity of school leaders has increased in the past decade, paths for women and minorities into educational administration should be formalized to ensure their continuance. For at least the past 40 years, other state task forces and state education agencies have also examined the diversity statistics and submitted reports and recommendations for action. While there has been progress, our performance as a state is still lacking. The issue must remain on the public agenda in Illinois until the presence of the subpopulation is proportional to that of the general population of our great state.

Some of the recommendations made by the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership would cost money. Others do not. Some merely require a will and a commitment to diversifying education leadership in Illinois and doing the work necessary to ensure a greater probability of success. A long-term approach is needed relative to meeting the social and cultural needs of our school children. The ICEL believes the time to start this long-term investment and approach is now.

Policy Recommendations

- 1) Since education leadership emerges from the teaching force, the Illinois Board of Higher Education should assess the number of universities in Illinois that operate “grow your own programs” that are designed to enhance the supply of ethnic/racial minorities as teachers for Illinois schools, including recruiting more males for elementary schools, and

evaluate the extent to which the current state disparity is likely to be affected by such programs. The IBHE should then determine whether these programs should be supported by state resources and strengthened in other ways.

- 2) The Illinois Board of Higher Education, in cooperation with the Illinois Scholarship Commission, should establish tuition-based scholarships to support women and minority educators as they enter and complete graduate programs in education leadership. As a condition of accepting such support, candidates must agree to seek and accept positions of education leadership within Illinois for a reasonable number of years.
- 3) The Illinois Board of Higher Education and the State Board of Education should cooperatively release and bid a competitive RFP to the state universities to support expanding the principal preparation program for at least 50 racial/ethnic minority individuals to attend full-time study, including stipends, tuition, fees, and internship stipends for those individuals.
- 4) As part of the state process for approving graduate principal programs, the Illinois State Board of Education should require universities to show good faith efforts that the leadership faculty and administrators are working with Illinois school districts to recruit, tap, and prepare women and minorities for leadership in Illinois schools.
- 5) As part of the state process for approving graduate programs for the superintendent's certificate, the Illinois State Board of Education should require universities to demonstrate that the knowledge and/or skills attained at the completion of the program include tapping and mentoring, including that for women and minorities, as a part of their expectation for leadership.
- 6) The Illinois State Board of Education should continue to annually assess the racial compositions of the state's teachers, leaders, and paraprofessionals in public schools and make annual recommendations, in cooperation with the Joint Education Committee, Illinois Community College Board, and the Illinois Board of Higher Education, about how diversity of the education workforce should be enhanced.
- 7) The State Board of Education, in cooperation with the Illinois Principals Association and others, should collectively plan and provide annual professional development opportunities and within-district opportunities relative to mentoring, recruiting, and tapping of women and minorities in education leadership until the point that diversity representation in education leadership is proportional to the presence of females and minorities in Illinois public schools.

References

- Astin, H. S., & Leland, C. (1991). *Women of influence, women of vision: A cross-generational study of leaders and social change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- DeAngelis, K., Peddle, M., Trott, C. and Bergeron, L. (2002). *Teacher Supply in Illinois: Evidence from the Illinois Teacher Study*. Edwardsville, IL: Illinois Education Research Council.
- DeAngelis, K.J. (2003) *In the pipeline: the early career paths of administrative certificate holders in Illinois*. Edwardsville, Illinois: Illinois Education Research Council.
- Edson, S. (1995.) "Ten years later: Too little, too late?" In *Women leading in education*, D. M. Dunlap & P. A. Schmuck, eds. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

- Educational Research Service (ERS). (1998). Is there a shortage of qualified candidates for opening in the principalship? An exploratory study. Reston, VA: National Association of Elementary Principals.
- Fullan, M. (2001a). *The new meaning of educational change*, 3rd ed. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M. (2001b). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Gardiner, M. E.; Enomoto, E.; & Grogan, M. (2000). *Mentoring women into school leadership: Coloring outside the lines*. NY: State University of New York Press.
- Grogan, M. (1996). *Voices of women aspiring to the superintendency*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Hale, E. and Norman, H. (2003). *Preparing School Principals: A National Perspective on Policy and Program Innovations*. Edwardsville, IL: Illinois Education Research Council.
- Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE). (2001). *2001 Technical Report: Educator supply and demand in Illinois*. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.
- Miller, L. S. (1995). *An American imperative: Accelerating minority educational advancement*. Binghamton, NY: Vali-Ballou Press.
- National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education. (2002). *Title IX at 30: Report card on gender equity*. Washington, D.C.: National Women's Law Center.
- O'Toole, J. (1995). *Leading change: Overcoming the ideology of comfort and the tyranny of custom*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Reynolds, C. (2002). *Women and school leadership*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Senge, P. (2000). *Schools that learn: A Fifth Discipline fieldbook for educators, parents, and everyone who cares about education*. New York: Currency Doubleday.
- Strand, K., & Ashby, D. (2001). *2001-2002 IPS salary and fringe benefit study*. Illinois. Principals Association Building Leadership: A Practitioners' Bulletin, 9(4). Springfield, IL.

CHAPTER 6

ESTABLISHING PATHWAYS FOR TEACHERS TO PROVIDE LEADERSHIP FOR LEARNING

Education leadership begins with and is dependent upon teachers in schools, parents in homes, and businesses and other entities in the community. While the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership primarily examined state policies relative to the principal and superintendent, recognition was also given to the essential role of teachers. Teachers form the talent pool from which principals and superintendents emerge.

Indeed, the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership believed that teachers must be included in the study of state policy about education leadership. The ICEL passed, as one of its “Principles for Action,” that “Education leadership includes but is broader than school administrative leadership; education leadership includes teacher leaders, staff leadership, and board and community leaders.” All have a crucial role relative to closing the achievement gap between groups of Illinois students.

Illinois has already committed itself to a program of support for teachers who wish to attain the third level of teacher certification: National Board Certification or Master Teacher certification. These are teachers who have demonstrated excellence in instruction according to extraordinarily high standards. They are a source of potential talent for leading other teachers toward greater excellence and improved student achievement in Illinois.

The policy questions that the ICEL addressed relative to Teachers as Leaders was: Should a state endorsement be developed for National Board Certified teachers so that they would be certified to serve as principals, assistant principals, or co-principals in Illinois public schools? What other roles can teachers play as leaders for learning?

The title of “principal” meaning the head of a school came from the term “principal teacher” as the primary instructional leader (Education Writers’ Association, 2002). Over the years, the title of principal has come to mean the one who manages the school. Clearly, academic programs that prepare principals emphasize the management responsibility of the principal. Parents, boards, and the public expect principals to manage their schools well. Critics argue that preparation programs over-emphasize the management and institutional role of schools at the expense of knowledge and skills about the instructional and learning culture needed in school leaders today (Bottoms, et al, SREB, 2003) and that insufficient attention is being given relative to the role of principal as the instructional leader once they are on the job (Chapter 4).

Because of the difference between managing schools and teaching children, “teachers with leadership potential are less willing to leave the classroom and move into administrative roles” (EWA, 2001). National reports summarized by Mitgang (2003) state that there are sufficient numbers of persons credentialed to become school principals, and the ICEL believes

this conclusion to be accurate for Illinois. The major issue is the relative ability of those individuals to influence positive change in the teaching-learning culture in the schools. Thus, the supply issue is one of quality, not quantity, throughout the nation.

As states and the nation have assumed greater responsibility for designating and monitoring the expectations for learning in American public schools, greater attention has been given to the roles, responsibilities, and authority of school principals. The new emphasis on all children learning—i.e. No Child Left Behind federal legislation as well as state accountability laws—suggests that states should consider other strategies for identifying instructional leaders as principals for schools (Bottoms et al, SREB, 2003).

One such strategy is to “move accomplished teachers into school leadership positions” (SREB, Strategy 5). Accomplished teachers are defined as those teachers with masters’ degrees who:

- Understand which school and classroom practices improve student achievement
- Know how to work with other teachers to bring about positive change—they can lead school change
- Support other teachers in carrying out instructional practices that help all students succeed
- Have proven records of raising student achievement and closing achievement gaps.

Accomplished teachers in this context are those who can focus on what Gene Bottoms (2003) at the Southern Regional Education Board calls the *core* functions of schools: curriculum, instruction, and student achievement. Schools today, in Illinois and elsewhere, require leaders who have the knowledge, skills, temperament and commitment to lead others to assure that students will succeed in their schools.

Teacher Leaders

There are, of course, practicing principals employed in Illinois schools today who indeed serve the role of the “primary teacher” and are focusing on the core functions of their schools. These principals were effective teachers and use their experience and theoretical and practical knowledge to strengthen the school’s culture for learning as well as improve the capacity for student learning. The sheer numbers and diversity of Illinois schools, however, imply that state action also must be taken to diversify the pools from which principals are recruited and to diversify the manner in which principal candidates are prepared to formally assume instructional leadership. A viable pool for new principals is National-Board Certified Teachers (NBCT).

Teacher leaders are those educators who have been designated by a professional review process as demonstrating significant leadership ability to bring about positive change. The

professional behavior of NBCTs demonstrates a passion for high quality teaching for themselves and other teachers and a commitment to assuring high standards of learning in their students.

To date, Illinois has 569 teachers who are NBCTs, with 700 additional candidates for future national-board certification. Lynn Gaddis (2003) estimates that there is a strong likelihood of Illinois having 1,000 national board certified teachers in the very near future. Gaddis also estimates that a high proportion of NBCTs in Illinois already hold a master's degree. NBCTs are considered "master teachers" by the *Illinois School Code* and hold certification for ten years (if they remain active in teaching.) National-board certified teachers have demonstrated to their teacher peers and the public their instructional expertise by passing rigorous board written and performance examinations in their content field. They have respect from their peers.

NBCTs who transfer into Illinois are exempt from taking the Illinois basic skills and knowledge tests. National-board certification represents the third tier of professional certification possible for Illinois teachers: Initial, Standard, and Master. Past studies on how to grant greater professionalism to teachers have argued for expanding the career ladders for teachers, and national-board certification is considered a mechanism for achieving greater professionalism in education.

Teachers holding both master's degrees *and* certification as a NBC teacher *and* having demonstrated significant leadership ability to bring about positive change could be granted an endorsement of Teacher Leader on their current certificate or that of 73, or 75 Certificate. With further training this endorsement would permit them to serve in positions of assistant principal, principal, or co-principal (where size of the school might support two individuals, one focusing on student learning and the other on management) in an Illinois public school. The endorsement of Teacher Leader should permit teachers to have the right and authority to supervise and evaluate certified professional staff from the perspective of student learning and the state's and local districts expectations for all children to learn. Such teacher leaders can bring the power and know-how to create schools from within as places where student learning is primary.

Principals must work collaboratively with other principals and district officials as well as students, teachers, and parents in order to provide leadership. For this reason, teacher leaders who seek the endorsement should be required to pass the state test for principals as a condition of receiving the endorsement.

Teacher Leader endorsements to certificates hold considerable value to Illinois education. They provide an additional career step in professionalizing education. They recognize formally the instructional primacy of schools, and they provide additional pathways to the position of principal in Illinois public schools.

In debating the issue of Teacher Leader endorsements, the ICEL supported a recommendation for a new endorsement on the administrative certificate or teacher's current certificate, offering another step in the professional career ladder for teachers. Some ICEL

members expressed concern that this action would “take excellent teachers out of the classroom.” While this action would indeed move excellent teachers into principal positions, should they want them, this action would also assure that more principals in Illinois have what it takes to become genuine instructional leaders. It is a risk worth taking.

Last, through advice from State Board of Education staff, it was determined that the Board, in consultation with the State Teacher Certification Board, has the power and authority to create standards leading to an endorsement of a certificate for Teacher Leaders to assume the position of principal in Illinois public schools. This topic has been brought to the attention of the State Board of Education’s Policy and Planning Committee.

Teacher Coaches

Other ICEL members added that one other professional career step should be taken at the state level, that is, of legitimizing the role of “teacher coaches” by offering an endorsement as “teacher coaches”, establishing preparation programs for them, or redesigning graduate programs in supervision to prepare teacher coaches. This step would permit teacher coaches to work with other teachers in efforts to improve instruction but would not permit them to evaluate teachers formally as prescribed by state statute. Formalizing the roles of teacher coaches was viewed positively. Teacher coaches are those outstanding teachers who can analyze and articulate alternative strategies to their fellow teachers in ways that are likely to enhance student learning. Teacher coaches do not assume the role of principal. They do not evaluate teachers, in the legal sense as prescribed by the School Code. They do serve as another source of teacher leaders, however, and they provide an additional career path for teachers.

To date the formal role of teacher coaches has not been formally recognized as a critical source for improving student learning. The Springfield School District, #186, has incorporated teacher coaches as a mechanism for improving student learning. Much can be learned by this LEAD district. The Illinois Consortium recommends that further study be given to this potential policy relative to its applicability across the state.

School Code Reference on National Board Certification of Teachers:

Article 21, *School Code of Illinois* (2002), “Certification of Teachers,” (p. 381), Sec. 21-0.01 (4) specifically gives the power and authority to the “State Board of Education, in consultation with the State Teacher Certification Board,” to “establish standards for the issuance of new types of certificates.”

Article 21-2(d) on Grades of certification (p. 384) dictates the Master Certificate for those individuals who have successfully achieved the National Board certification through the National

Board for Professional Teaching Standards. The only requirement for certification that must be fulfilled is the criminal background check (to date) though fingerprinting is being considered.

Article 5/21-1c of the School Code states that "Only the State Board of Education and State Teacher Certification Board, acting in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Act and the rules, regulations and standards promulgated thereunder, shall have the authority to issue or endorse any certificate required for teaching, supervising or holding certificated employment in the public schools."

Policy Recommendations:

- 1) The State Board of Education should develop and grant an administrative endorsement so that National-Board Certified Teachers **who have completed a specially-designed principal preparation program and passed the state certification test for the principal** are permitted to serve as principal, assistant principal, or co-principal.
- 2) The State Board of Education should convene a panel consisting of National-Board Certified Teachers, teacher education/administrator preparation faculty, practicing principals, and others to do the following:
 - a) Consider and recommend the standards for an endorsement of Teacher Leader Endorsement to Type 73, 75, or current certificate that would permit National-Board Certified Teachers to serve as assistant principals, principals, or co-principals and supervise and evaluate other certificated educators;
 - b) Consider and recommend the criteria by which National-Board Certified Teachers demonstrate or have demonstrated their capacity to lead other teachers in positive school change that should be used in selecting such teachers for the Teacher Leader Endorsement program;
 - c) Consider and recommend to the deans/department chairs of state-approved principal preparation programs (or other post-masters' degree programs for teachers) the criteria for recruiting, assessing and preparing an individualized graduate-level program that leads to the granting of the Teacher Leader endorsement. The programs should be performance-based, individualized, and based on skills and knowledge associated with instructional leadership and permit candidates to pass the state test for principals. The programs should not represent only the traditionally-approved curriculum. The programs should include individually-designed performance assessments and school-based internships; and
 - d) Consider and recommend standards for approving such endorsement programs within the state's universities, consulting with the State Teachers Certification Board as required.
- 3) In order to provide teachers with additional career ladders as teacher coaches as well as to recognize teacher coaches as professional educators, and assist other teachers in improving instruction to enhance student learning, the State Board of Education should convene a panel of teachers, teacher educators, practicing principals, and others to do the following:

- a) Consider and recommend the standards for the endorsement of a current certificate that would permit Teacher Coaches to be professionally recognized in Illinois public schools in order to assist other teachers in improving instruction to enhance student learning; and
- b) Consider and recommend to the deans/department chairs of state-approved teacher education programs the criteria and standards for a state-approved endorsement program for Teacher Coaches within the state's universities, consulting with the State Teacher Certification Board as required.

References

Bottoms, G., O'Neill, K., Fry, B., & Hill, D. (2003) *Good principals are the key to successful schools: six strategies to prepare more good principals*. Atlanta: GA, Southern Regional Education Board.

Education Writers Association (2002), Searching for a superhero: Can principals do it all? Special Report, Washington, D.C.

Gaddis, L. (2003). Personal interview and e-mail.

Mitgang, L. (2003). *Beyond the pipeline: getting the principals we need, where they are needed most*. New York: The Wallace Foundation.

School Code of Illinois (2002). Chapter 21. Springfield, IL: Illinois Association of School Boards.

CHAPTER 7

CREATING SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS TO ENHANCE SCHOOL LEARNING

The Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership supports the value of partnerships in enhancing school learning. It adopted as one of its action principles, “Partnerships are important to education leaders as they involve collaboration, teamwork, and design; these partnerships include those across school districts; school-community and school-business relationships, and partnerships between schools and universities.” Universities offer important resources that schools can use on behalf of student learning. Schools offer university faculty sites, activities, and opportunities for engaging in what is known as “school service.”

An important part of the education and preparation of education leaders is served by university faculty who teach the courses, provide the academic and career advising, and assist in the professional development of principals and superintendents as education leaders in training. Increasingly, there have been calls for university faculty to become more involved in schools. Under the label of “school service,” this public school involvement by university, however, may not now be a fundamental part of what is known as the “rewards system” for those faculty who teach in universities and should be changed.

There were two policy questions posed to the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership: Should university faculty be rewarded for school-based service? If so, by what means might university faculty be rewarded for school-based service?

Faculty who are hired to teach at the university level are subject to personnel systems that are grounded in a series of criteria that are utilized when decisions are made about faculty hiring, salary-determination, advancement (primarily promotion and tenure), and termination. These criteria traditionally fall into three categories: teaching, research, and service (Diamond, 1999).

In academic fields where clinical service is either expected or required, however, there is considerable evidence that faculty are subject to role conflict because of the time demands inherent in conducting clinical work which come into conflict with the time demands required to become active in either research or scholarly production (Hearn and Anderson, 2001; Oakes and Rogers, 2001). This conflict is particularly true for education faculty even though there is a consistent message from national groups about the value of professors becoming active in the schools, both from the perspectives of the faculty member and the school.

School involvement may take a number of forms, including providing consulting services to schools, conducting field research, and providing professional development. These are efforts to improve educational practice or assisting schools in solving ongoing, practical problems dealing with such matters as student learning, student achievement, and relations with parents

and the community. Benefits accrue to the faculty member as well, but as the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation has noted, these benefits need to be recognized by aligning tenure and promotion criteria with the work of colleges of education as professional schools (National Commission, 2003).

The literature on school reform makes clear the imperative for schools and universities to engage in collaboration, for universities to reach out and increase their involvement with schools, and for university faculty to increase their school service activities (O'Meara, 2002). For university faculty, therefore, there is a clear mandate from external organizations for increased school service. Universities, however, may not have defined what "school service" means to faculty as an expectation for them in the rewards system.

University rewards systems generally are established by the university itself and not in response to external mandates. Yet, there are a number of practical steps that universities might consider as they study ways to incorporate faculty involvement in schools as expected work in the process of making personal decisions.

First, the problem of getting university faculty more involved in schools needs to be recognized. Problem recognition by universities is the initial step toward formulation of alternatives for faculty to increase their school involvement and school-based productivity.

Second, ways to recognize university faculty involvement in schools need to be identified and incorporated into policy statements about rewards systems. One avenue for increased involvement in schools by university faculty would be to include as criteria the expectation for faculty to engage regularly in schools. In some universities, activities and products associated with external service may be required. Some universities expect school service of clinical faculty but not tenure-line faculty. The problem with this approach is that it "excuses" some faculty from the expectation for school service but grants them the opportunity for tenure. For clinical faculty, there is usually an expectation for school service but they are denied opportunities for tenure. Such differentiations create potential caste systems.

Third, the means must be created for turning increased faculty involvement in "service" into products that are legitimate and valued in each university community and still useful by schools. These products might include on-site professional development, creating new curricula, application of education research to practice, analysis of school achievement recommendations for improvement, and assisting in the development of board, district, or school policies.

Policy Recommendations

- 1) The Illinois Board of Higher Education, in cooperation with the Illinois Council of Professors of Educational Administration, should communicate to Illinois university presidents, deans, and education leadership chairs about the value of school service for university faculty, and in particular, that:
 - a) School service provides one acceptable basis for faculty rewards;

- b) School service offers another means by which the missions of universities are achieved;
 - c) For educators, schools are the venues by which research is translated into practice and the laboratories for generating important research, and
 - d) School service provides opportunities for important collaboration between universities and Illinois public schools.
- 2) As part of the “Results Reports” submitted annually by public universities to the Illinois Board of Higher Education, each university should be required to indicate how it is addressing the value of school service as part of its promotion and tenure policies for faculty. The Illinois Board of Higher Education should then publicize those activities that represent “best practice” in rewarding service for work in the public schools.

References

- Diamond, R.M. (1999). *Aligning faculty rewards with institutional mission*. Bolton: Anker.
- Fairweather, J.S. (1996). *Faculty work & public trust*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hearn, J.C. & Anderson, M.S. (2001). “Clinical faculty in schools of education,” in *Faculty work in schools of education*, W.G. Tierney, Ed. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation. (2003). “Conference Report.” Columbia, MO: UCEA.
- Oakes, J. & Roger, J. (2001). “The public responsibility of public schools of education,” in *Faculty work in schools of education*, W. G. Tierney, Ed. Albany, NY; SUNY Press.
- O’Meara, K.A. (2002). *Scholarship unbound*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

CHAPTER 8

CHANGING OTHER SYSTEMS TO SUPPORT LEADERSHIP FOR LEARNING

The Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership recognized that there were other policy issues beyond those addressed in the previous chapters of this report that can affect leadership for learning. Specifically, these issues included the governance of local school districts by school boards, election laws that prescribe the calendar for local school boards elections, other work conditions affecting the role of the principal as instructional leader, pension laws that affect Illinois educators being employed post-retirement (which in turn affect supply) and pension portability that also affects supply of educators for Illinois. Not all these topics could be examined as fully as they might merit within the confines of the time and the need to focus on priorities. (One policy issue about post-retirement employment for teachers and administrators was addressed by the Illinois General Assembly during the course of this study.)

School Board's Role in Leadership for Learning

The role of local school boards in leadership for learning—and the concomitant recommendations relative to policy on this topic—were given a great deal of attention by the Illinois Consortium. Local boards of education are the guiding and governing force for a school district. They are charged with decisions that impact what students learn, how students are taught, how learning is measured, how teachers are supported with professional development, how funds are focused on district priorities, and how effectively the community is engaged around student learning. While, by their nature school boards are removed from the day-to-day work of teaching and learning, they exercise decision-making control over many of the conditions that can allow successful teaching and learning to occur throughout the system.

Recent research (The Lighthouse Project, Iowa Association of School Boards, 1999) shows a high correlation between the effectiveness of boards of education and student performance. Student achievement was consistently higher in districts where the boards of education support staff development and school sites through the effective use of data and information, provide a supportive workplace with an emphasis on continuous improvement and proactively involve the community with the public schools.

In June and August 2003, the ICEL heard presentations from Dr. Margaret Noe, University of Illinois-Springfield, Dr. Michael Johnson, Executive Director of the Illinois Association of School Boards, and Dr. Randy Dunn, Chair, Department of Education Administration and Higher Education, Southern Illinois University-Carbondale. The presentations and lively debate that ensued underscored the importance of local school boards and the roles and responsibilities that boards take relative to providing community oversight of schooling for Illinois public school children. Presenters made it clear that the board members do not have to have and should not

be expected to exercise expertise in pedagogy as part of their board responsibilities. Such expertise is the domain of credentialed educators. Nevertheless, the board has an important leadership function relative to the achievement of Illinois school children in public schools.

Election Dates

Voters in each school district in Illinois, except Chicago #299, elect school board members to terms of office. Members serve without remuneration and often represent key community groups, either demographically or professionally. In Illinois, the number of members who may serve on an elected local board of education is seven. School board elections are held in an “odd year,” that is, the year after the federal congressional elections, a change from when elections were conducted during the general elections when federal congressional and other offices are decided.

The Illinois general election, held November 5, 2002, brought out 51.85% of the qualified voters in Illinois (Felts, 2003). During the following state primary election held on April 1, 2003, 32.84% of the electorate voted (Felts, 2003). While the State Board of Elections does not record percent of voters who voted in a school board election since the elections are local, the percent of voter turnout for school board elections and accompanying referenda is considered to be significantly less than that of the general election or primary. School board elections are held only in odd years on the first Tuesday of April (except if that date falls on the celebration of Passover, then the school board election is scheduled for the first Tuesday following the last day of Passover.) The value of combining the school board election date with that of the general election—and obtaining a large turnout vote for school board matters—is too important to keep the status quo in Illinois.

It was agreed by the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership that the date for the election for school board members should be changed back from April to the November election calendar. This reversal in dates is likely to lead to more citizens participating in school board elections. And, because school districts have had to pay for election costs during odd years, and school districts are short for cash, changing the date back to November would better ensure a greater economy of costs as well as participation.

Staggered Terms for School Board Members

Conflicts between local boards and superintendents often exist and may lead to higher turnover rates for superintendents. Since terms of office for boards are not systematically staggered—several Illinois school districts in the March 2003 board election had at least six board seats up for election—a superintendent may be hired by one board and released by the incoming board.

The problem of lack of staggered terms for school board members in Illinois is correctable. The Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership believes that the current four year term should be changed to a three year term and that the terms should be staggered so that the community elects two members one year, two members the second year, and three members the third year. This change should result in smoother transitions for school board members, and increase the number of people who would be willing to serve as school board members (by reducing the term by one year.)

Information on School Tax and Bond Referenda

In Illinois, local tax and bond referenda associated with the public schools are considered local matters, and information pertinent to these issues are not collected by the Illinois Board of Elections. The Illinois Association of School Boards and the Illinois Association of School Administrators try to obtain statewide results annually in order to assess trends, wins, and losses to issues of strong importance to the overall funding of Illinois public schools. These data, however, accurately assessed by professional associations on an annual basis, should be matters of state interest and archived for greater demographic and longitudinal analyses. The condition of Illinois education includes its fiscal health and the extent to which citizens—particularly in this time where there are fewer households with school age children—are supporting or not supporting local fiscal needs related to public schools.

The State Board of Education is required to annually report to the Governor and General Assembly on the condition of Illinois education. The Consortium supports the inclusion of such annual fiscal data within the report given to the Governor and General Assembly (School Code 5/2-3/11). Superintendent Schiller, on review of a draft recommendation to this effect agreed that the Board staff could and should report such data.

Pension Portability

Illinois public schools can and do attract educators from out-of-state, particularly from the border states surrounding Illinois for teachers. School boards can and do recruit nationally for school superintendents and principals. Married educators may also move to or from Illinois when their spouses relocate. There is a real advantage for school boards and districts to be able to recruit the very best educators for their schools, regardless of their state of origin.

Illinois pension laws differ for educators from the public school sector and educators from the public university sector. Public school teachers or administrators do not have choices of which pension system to join; university faculty and administrators do—the state’s system or a TIAA-CREF. Moreover, the state’s system may actually function to create barriers for a larger supply of quality educators from whom to choose.

The National Governors' Association (1988) observed that "pension portability is a mechanism that enables districts to compete with one another for the best [education leaders] by removing a barrier to the [individual's] ability to move". In its study, the NGA said that "education is one of the few careers in which people are penalized for moving from one place to another" and that "educators are more mobile than other public employees such as firemen and policemen." The ICEL believes that the General Assembly should revise the pension laws to permit out of state educators to transfer previous pension plans to either IRA or TIAA-CREF systems. And, the General Assembly should permit choice of pension plans to all Illinois educators.

Policy Recommendations

- 1) Illinois' public boards of education are required by law to provide leadership and governance for their public schools. The Illinois School Code states that boards have the responsibility "to adopt and enforce all necessary rules for the management and government of the public schools of their district." (105 ILCS 5/10-20.5) The Illinois Association of School Boards should encourage and train local boards of education to most effectively exercise this charge and provide leadership for learning by:
 - a) Clearly articulating the school district's ends—that is the underlying values and beliefs that support the educational process; the mission or overarching purpose of the district; a statement of vision, or direction for the district; and high level, long and short-term systemic goals for achieving the vision;
 - b) Connecting regularly and intentionally with the community to determine the community's educational aspirations for its school(s) and to report progress toward the district's goals and compliance with board policies including its fiduciary responsibility toward efficient use and distribution of public monies in pursuit of district goals;
 - c) Employing a qualified superintendent and delegating authority to the superintendent for developing and implementing action plans to achieve the district's goals and comply with district policies; then holding the superintendent accountable for the district's performance;
 - d) Regularly and purposefully monitoring district performance—progress toward goals and compliance with board policy; and
 - e) Taking full responsibility—collectively and individually—for the work the board chooses to do and how it chooses to do the work by focusing deliberations and decision-making on prioritized district goals and conducting its business in a prudent, ethical and civil manner.
- 2) Illinois public school board members voluntarily attend, in large numbers, formal training programs and workshops relative to their leadership for learning and governance roles at their district's expense, yet are often criticized for using district funds for this purpose. District superintendents, staff, and community should encourage board members to continue their board service-related education and recognize their commitment to their own and board professional development.

- 3) In order to recognize the importance of the principal as the instructional leader in schools, the Illinois State Board of Education, in collaboration with the Illinois Principals Association, Illinois Association of School Administrators, and the Illinois Association of School Boards, should disseminate information to local school boards in Illinois to underscore and highlight the following:
 - a) Changing roles and expectations of school principals to give primary attention to the analysis and improvement of student learning;
 - b) Identifying resources to support the roles of principals; and
 - c) Providing additional recognition and appreciation to their school principals relative to their essential contribution to children and society in light of the intense work load during the school year.

- 4) In order to increase the number of individuals willing to serve on the local school board and increase the public's attention and responsiveness to local school board elections, the General Assembly should change the statute regarding a four-year election term for school board members to a three-year term, and the terms should be staggered so that the community elects two members one year, two members in the second year, and three members in the third year. The date for the election for school board members should be changed from April to the November election calendar to move the costs of board elections to state expenditures and increase the probability of greater voter participation in school board elections.

- 5) In order to increase the supply of talented educators for Illinois schools and remove the barriers posed by the Illinois pension system for educators to consider employment in Illinois public schools, the General Assembly should revise the educator pension laws to permit out-of-state educators to transfer previous pension plans to either IRAs or TIAA-CREF systems. Further, the General Assembly should revise pension laws to permit new Illinois educators to have a choice of pension plans, IRAs, TIAA-CREF, or the Illinois Teachers Retirement System.

References

- Carver, J. (1991). *Boards that make difference*. Jossey-Bass.
- Felts, Diane (2003, June). Telephone Interview. Springfield, Illinois: State Board of Elections.
- Illinois Association of School Boards (2001). *The Foundational Principles of Effective Governance*. Springfield: IL.
- Iowa Association of School Boards (1999). *The Lighthouse Project*. Des Moines, IA.
- National Governors' Association. (1988). *Pension Portability for Educators: A Plan for the Future*. Washington, D. C.
- Vail, K. (2001). Team Work at the Top. *American School Board Journal* Vol. 188, p. 23-25.

CHAPTER 9

METHODS AND PROCEDURES FOR CONDUCTING THE POLICY STUDY

The purpose of this Project was to examine Illinois policies regarding education leadership and to strengthen those policies that affect student learning, either in practice or through governance. One of the first steps taken by staff was to establish, in cooperation with the Office of the Governor, an advisory council that would be representative of the various stakeholders in education leadership policy. The advisory council, the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership, was formed and met on a nearly monthly basis in order to critique, debate, and provide advice regarding the issues and potential policy recommendations. (Copies of the summaries of meetings may be obtained from the Center for the Study of Education Policy at Illinois State's website: <http://www.coe.ilstu.edu/edpolctr>.)

The research procedures utilized in this Project were based on an approach to policy analysis that relies upon a process of defining issues, exploring background, and ultimately formulating policy alternatives and finding consensus, where possible. When the Project began, however, it was critically important to assess the current condition of education leadership in the State of Illinois. Project staff conducted interviews with key education leaders and other leaders in the State (legislators, business leaders, e.g.) who were experienced and knowledgeable about education leadership.

The Initial Interviews with Selected Education Leaders

During the Summer of 2002, approximately 10 such interviews were held in locations throughout the State. Each interview lasted from one to three hours. The questions asked of education leaders drew upon the basic materials generated as part of the SAELP national project dealing especially with principals, superintendents, and teacher leaders as education leaders. In addition, there were specific examples from other states, such as formulating a SAELP resolution, studying teacher leaders, or considering alternatives to superintendent certification. Information and assistance were also provided by the SAELP National Consortium and national meetings held by the Wallace Foundation and attended by SAELP Project Staff. These interviews and materials were extremely valuable to the SAELP Project Staff in establishing credibility for the Project, identifying individuals who would be invited to serve on the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership, and identifying issues within Illinois that should be addressed in the review of education policies. From these interviews and work in other states, staff developed a policy inventory of issues and questions that were used to select the areas of study by ICEL and its priorities to be addressed.

Formulating an ICEL Plan for Action

Once the ICEL was formed and began meeting, it was necessary to identify the issues to be considered. Many potential policy questions were identified based on the information gained during the interviews, the results of the Design Phase of the SAELP Project, and information from the SAELP Projects in other states.

The Consortium identified policy areas of study that were deemed to be important in strengthening the connection between education leaders and student learning in Illinois. These areas included: education leaders' professional learning; supply and demand of education leaders; state certification; roles and responsibilities of education leaders; conditions of practice; university preparation programs; state; and continuing professional education of education leaders. Then, the Consortium went through a process by which these policy issues were translated into items for the group to consider as part of an Action Plan.

This Plan included more than 50 potential "actions" that the Consortium might have acted upon. These potential actions included the content and rigor of education leaders' academic training, the role of performance assessment in accountability, professional learning, supply and demand, and the working relationship between education leaders and local boards of education. The Action Plan also was used as an administrative plan to complete the work in the given time frame.

Consortium members assigned priorities to the policy questions, placing each question into one of three categories: 1) extremely important issue that must be studied by ICEL; 2) important policy issue that needs to be included if possible; and 3) issue of interest but probably cannot be included for study at this time. Priority work was established in this means.

Policy Analysis as a Study Tool

In the SAELP Project, this approach began with **Problem Definition** and was followed by **Current Policy Review**, **Formulation of Alternatives**, and finally **Discussion by the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership** (with continued formulation of alternatives and discussion by the Consortium, as necessary). Staff identified the current statute or regulations in the *Illinois School Code* and presented data, if available, on the issue as part of the development of a series of policy briefs.

Problem Definition. This initial phase of the Project was focused on identifying the problem to be studied. In the SAELP Project the choice was to pose the issue in the form of a policy question stated as clearly and simply as possible. One example was "*Are principal preparation programs in Illinois adequately preparing school leaders?*" The policy question needed to reflect accurately the focus of the current knowledge about the topic, and also it needed to begin to identify a direction in which to proceed in generating actual policy alternatives.

Review of Current Policy. This stage in the study process was to review current policy. This included reference to portions of the *Illinois School Code* where statutes could be found. This stage also included reference to the reports, policies, or plans of relevant organizations and associations such as the Illinois Principals' Association, the Illinois Association of School Administrators, or the Illinois School Boards Association, as well as others. In addition, references were made to appropriate research, scholarship, and documents produced by a wide range of individuals and organizations. Examples included numerous documents published by the Southern Regional Education Board, the National Governors Association, and the Education Commission of the States.

Formulating Policy Alternatives. The formulation of alternatives for policy was the outgrowth of steps 1 and 2, above, as well as numerous discussions and debate among SAELP Project Staff and the ICEL. Having regular and consistent ICEL meetings was extremely useful to the study of policy issues and the formulation of policy recommendations. Frequently, the policy options were articulated in a preliminary fashion followed by discussion and debate among the ICEL and Project Staff, then final drafting of recommendations for policy based on the input gleaned from the meetings.

Discussion and Refinement by ICEL. The structure that was established for the ICEL did not include a formalized procedure for casting votes for or against a recommended policy alternative. Rather, it was decided that a majority consensus would be sought and Consortium members were advised that dissenting views would be included in the final report. (See Chapter 10 on Dissenting Views). The Staff paid heed to all of the ICEL discussion and input.

Studying the Issues Using Policy Briefs

At each meeting of the Consortium, policy papers were presented by the SAELP staff, after research, review, and initial drafting. The papers identified policy alternatives for ICEL consideration. The general outline followed in the preparation of policy briefs was as follows:

- Definition of the policy issue
- Identification of the specific policy questions
- Background of the issue including references where appropriate (both state and national)
- *Illinois School Code* references or regulatory references where appropriate
- Generation of policy options for ICEL consideration
- Bibliography

Following action by the ICEL, the recommendations were consolidated into a final set of recommendations and forwarded for consideration to education entities. These bodies include the Office of the Governor, Illinois Board of Higher Education, the Illinois State Board of Education, the Illinois Community College Board, Joint Education Committee, and the Education Committees of the Illinois General Assembly as well as universities and professional associations related to issues of education leadership in Illinois.

Appendix A

HOUSE AND SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

A House and Senate Education Committee Resolution to recognize the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership and encourage the House and Senate Education Committee to study its reports and recommendations

Whereas, strong education leadership is essential to improving student learning in Illinois public schools and supporting quality in teaching;

Whereas, improving academic achievement of students and creating schools where continuous improvement happens requires superior education leaders in classrooms and in positions of principal and school superintendents;

Whereas, there are schools and/or districts throughout Illinois in which qualified personnel are not applying for positions of principal and school superintendent;

Whereas, the leadership of Illinois public schools could more accurately represent the diversity of the state of Illinois;

Whereas, relevant training and professional development is needed for the application of technology, new knowledge, and skills by education leaders in their preparation and continuing professional development;

Whereas, more education leaders in Illinois schools and districts need to be retained in order to sustain a commitment to improve student learning for all school children;

Whereas, the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership has been established as part of the State Action for Education Leadership Project (SAELP) with support from the Wallace Foundation, and includes representatives from school districts, education associations, business and community groups, state and university research institutes, and government, and the work of the Consortium is supported by those groups as one of 15 state initiatives in cooperation with the National Conference of State Legislatures, National Governors Association, Education Commission of the States, Council of Chief State School Officers, and the National Association of State Boards of Education;

Whereas, the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership is functioning to strengthen education leadership and make recommendations regarding education and professional learning, certification, program accreditation, conditions of professional practice, supply and demand, roles and responsibilities, diversification of the candidate pool, governance issues, authority and accountability, and attracting, supporting, and sustaining education leaders more effectively;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Illinois House and Senate Education Committees recognize the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership and encourage its members to study the reports and recommendations of the Consortium when they are submitted to the Committees, the State Board of Education, the Board of Higher Education, the Illinois Community College Board, the Illinois Community College Board, and the Joint Education Committee, and to consider and take such actions that are appropriate.

10/21/02

Appendix B

What We Know About Superintendents in Illinois and the Nation...A Work In Progress

Prepared for the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership Center for the Study of Education Policy at Illinois State University

A. Preparation of School Leaders

- Of 57 universities approved by ISBE to offer education programs, 14 universities offer programs to prepare superintendents.
- Only Western Illinois University is approved to offer alternative route to certification program to prepare superintendents. Approximately ten complete the program annually (Long, 2002).
- 69.4% of superintendents in the AASA national sample viewed their preparation as excellent or good (Glass, Bjork, and Brunner, 2000).
- Weaknesses of graduate training programs identified by superintendents in a 2000 AASA survey of practicing superintendents were lack of hands-on application, inadequate access to technology, and the failure to link content to practice (Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2000).
- 68.4% of superintendent leaders view their personal preparation program as excellent or good while nationally, 69.4% report their preparation program as excellent or good (Glass, 2001).
- One third of the state executive officers in AASA affiliates and NSBA affiliates believe that preparation programs “need improvement” or “need a great deal of improvement.” Glass, 2001.
- 45% of the national group of superintendents possess a Ph.D. or Ed.D. compared with 71% of superintendents identified as leaders (Glass, 2001*).

B. Licensure of School Leaders

- Illinois issued 134 superintendent certificates in FY 2001 (ISBE, 2002).
- 64% of Illinois superintendents hold doctorates or other advanced certificates (ISBE, 2002), as compared to 45% of superintendents across the nation (Glass, Bjork, and Brunner, 2000).

C. Recruitment of Individuals for School Leadership

- 65% of superintendents surveyed in 2000 would recommend the profession of a superintendent as a meaningful and satisfying career, although 91% reported real career satisfaction (Usdan, McCloud, Podmostko, and Cuban 2001).
- Only 29% of superintendents in the AASA study felt they were hired because of their ability to be an instructional leader, whereas 60% felt they were hired on personal characteristics or to be a change agent (Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2000).
- Over 50% of Illinois superintendents began their careers in elementary or social studies teaching positions (Pierson and Hall, 2002).
- Nearly half of current Illinois superintendents decided to pursue the superintendency while serving as building administrators (Pierson and Hall, 2002).
- Of 553 Illinois administrators who possessed identifiers characteristic of those who do seek superintendent positions, only 25% indicated strong interest in the position with interest decreasing with age (Azinger, 2002).
- Money, board micro-management, and lack of job security were the main reasons that both those interested and those not interested in the superintendency identified as areas of concern (Azinger, 2002).
- Policy makers need to consider taking steps to develop portable interstate pension and retirement plans (Glass, 2001*)
- About 29% of superintendent leaders and national group of superintendents feel they were hired because of their abilities to be an instructional leader. More than 60% of each

group believes they were hired based on personal characteristics and the ability to be a change agent.

- 75.3% of Illinois superintendents, once certified and ready, took 1 year or less to locate the first superintendency (Pierson and Hall, 2002).
- 61% of Illinois superintendents were appointed to their first superintendency from outside their school district while 39% were appointed inside the same district (Pierson and Hall, 2002).

D. Supply of School Leaders

- In 2001, there were 852 district superintendents employed in Illinois and 407 assistant superintendents (ISBE, 2002).
- The average age of a first-time Illinois public school superintendent was 42 (Pierson and Hall, 2002). The average age of an Illinois public school superintendent was 54, with 34% being age 56 or older (ISBE, 2002).
- Only 7% of superintendents were under 46 years of age (ISBE, 2002).
- 56.7% of Illinois superintendents in 2000 had been a superintendent for less than 10 years (Wiggall, Chaudhari, & Pifer, 2000).
- 91% of Illinois superintendents in 2001 had been in education for more than 20 years and 42% had more than 30 years of education experience (Wiggall, Chaudhari, & Pifer, 2000).
- 51% of Illinois superintendents in 2001 had held their current position for six or more years with 17% having held the same position for more than 11 years (Wiggall, Chaudhari, & Pifer, 2000).
- The Illinois district superintendent retention rate for 2001 was 91% (ISBE, 2002).
- Demand for district superintendents and assistant superintendents increased by 2% in 2002 (ISBE, 2002).
- Between 221 and 303 districts superintendents will be needed through 2005 (ISBE, 2002).
- Over half of current Illinois superintendents reported obtaining a position within a year of becoming certified and actively seeking a position (Pierson and Hall, 2002).
- In 2002, 339 Illinois superintendents had held only one position as district administrator, and an additional 164 had held only two positions as superintendents (Pierson and Hall, 2002).
- Nationally, 50% of superintendents leave their districts in less than six years (Glass, Bjork, and Brunner, 2000).
- A majority of public school superintendents in Illinois had been appointed to jobs in districts in which they had not been currently employed (Pierson and Hall, 2002).
- The AASA estimates that nearly 8,000 new superintendents will need to be hired by 2008, replacing over half of current superintendents in the nation (Cooper, Fusarelli, & Carella, 2000).
- 87.3% of superintendents in the AASA 2000 study remained in one state for their entire career.
- Reasons for certificated individual not to seek superintendent positions included satisfaction with current jobs, being place bound, politics of administrations, stress, job location, low pay differential from current position, school board relationships, lack of job security, size of district, and spouse's job (Wolverton, Rawls, & MacDonald, 2000).
- The average timeline to fill a superintendent vacancy has more than doubled from 4 months to 11 months within the last decade (Usdan, McCloud, Podmostko, and Cuban, 2001).
- 64% of board presidents reported turnover of 3 or more superintendents in the past ten years (Glass, 2001*)
- 79% - 87.3% of superintendents remain in one state for their entire career; only 13-21% crossed state lines (Glass, 2001*)
- Survey of search consultants said that applicant pools for the superintendent are decreasing; the average pool consisted of 30-40 applicants (Glass, 2001).

- A large majority of state AASA and NSBA executives believe that providing paid internships to aspiring superintendents could possibly attract more applicants (Glass, 2001*).

E. Diversity of School Leaders

- 17% of Illinois superintendents were female (ISBE, 2002).
- 4% of Illinois superintendents are minority while student minority enrollment is 41% statewide (ISBE, 2002).
- Nationally, 12% of superintendents were female and 5% were minority in 1998 (Pierson and Hall, 1999). Interestingly, 44% of elected school board members were female and less than 10% minority (Hodgkinson and Montenegro, 1999).
- 95% of the superintendents identified by their peers as outstanding leaders were white (Glass, 2001).
- Nationally, 95% of both superintendent leaders and the national group are white. (Glass, 2001*)
- In a survey of school board presidents who were hiring new superintendents, 85% of the pools included a woman applicant and 46% included a minority. Only 18% of the searches resulted in a woman being hired and 7% ended with the hiring of a minority superintendent (Glass, 2002*).

F. Continuing Professional Development of School Leaders

- New administrative requirements for the renewal of superintendent certificates mandates at least 5 professional development activities (a minimum of 100 hours) with performance demonstration linked to Illinois Professional School Leader Standards over a period of 5 years, as well as 36 hours of biennial Administrator Academy training (ISBE, 2002).

G. Roles and Responsibilities of School Leaders

- Superintendents tended to agree somewhat that learning standards improve teaching and learning (Wiggall, Chaudhari, & Pifer, 2000).
- Superintendents of smaller districts took a neutral position on whether standards would interfere with local control, while superintendents in larger districts say that standards would be an interference (Wiggall, Chaudhari, & Pifer, 2000).
- A majority of Illinois public school superintendents agreed somewhat that the time required to align local curriculum with state standards was prohibitive although necessary (Wiggall, Chaudhari, & Pifer, 2000).
- A majority of Illinois public school superintendents disagreed somewhat that the ISAT was a valid and reliable measure of student or school performance and agreed that there will be increased pressure to teach to the test and possible promote behaviors to alter test results (Wiggall, Chaudhari, & Pifer, 2000).
- Nationally, 55% of superintendents reported that state accountability and testing programs had a positive effect on their district (Glass, 2002).
- Superintendents are often hired to be “change agents” or “keepers of the status quo.” (Glass, 2002*)
- Superintendents in large cities who leave cite “confusion of roles between the school board and the superintendent as one of the greatest causes for resigning.” (Todras, 1993).
- In many states, the responsibilities of school boards and superintendents are delineated NOT in a single statute but are addressed separately and often scattered across various sections of state law (Glass, 2002*).

H. Incentives and Compensation

- Principals moving into superintendencies receive an average salary increase of \$26,000 while teachers moving into principalships receive an average increase of \$33,000 (Usdan, McCloud, Podmostko, and Cuban, 2001).

- 35.1% of superintendent leaders said they would more aggressively pursue school reform if given 6 year contracts (Glass, 2001).
- 86.6% of superintendents in Illinois have written multiple year performance-based contracts (Pierson and Hall, 2002).
- Majority of superintendents nationally have 2-3 year contracts. About 35.1% of the superintendent leaders say they would be more aggressive in pursuing school reform initiatives if given six year contracts, although AASA and NSBA executives in state affiliates are uncertain of the degree to which six year renewable contracts would encourage more applicants and reduce turnover (Glass, 2001*).
- 42.1% of Illinois superintendents hold three-year contracts but 10.4% and 30.7% have four and five year contracts, respectively (Pierson and Hall, 2002).
- 54% of the state chief education officers believe that school superintendents are not adequately compensated (Glass, 2001*).
- Chief state school officers and NSBA and AASA state executive directors believe that transportability of state retirement systems would likely increase applicant pools (Glass, 2001).

I. Governance

- The absence of clear delineation of superintendent and board member roles creates confusion that is compounded by a lack of professional standards and an increasing shift from educational trustee to politician by board members (Glass, 2001).
- Over 50% of current Illinois superintendents agree that board of education member training should be mandatory (Pierson and Hall, 2002).
- 30% of superintendents identified as leaders across the nation believe the current model for school board governance should continue (Glass, 2001).
- 69% of superintendents across the nation reported receiving an excellent evaluation rating from the school board (Glass, Bjork, and Brunner, 2000).
- 38% of superintendents nationally reported spending four or more hours per week in direct communication with their school board, whereas 58% of superintendents identified by their peers as leaders spent at least that amount of time in contact with board members (Glass, 2001).
- 71% of superintendents identified as leaders believe the superintendency is in a state of crisis (Glass, 2002*).
- 68% of superintendents identified as leaders believe the current model for school board governance system needs to be seriously replaced or completely replaced while 73% of a national sample of Board presidents reported that there is no need to change the present model of school board governance. (Glass, 2002*)
- Board turnover creates problems in leadership stability and likely plays a significant role in superintendent turnover, according to state affiliates of AASA and NSBA (Glass, 2001*).
- 52.5% of Illinois superintendents favor statutorily mandated board member training, 24.7% would “maybe” favor such training, and 22.8% oppose mandated board member training (Pierson and Hall, 2000).

J. Working Conditions

- The average tenure of superintendents in large urban districts from to 2.3 years in 1999 (Usdan, McCloud, Pomostko, and Cuban, 2001).
- A majority of superintendents in the United States work under two- or three-year contracts and can be terminated at the will of the board (Glass, Bjork, and Brunner, 2000).
- Superintendents identified higher pay and better benefits, increased help and support, and better perks as incentives to bring more candidates into the pool (Cooper, Fusarelli, & Carella, 2000).
- 37% of superintendent leaders and all superintendents in the 2000 AASA study reported having too many insignificant, yet time-consuming demands that limited their effectiveness (Glass, 2001).

- Inadequate funding and the need to attract more qualified teachers were the greatest concerns of superintendents across the nation (Glass, Bjork, and Brunner, 2000).
- Nearly 80% of Illinois superintendents reported spending over 50 hours each week in work related activities (Pierson and Hall, 2000).
- Over half of current Illinois superintendents report being “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with their present position (Pierson and Hall, 2000).

*Excerpted with permission from the ECS Issue Papers on Leadership, by Thomas E. Glass. Published by the Education Commission of the States (ECS), 700 Broadway, Suite 1200, Denver, Colorado, 80203-3460, 303.299.3600. Copyright 2001 from the ECS Web site. www.ecs.org. All rights reserved.

References

- Azinger, A. (2003). *The Pipeline to the Superintendency*. NCPEA 4(2), p.1-5.
- Cooper, B., Fusarelli, L., and Carella, V. (2002). *Career crisis in the superintendency. The results of a national survey*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Glass, T. (2001). *Superintendent Leaders Look at the Superintendency, School Boards and Reform*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Glass, T. (2002). *School Board Presidents and Their View of the Superintendency*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Glass, T., Bjork, L., and Brunner, C. (2000). *The Study of the American School Superintendency, 2000. A Look at the Superintendent of Education in the New Millenium*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Hodgkinson, H.L. and Montenegro, X. (1999). *The U.S. School Superintendent: The Invisible CEO*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Illinois State Board of Education (2001). *Illinois Public Schools by County with region, county, district I.D. codes included*. Retrieved 2/1/2003 from <http://www.isbe.state.il.us/research/htmls/reports.htm#statistics>.
- Illinois State Board of Education (2002). *Approved Programs for the preparation of Educational Personnel in Illinois Institutions of Higher Education*. Volume XXIV. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.
- Illinois State Board of Education (2001). *Technical Report: Educator supply and demand in Illinois*. Springfield, IL.
- Long, M. (2002, July). Personal Interview. Illinois State Board of Education: Springfield, IL.
- Pierson, M.E. and Hall, R.F. (2000). *Performance Excellence for the New Millenium, A Summary Report of the 2000 Survey of Illinois Superintendents*. Springfield, IL: Illinois Association of School Administrators.
- Pierson, M.E. and Hall, R.F. (2002). *Reality of Numbers Impact Salaries*. Illinois School Board Journal Jan/Feb. 2002. Springfield, IL: Illinois Association of School Boards.
- Todras, E. (1993). *The Changing Role of School Boards*. ERIC Digest, #84.

Usdan, M.; McCloud, B.; Podmostko, M.; and Cuban, L. (2001). *Leadership for Student Learning: Restructuring School District Leadership*. Washington, D.C: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Wiggall, R., Chadhari, R., and Pifer, D. (2002). *Statewide Survey of Superintendents: Report and Analysis, School Finance*. Normal, IL: Illinois State University.

Wolverton, M., Rowls, S., and McDonald, R. (2000). *The superintendent pool: Realities in the northwest*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Education Laboratory.

Appendix C

What We Know About Principals in Illinois and the Nation...A Work In Progress

Prepared for the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership Center for the Study of Education Policy at Illinois State University

A. Preparation of School Leaders

- All principals in Illinois held Masters degrees and 11% held doctorates or other advanced degrees (ISBE, 2001).
- Of 57 universities approved by the ISBE to offer education programs, 27 universities are approved to provide principal preparation.
- All Illinois education leadership programs must meet Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) and Illinois Professional Leader Standards (IPLS) as a function of program review every five years.
- High school principals felt that their training had little or no relevance in the areas of school safety and parent issues (NASSP, 2001).
- Type 75 holders in Illinois indicated that graduate preparation was least effective in the areas of discipline, business management, and school board interaction (DeAngelis, 2003).

B. Licensure of School Leaders

- There were 1,455 Type 75 certificates issued in FY2001 (ISBE, 2002).
- In 2001, there was a surplus of 956 certified administrators in Illinois (ISBE, 2002).
- In 1998, 56.7% of elementary principals held a masters degree, 30% held a sixth-year degree or certificate, and 12.7% had completed a doctoral degree (Doud & Edwards, 1998).
- 63% of elementary principals over age 40 and 35.3% principals with doctoral degrees worked in suburban districts (NAESP, 1998).
- In Illinois, 8% of principals and 6% of assistant principals in 2001 held doctoral degrees.
- The number of Illinois assistant principals holding the 6th year CAS or Ed.S. has ranged from 7% to 14% in the past three years (Strand and Ashby, 2001).

C. Recruitment of Individuals for School Leadership

- 59% of Illinois principals in 2000 had served as an assistant principal or program director, 33.4% had served as an athletic director or coach, 28.4% had served as a curriculum specialist or coordinator, and 18.7% had served as a department head (NCES, 2002).
- 25% of districts surveyed by NASSP in 1998 had an aspiring principals program and 46% had a formal induction or mentoring program for new principals (NASSP, 2001).

D. Supply of School Leaders

- There were 3,603 public school principals in Illinois in 2001 (ISBE, 2001).
- Specifically, there were 2,284 elementary principals, 586 junior high school principals, and 733 high school principals employed in Illinois public schools in 2001 (ISBE, 2001).
- There were 429 elementary assistant principals, 431 junior high school assistant principals, and 710 high school assistant principals, as well as 140 junior high and 471 high school deans, employed in Illinois public schools in 2001 (ISBE, 2002).
- 3,500 new administrators are expected to be needed in Illinois school districts in the next four years, 2002-2005 (ISBE, 2001).
- Administrative demand for directors or assistants, elementary assistant principals, and assistant junior high school principals increased the most in Illinois in 2001, as compared to other administrative categories (ISBE, 2002).
- The retention rate for Illinois administrators in 2001 decreased 2% to an average of 85%, with the largest decrease (6%) at the junior high school level (ISBE, 2002).

- 67% of new Illinois administrators came from the teaching force and only 2% were educators re-entering the profession (ISBE, 2001).
- 1,552 administrative certificates were issued in 2001 in Illinois (ISBE, 2002).
- Illinois administrator attrition had increased 80% since 1996, from 3.4% to 6.2%, with 518 administrators leaving education, of whom 300 had over 31 years of educational experience (ISBE, 2001).
- National turnover in the principalship between 1988 and 1998 was 42% (ERS, 1998).
- 37% of Illinois principals planned to retire and 58% planned to leave the principalship by 2007 (Strand and Ashby, 2001).
- 28% of assistant principals in Illinois planned to retire by 2007 (Strand and Ashby 2001).
- 32% of Illinois public school administrators will be eligible for retirement by the end of 2003 (ISBE, 2001).
- The average age of an Illinois public school principal was 50 (ISBE, 2001).
- Despite positive attitudes toward career choice, over 60% of elementary principals across the nation who were surveyed in 1998 planned to retire at the earliest age allowed by their state retirement system (NAESP, 1998).
- Practicing elementary principals in 2001 were considering leaving the field because of politics and bureaucracy (47%), unreasonable demands brought about by higher standards and accountability (34%), and low pay (14%) (Public Agenda Online, 2001).
- The attrition rate of Illinois administrators with less than one year of experience was 23% in 2001, but the attrition rate for administrators with 3 to 31 years of experience dropped to 2-5% (ISBE, 2001).
- 33% of individuals holding a Type 75 certificate did not apply for an administrative job and another one-third were unsuccessful in obtaining an administrative position in 1999-2000 (DeAngelis, 2003).
- 12% more men than women successfully sought and obtained an administrative job, while 9% more women than men did not apply for an administrative job (DeAngelis, 2003).
- Non-applicants reported the least amount of encouragement from others as a motivating factor in obtaining a certification (DeAngelis, 2003).
- Increased ability to make organizational, instructional, and curricular changes were the cited by 75% of all respondents as reasons for obtaining a Type 75 certificate (DeAngelis, 2003).
- A shared philosophy of leadership and reputation for providing a quality education in a safe environment were major factors in job acceptance decisions made by Type 75 holders (DeAngelis, 2003).
- Mobility was not reported to be a significant factor in making decisions about accepting a new position (DeAngelis, 2003).
- The number of elementary principals across the nation who worked in more than one district increased 21-35% between 1988 and 1998, indicating a possible decrease in job stability (NAESP, 1998).
- 115 administrative jobs in Illinois remained vacant in 2000, 72 of which were elementary or secondary principals or assistant principals. This is an increase of over 500% since 1996 (ISBE, 2001).
- 40 principals in Illinois also served as superintendent in the same school districts (D. Turner, 2002).
- 50% of districts across the nation surveyed by the NASSP in 1998 had a shortage of qualified principal candidates (NASSP, 2001).

E. Diversity of School Leaders

- Nationally, the typical high school principal in 2001 was a white male who had been in the position for more than 15 years in a school with fewer than 750 students (NASSP, 2001).
- While 76% of Illinois public school teachers are female, 48% of public school principals in Illinois are female (ISBE, 2001).

- 19% of Illinois public school principals are minority while 40% of the state student population is minority (ISBE, 2001).
- In Illinois, women tend to enter the principalship with more instructional and curriculum experience than men and yet their salaries appear to continue to lag particularly outside of Cook, DuPage, and Lake counties (Strand and Ashby, 2001).
- In 1998, 42% of all elementary principals across the nation were women and 65% of all elementary principals with less than 5 years of experience were women (NAESP, 1998).
- The three areas where female high school principals rated their job satisfaction lower than males were facilities management, budgets, and school safety (NASSP, 2001).
- 67% of urban elementary superintendents in 1998 saw increasing diversity in management positions as a concern, with 44% of suburban and 29% of rural elementary superintendents also concerned about administrative diversity (ERS, 1998).

F. Continuing Professional Development of School Leaders

- New administrative requirements for the renewal of the principal certificate mandates at least 5 professional development activities (a minimum of 100 hours) with performance demonstration linked to Illinois Professional School Leader Standards over 5 years, as well as 36 hours of biennial Administrator Academy training (ISBE, 2002).
- Understanding and using technology was identified by 50% of elementary principals across the nation as an area of needed professional development, and 30% also identified improving staff performance, planning school improvement, improving student performance, or managing organizational change (NAESP, 2000).

G. Roles and Responsibilities of School Leaders

- A principal in American public education supervises an average of 13.5 staff members, whereas manufacturing industry supervisors oversee the work of 6.2 staff members and public administrators supervise 3.5 staff members (Bagin, 1999).
- Nationally, elementary principals reported the following reasons for leaving their jobs: long hours (60-80 per week), workload and complexity of the job, supervision of evening activities, minimal pay difference between top teacher and administrator salaries, overwhelming expectations, paperwork required by state and district mandates, and increasingly complex social problems (NAESP, 2000).
- Time and excessive paperwork were the two greatest impediments to instructional leadership by high school principals in 2001 (NASSP, 2001).
- While Illinois defines the evaluation process of a principal more thoroughly than many states, effective leadership characteristics identified by current research were not included in the evaluation process (Kemper & Cooper, 2002).

H. Incentives and Compensation

- There is as little as 4% difference in salary for new assistant principals and 23% difference for principals over relatively experienced teachers (Williams, 2003).
- The average daily pay rate of highly experienced teachers is more than that of the beginning administrator (Williams, 2003).
- Between 1998 and 2001, principal and assistant principal salaries have shown relatively little change (Strand and Ashby, 2001).
- Administrator pay varied in relation to school size with pay in Cook, Lake, and DuPage counties greater than corresponding salaries in the remainder of the state taken as a whole (Strand and Ashby, 2001).
- Superintendents in California identified poor interpersonal skills as a significant reason why principals are unsuccessful (Davis, 1997).

I. Governance Issues

- Nationally, 60% of districts had school councils with a majority of high school principals identifying the impact of the school council as positive or highly positive (NASSP, 2001).

- Teachers and parents were the greatest influences on site-based decisions made by elementary principals, with student influence being low (NAESP, 1998).

J. Working Conditions

- The median elementary principal contract length was 11 months or 214 days (NAESP, 1998).
- In Illinois, approximately 80% of principals and most assistant principals had annual contracts (Strand and Ashby, 2001).
- 50% of principals had tenure as professional employees, with 24% having tenure as principals and 30% having no tenure protection at all (NAESP, 2000).
- The typical elementary principal spent 45 hours a week in work-related activities, with hours increasing with lack of experience (NAESP, 2000).
- High school principals work an average of 62 hours each week (NASSP, 2001).
- One tenth of principals reported being involved in a work-related civil lawsuit with all cases being dropped, settled out of court, or settled in the principals' favor (NAESP, 1998).
- The three most important responsibilities of high school principals were establishing a supportive learning climate, dealing with personnel issues, and providing curricular leadership (NASSP, 2001).
- The average percentage of the school's budget controlled by K-8 principals across the nation in 1998 was 26% (ERS, 1998).

References

Bagin, R. (1999). What is right with our schools. *Principal*, January, pgs. 5-10.

Davis, S.H. (1997). The Principal's Paradox; Remaining Secure in a Precarious Position. NASSP Bulletin 81, 592 p. 73-80.

DeAngelis, K.J. (2003). *In the pipeline: the early career paths of administrative certificate holders in Illinois*. Edwardsville, IL: Illinois Education Research Council.

Doud, J.L., and Edward, P. (1998). Elementary/middle school principals: 1998 and beyond. *The Education Digest*. November, Vol 64, Issue 3 pg. 4,7.

Educational Research Service (1998). *Is there a shortage of qualified candidates for opening in the principalship? An exploratory study*. Reston, VA: National Association of Elementary Principals.

Illinois State Board of Education, (2001). *2002 Directory: Approved Programs for the Preparation of Educational Personnel in Illinois Institutions of Higher Education*. Volume XXIV, October. Springfield, IL.

Illinois State Board of Education (2001). *Technical Report: Educator supply and demand in Illinois*. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.

Kempher, L., and Cooper, G.R. (2002). A Document Analysis of State-Mandated Principal Evaluation Programs in the North Central Association States. *Journal of School Business Management*, Spring vol. 14 n1 p30-35.

National Association of Elementary School Principals (1998). *Is There a Shortage of Qualified Candidates for Openings in the Principalship?* January. Alexandria: VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

National Association of Elementary School Principals (2000, April). *The Principal, Keystone of a High-Achieving School: Attracting and Keeping the Leaders We Need*. Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

National Association of Secondary School Principals (2001). *Priorities and Barriers in High School Leadership: A Survey of Principals*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

National Center for Education Statistics (2002). *Schools and Staffing Survey 1999-2000: Overview of the Data for Public, Private, and Bureau of Indian Affairs, Elementary and Secondary Schools*. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Education Research and Improvement.

Public Agenda Online (2001). *Trying to stay ahead of the game: Superintendents and principals talk about school leadership*. New York: Public Agenda Online.

Strand, K., and Ashby, D. (2001). *Building leadership, a practitioner bulletin: 2001-2002 IPA Salary and Fringe Benefit Study*. Vol. 9, No. 4. Springfield, IL: Illinois Principal Association.

Turner, D. (2002). Personal Interview. Springfield, IL: Illinois Principals Association.

Williams, A. (2003). *ERS Survey: 2001-2002 Salaries of School Business Officials*. Arlington, VA: Education Research Service.