



Enacting Greatness: Leadership by Design

Growth Minded Practices for California Principals

**Principals' Excellence Project (PEP)
Task Force**



CONTENTS

Principals' Excellence Project (PEP) Task Force

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Message from REEd, UC Davis.....	i
The Principal Effectiveness Design Team Charge	ii
Section 1: Introduction to the Successful School Framework	1
Section 2: Prologue to the High-Leverage Leadership Practices (HLLP) and HLLP Grid	5
Section 3: High-Leverage Leadership Practices (HLLP) and Strategies.....	9
HLLP #1 – Teacher Growth	9
HLLP #2 – Equity-centered Culture	13
HLLP #3 – Collaborative Leadership.....	19
HLLP #4 – Principal Growth	25
HLLP #5 – Evidence-based Decision Making.....	30
Section 4: Successful School Capacity Building Tool.....	33
Introduction and Explanation of the Tool.....	33
Form 1 – Implementation Flow Chart.....	35
Form 2 – High-Leverage Practice Strategies & Cross-cutting Questions.....	36
Form 3 – Identification of Area for Improvement Tool	37
Form 4 – Successful Schools Capacity Building Tool	38
Form 5 – Capacity Building Worksheet	40
Form 6 – Cross-cutting Questions	42
Form 7 – Implementation Plan Worksheet.....	43
Section 5: Final Thoughts	44
Section 6: Research Methodology	45
Section 7: Principal Excellence Project Task Force Member Profiles	47
Section 8: Acknowledgements.....	48
Section 9: Annotated Bibliography	50
Section 10: References and General Bibliography	56
Section 11: Appendix	
A – Terms.....	65
B – Acronyms	69
C – Links to Key Resources	69

Message from Resourcing Excellence in Education (REEd)

In 2014, **Resourcing Excellence in Education (REEd)**, at the School of Education, UC Davis, was asked to lead the two-year statewide pilot: Integrated Professional Learning Systems Initiative* (IPLS) in support of the California Department of Education rollout of recommendations for the professional learning and teacher evaluation practices of *Greatness by Design: Supporting Outstanding Teaching to Sustain a Golden State* report by State Superintendent of Public Instruction Tom Torlakson's Task Force on Educator Excellence (2012). The IPLS initiative focused on positioning learning and professional growth at the center of teacher effectiveness systems and is closely linked to the nation-wide interest in teacher accountability systems.



Dr. Joanne Bookmyer

IPLS is led by Drs. Joanne Bookmyer and Susan O'Hara, working together with a statewide network of Local Education Agencies (LEAs) that includes school district partners and county offices of education. Partners have committed to providing a diverse team of participants who are high-level staff with decision-making responsibilities and varied backgrounds to represent the variety of school stakeholders. The teams are individually and collectively developing and testing prototypes that put teacher growth at the center of teacher evaluation systems. Results of the pilot will inform California Department of Education's support for educator effectiveness across all California school districts.



Dr. Susan O'Hara

Along with the development of an integrated professional learning system and teacher evaluation and growth as focal points, IPLS undertook the task of identifying and making recommendations related to high-leverage principal leadership practices that advance continuous teacher growth for student learning. Addressing principal evaluation directly was not within the charge of the **Principals' Excellence Project (PEP) Task Force**. Nonetheless, this report contributes to the effectiveness of any evaluation process by identifying which principal actions *should be the basis of an evaluation or reflection process*. The combination of California Professional Standards for Education Leaders Descriptions of Practice and High-Leverage Leadership Practices provides the tools for principals to devise their own course of action, for principal coaches to have confidence in their guidance, and for principal evaluators to ground evaluations using district goals, portfolio formats or Individual Learning Plans.

In effect, the CPSEL, DOP and HLLPs could become the basis for a principal effectiveness system. The key elements of a growth plan would include identifying an area of needed or desired growth; a self-assessment of strengths, growth areas, interests and preferences; an actionable and realistic plan including goals, resources needed and timelines; desired outcomes and a way to celebrate successes ("Personal and Professional," 2012).

* Funding is through a Title II Improving Teacher Quality—State Agency for Higher Education Award administered through the California Department of Education.

THE CHARGE

The Charge for the Principal Excellence Project (Pep) Task Force

As part of an integrated professional learning system that advances continuous teacher growth and enhances student learning, the **Principal Excellence Project (PEP)** project investigators will:

1. Investigate, identify, and recommend high-leverage leadership practices for California principals; and
2. Identify the necessary knowledge and skills, resources, organizational structures, and interpersonal behaviors needed to effectively implement the identified practices.

For this report, the PEP Task Force narrowly defined high-leverage leadership practices as those that have the highest probability of producing direct or indirect positive effects on student success, based on both compelling research and the extensive experience of the Task Force and interviewed school leaders.

SECTION 1: Introduction to the Successful School Framework

“The critical need for investments in teacher and principal learning has been made clear over and over again in efforts aimed at educational change. Those who have worked to improve schools have found that every aspect of school reform depends on highly skilled educators who are well supported in healthy school organizations.”

(California Department of Education, 2012, p. 7)

Recognizing that principals are frequently admonished to perform the near impossible with minimal resources and, realistically, only the authority their staff and supervisors grant them, the goal of the Principle Excellence Project Task Force is to identify and recommend the highest leverage principal leadership practices and key strategies for operationalizing the recommendations of *Greatness by Design: Supporting Outstanding Teaching to Sustain a Golden State* (California Department of Education, 2012). California State Superintendent of Public Instruction Tom Torlakson’s Task Force on Educator Excellence charted a course for reclaiming California’s status as a national and global leader in educational innovation and equitable access for all of its more than 6.2 million

K-12 students in public and charter schools. The preponderance of its recommendations address factors of teacher practice that directly impact the quality of instruction. However, the Task Force recognized and validated the need for the highest quality principal leadership to support teacher effectiveness. The advent of changing demographics and state policies (e.g. Common Core State Standards, new administrator preparation standards) and approaches to educational funding (e.g. Local Control Funding Formula) reinforces the need to re-conceptualize the role of the principal.

The Educator Excellence Task Force assessed the condition of teaching in California, including the leadership related areas of how teachers are supported throughout their careers and inspired to do their best work. *Greatness by Design* states that we must build capacity among principals and teachers to lead schools with a sense of urgency and unrelenting focus on student success (California Department of Education, 2012, p. 72). Research commissioned by the Wallace Foundation (Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010) confirms that, “leadership is second only to classroom instruction as an influence on student learning” (p. 9). Bryk, Sebring, Allensworth, Easton, and Luppescu (2010), Fullan (2014), and Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2014) all identify ongoing, focused teacher and principal professional learning as essential to, and a characteristic of, schools that continuously improve as they adapt to meet the learning and social needs of students.

The California Department of Education (CDE) funded the Integrated Professional Learning Systems (IPLS) initiative using federal Improving Teacher Quality State Grant Program funds as a way to identify and support multiple paths for enacting *Greatness by Design*. Resourcing Excellence in Education (REEd), housed in the UC Davis School of Education, tasked the Principle Excellence Project Task Force, hereafter referred to as the PEP Task Force, with identifying high-leverage leadership practices that expand the capacity of principals to inspire and direct instructional improvement and increase school effectiveness.

To this end, the PEP Task Force applied REEd’s E4 (Expanding Educator Evaluation and Effectiveness) process, based on design thinking processes and improvement science concepts. The team conducted

a comprehensive review of the literature on effective schools and principals, surveyed and interviewed school leaders, studied the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2014) and the Quality Professional Learning Standards (California Department on Education, 2015) as well as the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2014) Standards, and invoked the PEP Task Force’s collective 250 years of experience in education. (See Section 7 for additional information on research design and methodology).

To make sense of the large amount of information gathered during the research portion of this project, the team developed a tiered conceptual framework, the Successful Schools Framework. It identifies characteristics of successful schools, high-leverage principal leadership practices, and key strategies to implement the leadership practices.

THE SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLS FRAMEWORK



The structure of the Successful Schools Framework helped the PEP Task Force identify and evaluate the connections between successful school characteristics and high-leverage principal leadership practices. Analysis and interpretation of data revealed that effective principals typically enact multiple strategies as they move their schools toward success.

CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLS

Research by the PEP Task Force led to identification of characteristics common to highly effective schools across much of the literature and in discussions among educators. The characteristics are largely interdependent; they bolster each other and are presented here so that each subsequent characteristic builds on the previous one.

SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLS:

1. Embody the belief that all people learn, change, and adapt to positive and negative environments.
2. Enact a shared vision of collective responsibility for the welfare and achievement of all students.
3. Promote culturally responsive communities, and have staff who recognize the impact of biases on student learning and work to remove such barriers.
4. Systematically inquire into their practice, monitor their progress, and make adjustments based on evidence.
5. Develop and equitably distribute financial and human resources to carry out missions.
6. Expect and support professional learning by all adults.
7. Hire and retain principals and staff who are adaptive, flexible, and collectively engage in school leadership.
8. Receive consistent, coherent, coordinated, and sustainable support from the community, district and state.



These Characteristics of Successful Schools can best be explained in practical terms. The principal leads the community in a shared vision made real by their choice of actions and their plan for resources to manifest it. Every adult in that school should model the type of continuous learning they want for students, and take responsibility for the collective success of the school community. These characteristics underpin the growth-mindset model (Dweck, 2006) advanced in this report and are elemental to an integrated system of lifelong learning for students and the adults who teach them. Glickman (1987) states that a successful school is foremost an organization that defines good education for itself, through its goals and desired practices, and then engages in collective action to achieve that vision.



HIGH-LEVERAGE PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP PRACTICES

Section 3 of this report provides complete details for each of the five high-leverage principal leadership practices identified by the PEP Task Force. The team identifies key strategies to implement the high-leverage practices and provides explanatory narratives, resources, and references for the practices and strategies.

Additionally, a Successful Schools Capacity Building Tool with prompts to assist school communities in identifying resources in-hand and resources needed, is provided. (See Section 4). The Successful Schools Capacity Building Tool (adapted from Jaquith, 2012) is integrated and aligned with both the CPSEL and the Characteristics of Successful Schools and designed to facilitate enactment of the high-leverage practices.

After conducting this study into principal leadership from the literature and practitioner experiential perspectives, members of the PEP Task Force are convinced that improving professional learning for California principals around these high-leverage leadership practices and key strategies will increase principals' capacity to lead schools and, ultimately, advance the growth-minded concept of continuous teacher and principal learning and development. Louis et. al, (2010) summarized the foundation for this belief when they concluded that, "Among all the parents, teachers, and policy makers who work hard to improve education, educators in leadership positions are uniquely well positioned to ensure the necessary synergy" (p. 9).

SECTION 2: Prologue to the High-Leverage Leadership Practices

“Creating schools that enable all children to learn requires the development of systems that enable all educators and schools to learn. At the heart, this is a capacity building enterprise” (Darling-Hammond, 2010, p. 327). In order to build leadership capacity for student learning, this report presents five high-leverage principal leadership practices that are aligned with the Successful Schools Framework presented in the Introduction. These practices emerged from research conducted by the PEP Task Force. Every descriptor in the Successful Schools Framework relies on leadership that unearths and addresses obstacles to student success created by inequities of instruction and school climate. A powerful, growth-minded leadership response (Dweck, 2006) to the need for change and continuous improvement is for principals to develop the professional capital of the teachers and staff of their schools (Fullan, 2014) as they develop an integrated system of lifelong learning for students and the adults who teach them.

The following section of this report comprises the synthesis of research, insight gathering, feedback and extensive experience to streamline and improve the practice of principals and, by extension, the instruction and environment of the school community. Like many other terms in the educational lexicon, the term “high-leverage” practices has been generalized and morphed to convey multiple meaning. For this report, the PEP Task Force narrowly defined it as practices that have the highest probability of producing direct or indirect positive effects on student success, based on both compelling research and extensive experience.

Over the next several pages, each high-leverage principal leadership practice is presented and explained. For each practice, selected strategies are included to help principals implement the practice. The term “selected strategies” is intentionally used because the strategies identified herein are not meant to be all inclusive. Implementing any individual strategy may lead to positive outcomes. Strategies, however, are intended to work together for greater impact and are related across high-leverage practices and increase the overall impact of *all* identified practices. Explanations include additional resources for practices and strategies as well as recommended supporting references.

The PEP Task Force avoids using common or contemporary jargon as much as possible in order to focus on the key concepts of practices or strategies, not on the originator or a potential branded product. In this way, the practices and strategies put forward have the broadest application to the myriad contexts of education in California. For example, the PEP Task Force holds the value of learning communities to be of paramount importance to a collaborative culture that centers on student outcomes. Similarly, we have promoted systemic shared leadership structures and opportunities. We have not, however, used the terms “Professional Learning Communities” or “distributed leadership.” While strict adherence to a Professional Learning Community protocol as DuFour and colleagues (DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, & Many, 2010) have envisioned it may be the best possible option, the key concept for all readers and users of this report is the routine-embedded sharing of student data and plans to improve outcomes. Likewise, given the time demands and constraints on all principals, the key concept of distributed leadership as studied and defined by Spillane and Coldren (2011) holds that the principal maintains or gains influence when a vision is shared such that it can be advanced by any number of actors in the school. The newly adopted Descriptors of Practice for the CPSEL- 2015 (available at <http://www.wested.org/>) reinforce this idea by characterizing masterful leadership as the ability to create structures than can be sustained by other stakeholder leaders.

Of particular note is the fact that the PEP Task Force attempted to write each high-leverage leadership practice in a manner whereby it could be measured or observed via traditional observational, qualitative, and quantitative protocols. With a small amount of effort, principals can establish procedures or systems whereby they can ascertain whether or not they are making progress in implementing and successfully executing an identified leadership practice. With reference to measuring the degree to which selected high-leverage leadership practices are being implemented or executed, principals need simply to recall the 3Ms of measurement—meaningful, measurable, and able to be monitored. To a degree, the strategies associated with each high-leverage practice can serve as guideposts for principals as they develop academic action plans to advance continuous teacher growth and enhance student learning.

The PEP Task Force found a dearth of material focused on principal actions that impact student growth. However, at the same time a preponderance of material offered endless lists of principal tasks that differed from one author to another. Thus, the identified high leadership practices and the strategies to enact them are by no means exhaustive, nor should they be. The goal was to filter the multitude of directives, “secrets,” and “steps” into the least number of interwoven, essential and interactive actions as a way to ensure principal’s precious and limited time is maximized both quantitatively and qualitatively.

While this report is primarily designed to guide practicing principals, feedback from a wide range of educators revealed a number of other potential uses:

- Principal supervision, a widely varying endeavor at best, can be informed and/or directed by the high-leverage practices when customized for a principal’s skill level, interests, or challenges and supported by a supervisor;
- With the advent of coaching for new administrators provided by credentialing agencies, the high-leverage practices and strategies can become a common language between a new principal, his/her coach and district supervisors;
- In the absence of communication between a district and the credentialing agency, a coach can be confident when guiding a new administrator when using the Successful School Framework and the high-leverage practices and strategies it employs; and
- In the absence of a professional community of peers, principals can support each other’s growth as they enact the identified practices, strategies and planning tools.

To summarize, principals seeking to enact greatness at their schools need to realize that the evolution of change is a journey, not an event. Leaders effect change when they take the time to “provide direction and exercise influence” (Louis et al., 2010, p. 9). The PEP Task Force recommends that when beginning to implement the high-leverage practices a principal start with one or two practices based on identified high priority school needs.

HIGH-LEVERAGE LEADERSHIP PRACTICES (HLLP)	STRATEGIES THAT SUPPORT HLLPs
<p>#1 TEACHER GROWTH</p> <p>Effective principals apply coherent systems of teacher assistance and development to improve instruction and student learning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Adopt or create a standards-based definition of good teaching with all teaching staff. B. Develop observation, coaching, and feedback skills among teaching staff that enable interactions focused on the improvement of instructional practices. C. Provide resources that support teacher collaboration, allowing time to analyze student needs and progress, plan high quality instruction, and celebrate successes. D. Provide all staff with professional learning opportunities that respond to student learning and social-emotional needs E. Facilitate continuous learning about teaching through the lens of equity for all students using current research and practice.
<p>#2 EQUITY-CENTERED CULTURE</p> <p>Effective principals, considering the race, culture, and socio-economic, and linguistic status of students, take specific actions to establish and maintain collective responsibility for maximizing the potential of every student.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Develop a culture of caring adults who build relationships with students in order to provide needed support, build mutual respect and a sense of belonging and engagement in the school community. B. Establish and communicate norms and expectations with all members of the school community that promotes a positive learning and work environment based on principles of social justice. C. Provide continuous professional learning opportunities for all staff about the factors that impact the achievement gap, (race, culture, and socio-economic status as well as other factors related to diversity on school success.) D. Assign the most accomplished instructors to the students with the highest academic need. E. Engage families and the larger community to solicit expertise and advice in matters related to equity and diversity. F. Seek out and allocate resources to support positive school climate and equity goals.

HIGH-LEVERAGE LEADERSHIP PRACTICES (HLLP)	STRATEGIES THAT SUPPORT HLLPs
<p>#3 COLLABORATIVE LEADERSHIP</p> <p>Effective principals facilitate a shared vision of a democratic education by establishing and maintaining inclusive structures that build leadership capacity for all members of the school community.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Collaborate with stakeholders to revisit, develop, and communicate the shared vision of the school. B. Establish structures that promote a culture of collaboration, and a sense of trust and belonging among staff and the school community. C. Cultivate and provide support for leadership opportunities among all members of the school community. D. Lead stakeholder understanding budgets and allocations and how to build capacity for all types of resources.
<p>#4 PRINCIPAL GROWTH</p> <p>Effective principals model commitment to ongoing learning to sustain and enhance leadership skills that improve instruction and the learning community as a whole.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Engage in a professional community with peers within the district and county. B. Acquire a coach and/or mentor for him/herself for the purpose of supportive reflection and the continuous improvement of leadership practices. C. Align professional learning provided for and by staff to the Quality Professional Learning Standards and participate fully in those learning opportunities. D. Reflect on his/her own practice and seeks guidance from the CPSEL and associated Descriptions of Practice to establish goals and monitor progress. E. Seek the required training to effectively manage all types of resources.
<p>#5 EVIDENCE-BASED DECISIONS</p> <p>Effective principals engage the learning community in evidence-based decision making.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Adopt or construct a system for continuous inquiry into instructional practices for improving student learning. B. Inventory all types of available data to determine what data is needed to monitor instruction and student learning. C. Ensure that teachers have opportunities to analyze, query, interpret, and make decisions based on data. D. Inform the school community about initiatives, the evidence leading to change, and the resulting outcomes.

SECTION 3: High-Leverage Leadership Practices (HLLP) and Strategies

High-Leverage Leadership Practice #1: Teacher Growth

EFFECTIVE PRINCIPALS APPLY COHERENT SYSTEMS OF TEACHER ASSISTANCE AND DEVELOPMENT TO IMPROVE INSTRUCTION AND STUDENT LEARNING.

WHAT IT IS

This practice focuses on the most effective and efficient ways to support teacher professional learning to increase student outcomes. It does this by redefining roles so that principal and teachers share in instructional leadership. Together, principals and teachers define good teaching. They also identify and implement systems for teacher growth that are research-based, reasonable, motivate more effective teaching, and are consistently applied.

WHY IT MATTERS

Over the last few decades changes in education that were intended to improve student learning and academic achievement have resulted in defining the role of the principal as a direct instructional leader. This has increased principal responsibilities and job stress, while decreasing job satisfaction (Fullan, 2014). Due to the complexity of the work and high expectations of principals, Fullan (2014) states that the first key to maximizing principal impact on student learning is to redefine the principal's role so that it is "to lead the school's teachers in a process of learning to improve their teaching, while learning alongside them about what works and what doesn't" (p.55).

In a growth-based model (Dweck, 2006), professional learning is pivotal to the improvement of teaching. Supporting and facilitating teacher learning is one of the most important tasks for every school principal (Glickman et al., 2014; Fullan, 2014). To build a school culture that can identify its own professional learning needs, the principal must first establish the structures that yield opportunities for teachers to learn. The principal's instructional leadership role needs to be as **lead learner**. He or she should help teachers determine their learning needs, provide support, and learn along with them. The California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL) reinforces the lead learner role, stating in Standard 2 that, "education leaders shape a collaborative culture of teaching and learning informed by professional standards and focused on students and professional growth" (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2014, p. 44).

The use of coherent and common systems and protocols, and universal language for best pedagogical and classroom cultural practices, regardless of the content area or grade level, provides the basis for shared understanding of the essential elements of teaching. Systems of teacher assistance and development foster trusting environments that open doors to real professional growth for teachers. "Given the pace of change in schools with shifts in student demographics, curriculum updates, and new instructional approaches, teaching must be the *learning* profession" (Lipton and Wellman, 2013, p. 1).

STRATEGY A

ADOPT OR CREATE A DEFINITION OF GOOD TEACHING WITH ALL TEACHING STAFF THAT UTILIZES A STANDARDS-BASED TEACHING MODEL.

This strategy encourages the principal and teachers to have deep conversations about the characteristics of good teaching for the purpose of developing and refining clear, consistent ways to communicate about teaching. Relevant questions include: What does effective teaching look like? How do we describe good teaching to each other? How do I improve my teaching in a particular area? Darling-Hammond wrote that in a comprehensive system of teacher development, it is important to start with standards for student learning and align these to standards for teaching that can guide assessments [and self-assessments] of teaching . . . throughout the entire career (Darling-Hammond, 2010). California has designed and adopted standards for student learning as well as the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2009). These sets of standards can be useful in focusing deep conversations on teaching. The Continuum of Teaching Practice (2009) was developed as a multi-level tool aligned with the CSTP that assists teachers in identifying current levels of practice, as well as to set goals for improvement and growth.

STRATEGY B

DEVELOP OBSERVATION, COACHING AND FEEDBACK SKILLS AMONG TEACHING STAFF THAT ENABLE INTERACTIONS FOCUSED ON THE IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES.

There are numerous coaching models with the potential to transform interactions among and between administrators, teachers, and students. All of them focus on the learning itself and seek or produce evidence that may be used to confirm observations. Cognitive Coaching, a model developed by Costa and Garmston (2002), provides the basis for growth-minded conversations that lead to teacher improvement. Lipton and Wellman (2001) have made Learning Focused Conversations both their brand name and an oft-used expression of the ideal in communication for growth. Their model has been extended to Learning Focused Supervision, adding the importance of calibration to the initial stances of consulting, collaborating, and coaching (Lipton & Wellman, 2013). Glickman's developmental and clinical supervision models (Glickman et al., 2014) provide well-researched guidance to school leaders in assisting teachers to higher levels of performance. Coaching, communication, and supervision skills are not complicated, but they do require patience and practice to achieve full system impact.

STRATEGY C

PROVIDE RESOURCES THAT SUPPORT TEACHER COLLABORATION, ALLOWING TIME TO ANALYZE STUDENT NEEDS AND PROGRESS, PLAN HIGH QUALITY INSTRUCTION, AND CELEBRATE SUCCESSES.

A workplace for teachers that encourages collaboration can become an environment in which teachers share ideas, solutions to problems, analyze student work, plan lessons and interventions, and share learning about educational practice. As teachers learn from each other in a community, they improve

their own practice, and the benefits to students increase (Rosenholtz, 1989; Shulman & Shulman, 2004). To ensure that the collaborative groups remain focused and productive, school leaders (i.e. grade level and department teacher leaders, instructional coaches) need training on how to facilitate group learning. Resources should be made available to (1) support professional learning as the teachers identify areas for growth in their practice; and (2) to support teacher collaboration such as, time for teachers to meet regularly.

STRATEGY D

PROVIDE ALL STAFF WITH PROFESSIONAL LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES THAT RESPOND TO STUDENT LEARNING AND SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL NEEDS.

Taken together, the HLLP's recommended in this report will surface important questions for any school context about its culture, climate and the intersection with student learning. Authentic professional development will naturally arise in the process of addressing those questions.

- Teacher-selected professional learning, especially when selected through teacher collaboration, can be effective in helping teachers make changes and design interventions that lead to improved student learning outcomes.
- Principals and teachers can collaborate to determine needed professional learning based on shared beliefs about good instruction, observations of teachers' practice and the conversations that engenders. (Strategies A, B and C of this HLLP.)
- Both the creation of an equity-centered culture and collaborative leadership structures empower stakeholders to look broadly at factors affecting the welfare of students as well as their achievement data, opening doors to a broader view of professional learning that will serve student needs. (HLLP #2 and #3).
- Principals who are routinely involved in professional learning themselves may be more attuned to the adult learning process and the range of opportunities that can be created within the organization to learn together. (HLLP #4).
- Evidence-based decisions lead to identifying priorities for improvement, as well as identifying areas of strength on which to capitalize. (HLLP #5).

STRATEGY E

FACILITATE CONTINUOUS LEARNING ABOUT TEACHING THROUGH THE LENS OF EQUITY FOR ALL STUDENTS USING CURRENT RESEARCH AND PRACTICE.

As a faculty works on continuous improvement in instructional practices to enhance student learning, it is important for them to be aware of the most up-to-date research in order to maximize the impact of classroom instruction. Many options are available for a principal to share current research on the science of how children and adults learn but he or she needs to ensure that all teachers have access to relevant

information about the art and science of knowledge acquisition. Reading current journal articles and books can be incorporated into the routines of faculty meetings, conference attendees can share new information with colleagues, partnerships with local colleges and universities can be forged, and teachers can be encouraged to join the local, state and national organizations that support their teaching context.

It is critical that principals ensure that teachers increase their knowledge related to the impact of race, culture, and socio-economic status on student success. Caring adults must know students as individuals, build relationships with them, and consider multiple factors when making decisions about needed interventions and supports for individual students. More detailed information about how to initiate these discussions can be found in Strategy C of the High-Leverage Leadership Practices.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

Additional standards-based models for observing classroom instruction and for providing growth minded feedback and coaching:

Strategic Observation And Reflection (SOAR™) Calibration Platform: In response to school districts seeking tools for formal and informal evaluations of teaching practice and professional learning, REED at UC Davis and partners have developed an on-line platform around the *EPF for teaching* SOAR™ Frames. These frames address: TK-2 Literacy: The CCSS ELA and Anchor Literacy standards and CA ELA/ELD framework (grades TK-2); 3-12 Literacy: The CCSS ELA and Anchor Literacy standards and CA ELA/ELD framework (grades 3-12); and TK-12 Math: The CCSS Mathematical practices standards and CA Mathematics Framework (currently under development by EPF for teaching). (REED at UC Davis: <http://education.ucdavis.edu/resourcing-excellence-education-reed>)

Coalition for Essential Schools, Cycle of Inquiry: <http://archive.essentialschools.org/resources/72.html>.

The Danielson Framework—a scientifically validated set of components of instruction, aligned to INTASC standards, and grounded in a constructivist view of learning and teaching. Teaching is divided into 22 components clustered into four domains of teaching responsibility. An observation protocol that requires training and calibration is available. (Danielson, 1996).

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2010). *SuperVision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon Publishing. (Glickman's models of Development and Clinical Supervision (p. 11) supports several of the strategies mentioned in this high-leverage leadership.)

Hurd, J., & Lewis, C. (2011). *Lesson study step by step: How teacher learning communities improve instruction*. Heinemann: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Reiss, K. (2015). *Leadership coaching for educators: Bringing out the best in school administrators*, 2nd. ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

High-Leverage Leadership Practice #2: Equity-Centered Culture

EFFECTIVE PRINCIPALS, CONSIDERING THE RACE, CULTURE, LINGUISTIC, AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF STUDENTS TAKE TARGETED ACTIONS TO ESTABLISH AND MAINTAIN COLLECTIVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR MAXIMIZING THE POTENTIAL OF EVERY STUDENT.

WHAT IT IS

This practice lays the groundwork for a climate of inclusion and responsiveness for all student and adults in the school's community, while simultaneously maintaining a primary focus on meeting the challenges of doing whatever is necessary to meet the most urgent student needs.

WHY IT MATTERS

This practice is tightly targeted to address the academic and social needs for the student populations historically and persistently underserved. While all children deserve attention from competent and caring adults who will honor their diverse characteristics, only characteristics of race, language, and socio-economic status are directly correlated with the gaps in opportunity and achievement. The labels for these children have served to marginalize their needs, as if success for the majority in some way has justified the status quo in teaching and leadership so detrimental to these students. Given shifts in the population and instructional landscape, that label is no longer accurate and demands reprioritization of educational goals and the methods to achieve them with all children.

Thirty-six years later we are still talking about inequity of educational experience without having achieved broad or replicable advancements to close achievement and opportunity gaps, or perhaps as importantly, to make school a valuable personal experience. Children of color and poverty are taught largely by white teachers who comprise 82% of all teachers in the country (73% in California), creating a “diversity gap” (Helland, 2014), for relationship building and modeling. Further compounding the inequities, segregated school environments “have fewer resources, tend to have teachers with less experience, and are teaching outside of their areas of specialty” (Orfield & Frankenberg, 2014). A long history of lack of will to resolve the obvious long-standing inequities remains embedded in our current system. When the State of California can defend itself in *Williams v. California*, (*Williams et al. v. State of California*, 2000) a lawsuit brought to correct egregious inequities in the public schools, by explaining how it “has no responsibility” for such conditions (Darling-Hammond, 2010, p. 153) one has to ask who should be accountable—students who take tests poorly or the system that designs their success or failure.

In 1979, Ronald Edmonds (p.15), referring to the urban poor, wrote:

“We can, whenever and wherever we choose, successfully teach all children whose schooling is of interest to us; we already know more than we need to do that; and whether or not we do it must finally depend on how we feel about the fact that we haven’t so far.”

With the advent of requirements of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), new administrator preparation standards, and alignment of fiscal allocations, California policy makers have sent a clear message that our future depends on the success of our students. However, that effort is endangered when, as professionals, we remain reluctant to identify our own unconscious biases, our lack of understanding for conditions beyond our own experience that directly impact the opportunity for academic success in school, or speak up about the misguided acts of our colleagues. Courageous leaders must prepare for resistance to inquiry into the daily practice of teaching and learning. At the same time they must expect the best of themselves and others, and foster that same courageous leadership in their school community.

Creating an equity-centered school community culture engenders candid, sometimes difficult, conversations about everything from segregated programs to attendance procedures. It also requires reaching out intentionally to marginalized families and the larger community. The principal's ability to build the needed capacity will be pivotal to success.

Enacting the following strategies calls for the courage to transcend fear and resistance and to calmly do what is right according to our democratic ideals and our avowed guardianship for our collective future. It is quite likely this practice requires breaking whatever silence must be broken to place children bound for another generation of inequity above all other concerns. If equity is really a "principal's passion" (Singleton & Linton, 2006), s/he must ensure collective responsibility for equitable opportunities to learn and appropriate supports to maximize students' potential.

STRATEGY A

DEVELOP A CULTURE OF CARING ADULTS WHO BUILD RELATIONSHIPS WITH STUDENTS IN ORDER TO PROVIDE NEEDED SUPPORT, BUILD MUTUAL RESPECT AND A SENSE OF BELONGING AND ENGAGEMENT IN THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY.

In documenting specific strategies principals use to disrupt injustices in school settings, Theoharis (2010) found that creating a warm and welcoming climate was a key component, changing the entire school experience for both students and their families (Darling-Hammond, 2010, p. 357). In their vision of equity, Singleton and Linton described an environment where "children feel safe and secure . . . due to their understanding that school has their physical, emotional, and spiritual safety at heart. School is staffed by "teachers [who] are well aware of the individual talents of the students and provide the support that every child needs" and where "the curriculum is respectful and reflective of the diversity of students; experiences, backgrounds and cultures" (Darling-Hammond, 2010, p. 226).

Conclusions from the Adverse Childhood Experiences Study (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1997) and 40 Developmental Assets (Search Institute, 1990) demonstrated the inestimable value of feeling known and cared for at school. With that in place, academic achievement can follow. As work from the New Leaders for New Schools Center describes it, "the school's work reinforces the messages," school is important," "you can do it," "we're here to help" and "you and we are responsible for your successes." Leaders are responsible for both modeling and communicating these messages to the entire school community (New Leaders, 2009, p 4).

Implementation of this strategy will first require articulating what a caring environment looks and feels like before moving on to develop and broadly communicate group norms for interpersonal behavior

among all stakeholders. By observing the adults around them, by being expected to be a good leader and follower, and by the celebration of success, it should be evident to students that the adults at the school respect each other and are collectively working on their behalf.

Highly supportive school cultures often have systems by which every child is connected to one staff member whom they know is looking out for them and their needs. No matter the source of hardship, the single most common factor for children who end up doing well is having the support of at least one stable and committed relationship with a parent, caregiver, or other adult. These relationships are the active ingredient in building resilience: they provide the personalized responsiveness, scaffolding, and protection that can buffer children from developmental disruption (Center on the Developing Child, 2015).

STRATEGY B

ESTABLISH, MAINTAIN, AND NURTURE A POSITIVE LEARNING AND WORK ENVIRONMENT BASED ON PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL JUSTICE.

A positive learning and work environment benefits students both directly and indirectly. Louis et al. (2010) reported on links to student achievement and concludes that the single most important variable for engaging teachers in collective leadership at a given school site was their work setting. Thus, a principal who leads her/his school with social justice principles of fairness and inclusiveness not only creates a nurturing environment for students, but also is more likely to retain teachers, an additional stabilizing factor beneficial to student learning (Darling-Hammond, 2010, p. 152).

Blankstein and Noguera (2015) write that “equity requires uplifting leadership as a process to inspire multitudes, not just a few individuals, to have the courage, commitment, and tenacity to lift up those around them” (p. 27). It is often said that a visitor to any school will feel, will know, in just a few moments whether the school is lifting up all members of the community or not. The degree to which every adult and child respects the norms of communication and interactions (including discipline codes), seeks to understand and support each other, and have positive models for conflict resolution determines the nature of the learning and teaching environment. Practices that maintain and restore respect, order, civility, face, accountability, integrity, dignity and hope (Lindsey, Roberts, & Campbell Jones, 2013, p.vi) are the heart of the environment all parents want for their children.

Full implementation of this strategy includes the professional obligation to regularly review and communicate about the dispensations of discipline, assignment to special education, and status of English language learners for disproportionality. If found, set a course of action to investigate and resolve such disparities.

STRATEGY C

PROVIDE CONTINUOUS PROFESSIONAL LEARNING FOR ALL STAFF ABOUT THE IMPACT OF RACE, CULTURE AND SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, EXPECTATIONS, AND BIASES ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT.

This strategy addresses the views and behaviors of adults through professional development that opens *explicit* conversations and learning. Singleton and Linton’s (2006) seminal work proposes that the first

condition of these conversations about race “requires and establishes a context that is personal, local and immediate” (p. 73). Clearly the same requirement applies to the discussion of any societal condition impacting the students of a given school in a given time and place. Thus, an effective principal will need to facilitate conversations specific to their school community despite the predictable “resistances, barriers, and countervailing pressures to school change and, more specifically, to equity-oriented reform” (Theoharis, 2010, p. 339). Since the vast majority of principals in the United States are white (Ford, 2008; Holland, 2014), “equity and justice are the work of white leaders and cannot be seen as the calling or duty only of leaders of color” (Theoharis, 2010, p. 336).

A word of caution: Facilitating is not the same as leading these conversations. There are many ways to go about arranging for productive learning and conversation, with the best outcomes most likely emerging from conversations among principals and teachers on how to manage the material as well as the feelings that can emerge. The principal will need to convey the importance of this work and find allies to support and advise it. It is also wise for the principal to be transparent about his/her own need to learn and grow in this regard both as a leader and as a member of the community.

STRATEGY D

ASSIGN THE MOST ACCOMPLISHED INSTRUCTORS TO THE STUDENTS WITH THE HIGHEST ACADEMIC NEED.

In an equity-centered culture, the assignment of teaching staff is a paramount consideration. In the process of review of this report by successful practitioners from all levels of leadership, all of whom were committed to equitable opportunities to learn, the most intense emotions were provoked when discussing their belief in an ethical and practical mandate to assign the best teaching staff to underperforming groups. Darling-Hammond cited devastating statistics about the distribution of underprepared teachers to the neediest schools and the direct correlations between teacher competency and student achievement. Poor teacher quality serves to “exacerbate disparities [which] further increased the achievement gap” (Darling-Hammond, 2010, p.157).

There are various positions from which to view teachers’ professional capital, but none “defends a system where older and more experienced teachers get the easiest classes, where job allocations are made according to seniority and not suitability...” (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012, p. 14). Principals universally want every student to have an outstanding teacher every year. Hargreaves and Fullan (2012) attest to the extreme importance of placing highly accomplished and equity-committed teachers with students who are in danger of not being taught, or are struggling to learn the core curriculum. They note the tendency of principals to acquiesce to school or district cultures that place the “best” teachers with the “best” students. They are equally emphatic about the moral obligation of principals to intensely supervise and assess probationary teachers so that, over time, a principal can expect all teachers to be ready and able to meet the challenges of any classroom assignment.

If making these teaching (and teaching support) assignments with equity as the highest value is not part of the district culture, the principal will need to lay some groundwork with the district human resources office, develop a relationship with the union representation at the school, and even persuade teachers to request the assignment that will maximize their positive impact.

STRATEGY E

ENGAGE FAMILIES AND THE LARGER COMMUNITY AS EXPERTS AND ADVISORS IN MATTERS RELATED TO EQUITY AND DIVERSITY.

Confronting inequities and opening the space to create a better educational world requires both strength and wisdom. There can be no better place for the wisdom of families and community members than in school culture and climate endeavors. Even parents who may be unable or unwilling to advise curriculum or management questions will contribute to creating and sustaining a school environment in which students can enjoy learning. Having their voices heard and their influence felt builds their confidence that their children will be well served by the teachers and leaders to whom they must entrust them every day.

Louis and colleagues found “little evidence that teachers perceive much influence from parents, or from students.” This outcome probably reflects the well-known and persistent challenges teachers and administrators face in creating authentic relationships with parents for school improvement purposes (Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010, p. 32). However, the report also found a direct connection between high performing schools and the opportunity for all stakeholders to influence decisions. “The high performance of these schools might be explained as a consequence of the greater access they have to collective knowledge and wisdom embedded within their communities” (Louis et al., 2010, p. 35). Remarkably, Raymond Edmonds (1979) documented this same effect in this analysis of multiple studies comparing high and low performing schools in 1979 (p 20).

Stories about the transformational impacts of engaging families and the larger community abound whenever school leaders discuss the trials and the triumphs of bringing diverse voices into the school structure. With the advent of the Local Control Funding Formula, such engagement is no longer a lofty goal, but a legal necessity. In any case, before families and the community will genuinely invest themselves in the business of the school, the principal and all other leaders in the school must publicly and sincerely demonstrate a commitment to inclusion and equity for all.

STRATEGY F

SEEK OUT AND ALLOCATE RESOURCES TO SUPPORT POSITIVE SCHOOL CLIMATE AND EQUITY GOALS.

Just as the State of California in its newest funding model (Local Control Funding Formula) aligns money with achieving equity and academic goals, so must a principal lead the community in decisions that ensure adequate resources for the goals of an equity-centered culture. This will involve building capacity, a process of examining all types of resources to maximize fiscal, structural, relational and human assets. When the parent community and the larger community understand the vision and values of the school leadership and staff, they often become partners with the school, creating a whole new source of support.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES:

- Blankstein, A. M., & Noguera, P. (Eds.). (2015). *Excellence through equity: Five principles of courageous leadership to guide achievement for every student*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Barton, R. & Larson, R. (March 2012). Leadership for equity. *Principal's Research Review*, 7(2), 1-7.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (1997). *Adverse childhood experience study*. Atlanta, GA: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/acestudy/>
- Claassen, R. & Claassen R. (2008). *Discipline that restores: Strategies to create respect, cooperation, and responsibility in the classroom*. North Charleston, SC: Booksurge, LLC.
- Cooper, D. (2011). *Redefining fair: How to plan, assess, and grade for excellence in mixed-ability classrooms*. Bloomington, ID: Solution Tree Press.
- Costello, B., Wachtel, J. & Watchtel T. (2009). *The restorative practices handbook for teachers, disciplinarians, and administrators*. Bethlehem, PA: International Institute for Restorative Practices.
- The Education Trust. (2013). *Breaking the glass ceiling of achievement for low-income students and students of color*. Washington, DC: Haycock, K.
- Kafele, B. K. (2009). *Motivating black males to achieve in school and in life*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). *The dream-keepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lindsey, R. B., Roberts, L. M., & Campbell Jones, F. L. (2013). *The culturally proficient school: An implementation guide for school leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Milner, R. H. & Howard, T. (2015). *Rac(e)ing to class: Confronting poverty and race in schools and classrooms*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Search Institute. *40 Developmental Assets*. (1990). Retrieved from <http://www.search-institute.org/research/developmental-assets>
- Singleton, G. E. & Linton, C. W. (2006). *Courageous conversations about race: a field guide for achieving equity in schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Wachtel, J. (2012, August 30). Connecting the dots between brain research & restorative practices [Web log post]. Retrieved from <https://restorativeworks.net/2012/08/brain-research-restorative-practices/>
- Saufler, C. (2011). *School climate, the brain and connection to school*. Safe Schools for All. Retrieved from <http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/Bethlehem-2012-Presentations/Bethlehem-2012-Saufler.pdf>

High-Leverage Leadership Practice #3: Collaborative Leadership

EFFECTIVE PRINCIPALS ESTABLISH AND COMMUNICATE A SHARED VISION OF A DEMOCRATIC EDUCATION. THIS IS DONE BY ESTABLISHING AND MAINTAINING INCLUSIVE STRUCTURES THAT BUILD LEADERSHIP CAPACITY FOR ALL MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY.

WHAT IT IS

In their new roles, “principals must adapt from having largely managerial roles to being architects of collaborative learning organizations and adult developers” (Drago-Severson, 2007, p. 4). Principals make that shift by sharing a vision for equity, by promoting a culture of collaboration and trust, sharing leadership and ensuring informed resource allocation. In doing so, principals have a unique opportunity to create a school culture that mirrors the best elements of our democracy—creating and enacting a vision for a community in which the members wish to live and work and share the decisions that will benefit the next generation of children. Most importantly, “collective leadership explains a significant proportion of variation in student achievement across schools. Higher-achieving schools award leadership influence to all school members and other stakeholders to a greater degree than lower-achieving schools. These differences are most significant in relation to the leadership exercised by school teams, parents, and students” (Leithwood & Mascall, 2008, p. 1).

WHY IT MATTERS

Collaborative leadership and shared decision-making engages stakeholders in meaningful ways that engender their ability to help communicate and implement the school vision. Not only does this enliven a school community, it lightens all loads and creates an organization structured to work and learn collaboratively at all levels.

Dewey’s words ring as true today as they did in 1907. *What is our vision today for a democratic education that reflects the values of the parents and community while preparing children for their future in the 21st Century? All*

successful schools articulate the answer for themselves in the form of a shared vision on which they base their decisions for both the instructional program and the school environment.

If “every organization is perfectly structured to get the results that it gets” (Darling-Hammond, 2010, p. 8) then educational leaders must intentionally structure a workplace model that reflects exactly what we want for all stakeholders, students most importantly. We want students to have equal opportunities, to be engaged in their learning and to have a sense of belonging to a community. We want staff, students, and parents to work collaboratively, to have agency in shared decisions, and opportunities to develop their own leadership capacity to advance the shared vision in their daily work and without supervision.

One hundred and nine years ago, educator John Dewey, wrote:

“What the best and wisest parent wants for his own child, that must the community want for all of its children. Any other ideal for our schools is narrow and unlovely; acted upon, it destroys our democracy. (Dewey, 1907, p. 3)”

Many of the upheavals of the last decade in education policy, funding structures in the so-called age of accountability were initiated or justified by the need to move from a factory model to a new paradigm for the Information Age—the 21st Century. In this “new” world, students’ futures are tied to innovation, collaboration and connectivity are the norm. Businesses realize the need for a similar shift long ago, but unlike the field of education, they did “not just offer incentives for staff to try harder within traditional constraints” (Darling-Hammond, 2010 p. 237). With few exceptions, a parallel transformation in the world of education has simply not occurred despite enormous effort. Paul Hill of the Progressive Policy Institute articulates our collective dilemma:

“Today’s public schools system tolerates new ideas only on a small scale and it does so largely to reduce pressures for broader change. The current system is intended to advance individual, community and national goals, but is, in fact, engineered for stability.” (Hill, P., 2006, p. 1)

We need educational leaders, who can overcome the inertia described by Hill and respond to a new set of criteria for a paradigm shift that benefits both professional staff and students. Collaborative (sometimes called collective) leadership offers a new vision and structure to the governance of schools. Hill also finds “encouragement for claims about benefits accruing to students when leadership is more widely distributed in schools” (Louis et al., 2010, p. 29) and indirectly related to student achievement, as well as offering “greater acceptance of jointly-made decisions along with an increased sense of responsibility for and motivation to accomplish organizational goals” (Louis et al., 2010, p. 20).

“Vision is a compelling picture of the future that inspires commitment. It answers the questions: Who is involved? What do they plan to accomplish? Why are they doing this?” (Mendez-Morse, 1993, p. 1). In wrestling with these questions, each school community both creates and shares the vision that lies at the heart of this leadership practice. That vision, like all democratic values, are ideals to be worked towards, with leaders who will clarify and communicate the vision through governance structures that give stakeholders a place and a voice.

To accomplish this, leaders must first be able to weather the instability of the improvement process. In their work Hill and her co-authors investigate some of the most creative and successful organizations in the recent history. They describe their concept of “the paradoxes of collaboration” as that tension in which “innovation emerges most often from the collaboration of diverse people as they generate . . . new ideas through discussion, give and take, and often-heated contention” (Hill, Brandeau, Trulove, & Lineback, 2014, p. 59). Understanding these tensions allow principals to both cultivate and normalize an environment that expects and supports innovation and shared decision-making.

STRATEGY A

COLLABORATE WITH STAKEHOLDERS TO REVISIT, DEVELOP, AND COMMUNICATE THE SHARED VISION OF THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY.

In any organization, success rests squarely on the ability of the leader to facilitate the development of “a picture of the future for which people are willing to work (Mendez-Morse, 1993, p. 1). Sometimes a strong school culture already exists and may only need the principal to facilitate a review, renewal or

re-commitment to its working vision. In any case, communicating the vision is paramount. The PEP Task Force would argue that the principal's conveyance of the shared vision should be apparent and consistent in all aspects of his/her leadership without undue effort. Simply asking—how does this action reflect our vision and align with the highest leverage leadership practices—leads to both reflection and coherence. In that way, virtually any work the principal does or shares reinforces the community's ability and commitment to create the school staff members want to work in and parents want their children to attend.

The biggest challenge lies in visualizing how to connect leadership practice with student learning, and “then mobilizing others’ energies and commitment accordingly” (Knapp, Copland, Plecki, Portin, 2006, p. 1). In their extensive study of the impact of leadership on learning, Louis and colleagues found that principals’ two core functions are to provide guidance and exercise influence. Nowhere could that be more important than in solidifying a vision that mobilizes energy and commitment to an environment, instruction, and support mechanisms for student learning (Louis et al., 2010, p. 9).

STRATEGY B

ESTABLISH STRUCTURES THAT PROMOTE A CULTURE OF COLLABORATION, AND A SENSE OF TRUST AND BELONGING AMONG STAFF AND THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY.

While a shared vision is the foundation of a successful school, extensive research confirms that collaborative practices are the building blocks of a positive workplace and learning environment. Schools characterized by collaborative cultures are places of hard work and dedication, collective responsibility, and pride in the school (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012, p. 113). Darling-Hammond (2010) cites the National Education Longitudinal Study of 820 high schools to report that “in addition to many other case studies of successful schools, research found that schools that had restructured to personalize education and develop collaborative learning structures produced significantly higher achievement gains and were also more equitably distributed” (p. 239). To gain these benefits, “principals have a responsibility to structure the school day and teachers’ schedules so that teachers have dedicated time to collaborate on teaching strategies, develop lessons together, and determine curricular goals” (Knapp et al., 2006, p. 60).

Louis et al. (2010) finds “that collegial relationships among adults in the school, whether principal-teacher or teacher-teacher, lead to strong focused instruction” (p. 48). Since strong instruction is the ultimate goal of all teachers, and the strongest instruction comes from productive collaborations, the principal's efforts to build a culture of collaboration cannot be underestimated. However, not only do such levels of teacher engagement require principal support, they require a level of trust on the part of teachers—perhaps the most elusive of goals but a key to success for a principal. John Diamond, co-editor of *Distributed Leadership*, asserts that “teachers typically turn to other teachers for instructional guidance and therefore administrators need to recognize the limits of their direct influence on how teachers teach” (Anderson, 2007, p. 1). Louis cites work by Tartar et al., (1989) that found supportive principal behavior and faculty trust were significantly correlated. However, the study implies that principals can build trust indirectly through support behavior, but they cannot make teachers trust one another through direct action,” (Louis et al., 2010, p. 41). This again validates the need for principals to facilitate a broad range of collaborative options for staff members.

When teachers trust each other and work together, they model both the skills and the social capital they desire for their students, permeating and creating a psychologically safe community where children feel supported, safe and free to learn. Such an environment also promotes teacher retention. Harris Interactive (2003) found that practices of effective school leaders such as establishing a shared vision and scheduling time for collaboration make a difference to teachers as they decide whether to remain at their schools or even in the profession.

STRATEGY C

CULTIVATE AND PROVIDE SUPPORT FOR LEADERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES AMONG ALL MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY.

“We are paying more attention to leadership and leadership development but still putting too much faith in leaders as heroic individual saviors, rather than in communities of leaders who work together effectively and build on each other’s work over time” (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012, p. 44). For anyone who has experienced the daily rigors of school leadership, the notion of a lone, heroic school principal being the manager of operations, instructional leader and coach, supervisor, counselor, professional development specialist, and public relations officer is absurd, if not dangerously close to doomed.

Although the job of principal exploded long before a plausible strategy to manage it emerged, the tide seems to have turned towards a leadership model variously described as distributed, collaborative, democratic, or shared (Spillane & Diamond, 2007). Regardless of the name, the *key concept* envisions the principal as director of the orchestra, not someone required to play every instrument at the same time. Ironically, this sets in motion a new non-traditional job for principals, that of teaching others to be leaders, including students and parents. However, effective principals understand that their influence is not diminished by sharing leadership (Louis et al., 2010). On the contrary, in the long run it can save time and energy, focus collective efforts more tightly, build a better school and be highly satisfying because it invests in our finest educational stock in trade, increasing human capital.

Drago-Severson (2007) cites Leithwood, Jantzi, Ryan and Steinbach (1997) to advocate for “creating school conditions that support teacher leadership.” Those studies “found that teachers had the strongest influence on school planning and structure, while principals had a great impact on school culture and mission” (p. 98). Further, the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (2008) reports that “enhancing teacher leadership can help schools and districts...improve teacher quality, student learning, reform efforts, teacher retention, provide professional growth, extend principal capacity and create a democratic school environment” (p.3). With this knowledge, the principal can strategically employ such “mechanisms as cross-disciplinary teams, cross functional teams, grade level, subject area, specialized units, etc.” to promote teacher growth and maximize human resources (Drago-Severson, 2007, p. 83).

The coaching skills that principals are encouraged to acquire and use to assist classroom teachers (HLLP #1, Strategy B) can be extended to include teachers or staff members who are taking leadership roles. Given the new administrative credentialing requirement to provide coaching for all new administrators for two years, California has validated coaching as a key component of developing leadership, one that principals can pass on to their aspiring leaders.

In an analysis of groups of teachers pursuing administrative credentials who thought the job “worth it” despite the complexity and pressures, “proportionately more people who had been encouraged by a practicing administrator to consider a principalship position were in the ‘worth it’ group” as opposed to those who had no mentoring or coaching by their school leader (Howley, et al., 2005, p. 769). Since the study also found discriminatory practices in the hiring of women, and the dearth of *minority* teachers and leaders is well-recognized, creating a potential pool of new leaders “might be well served by having its current leaders identify and then groom a cadre of new leaders” (Howley, Andrianaivo, & Perry, 2005, p. 772).

STRATEGY D

INCLUDE STAKEHOLDERS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BUDGETS, ALLOCATION DECISIONS AND IN BUILDING CAPACITY FOR ALL TYPES OF RESOURCES.

Among the distinctive features of successful, redesigned schools is the fact that they use the resources of people and time very differently from traditional systems in order to foster more intense relationships between adults and students, and to ensure collaborative planning and learning time for teachers, as schools in other nations do (Darling-Hammond, 2010, p. 273). In order to manage resources “very differently” for the purposes Darling-Hammond highlights, all stakeholders need some understanding of the finances involved. California’s Local Control Funding Formula, when used as the law intended, goes a long way to bring stakeholders into the basic allocation decisions. However, in a culture of collaboration and shared decision-making, knowledge of resources should include exploring fresh perspectives on what constitutes resources, how they might be used more creatively and how to determine what resources are needed to improve outcomes for students.

The PEP Task Force found this element of a collaborative culture largely ignored in the literature, despite its practical importance. Ann Jaquith’s (2012) model for Instructional Capacity Building provides one model that lends itself to collaboration and innovation. In addition, the model is well-aligned to the CPSEL elements, ensuring that principals can provide sound leadership in money matters. Regardless of the model a principal uses, Drago-Severson’s (2007) study of initiatives principals used to support *transformational learning* for teachers found that school leaders most committed to the growth of teachers “discussed financial and human resource challenges (time, and resistance to change) in their creative strategies to support teacher learning despite these obstacles“ (p. 86).

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

- Anderson, J. (2007). *Distributed leadership: Five questions with assistant professor John Diamond*. Retrieved from <http://www.gse.harvard.edu>.
- Center on the Developing Child (2015). *The Science of Resilience (InBrief)*. Retrieved from www.developingchild.harvard.edu.
- Drago-Severson, E. (2007). Helping teachers learn: principals as professional development leaders. *Teachers College Record*, 109(1), 70-125.
- Hargreaves, A., Fullan, M. (2012). *Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- *Harris Interactive. (2003). *The MetLife survey of the American teacher: An examination of school leadership*. New York: MetLife. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?q=+An+examination+of+school+leadership.&id=ED505002>
- Hill, L. A., Brandeau, G., Truelove, E., & Lineback, K. (2014). *Collective genius: the art and practice of leading innovation*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Hill, P. (2006). *Put learning first: A portfolio approach to public schools*. Washington, DC: Progressive Policy Institute.
- Howley, A., Andrianaivo, S., Perry, J. (2005). The pain outweighs the gain: Why teachers don't want to become principals. *Teachers College Record*, 107(4), 757-782.
- Jaquith, A. (2012). Building instructional capacity: A research brief. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved from <https://cset.stanford.edu/publications/reports/building-instructional-capacity-research-brief>
- Knapp, M., Copland, M. A., Plecki, M. L., & Portin, B. (2006). *Leading, learning, and leadership support*. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy. Retrieved from <https://depts.washington.edu/ctpmail/PDFs/Synthesis-Oct16.pdf>
- Leithwood, K. Mascall, B. (2008). Collective leadership effects on student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), 529-561.
- Louis, K., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K., & Anderson, S. (2010). *Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings*. University of Minnesota. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Pages/Investigating-the-Links-to-Improved-Student-Learning.aspx>
- Mendez-Morse, S. (1993). The principal's role in the Instructional Process: Implications for At-Risk Students. *Issues . . . about Change*, (2, 3). Retrieved from <http://www.sedl.org/change/issues/issues13.html>
- Mendez-Morse, S. (1993). Vision, leadership and change. *Issues . . . about Change*, (2, 3). Retrieved from <http://www.sedl.org/change/issues/issues23.html>
- National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. (2008). *Enhancing leadership quality: TQ source tips & tools: Emerging strategies to enhance educator quality*. Retrieved from http://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/3184_Enhancing_Leadership_Quality_active_links_2_Opt_11-16-09_0.pdf
- University of Washington Center for Educational Leadership. (2013). *Principal Support Framework*. Retrieved from <http://info.k-12leadership.org/principal-support-framework-download-webinar?submissionGuid=ddb69f88-bfd1-4b5c-aab1-aab8e9453994>

High-Leverage Leadership Practice #4: Principal Growth

EFFECTIVE PRINCIPALS MODEL COMMITMENT TO ONGOING LEARNING TO SUSTAIN AND ENHANCE LEADERSHIP SKILLS THAT IMPROVE INSTRUCTION AS WELL AS THE LEARNING COMMUNITY AS A WHOLE.

WHAT IT IS

When principals adopt a growth mindset to direct their work with staff, students, and the school community, that mindset must also apply to their own development as a leader. This high-leverage leadership practice includes the actions that principals take to learn how to better support organizational learning, maintain resolve and focus, and find solutions in response to challenges. To grow and develop in the principalship, principals must continuously engage in learning opportunities, mentoring or coaching sessions, or professional development (Wiggins, 2012).

WHY IT MATTERS

The role of the principal has changed significantly in recent years. School leaders are not only building managers, but also key drivers of the many facets of school improvement. Principals fill a wider variety of roles than ever before, serving as supervisors, instructional leaders, fund-raisers, visionaries, community organizers, data analysts, and change agents (Guilfoyle, 2014).

With so many changes to the role of principal, many site administrators have not been afforded the opportunity to work in the very type of organization they want to create in their school. In their previous roles as a teacher they may not have been a part of a learning community, worked with evidence to determine how to improve instruction, or had many productive years as an instructor. Since you cannot teach what you have not learned, this practice highlights the invaluable and essential need for principals to be respected and valued as a learner in an integrated learning system.

“Despite the expensive investment in principal preparation, selection, and transition, a study conducted by Fuller and Young found that just over 50 percent of newly hired principals stay at a school for three years and less than 30 percent stay to year five” (School Leaders Network, 2014, p. 11). However, “it takes an average of five years to put a mobilizing vision in place, improve the teaching staff, and fully implement policies and practices that positively impact the schools’ performance” (School Leaders Network, 2014, p. 3). Setting aside the financial losses for principal turnover, the loss of stability and progress for staff growth and student achievement has been documented (Beteille, Kalogrides, & Loeb, 2011).

STRATEGY A

ENGAGE IN A PROFESSIONAL COMMUNITY WITH PEERS WITHIN THE DISTRICT AND COUNTY.

This strategy specifically addresses the need to have a group of people who understand the context and complexity of a principal’s daily work. While some principals may be lucky enough to have district meetings that are similar in nature to professional communities, most do not. District meetings tend to be focused on management and policy implementation and allow little or no principal growth opportunities. Professional

learning communities advocated in this practice focus on problems of practice, where principals get counsel and feedback that is trusted and valued, and where they can be comfortable and supported in discussion and reflection on their practice.

A recent report by the School Leaders Network (2014) reveals that when principals were asked what they needed to sustain in the profession and impact their schools, the participating principals overwhelmingly reported ongoing support with peers. Principals, like teachers, prefer to learn in “context relevant, collaborative settings, where they have the ability to influence the learning agenda” (p.13). In a study sponsored by MetLife (2012), the researchers reported that nearly nine in 10 (87%) principals participated in a professional learning community with principals of other schools, while half (49%) engaged in mentoring with a principal from another school, either as a recipient or a provider. Clearly, a high percentage of principals view participation in a professional learning community as a way to look deeply into the teaching and learning process and to learn how to become more effective in their work with teachers and students.

Participation in professional communities can provide a forum to grow and exchange ideas, access the latest research and resources, and engage in professional development and networking opportunities. Some principals take advantage of additional connections at the state or national level which can broaden a principal’s perspective.

STRATEGY B

ACQUIRE A COACH AND/OR MENTOR FOR HIM/HERSELF FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUPPORTIVE REFLECTION AND THE CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT OF LEADERSHIP PRACTICES.

The terms coaching and mentoring are often used interchangeably, however, they are quite different. Coaching is task-oriented, short term, and performance driven. Mentoring is relationship oriented, long-term, and development driven. While having both would be beneficial, having at least one is essential to being able to spend time in reflection on practice and exploration of one’s own capacity. Beginning August 2015, all administrative preparation programs in California are required to provide all new administrators with coaching for the first two years of their practice. However, the School Leaders Network (2014) advocates for one-to-one coaching support to principals beyond the first two years. Since this model is being recognized for its power to support and develop our future principals, clearly coaching should be extended to principals at all experience levels as well. As Dr. Nancy Carter-Hill at the Center for Urban Education points out, “providing pre-service coaching alone could be likened to coaching an athlete only before he or she signs with a pro team” (Carter-Hill, 2013).

Ideally, every district would provide a trained coach, conversant with CPSEL as well as district standards and goals, to their administrators. In reality, it is likely that a principal will have to seek out his/her own coach. Networking with other principals or seeking a connection with the district and county offices may offer potential resources. In any case, a mentor can be valuable at the same time, or until a coach can be identified.

STRATEGY C

ALIGN PROFESSIONAL LEARNING PROVIDED FOR AND BY STAFF TO THE QUALITY PROFESSIONAL LEARNING STANDARDS, AND PARTICIPATE FULLY IN THOSE LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES.

Professional development is one of the primary ways that schools and school districts ensure that educators continue to strengthen their practice and grow throughout their careers. The Quality Professional Learning Standards (QPLS) identify essential elements of professional learning that cut across subject specific content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and dispositions. The QPLS are seven interdependent standards that serve as a foundation for the content, processes, and conditions for educator professional learning (California Department of Education, 2015).

The most effective professional development sessions engage school teams that focus on the needs of their students and include the principal (Mizell, 2010). Often principals find themselves so overwhelmed with paperwork and other management duties that they succumb to the temptation to use the time teachers are in professional development to deal with these tasks instead of attending themselves, or they might attend but not participate. However, the principal's full participation during a professional development session signals the importance of the professional learning, increases teachers' engagement, and models commitment to growth. It also reinforces the principal's commitment to teams and demonstrates willingness and intention to monitor and support implementation (Mizell, 2010, p. 7).

Conversely, it is the experience of the PEP Task Force members, as well as interviewees, the principal's absence during professional development sessions decreases the potential of the learning. It can reasonably be expected to weaken the importance of the learning and the monitoring of any implementation effort, in addition to undermining the sense of collective responsibility that fuels positive team interactions and the potential for student benefits.

For maximum effect and buy-in by staff, principals and teachers will identify emerging professional learning needs through evidence-based concerns about student progress (HLLP #5) and observations, coaching and feedback conversations (HLLP #1). The Planning Tool in this report provides a form useful in identifying areas for improvement that might become topics for professional learning. Using a collaborative process to plan professional learning and identifying internal experts to lead it will strengthen the cohesiveness of the school community, but staff must also attend to the quality of offerings. Quality can be assessed when principals and teachers use the Quality Professional Learning Standards (California Department of Education, 2015). (See Appendix C). The standards are user-friendly, based on adult learning models, practical, and consistent with the high-leverage leadership practices recommended in this report, as well as the CPSEL and CSTP. (See Appendix C).

STRATEGY D

REFLECT ON HIS/HER OWN PRACTICE AND SEEK GUIDANCE FROM THE CPSEL AND ASSOCIATED DESCRIPTIONS OF PRACTICE TO ESTABLISH GOALS AND MONITOR PROGRESS.

Reflection sometimes carries an overly somber notion of examining oneself. This practice asks only that a principal make use of the excellent tools available to build his/her own self-awareness. While reflection

connotes a degree of vulnerability required for realistic self-assessment, seeking the trusted feedback of a peer community, coach, mentor (Strategies A and B in this practice) or trusted supervisor, facilitates and eases the growth process. Equally important, the practice requires for principals to do for themselves what they should be requiring of their teachers.

The CPSEL and related Descriptions of Practice (DOP) identify what an administrator must know and be able to do in order to move into sustainable, effective practice (Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2014). They also reflect current and emerging expectations for educational leaders. As a result, principals can refer to the CPSEL and DOP to ground, guide, and direct their day-to-day actions.

The original CPSEL were adapted from the national Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) leadership standards developed in 1996 and then revised in 2008 and 2015. The updated CPSEL (2015) are informed by current research studies, policy and practice literature, and state statutes and reflect experiences of California administrators and stakeholders, that together validate the CPSEL content as accurately representing expectations for the work of education leaders. Despite their credibility, they remain an underutilized resource for principal reflection, guidance and growth. (Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2014, p. 2) This year, CPSEL will be aligned more closely with the California Administrative Performance Expectations used in administrative preparation programs, as the CDE continues its march toward the integrated cohesive and aligned path for all educator development recommended in *Greatness by Design* (California Department of Education, 2012). Thus, the CPSEL will become more broadly understood and used. Further, the DOP illuminates in detail, including competence indicators, exactly how those standards can be enacted. The latest DOP revision was completed in May 2015 and is available at WestEd.com.

STRATEGY E

SEEK THE REQUIRED TRAINING TO EFFECTIVELY MANAGE ALL TYPES OF RESOURCES.

California schools are big business: the public school system provides instruction and support services to roughly six million students in grades kindergarten through twelve in more than 10,000 schools throughout the state (Governor's Budget Summary, 2015). Principals may not be required to fully understand the machinations of state funding, but their schools are certainly affected by changes in the economy of the state or funding models as evidenced by upheavals during the recent recession and the subsequent shift to a Local Control Funding Formula.

Readers of this report may notice that there are no references to literature in this strategy discussion. The PEP Design Team Task Force notes little research specific to effective resource management. As a result, this report has specific recommendations in HLLP #1, #2 and #3 related to resources, all of which are based on the principal having the knowledge needed to navigate budgets, effectively analyze and allocate resources, and even generate external ones.

Some preparation programs offer effective courses in school finance. Most central offices keep principals abreast of funding issues and projections, and also provide site principals with comprehensive budget planning training. However, if adequate training was not part of the preparation program and district training is not forthcoming, principals must seek information and advice about district expectations and/

or make a connection with the finance office on their own. Coaches, mentors and supervisors are good sources of guidance.

Like all other high-leverage principal practices, this one relies on collaboration and shared decision making for maximum effectiveness. When a principal informs staff and other appropriate stakeholders about budgeted resources, s/he has laid the groundwork for collective understanding needed for the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) and priority setting. As a principal teaches staff and other stakeholders how to use the Successful School Planning Tool, i.e. how to analyze and expand the notion of resources, they build capacity in the school community to approach resources more creatively. (See Section 4). More veteran principals may form alliances with the parent or business community to generate external resources for the school. Even if a new principal is fortunate enough to inherit a source of external resources, s/he will still need to understand district policy and regulations related to those resources, so that they can lead their stakeholders in taking responsibility for and decisions about how to support the best learning environment and quality of instruction for all students.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

- Branch, G., Hanushek, E. A., & Rivkin, S. G. (Winter, 2013). School leaders matter: Measuring the impact of effective principals. *Education Next*, 13(1), 62-69. Retrieved from <http://educationnext.org/school-leaders-matter/>
- Carter-Hill, N. (2013). *Spotlight on coaching*. Center for Urban Education Leadership. University of Illinois, Chicago. Retrieved from urbanedleadership.org
- Dweck, C. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. New York, NY: Random House Publishing Group.
- Governor's Budget Summary. (2015). *Governor's Budget Summary—2014-15: K thru 12 Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/2014-15/pdf/BudgetSummary/Kthru12Education.pdf>
- Lotich, P. (2014, May 7). *5 Advantages of professional networking*. Retrieved from <http://thethrivingsmallbusiness.com/what-are-5-advantages-of-professional-networking/>
- New Leaders. (2011). *Great principals at scale: Creating district conditions that enable all principals to be effective*. New York, NY: Author.
- Osborne-Lampkin, L., Folsom, J. S., and Herrington, C. D. (2015). A systematic review of the relationships between principal characteristics and student achievement (REL 2016–091). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southeast. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>
- Personal and Professional Development Plan: 6 Considerations, 6 Elements*. (2012, August 19). Retrieved from <https://www.goshareon.com/blog?p=327>
- School Leaders Network. (2014). *Churn: The high cost of principal turnover*. Retrieved from https://connectleadsucceed.org/churn_the_high_cost_of_principal_turnover
- Wilde, M. (2015). *The ins and outs of school finance* | GreatKids. Retrieved from <http://www.greatschools.org/gk/articles/the-ins-and-outs-of-school-finance/>

High-Leverage Leadership Practice #5: Evidence-Based Decisions

EFFECTIVE PRINCIPALS ENGAGE THE LEARNING COMMUNITY IN EVIDENCE-BASED DECISION MAKING

WHAT IT IS

Decisions based on data and evidence are being made across all areas of human endeavor, including education, to more systematically understand and increase the positive impact of practices on outcomes. Three hallmarks of evidence-based decision-making emerged from research. These are: (1) identify and implement a system that includes steps for collecting and analyzing data, determining needs, and designing, implementing and evaluating changes; (2) collaborate with colleagues; and (3) align decisions with evidence (Boudett, City, & Murnane, 2013; Bryk, Gomez, Grunow, & LeMahieu, 2015).

WHY IT MATTERS

The primary work of teachers and principals is to advance student academic learning and social emotional growth. Well-defined learning is guided by standards and goals, and can be measured through multiple assessment tools and data sets that reveal the learning accomplishments and needs of individuals and groups of students. Principals have instructional leadership responsibilities, as indicated in the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL) Standard 2 to, “guide and support the implementation of standards-based curriculum, instruction, and *assessments* that address student expectations and outcomes” and “to develop and use *assessment and accountability systems* to monitor, improve, and extend educator practice, program outcomes and student learning” (Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2014, p. 44). Appropriate, systematic, and continuous use of evidence refines and focuses the work of teachers and principals in improving instruction and the school environment to support more effective student learning.

The strategies associated with this high-leverage practice form a sequence of actions that lead to effective use of data and evidence for decision-making. In addition, these strategies support a collaborative and consistently implemented improvement process. Principals and teachers must recognize that the work of assessment, analysis, and change is never finished (Boudett et al., 2013; Bryk et al., 2015).

STRATEGY A

ADOPT OR CONSTRUCT A SYSTEM FOR CONTINUOUS INQUIRY INTO INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES FOR IMPROVING STUDENT OUTCOMES.

Promote a school culture of inquiry that respects and practices evidence-based decision making. For greater effectiveness and efficiency, adopt a protocol or construct a system for inquiry that combines essential steps and components. Protocols typically consist of described steps for inquiry. Essential components include collaboration, data collection, data analysis, and interpretation to identify potentially useful changes. An additional essential component is a plan for evaluating changes and applying this information to guide the next improvement. Protocols for inquiry often include tools and forms for conducting the activities associated with the component steps.

Examples of collaborative protocols for making school improvements include the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's conceptualization of Improvement Science and 90-Day Cycles for rapid, responsive, *local* research, the Data Wise Improvement Process developed at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, and the Collective Instructional Leadership System designed through research on the Teacher-Based Reform Project at California State University, Chico. An example of a collaborative protocol for examining the effectiveness of lessons is Lesson Study, a process developed in Japan, "in which teachers jointly plan, observe, analyze, and refine actual classroom lessons (Lewis & Hurd, 2011).

STRATEGY B

INVENTORY ALL TYPES OF AVAILABLE DATA TO DETERMINE WHAT DATA ARE NEEDED TO MONITOR INSTRUCTION AND STUDENT LEARNING.

A wide variety of data from multiple sources is available at school sites as well as within a district. This data usually include results of standardized and local student assessments, classroom assessments, student work samples, attendance and discipline records, and demographic information.

Creating a school data inventory (Boudett et al., 2013) is an information-gathering task in which principals and teachers identify the data they currently have and the initiatives the school is implementing for improvement. The product of this task is a list categorized by external and internal assessments, and instructional initiatives. Teachers and principals also gain an understanding of how the school maintains and organizes its data. This allows for discussions of current and future data use, and determination of information still needed, such as multiple measures to confirm student performance. In practice, creation of a school data inventory should be delegated to a small group of interested faculty.

Data can be enhanced with student, staff, and community perceptions of the school through surveys such as, the Illinois 5 Essentials Survey that looks at indicators of school improvement (Illinois State Board of Education, 2015).

STRATEGY C

ENSURE THAT TEACHERS HAVE OPPORTUNITIES TO ANALYZE, QUERY, INTERPRET, AND MAKE DECISIONS BASED ON DATA.

The purpose of examining school data, reorganizing it, and comparing different data sets is to find patterns that indicate how instruction is working for different students, as well as how effective the school is at meeting the needs of the school community. Since student learning is the primary responsibility of the school, those closest to instruction and teachers need to be afforded opportunities, and must be involved in examining and analyzing data. Involvement in data analysis provides teachers an insight into relationships between performance, student characteristics, and instructional practices. New questions that emerge from early analysis can lead to reorganization of data and deeper understanding of how instruction is working for students. The steps in this process allow teachers and principals to design and implement better interventions that focus on the students they serve and determine the areas for teacher growth and professional learning.

In practice, data preparation work should be delegated to interested faculty. A small group of faculty with expertise in creating displays of data, including graphs and charts that help with analysis, should be recruited to assist the principal. As analysis and discussions among the entire faculty raise questions, the small group of data-proficient faculty can reorganize data and create new graphs and charts for additional analysis. When needed, technical support and assistance should be brought in (Boudett et al., 2013).

STRATEGY D

INFORM THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY ABOUT INITIATIVES, THE EVIDENCE LEADING TO CHANGE, AND THE RESULTING OUTCOMES.

Schools need to engender the support of their communities by developing good relationships with school staff, students, their parents and families, and the wider community (Glickman et al., 2014). The five high-leverage leadership practices focus attention on serving the student as the primary purpose of school. To accomplish this purpose leaders need to help move a critical mass, a sufficient number of people in the community to “become advocates for [the school’s] purpose and mission” (De Pree, 1997, p. 76-77). Clear, open, and regular communication with the school community is the main component of this strategy. Principals and staff need to communicate about the issues faced by the school, such as improving student learning, the work being done to address issues, and the evidence of accomplishments as well as areas that need more work.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

Association of California School Administrators. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.acsa.org/>

Association of California School Administrators. (2009). *The new elementary principal’s handbook: Proven resources for principals by principals*. Burlingame, CA: Author.

Ferguson, C., Jordan, C., Wood, L., Rodriguez, V., & Litke, B. (2005). *Beyond the building: A facilitation guide for school, family, and community connections*. Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Retrieved from: <http://www.sedl.org/pubs/catalog/items/fam40.html>

Lew, C.C. & Hurd, J. (2011). *Lesson study step by step: how teacher learning communities improve instruction*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

McCrea, B. (2013). 7 free apps for keeping parents and teachers connected. *T.H.E. Journal*. Retrieved from <https://thejournal.com/articles/2013/06/11/7-free-apps-for-keeping-parents-and-teachers-connected.aspx>

Local control funding formula: Stakeholder engagement. (2014). WestEd. Retrieved from <http://lcff.wested.org/stakeholder-engagement/>

National standards for family-school partnerships. (n.d.). *National PTA*. Retrieved from <http://www.pta.org/nationalstandards>

Parent involvement. (2014). *California State PTA*. Retrieved from <http://capta.org/focus-areas/lcffcap/priority%20areas/parent-involvement/>

Support for principals. (n.d.). *National School Public Relations Association*. Retrieved from <http://www.nspr.org/principals>

SECTION 4: Successful School Capacity Building Tool

Introduction and Explanation of the Tool

Recognizing that the hardest part of a principal's job is balancing the expenditure of time, energy and resources with a myriad of needs for continuous improvement; the most efficient system for growth of staff and students would be one in which work on any one high-leverage practice enhances and supports all the others. To create such an integrated system, a principal needs to be confident that the enactment of high-leverage practices and strategies are inter-related, aligned to characteristics of successful schools, administrative standards and capacity building options. Ideally, this system of improvement would also cultivate collaborative relationships and enhance an equity-centered culture.

Because the recommended practices and strategies in this report meet all those requirements, the PEP Task Force capitalized on that alignment by creating a planning tool principals can readily use for both large and small initiatives, in large or small groups, or even in the confines of his/her office to help guide pre-planning for school improvement initiatives.

With regular use of the **Successful Schools Capacity Building Tool**, familiarity with the process will allow leaders in all settings to identify an area for improvement related to a high-leverage practice strategy, assess resources from broad and innovative perspectives, write an action plan and then check that plan for coherence against all five of the high-leverage practices. Like any new process, it is best to start small, but in time, this tool can become indispensable because it ensures maximization of time, energy, resources and collaborative relationships.

The Successful Schools Capacity Building Tool includes:

FORM 1 – PLANNING STEPS FOR HIGH-LEVERAGE LEADERSHIP PRACTICE IMPLEMENTATION FLOW CHART

This flow chart explains each step to creating plans for improvement using strategies for only the highest leverage practices. All the forms referenced and shown on the chart follow.

FORM 2 – HIGH-LEVERAGE LEADERSHIP PRACTICE STRATEGIES AND CROSS-CUTTING QUESTIONS

The single page format of practices, strategies and cross-cutting questions is intended to assist principals in reflecting, re-centering and/or focusing on the highest leverage leadership practices before beginning work with staff on identified area for improvement.

FORM 3 – IDENTIFICATION OF AREA FOR IMPROVEMENT

This form functions as a filter to ensure that perceived problems are, in fact, supported by evidence and being addressed by those most able to affect positive a change for students. The tool can be used by an individual, grade level/department team, leadership team, professional community or school site council for any problem-solving initiative.

FORM 4 – SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLS CAPACITY BUILDING TOOL

This instrument identifies the types of resources that schools can analyze and how the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL) supports that analysis.

The work of Ann Jaquith (2012) in identifying resources in creative ways underpins this improvement tool. In her Capacity Building Framework, she identified four quadrants for analysis: instructional knowledge, instructional materials, instructional relationships, and organizational structures. The PEP Team adapted that format by adding a fifth area for analysis in order to keep equity (and CPSEL-Standard 5) at the center of all school endeavors, a direct reflection of the findings in this report.

While faculty and staff members may not necessarily be attuned to the standards for administrators, principals can readily see what parts of the leadership standards are linked to each resource sector. Principals may find other CPSEL elements not noted in this instrument useful depending on the task at hand. Note that CPSEL- Standard 6 surrounds all resource sectors, representing the importance of context given the variety of school settings in California.

The Successful Schools Capacity Building Tool serves two purposes. For a principal, it provides a framework on which s/he can readily see the alignment of essential leadership parameters. For staff members, questions in each of the resource sectors prompt participants to examine their perceptions of their ability to make needed changes. The questions in each area in both the “Have” and “Need” categories are consistent throughout and designed to broaden perspectives for participants who are addressing a problem of practice and looking at their options.

FORM 5 – CAPACITY BUILDING WORKSHEET

A principal may choose a variety of ways to engage staff in this process. Questions on the Successful Schools Capacity Building Tool could be put on a separate sheet or Form 4 could be enlarged enough to provide room to write answers on the same sheet as either a “placemat” or poster. The questions offered in this tool are comprehensive and appropriate for individuals or groups. At some point, a principal or other leaders may be able to adapt or shorten the questions as their skill with the tool increases.

FORM 6 – CROSS-CUTTING QUESTIONS

This form articulates the five areas of high-leverage leadership and poses questions to ensure that any initiative taken on by the school community is consistent with and supported by the leader. Furthermore, by sharing these questions with the whole staff, they reinforce commitments to equity, collaboration, shared leadership and professional growth for all. Before an Action Plan is created, whether comprehensive or simple, it must be tested against the cross-cutting questions. If the questions reveal inconsistencies or obstacles, the Action Plan can be modified.

FORM 7 – IMPLEMENTATION PLAN WORKSHEET

This form is provided for convenience. Many other formats are commonly used.

Form 1 – Planning Steps for High-Leverage Leadership Implementation Flow Chart

FORM 2 – Principals use this form to reflect on their current practice and plan for continuous improvement.

FORM 3 – Individuals or collaborative groups use this form to select an area of improvement.

FORM 4 – Record the identified area for improvement in the upper right side of the *Successful Schools Capacity Building Tool*.
This is a planning tool to be completed by school leaders; a collaborative effort is highly recommended (i.e. principal and other administrators, a leadership team, school site council, teacher leaders, and collaborative professional groups)

FORM 5 – Using questions 1, 2, and 3 in each section, discuss and identify the resources (human, time, fiscal, materials) and conditions that represent the current state of the school that will impact the successful implementation of the area for improvement you have selected.
Record notes from the discussion on the Capacity Building Worksheet in the HAVE sections.
Using questions 3, 4, and 5 in each section, discuss and identify the resources (human, time, fiscal, materials) and conditions that will be needed to successfully implement the area for improvement that has been selected.
Record notes from the discussion on the quadrant planning tools in the NEED sections.

FORM 6 – Review the *Cross-cutting Questions* to ensure that your action plan addresses all the essential themes.

FORM 7 – Using an Implementation Plan Worksheet, sequence activities, people who will be involved or responsible for each step, and resources that will be needed. Include a timeline for the plan that includes specific times to collect evidence in order to monitor the progress of the plan.

Form 2	High-Leverage Practice Strategies and Cross-Cutting Questions	Cross-cutting Implementation Considerations
Teacher Growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Adopt or create a standards-based definition of good teaching with all teaching staff. B. Develop observation, coaching, and feedback skills among teaching staff that enable interactions focused on the improvement of instructional practices. C. Provide resources that support teacher collaboration, allowing time to analyze student needs and progress, plan high quality instruction, and celebrate successes.. D. Provide all staff with professional learning opportunities that respond to student learning and social-emotional needs. E. Facilitate continuous learning about teaching through the lens of equity for all students using current research and practice. 	<p>After using the Successful Schools Capacity Building Tool, consider the following questions:</p> <p>Teacher Growth</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How will the teaching staff be provided with professional learning needed to enact the plan?
Equity-Centered Culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Develop a culture of caring adults who build relationships with students in order to provide needed support, build mutual respect and a sense of belonging and engagement in the school community. B. Establish and communicate norms and expectations with all members of the school community that promotes a positive learning and work environment based on principles of social justice. C. Provide continuous professional learning opportunities for all staff about the factors that impact the achievement gap, (race, culture, and socio-economic status as well as other factors related to diversity on school success.) D. Assign the most accomplished instructors to the students with the highest academic need. E. Engage families and the larger community to solicit expertise and advice in matters related to equity and diversity. F. Seek out and allocate resources to support positive school climate and equity goals. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. How is the plan consistent with an equity-centered culture? <p>Collaborative Leadership</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. How have stakeholders been included in creating the plan, especially those directly affected by it? <p>Principal Growth</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. How will the principal and/or other school leaders acquire needed knowledge or skills to support the plan?
Collaborative Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Collaborate with stakeholders to revisit, develop, and communicate the shared vision of the school. B. Establish structures that promote a culture of collaboration, and a sense of trust and belonging among staff and the school community. C. Cultivate and provide support for leadership opportunities among all members of the school community. D. Lead stakeholder understanding budgets and allocations and how to build capacity for all types of resources. 	<p>Evidence-based Decisions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. How is the evidence for the planning decisions collected and how will progress be monitored and communicated to stakeholders?
Principal Growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Engage in a professional community with peers within the district and county. B. Acquire a coach and/or mentor for him/herself for the purpose of supportive reflection and the continuous improvement of leadership practices. C. Align professional learning provided for and by staff to the Quality Professional Learning Standards and participate fully in those learning opportunities. D. Reflect on his/her own practice and seeks guidance from the CPSEL and associated Descriptions of Practice to establish goals and monitor progress. E. Seek the required training to effectively manage all types of resources. 	
Evidence-Based Decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Adopt or construct a system for continuous inquiry into instructional practices for improving student learning. B. Inventory all types of available data to determine what data is needed to monitor instruction and student learning. C. Ensure that teachers have opportunities to analyze, query, interpret, and make decisions based on data. D. Inform the school community about initiatives, the evidence leading to change, and the resulting outcomes. 	

Form 3 – Identification of Area for Improvement Tool

What challenges, behaviors or conditions have you identified as a potential area of need?

State the specific problem of practice to be analyzed:

Multiple sources of evidence (academic, socio/emotional, discipline and attendance records, or other external measures) that demonstrate the current status of the problem (baseline data):

Who is being affected by the problem?

Which stakeholders should be involved in developing and implementing an action plan?

CPSEL – Standard 6

KNOWLEDGE and VISION

CPSEL Standard 1-Development & Implementation of a Shared Vision (1A, 1B, 1C) & CPSEL Standard 2-Instructional Leadership (2A)

HAVE

- 1. What knowledge and/or skills currently exist at my school or in my district that could support the HLLP/strategy of focus?
- 2. In what ways does the current vision of the school support the introduction or strengthening of the HLLP/strategy of focus?
- 3. What current resources for knowledge/skill development (human, time, fiscal, materials) can support the implementation of the HLLP/strategy of focus?

NEED

- 4. What knowledge and/or skills will be needed to implement or strengthen the HLLP/strategy of focus?
- 5. How might the vision of the school be refocused to reflect the HLLP/strategy of focus? How will the school community be involved and how will the new focus be communicated to students, staff, families and the community?
- 6. What additional resources (human, time, fiscal, materials) will be needed to implement the HLLP/strategy of focus?

CULTURE

CPSEL Standard 2-Instructional Leadership (2A), CPSEL Standard 3-Management & Learning Environment (3C) & CPSEL Standard 5-Ethics & Integrity

HAVE

- 1. In what ways does the equity-centered culture ensure that all stakeholders are ready and willing to engage in the implementation of the HLLP/strategy of focus?
- 2. How do stakeholders participate in decisions that impact the school (i.e. leadership team, school site council, collaborative teams?) In what ways were stakeholders involved in selecting the HLLP/strategy of focus?
- 3. What resources (human, time, fiscal, materials) currently exist that support the culture of learning at the school?

TOOLS and MATERIALS

CPSEL Standard 2-Instructional Leadership (2B & 2C) & CPSEL Standard 3-Management & Learning Environment (3B)

HAVE

- 1. What tools and materials currently exist that would support the HLLP/strategy of focus?
- 2. How do the current leadership/management structures enhance the implementation of the HLLP/strategy of focus?
- 3. What curriculum, instructional strategies, and assessment tools are currently being used that might support the implementation of the HLLP/strategy of focus?

NEED

- 4. What other tools and materials will be needed to successfully implement the HLLP/strategy of focus?
- 5. What are some ways the leadership/management structures be adjusted to better support the HLLP/strategy of focus?
- 6. What changes or additions to the curriculum, instructional strategies, and assessment tools might enhance the implementation of the HLLP/strategy of focus?

CPSEL Standard 6 – External Context & Policy

External Context & Policy

RELATIONSHIPS

CPSEL Standard 3-Management and Learning Environment (3D) & CPSEL Standard 4-Family & Community (4A & 4B) Engagement

1. What structures currently exist to engage students, staff, families and the community in the life of the school? How do these relationships impact the HLLP/strategy of focus?
2. What are the ways information is communicated to students, staff, families and the community that

ensures that they understand and support new initiatives, like the HLLP/strategy of focus?

3. What resources (human, time, fiscal, materials) support the strengthening of relationships among students, staff & the community?

HAVE

4. What additional structures might increase engagement of students, staff, families and the community to enhance the implementation of the HLLP/strategy of focus?
5. What are some ways that communication can be improved to ensure that new initiatives, like the

HLLP/strategy of focus will be understood and supported?

6. What additional resources (human, time, fiscal, materials) could strengthen relationships and engagement of students, staff, families and the community in the life of the school?

NEED

CULTURE

CPSEL Standard 2-Instructional Leadership (2A) & CPSEL Standard 5-Ethics & Integrity (5A, 5B, 5C)

4. How might the equity-centered culture of the school be improved in order to ensure successful implementation of the HLLP/strategy of focus?
5. What are some ways to increase involvement and engagement of stakeholders, especially those who are

directly impacted, as the HLLP/strategy of focus is implemented, monitored and evaluated?

6. What additional resources (human, time, fiscal, materials) will be needed to enhance the school culture of learning?

NEED

STRUCTURES

CPSEL Standard 3-Management & Learning Environment (3A, 3B)

1. What structures exist that engage students and staff in the leadership/management of the school that will support the implementation of the HLLP/strategy of focus?
2. What structures are currently in place that support equity and learning opportunities for all

staff and students in regards to the HLLP/strategy of focus?

3. What management & learning resources (human, time, fiscal, materials) currently exist that support the HLLP/strategy of focus?

HAVE

4. What additional structures could be introduced to increase staff and student engagement in the management/leadership of the school?
5. How might the learning environment be enhanced as the HLLP/strategy is implemented?

6. What additional management & learning resources (human, time, fiscal, materials) will be needed to successfully implement the HLLP/strategy of focus?

NEED

CPSEL – Standard 6

CPSEL Standard 6 – External Context & Policy

KNOWLEDGE and VISION

HAVE

NEED

CULTURE

HAVE

TOOLS and MATERIALS

HAVE

NEED

External Context & Policy

RELATIONSHIPS

HAVE

NEED

CULTURE

NEED

STRUCTURES

HAVE

NEED

CPSEL Standard 6 – External Context & Policy

Form 6 – Cross-Cutting Questions

FORM 6 Cross-cutting Questions

After using the *Successful Schools Capacity Building Tool*, consider the following questions:

Teacher Growth

1. How will the teaching staff be provided with professional learning needed to enact the plan?

Equity-Centered Culture

2. How is the plan consistent with an equity-centered culture?

Collaborative Leadership

3. How have stakeholders been included in creating the plan, especially those directly affected by it?

Principal Growth

4. How will the principal and/or other school leaders acquire needed knowledge or skills to support the plan?

Evidence-based Decisions

5. How is the evidence for the planning decisions collected and how will progress be monitored and communicated to stakeholders?

Form 7 – Implementation Plan Worksheet

Problem of Practice: _____

Action Steps	People Involved/ Responsible	Resources Needed	Implementation Timeline (Include Progress Monitoring)

SECTION 5: Final Thoughts

On a personal and professional note from the Principal Effectiveness Project Task Force:

Given the crucial nature of our project and the passion and commitment of the task force members, it is unlikely that there will ever be a final thought among us on the topic of principal effectiveness. Nonetheless, there must be closure and we will feel better about leaving our readers with these considerations.

From the start, we believed that principals are extraordinarily important in the mission to grow *people*, be they students, staff members, teachers, parents, or themselves. As educators, growth is our business, our goal, our purpose. For that reason, we actively challenged each other to maintain a growth mindset during the course of the study, just as we are challenging principals to do as they enact the high-leverage leadership practices. The continuous and consistent attention to developing human capital is attainable by using these practices and specific strategies.

Early in the study, we had hoped to include commentary on the dispositions of a prospective principal most suited to carrying out the high-leverage practices, but soon realized that would go beyond the scope of the charge and the available resources. According to Leithwood, Day, Sammons, Harris, and Hopkins (2006), those personal leadership qualities would include open-mindedness, readiness to learn from others, flexibility in one's views, persistence in the pursuit of achievement for all, resilience and optimism. In other words, a growth mindset, consistent with the philosophy and scholarship for each of the high-leverage leadership practices.

We also believed, and the research concurred, that the role of principal has moved from predominately operations and maintaining order to one that seems to require superhuman energy, inspirational character and some degree of star quality. For some time the literature about leadership has distinguished between managers and leaders by stating that a manager does things right and a leader does the right things (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). That may be true, but what are the right things? From the research we learned that, depending on whom you ask, it could be literally hundreds of things. Principals need the same personal and professional renewal as their staffs do, they need a reduction of stress and conflicting demands and a clearer path to success. The practices we recommend speak to those needs by identifying the right actions and making every action contribute to a cohesive whole.

“Creating a system that supports the learning of all students is not impossible. It will take clarity of vision and purposeful, consistent action to create a web of supportive, mutually reinforcing elements” (Darling-Hammond, 2010, p. 277). The High-Leverage Leadership Practices, Strategies and the Successful Schools Planning Tool meet those requirements. Our goal was to offer principals the most streamlined, the most context flexible, the *highest* leverage practices that both compelling research and our collective experience could validate. In doing so, we have also provided a framework for guidance for coaches, mentors, and district supervisors. While the practices and strategies are not a valid evaluation tool, they are credible elements on which evaluation, coupled with the CPSEL, can be developed.

If readers take only two ideas from this report, after 15 months of research, insight gathering and spirited discussion, the task force members stand united in the belief that the *combination of* collaborative structures and the pursuit of equity are the heart of democratic education and the hope for the future

of American education. Therefore, we had to make the difficult decision of whether to embed both concepts into other practices or call them out as separate focus areas. Having seen unfortunate results from both of these methods of presenting essential initiatives, we could not do either alone, so we did both. Collaboration drives every other HLLP but it is also advanced through specific strategies. Most importantly to every member of the task force, and we hope to all readers, in addition to strongly addressing equity with discreet strategies, every other practice and most other strategies directly or indirectly serve the moral and educational imperative for equity of treatment and access, environment and instruction for all members of the school community.

To achieve the goal of an integrated professional learning system, the California Department of Education has committed to enacting *Greatness by Design*, invested heavily in teacher growth initiatives, and created this task force to design a system for principal effectiveness that will encourage and promote that teacher growth. The Department has also created the Quality Professional Learning Standards, overhauled administrative program preparation standards, updated the California Professional Learning Standards for Educational Leaders along with their Descriptions of Practice, and instituted the Local Control Funding Formula. This report aligns with all these efforts, but perhaps most in philosophy with the new (2015) California State Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educator in an concerted effort toward achieving equitable access for all students to the best instructors and leaders. We dedicate this report to that goal and offer it as a blueprint to creating and supporting great principals and every one of their students in the Golden State.

SECTION 6: Research Methodology

From the onset of this study, the Principal Excellence Project Task Force focused on building a solid research-based foundation for its report, fortified by experiential and anecdotal perspectives of practicing principals. We began by studying *Greatness by Design: Supporting Outstanding Teaching to Sustain a Golden State* (California Department of Education, 2012) in whole, and with particular reference to its description of, and recommendations for principal leadership.

The PEP Task Force employed the REEd E⁴ (Expanding Educator Evaluation and Effectiveness) Quality Improvement Process. The team gathered insights through interviewing and surveying current and former principals and other educators. Additional iterations of information gathering were conducted with potential users of the final report and tools at various stages in the process. Additionally, the team applied more typical research strategies to a review of the literature on principal leadership. The collective experience of PEP Task Force members provided a lens through which the team synthesized characteristics of successful schools, high-leverage and realistic principal leadership practices, and implementation strategies for the principal leadership practices.

With the support of colleagues at the California Department of Education and at REEd, we initially identified more than 40 articles and other reports and documents related to principal evaluation, the original focus of the PEP Task Force's study. The team developed a survey, administered to an online database of California school administrators to assess the current and ideal state of principal evaluation, as well as a structured interview process and questions. Shortly after administering the survey and conducting interviews the charge of the PEP Task Force was changed from principal *evaluation* to principal *excellence*. The team redirected research efforts to the identification of high-leverage principal

leadership practices that build instructional capacity and move student learning forward. With this new lens for the study the team reviewed all of the previous readings and identified and studied additional research reports, articles, and books focused on effective principal practices.

The team applied a systematic process for identification of high-leverage practices and strategies. This process included at least two members of the team reading each identified research report and article, and all team members reading works that were judged as among the best on the initial read. Team members discussed findings and insights from readings with the entire team. These discussions led to development of the Successful Schools Framework and the process for identification of practices and strategies. That process began with individual team members posting practices they had abstracted from the research. Individually identified practices were categorized. Then, through multiple iterations discussion and posting, the final five high-leverage practices were synthesized. These high-leverage practices were confirmed through a reference checking process that looked back at initial readings and sought additional research studies, and through structured interviews of practitioners. A similar iterative process was applied to identify key strategies for implementation of the practices.

This project, as well as parallel projects for teacher evaluation, teacher initiated reform, and others, manifests the California Department of Education vision for “learning system” wherein California educators thrive in a coherent, consistent, aligned and growth-based environment from pre-service to retirement (California Department of Education, 2012). The PEP Task Force regarded IPLS as its prime directive, guiding both process and product towards a tight focus on essential practices underpinned by standards and models that are highly regarded by educators and highly adaptable to all educational contexts. The high-leverage practices identified in this report are research-based, and aligned with the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL) and their associated Descriptions of Practice. Both are based on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards for School Leaders that have been extensively vetted. To further advance the IPLS directive, we offer a model for planning school improvement, the School Success Capacity Building Tool that aligns the CPSEL with an adaptation of Jaquith’s *Instructional Capacity Building Framework* (2012).

Throughout the study, we continued to seek insights and feedback from a wide range of practitioners and policy makers, and to broaden our collective knowledge base. Various members of the PEP Task Force:

- participated in state level workgroups to rewrite the Descriptors of Practice for the CPSEL and to create coaching modules for new administrators.
- attended training in Design Thinking, observation protocols, and Learning Focused Conversations.
- planned and attended the “academies” designed for the study of teacher evaluation in both northern and southern California.
- represented the Design Team at the State Steering Committee that advised REEd in its management of the grant supporting this study.
- interviewed principals, teacher leaders, principal supervisors, superintendents, and professors of educational administration to acquire their ideas and receive feedback early in the study as well as after identification of the high-leverage practices and strategies.

SECTION 7: Principal Excellence Project Team Member Profiles

Janet Hecsh, Ph. D.

Janet is currently a Professor of Teacher Education at California State University, Sacramento. In addition to her responsibilities related to teacher credentialing, Janet's interests also include program design and implementation; assessing teacher performance; institutional assessment and evaluation; education policy studies; K-12 curriculum development; and professional development design.

Email: jhecsh@csus.edu

Linda James, Ed. D.

Linda is a retired director and principal from the Oakland Unified School District. She also served as project director for GEAR-UP at California State University East Bay preparing underserved youth for higher education. Her areas of expertise include professional development training of principals; coaching support for principals, leadership teams, and district office supervisors.

Email: lsjames@comcast.net

Michael Kotar, Ed. D.

Michael is an emeritus professor from California State University, Chico where he worked to prepare students for their teacher and administrative credentials. He currently serves as the Project Co-director for Teachers' Professional Learning for Inland California.

Email: mkotar@csuchico.edu

Pamela Mari

Currently serving as team leader for the Principal Excellence Project, she was formerly an assistant superintendent of the Davis Unified School District after a long and varied teaching career at the secondary level. Pamela has expertise in principal supervision strategies, cultural proficiency initiatives, community/public relations, and board policy development. She recently served on WestEd/CTC workgroups to develop California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL) Descriptions of Practice and the Coaching Modules to support new administrators.

Email: 2pamelamari@gmail.com

Tina Murdoch

Tina currently serves as Director of the California Institute for School Improvement (CISI) within the Center for Applied Policy (CAP-Ed) in the UC Davis School of Education. An annual membership organization, CISI supports superintendents, principals, and curriculum and instructional leaders through monthly policy and research resource digests and annual workshops. CAP-Ed is responsible for the Superintendents' Executive Leadership Forum (SELF), an annual program for superintendent cohorts, and other grant funded projects.

Email: tmurdoch@ucdavis.edu

Eileen Rohan

Eileen is the former superintendent of Ross Valley School District. Her areas of expertise include board policy, administrative supervision, and principal and teacher evaluation initiatives. She recently served on the WestEd/CTC California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL) Descriptions of Practice Workgroup.

Email: eileenrohan@gmail.com

Starla Wierman

Starla is the former Director of the Yolo/Solano BTSA Induction Consortium. Currently she is serving as a consultant to REEd and a team member of the Principal Excellence Project. She is an experienced teacher at the middle school level, a professional development provider, a curriculum developer, a school improvement coach, and has extensive knowledge about the Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) Program. Email: starlawierman@gmail.com

Thomas L. Williams, Ed. D.

Tom is an emeritus professor from California State University, Sacramento—Department of Teacher Education and the Department of Educational Leadership. Tom is also the Founder & CEO of The Institute for Leadership Enhancement And Development (I-LEAD), a consulting company that focuses on mentoring and coaching aspiring, novice, and veteran administrators; and works with district and site staff to employ research-based strategies that are designed to accelerate the learning of all students. Email: williamst@csus.edu

SECTION 8: Acknowledgements

First, thanks to Marcia Trott Education Program Consultant at the California Department of Education for her vision and recognition that effective leadership underpins teacher growth and improved instruction, and for arranging resources to ensure that principal practices received the necessary attention to strengthen and renew leadership capacity in California; and for her confidence in the task force members and her encouragement and guidance of me as leader.

Joanne Bookmyer, REEd Senior Director, assembled the task force, guided it through many months of intense work, allotted us the freedom to do the job as we saw necessary while also keeping boundaries clear, provided us with skilled support staff and kept a positive perspective and a sense of humor throughout the process --which was no mean feat. We could not have been as successful with the direction and process wisdom from Joanne and REEd Executive Director Susan offered us.

From Educator Excellence, the California Comprehensive Center at WestEd, Karen Kearney and Heather Mattson were more than generous with their time, knowledge, research, and large-scale perspective. Karen has successfully devoted much of her professional life to the development of administrative leadership and could not have been more gracious in contributing her invaluable insights to the success of this report.

Gay Roby from the Professional Services Division at the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, had the foresight to include two of us in CTC/WestEd workgroups for online administrative coaching modules and the revision of the Descriptions of Practice for the CPSEL. The perspectives we gained from our workgroup colleagues and leaders deeply influenced the report and helped us to create a product in full alignment and harmony with the IPLS goal.

Our Thought Partners included Julie Webb, a REEd consultant, who kept an eye out for material and trending information that would advance our work. Chris Reising and Jill Tellier-Roth from the San Diego County Office of Education who not only acted as liaisons from the teacher evaluation projects,

but provided us access to a group of forward thinking district cohorts from whom we gathered insights and feedback to inform the arc of the work. Those administrators included Bonita Deamicis, Olga West, Rosario Villareal, Lucia Garay, Jose Villareal, Ana Pedroza, Richard Carreon, Milena Aubry. Special thanks to Dan Wolfson and Carol Osborne for their insights into administrative preparation.

Karen McGahey in the Sonoma County Office of Education kept abreast of our progress and provided invaluable insight into the need for administrative skills to support teacher imitated reforms. Karen also provided us access to administrators connected to the TBAR work in her county; their feedback on the HLLPs was invaluable. They included Leslie Clark, Teri Metzger, Gina Silveira, Jennie Snyder, Jill Rosenquist and Brulene Zamutto.

Principal Troy Allen and Assistant Superintendent Matt Best in Davis, CA added the perspectives and context of charter school innovation to the principal practices, allowing us to better adapt our work to non-traditional settings.

Finally, every task force member contributed endless goodwill, decades of experience and a relentless drive to improve the meaning of school for every child in California. Thanks to Linda for her compassion, insight into human nature and perspectives on equity; to Tom Williams for his attention to detail and the process of getting things done well; to Janet Hecsh for her dynamic and insightful questions that made us think hard about our own leadership as well as school leadership; to Tina Murdoch for finding and organizing materials and policy perspectives and for testing our assumptions; to Eileen Rohan for never ever letting us forget the reality of a principal's day and the responsibility they carry for our collective future; to Mike Kotar for deep and often inspirational thinking, and for extraordinary advice gently and thoughtfully delivered; and to Starla Weirman for her meticulous professionalism and willingness to organize us all with endless grace.

In the process of preparing this report, I've come to believe in the wisdom of teams now more than ever.

Thanks to All,

Pamela Mari
Leader, Principal Effectiveness Project Task Force

SECTION 9: Annotated Bibliography

The PEP Task Force found the following sources to be the most influential to this report and have annotated them for the convenience of our readers.

CITATION	KEY WORDS	ANNOTATION
Blankstein, A., & Noguera, P. (2015). <i>Excellence through Equity: Five principles of courageous leadership to guide achievement for every student</i> . Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin.	Equity-centered Culture, Evidence-based Decision Making	The book discusses the system wide changes that need to be made in order to enhance academic success for all students through equity. Five principles of courage are described: 1) Getting to Your Core, 2) Making Organizational Meaning, 3) Ensuring Constancy and Consistency of Purpose, 4) Facing the Facts and Your Fears, 5) Building Sustainable Relationships. Practical, detailed accounts of schools and districts who have successfully implemented one or more of the principles are provided, along with the positive impacts on students. The role of school leaders is critical in recognizing the need for change and then guiding all stakeholders through the process that places the needs of all students as the highest priority.
Boudett, K. P., City, E. A., Murnane, R. J. (2013). <i>Data wise: A step-by-step guide to using assessment results to improve teaching and learning, revised and expanded edition</i> . Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.	Evidence-based Decision Making, Teacher Growth, Collaborative Leadership	<i>Data Wise</i> presents a clear protocol for evidence-based continuous school improvement and instructional decision making. It shows how examining the variety of student and school data can become a catalyst for professional conversations that identify student and teacher needs, foster collaboration, identify obstacles to change, and enhance school culture and climate. This newer edition is updated with connections to Common Core, and more experiences of the authors in helping schools implement the protocol.
Bradley, B. W., Gooden, M. A., & Micheaux, D. J. (2015). Color-blind leadership: A critical race theory analysis of the ISLLC and ELCC Standards. <i>Educational Administration Quarterly</i> , 51(3), 335-371.	Equity-centered Culture	These researchers use critical race theory to investigate how well the ISLLC and ELCC standards address the question of equity via race. They propose that color-blind leadership has stagnated the conversation about race (and other identifiers) by being color-blind. They believe that color blindness is outmoded and dangerous given the lack of progress in helping kids of color succeed. The negative consequences for students are identified when administrators do not actively address race and are not even called to do so by the standards. They note that neither set of standards on which many states, including California, base their standards, ever use the word race or any other synonyms, thus soft peddling the problem such blindness and silence exacerbates. Curiously, the references for both sets of standards include sources that are strident and insistent on having the needed conversations.
Bryk, A. S., Gomez, L. M., Grunow, A., LeMahieu, P. G. (2015). <i>Learning to improve: How America's schools can get better at getting better</i> . Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.	Evidence-based decision making	In <i>Learning to Improve</i> , the authors argue for continuous school improvement by applying ideas from improvement science. This includes disciplined inquiry into the effectiveness of changes, combined with collaboration with colleagues to identify, adapt, and successfully scale up promising interventions in education. The book is organized around six principles for improvement science that can generate ideas for readers for conducting evaluations of local interventions: 1. Make the work problem-specific and user-centered, 2. Focus on variation in performance, 3. See the system that produces the current outcomes, 4. We cannot improve at scale what we cannot measure, 5. Use disciplined inquiry to drive improvement, and 6. Accelerate learning through networked communities.

CITATION	KEY WORDS	ANNOTATION
<p>California Department of Education. (2015). The Superintendent's Quality Professional Learning Standards. Sacramento, CA: CDE. Retrieved June 26, 2015 from http://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ps/documents/caqpls.pdf</p>	<p>Standards for educator professional learning</p>	<p>Originally adopted in December 2013, the Quality Professional Learning Standards for Superintendents were revised in March 2015. Intended to promote quality teacher learning and development, the seven interdependent standards focus on: Data — using varied data to guide priorities and make decisions Content & Pedagogy — professional learning to increase student capacity Equity — equitable access, opportunities, and outcomes for all students — emphasis on addressing achievement and opportunity disparities Design & Structure — evidence-based approaches, focused and sustained to enable educators to acquire, implement, and assess improved practices. Collaboration & Shared Accountability — development of shared purpose for student learning and collective responsibility for achievement Resources — dedicates resources that are adequate, accessible, and allocated appropriately toward established priorities and outcomes Alignment & Coherence — contributes to a coherent system of educator learning & support that connects district and school priorities and needs with state and federal requirements and resources.</p>
<p>Dweck, C. S. (2006). <i>Mindset: The new psychology of success</i>. New York: Ballantine Books.</p>	<p>Teacher growth, Principal growth, Collaborative leadership</p>	<p>In <i>Mindset</i>, Dweck compares the fixed mindset to the growth mindset. A fixed mindset is the belief that people are endowed with certain levels of talents and abilities that cannot be changed significantly. Alternatively, the growth mindset sees people as learners able to grow, change, and adapt to challenges and situations they face. Growth-minded leaders take steps to increase collective responsibility in schools by supporting teamwork and collaboration, and thereby increasing agency and affirmation among staff. <i>Mindset</i> also includes ideas for communicating effectively with students to foster self-esteem, effort, and accomplishment.</p>
<p>Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P. & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2014). <i>Supervision and instructional leadership: A Developmental Approach, 9th ed.</i> Boston: Allyn & Bacon.</p>	<p>Teacher growth, Equity-centered culture, Collaborative leadership</p>	<p>This book is a reference useful throughout a principal's career. It addresses information and practices related to school culture, teachers as adult learners, democratic education, and developmental and clinical supervision. The authors construct a framework for the principal's instructional leadership function around knowledge, interpersonal skills and technical skills. Instructional improvement is: . . . helping teachers acquire teaching strategies consistent with their instructional goals and compatible with their general teaching styles that increase the capabilities of students to make wise decisions in varying contexts (with regard to peers, adults, academics, and life). Effective teaching consists therefore of those teaching decisions about actions, routines, and techniques that increase the decision making capabilities of students (p. 93). School leadership has three integrated cultural tasks. They are "facilitating change, addressing diversity, and building community so that, "For successful school, education is a collective rather than an individual enterprise" (p.43).</p>

CITATION	KEY WORDS	ANNOTATION
<p>Fullan, M. (2014). <i>The principal: Three keys to maximizing impact</i>. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.</p>	<p>Teacher growth, Principal growth</p>	<p>The three keys principals must use to maximize impact on student learning are (1) Leading the learning at the site. This includes all professional learning and student learning. The leading learning dimensions are capacity building through human, social, and decisional capital; The leader whose instructional leadership focus is on establishing and acquiring resources for teachers does not learn what is specifically needed to foster ongoing teacher growth for increased student learning. The leader must participate as a learner in teacher learning and development if he/she is to engage teachers in conversations about effective practices. (2) Becoming the change agent who uses the right drivers to effect change. Those drivers encompass the seven change agent competencies that include challenging the status quo, building trust through clear communication and expectations, and having a sense of urgency for sustainable results. (3) Becoming a system player or collaborator. Fullan discusses the importance of external lateral capacity building through external collaborations.</p>
<p>Hargreaves, Andy, Fullan, Michael (2012). <i>Professional Capital: Transforming teaching in Every School</i>. New York: Teachers College Press</p>	<p>Teacher growth, Professional capital, System leaders, Growth-oriented programs of evaluation, Principal support, Evaluation</p>	<p>Hargreaves and Fullan clearly articulate the steps that teachers and system leaders need to take to build an effective and highly charged profession. To accomplish this model for education, the authors introduce the concept of professional capital, the systematic development and integration of three kinds of capital—human, social, and decisional—into the teaching profession. Human capital must be circulated and shared. Social capital is based on the belief in the power of individuals to change the system. Decisional capital requires the skills developed in human and social capital. Leaders/teachers make decisions in complex situations, exercising judgment and decisions with collective responsibility as they strive for exceptional performance. Professional capital is about collective responsibility, not individual autonomy; scientific evidence as well as personal judgment; about being open to one’s clients; and ultimately about getting tough on the colleagues who fall short of the professional mission.</p>
<p>Hattie, J., Yates, G. (2014). <i>Visible Learning and the Science of How We Learn</i>. New York: Routledge.</p>	<p>Teacher growth, Principal growth, Development of expertise</p>	<p>Visible Learning and the Science of How We Learn outlines the major principles and strategies of learning, explaining why it can be so hard sometimes, and yet easy on other occasions. The book is structured in three parts: 1) learning within classrooms; which challenges the notion that our brain was designed for thinking, learning foundations; which explains the cognitive building blocks of knowledge acquisition and know thyself which explores, confidence and self-knowledge. Data collected reinforced the need for deliberate practice to develop skills: teaching expertise hinges on extensive development—practice needs to be developmental, effortful, goal structured, and actively monitored. Although the book focused on teacher preparation, development and continuous improvement, the application of research strategies can easily cross into the administrative realm.</p>

CITATION	KEY WORDS	ANNOTATION
<p>Ikemoto, G., Taliaferro, L., Fenton, B. & Davis, J. (2014). Great principals at scale: Creating district conditions that enable all principals to be effective. The Bush Institute and New Leaders.</p>	<p>District conditions for principal success</p>	<p>“Too often, principals are effective in spite of—rather than because of—district conditions. They are superheroes who work around the clock and circumvent barriers to create an oasis of high performance in the midst of unsupportive systems.” This report focuses on the conditions that school districts must create to ensure an effective principal at every school within the district. The Bush Institute’s AREL and New Leaders partnered to generate a research-based framework for effective school leaders and the conditions necessary to scale effective leadership at every school. The framework is divided into 4 strands: 1) Aligned goals, strategies, structures, and resources; 2) Culture of collective responsibility, balanced autonomy, and continuous learning and improvement; 3) Effective management and support for principals with roles and responsibilities that are feasible; 4) Systems and policies to effectively manage talent at the school site.</p>
<p>Lipton, L., & Wellman, B. (2014). Learning-focused supervision: Developing professional expertise in standards-driven systems. Charlotte, VT: MiraVia</p>	<p>Teacher growth, Evidence-based decisions</p>	<p>Learning-focused Supervision articulates a developmental approach to support teacher learning and instructional leadership capacity in building learning cultures. Research informed, Lipton and Wellman, articulate a model for capacity building, a growth minded process based on the following four assumptions: learning-focused supervision is a developmental process; driven by standards to frame expectations and establish and clarify measures of excellence for teachers and students; identify and utilize quality data to calibrate performance; focus on the specific needs of the practitioner; and to create a culture of learning. The skilled practitioner shifts between a continuum of stances as described for anyone who assumes the role of a growth minded coach for an educator. The continuum allows for fluid movement among the stances depending on the experience and skill of the educator who is being coached. Calibration to a set of validated teaching standards is key to the gathering of evidence from a teacher's practice and the delivery of feedback that will move him/her to the next level.</p>
<p>Oregon Department of Education. (2014). Oregon Framework for Teacher and Administrator Evaluation and Support Systems. Salem, OR: Oregon DOE. Retrieved from: www.ode.state.or.us/wma/teacherlearn/educatoreffectiveness</p>	<p>Policy and implementation, Role and evaluation of principals</p>	<p>Statewide initiative designed to guide and support local districts in the development and implementation of teacher and administrator evaluation systems, aligned to State and Federal requirements. The five required elements establish the parameters for the local evaluations and support systems: Standards of Professional Practices, differentiated (4) performance levels, multiple measures, evaluation and professional growth, and aligned professional learning.</p>

CITATION	KEY WORDS	ANNOTATION
<p>Louis, K., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K., & Anderson, S. (2010). <i>Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings</i>. University of Minnesota. Retrieved from http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Pages/Investigating-the-Links-to-Improved-Student-Learning.aspx</p>	<p>Leadership, Student achievement, Teacher leadership</p>	<p>This report is the result of a five-year study commissioned by the Wallace Foundation that focuses on the impact of school leadership on student learning. Researchers explored the linkage through the lens of three different types of leadership—collective, shared, and distributed. The report provides key findings of each sub-study and also concludes with recommendations or implications for policy and practice.</p>
<p>The pain outweighs the gain: Why teachers don't want to be principals. Teachers College Record</p>	<p>Incentives/ disincentives of the principalship, Gender, Grooming teachers for leadership positions</p>	<p>Significant results suggested the following generalizations—<i>proportionately</i> more males were in the 'worth it' group; <i>proportionately</i> more people holding admin licensure were in the "worth it" group; and <i>proportionately</i> more people who had been encouraged by a practicing admin to consider the principalship were in the "worth it" group.</p> <p>CONCLUSIONS: in general the study confirms generalizations from previous research; encouragement from current school leaders is important for teachers considering administration (coaching, leadership opportunities); some mentoring progress the needs of females- <i>the approach still harbors the danger of creating an "old-boy network"</i>.</p> <p>CAUSE for CONCERN: <i>Teachers generally view the disincentives associated with the principalship as more salient than the incentives...implying that, the principalship appears not to represent a professional aspiration.</i></p> <p>RESEARCHERS Recommendation: <i>"districts may want to take steps to demonstrate a commitment to social justice by nurturing a group of potential principals whose characteristics are even more diverse than those of its teaching staff. And given what our data suggest about gender bias, districts need to make special efforts to ensure that qualified females receive fair consideration for positions as school leaders."</i></p>
<p>Principal Effectiveness: A New Principalship to Drive Student achievement, teacher effectiveness and school turnarounds</p>	<p>Leadership action, Urban lowest-achieving schools</p>	<p>Specific leadership actions within the following 5 categories were critical to achieving transformative results: 1) ensuring rigorous, goal-and data-driven learning & teaching; 2) building & managing a high quality staff aligned to school's vision of success for every student; 3) developing an achievement-and belief-based school-wide culture; 4) instituting operations and systems to support learning; and 5) modeling the personal leadership that sets the tone for all student/adult relationships in the school.</p>

CITATION	KEY WORDS	ANNOTATION
<p>Reiss, K. (2007). <i>Leadership coaching for educators: Bringing out the best in school administrators</i>. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.</p>	<p>Principal growth, Teacher growth</p>	<p>The author provides a balance of theory and practice in providing leadership coaching for principals to develop their own skills in becoming effective instructional coaches for teachers. As such, school leaders should not only be the recipients of leadership coaching, but they must also learn to integrate this skill into their interactions with others in the school community to facilitate effective school change. Reiss gives an operational definition of coaching that enables the reader to distinguish between coaching functions and roles from other supportive roles such as mentoring. She discusses the 11 core competencies of coaching developed by the International Coach Federation (ICF). Also included are strategies for overcoming resistance, conducting a coaching session with teachers, and creating a coaching plan. The book also provides a resource section of tools that can be used for self-assessment as well as tools that can be used in the coaching process.</p>
<p>Theoharis, G. (2010). Disrupting injustice: Principals narrate the strategies they use to improve their schools and advance social justice. <i>Teachers College Record</i>, 112(1), 331-373. doi: January 2010</p>	<p>Equity-centered culture, Evidence-based decisions</p>	<p>Six principals were identified, interviewed and studied to determine strategies that led to schools that demonstrated academic success with students from varied racial, socioeconomic, linguistic ability and cultural backgrounds. For the benefit of this article, leadership for social justice was defined as the ability to advocate, lead, and keep at the center of their practice and vision issues of race, class, gender, disability, sexual orientation, and other historically and currently marginalizing conditions in the United States. These principals identified four injustices that they found at their schools that needed to be addressed: 1) School structures that marginalize, segregate, and impede achievement; 2) De-professionalized teaching staff; 3) A disconnect with the community, low-income families, and families of color. Injustice; and 4) Disparate and low student achievement. Multiple strategies were explained for how the principals addressed these injustices at their school site.</p>
<p>The Urban Excellence Framework: Leadership actions to drive breakthrough student learning gains and teacher effectiveness. (2011). Retrieved March 26, 2015, from http://www.newleaders.org/newsreports/publications/uef/</p>	<p>Teacher growth, Equity-centered culture, Evidence-based decisions</p>	<p>The Urban Excellence Framework describes the leadership actions that New Leaders for New Schools has found to be critical for driving breakthrough student learning gains and teacher effectiveness. There are five categories of a principal's work that have been identified: 1) ensuring rigorous, goal- and data-driven learning and teaching, 2) building and managing a high-quality staff, aligned to the school's vision of success for every student, 3) developing an achievement- and belief-based school-wide culture, 4) instituting operations and systems to support learning, and 5) modeling the personal leadership that sets the tone for all student and adult relationships in the school. Of these five categories, the two that are most closely aligned with student outcomes are learning and teaching and aligned staff.</p>
<p>Wahlstrom, K. L., Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Anderson, S. E., & Educational Research, S. (2010). <i>Learning from Leadership: Investigating the Links to Improved Student Learning</i>. The Informed Educator Series. Educational Research Service</p>	<p>Leadership types</p>	<p>"As we began our work five years ago, we argued that leadership is second only to classroom instruction among all school-related factors that contribute to what students learn at school. Five years later, we are even more confident about this claim." This report is the result of a five-year study commissioned by the Wallace Foundation that focuses on the impact of school leadership on student learning. Researchers explored the linkage through the lens of three different types of leadership-collective, shared, and distributed. The report provides key findings of each sub-study and also concludes with recommendations or implications for policy and practice.</p>

SECTION 10: References and General Bibliography

An asterisk (*) in front of an entry indicates the source has been cited in the report.

- Alvoid, L., & Black Jr., W. L. (2014). The changing role of the principal: How high-achieving districts are recalibrating school leadership. Center for American Progress. Retrieved from <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/report/2014/07/01/93015/the-changing-role-of-the-principal/>
- Anderson, J. (2007). *Distributed leadership: Five questions with assistant professor John Diamond*. Retrieved from <http://www.gse.harvard.edu>
- *Association of California School Administrators. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.acsa.org/>
- *Association of California School Administrators. (2009). *The new elementary principal's handbook: Proven resources for principals by principals*. Burlingame, CA: Author.
- *Barnes, J.E., Bentrup, N., Ekman, M., & Brady, M. (2004, March). Unequal education. *U.S. News & World Report*, 136(10), 66-75.
- Barton, R. & Larson, R. (March 2012). Leadership for equity. *Principal's Research Review*, 7(2), 1-7.
- Bennis, W., Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.
- *Beteille, T., Kalogrides, D., & Loeb, S. (2011). Stepping stones: Principal career paths and school outcomes. Working Paper Series (17243).
- *Blankstein, A. M., & Noguera, P. (Eds.). (2015). *Excellence through equity: Five principles of courageous leadership to guide achievement for every student*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- *Boudett, K. Pl, City, E. A., & Murname, R. J. (2013). *Data wise: A step-by-step guide to using assessment results to improve teaching and learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- *Branch, G., Hanushek, E. A., & Rivkin, S. G. (Winter, 2013). School leaders matter: Measuring the impact of effective principals. *Education Next*, 13(1), 62-69. Retrieved from <http://educationnext.org/school-leaders-matter/>
- Bromberg, M., and Theokas, C. (2013). *Breaking the glass ceiling of achievement for low-income students and students of color*. The Educational Trust. Retrieved from <https://edtrust.org/resource/breaking-the-glass-ceiling-of-achievement-for-low-income-students-and-students-of-color/>
- Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Easton, J. Q., & Luppescu, S. (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bryk, A. S., Gomez, L. M., Grunow, A., & LeMahieu, P. G. (2015). *Learning to improve: How America's schools can get better at getting better*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- California Department of Education. (2012). *Greatness by design: Supporting outstanding teaching to sustain a golden state*. Sacramento, CA: Task Force on Educator Excellence. Sacramento, CA: Author.
- *California Department of Education. (2015). *The superintendent's quality professional learning standards*. Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ps/documents/caqpls.pdf>

- *California Educator Excellence Task Force. (2015). *The superintendent's quality professional learning standards (revised)*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ps/qpls.asp>
- Carbaugh, B.G., Marzano, R.J., & Toth, M.D. (2015). *School leadership for results: Shifting the focus of leader evaluation*. Bloomington, IN: Learning Sciences.
- *Carter-Hill, N. (2013). *Spotlight on coaching*. Center for Urban Education Leadership. University of Illinois, Chicago. Retrieved from urbaneduleadership.org
- * Center on the Developing Child. (2015). The science of resilience (In Brief). Retrieved from www.developingchild.harvard.edu
- *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (1997). *Adverse childhood experience study*. Atlanta, GA: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/acestudy/>
- Cheliotis, L. M. G., & Reilly, M. F. (2010). *Coaching conversations: Transforming your school one conversation at a time*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- *The Civil Rights Project at University of California, Los Angeles. (2014). *Brown at 60: Great progress, a long retreat and an uncertain future*. Los Angeles, CA: Orfield G. & Frankenberg E.
- *Claassen, R., & Claassen R. (2008). *Discipline that restores: Strategies to create respect, cooperation, and responsibility in the classroom*. North Charleston, SC: Booksurge, LLC.
- Clifford, M., Menon, R., Gangi, T., Condon, C., & Hornung, K. (2012). *Measuring school climate for gauging principal performance: A review of the validity and reliability of publicly accessible measures*. American Institutes for Research. Retrieved from http://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/school_climate2_0.pdf
- Coalition for Essential Schools. (1999). *The cycle of inquiry and action: Essential learning communities*. Retrieved from: <http://archive.essentialschools.org/resources/72.html>
- *Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2009, September). Administrative services credential application/issuance information. Sacramento, CA: Author.
- * Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2009). *California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP)*. Sacramento, CA. Author.
- *Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2014). *California professional standards for education leaders (CPSEL)*. Sacramento, CA. Author.
- Cooper, D. (2011). *Redefining fair: How to plan, assess, and grade for excellence in mixed-ability classrooms*. Bloomington, ID: Solution Tree Press.
- *Costa, A., & Garmston, R. (2002). *Cognitive coaching: A foundation for renaissance schools*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Costello, B., Wachtel, J., & Wachtel T. (2009). *The restorative practices handbook for teachers, disciplinarians, and administrators*. Bethlehem, PA: International Institute for Restorative Practices.
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2014). *California's problem of practice: For SCEE state teams attending Learning Forward's annual conference 2014 "Meeting-within-a Meeting."*

- *Council of Chief State School Officers. (2014). *2014 Interstate school leaders licensure council standards*, Washington, DC. Retrieved from www.ccsso.org
- Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching 2nd ed.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- *Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and educations: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future.* New York and London: Teachers College.
- Davis, A., Mitchell, K., Dray, B., & Keenan, T. (2012). Bruce Randolph High School: A case study of an urban school becoming successful for multilingual learners. *Journal of Urban Learning, Teaching, and Research*, 8, 61-72.
- Davis, B. W., Gooden, M. A., & Micheaux, D. J. (2015). Color-blind leadership: A critical race theory analysis of the ISLLC and ELCC Standards. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 51(3), 335-371.
- DeMonte, J., & Pennington, K. (2014). Professional support for principals is essential for strong teacher-evaluation systems. *Center for American Progress*. Retrieved from <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/news/2014/07/01/92852/professional-support-for-principals-is-essential-for-strong-teacher-evaluation-systems/>
- *De Pree, M. (1997). *Leading without power: Finding hope in serving community.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- *Dewey, J. (1907). *The school and society.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- *Drago-Severson, E. (2007). Helping teachers learn: Principals as professional development leaders. *Teachers College Record*, 109(1), 70-125.
- *Drago-Severson, E. (2012). The need for principal renewal: The promise of sustaining principals through principal-to-principal reflective practice. *Teachers College Record*, 114(12), 1-56.
- *DuFour, R., DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & Many, T. (2010). *Learning by doing: A handbook for professional communities at work—a practical guide for PLC teams and leadership, 2nd ed.* Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- *DuFour, R. & Marzano, R. (2011). *Leaders of learning: How district, school and classroom leaders improve student achievement.* Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- *Dweck, C. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success.* New York: Random House Publishing Group.
- *Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 15-23.
- The Education Trust. (2013). *Breaking the glass ceiling of achievement for low-income students and students of color.* Washington, DC: Haycock, K.
- *Ellerson, N. (2011). *AASA white paper: School budgets 101.* Retrieved from https://www.aasa.org/uploadedFiles/Policy_and_Advocacy/files/SchoolBudgetBriefFINAL.pdf
- Elmore, R. F. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership.* Washington, DC: Albert Shanker Institute.
- Ferguson, C., Jordan, C., Wood, L., Rodriguez, V., & Litke, B. (2005). *Beyond the building: A facilitation guide for school, family, and community connections.* Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Retrieved from: <http://www.sedl.org/pubs/catalog/items/fam40.html>

- *Finnan, C., & Swanson, J. D. (2000). *Accelerating the learning of all students: Cultivating culture change in schools, classrooms and individuals*. Boulder CO: Westview Press.
- *Ford, B. (2008 March). *White “social justice” principals as “racists”: Negotiating identity and developing strategies*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting, New York, NY.
- *Fullan, M. (2014). *The principal: Three keys to maximizing impact*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Glickman, C. D. (1987). Good and/or effective schools: What do we want? *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 68(8), 622-624.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2010). *SuperVision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon Publishing.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J.M. (2014). *SuperVision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (9th ed.). New York: Pearson Education.
- Goldberg, M. F. (2001). Leadership in education: Five commonalities. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(10), 757-761.
- *Gonder, P. O., & Hymes, D. (1994). *Improving school climate and culture* (AASA Critical Issues Report No. 27). Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- *Governor’s Budget Summary. (2015). *Governor’s Budget Summary – 2014-15: K thru 12 Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/2014-15/pdf/BudgetSummary/Kthru12Education.pdf>
- *Guilfoyle, C. (Summer, 2013). *Principal evaluation and professional growth*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), 19(2), 1-3, 5-7.
- Guilfoyle, C. (2014). *Principal evaluation and professional growth*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD). Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/newsletters/policy-priorities/vol19/num02/Principal-Evaluation-and-Professional-Growth.aspx>
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2010). Collaborative leadership and school improvement: Understanding the impact on school capacity and student learning. *School Leadership and Management*, 30(2), 95-110.
- *Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2012). *Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- *Harris Interactive. (2003). *The MetLife survey of the American teacher: An examination of school leadership*. New York: MetLife. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov>
- Hattie, J., & Yates, G. C. (2014). *Visible learning and the science of how we learn*. New York: Routledge.
- *Helland, J. (2014, May 5). Studies highlight teacher-student “diversity gap.” *Boston Globe*.
- Hill, L. A., Brandeau, G., Truelove, E., & Lineback, K. (2014). *Collective genius: The art and practice of leading innovation*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- *Hill, P. (2006). *Put learning first: A portfolio approach to public schools*. Washington, DC: Progressive Policy Institute.
- *Howley, A., Andrianaivo, S., & Perry, J. (2005). The pain outweighs the gain: Why teachers don’t want to become principals. *The Teachers College Record*, 107(4), 757-782.

- Hurd, J., & Lewis, C. (2011). *Lesson study step by step: How teacher learning communities improve instruction*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Ikemoto, G., Taliaferro, L., Fenton, B., & Davis, J. (2014, June). *Great principals at scale: Creating district conditions that enable all principals to be effective*. The Bush Institute at the George W Bush Presidential Center & New Leaders. Retrieved from www.newleaders.org/wp-content/uploads/GPAS_FullReport_Final.pdf
- Ikemoto, G., Taliaferro, L., Fenton, B., & Davis, J. (2014, June). *Great principals at Scale: Toolkit*. The Bush Institute at the George W Bush Presidential Center & New Leaders. Retrieved from http://www.newleaders.org/wp-content/uploads/GPAS_Toolkit_Final.pdf
- *Illinois State Board of Education. (2015, December). *Illinois 5 Essentials Survey: Organizing schools for improvement*. Retrieved from <http://www.isbe.net/5essentials/>
- *Jaquith, A. (2012). Building instructional capacity: A research brief. *National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality*. Retrieved from <https://cset.stanford.edu/publications/reports/building-instructional-capacity-research-brief>
- Kafele, B. K. (2009). *Motivating black males to achieve in school and in life*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- *Knapp, M., Copland, M. A., Plecki, M. L., & Portin, B. (2006). *Leading, learning, and leadership support*. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy. Retrieved from <https://depts.washington.edu/ctpmail/PDFs/Synthesis-Oct16.pdf>
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). *The dream-keepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lambert, L. (2003). *Leadership capacity for lasting school improvement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- LaPointe, M., Meyerson, D., Orr, M. T., & Cohen, C. (2007). *Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Lessons from exemplary leadership development programs* (Vol. 6). Stanford, CA: Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). How leadership influences student learning. Review of research. *The Wallace Foundation*. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Pages/How-Leadership-Influences-Student-Learning.aspx>
- *Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D (2006). *Seven strong claims about successful school leadership*. Nottingham, England: National College of School Leadership. Retrieved November 10, 2008. Retrieved from <HTTP://www.npbs.ca/2007-elements/pdf/seven-strong&20claims.pdf>
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., Ryan, S., & Steinbach, R. (1997). *Distributed leadership in secondary schools*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, March, 1997 Chicago, IL.
- * Leithwood, K., & Mascall, B. (2008). Collective leadership effects on student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4) 529-561.

- * Local control funding formula: Stakeholder engagement. (2014). WestEd. Retrieved from <http://lcff.wested.org/stakeholder-engagement/>
- *Louis, K., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K., & Anderson, S. (2010). *Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings*. University of Minnesota. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Pages/Investigating-the-Links-to-Improved-Student-Learning.aspx>
- Lindsey, R. B., Roberts, L. M., & Campbell Jones, F. L. (2013). *The culturally proficient school: An implementation guide for school leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- *Lipton, L., & Wellman, B. (2001). *Mentoring matters: A practical guide to learning-focused relationships*. Sherman, CT: MiraVia, LLC.
- *Lipton, L., & Wellman, B. (2013). *Learning-focused supervision: Developing professional expertise in standards-driven systems*. Sherman, CT: MiraVia, LLC.
- *Lotich, P. (2014, May 7). *5 Advantages of professional networking*. Retrieved from <http://thethrivingsmallbusiness.com/what-are-5-advantages-of-professional-networking/>
- *MetLife. (2012). *The MetLife survey of the American teacher: Challenges for school leadership*. Retrieved from <https://www.metlife.com/metlife-foundation/about/survey-american-teacher.html?WT.mcid=vu1101>
- * Mendez-Morse, S. (1993). The principal's role in the instructional process: Implications for at-risk students. *Issues . . . about Change*, (2, 3). Retrieved from <http://www.sedl.org/change/issues/issues13.html>
- Mendez-Morse, S. (1993). Vision, leadership and change. *Issues . . . about Change*, (2, 3). Retrieved from <http://www.sedl.org/change/issues/issues23.html>
- Michael & Susan Dell Foundation. (2010). *Denver public schools: The impact of school-based performance management on student achievement*. Austin, TX: Michael & Susan Dell Foundation.
- Milner, R. H., & Howard, T. (2015). *Rac(e)ing to class: Confronting poverty and race in schools and classrooms*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- *Mizell, H. (2010). *Learning forward – professional learning for student results*. Retrieved from <http://www.learningforward.org/advancing/whypdmatters.cfm>
- Mongon, D., & Chapman, C. (2011). *High-leverage leadership: improving outcomes in educational settings*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- *McCrea, B. (2013). 7 free apps for keeping parents and teachers connected. *T.H.E. Journal*. Retrieved from <https://thejournal.com/articles/2013/06/11/7-free-apps-for-keeping-parents-and-teachers-connected.aspx>
- *National Association of Elementary School Principals. (2010). *Rethinking principal evaluation: A new paradigm informed by research and practice*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- *National Association Secondary School Principals. *10 skills for successful school leaders*. Retrieved from https://www.nassp.org/Content/44755/TenSkills%202nd_ed_exec_summ.pdf

- *National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. (2008). *Enhancing leadership quality: TQ source tips & tools: Emerging strategies to enhance educator quality*. Retrieved from http://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/3184_Enhancing_Leadership_Quality_active_links_2_Opt_11-16-09_0.pdf
- *National standards for family-school partnerships. (n.d.). *National PTA*. Retrieved from <http://www.pta.org/nationalstandards>
- **New administrator program | New teacher center*. (2015, November 3). Retrieved from <http://www.newteachercenter.org/services/new-administrator-program>
- *New Leaders. (2009). Principal effectiveness: A new principalship to drive student achievement, teacher effectiveness and school turnarounds. *New Leaders*. Retrieved from http://www.newleaders.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/principal_effectiveness_executive_summary_nlns.pdf
- *New Leaders. (2011). *Great principals at scale: Creating district conditions that enable all principals to be effective*. New York, NY: Author.
- New Leaders. (2011). Urban excellence framework. *New Leaders*. Retrieved from <http://www.newleaders.org/newsreports/publications/uef/>
- Nocon, H., Davis, A., Keenan, T., Brancard, R., Dray, B. J., Johnson, H., Mitchell, K., Nathenson-Mejia, S., Shanklin, N., Shannon, S., Poulsen, S., Thomas-Ruzic, M., Tzur, R., Verma, G., & DPS-UCD Research Collaborative. (2011). *DPS exemplary schools case study: A cross-case analysis*. DPS-UCD collaborative. Denver, CO: University of Colorado & Denver Public Schools.
- Oregon Department of Education. (2014). *Oregon framework for teacher and administrator evaluation and support systems* (OAR 581-022-1723). Salem, OR: Oregon State Archives.
- Orfield, G., & Frankenberg, E. (2014). Increasingly segregated and unequal schools as courts reverse policy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 50(5), 718-734.
- Osborne-Lampkin, L., Folsom, J. S., & Herrington, C. D. (2015). A systematic review of the relationships between principal characteristics and student achievement (REL 2016–091). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southeast. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>
- *Parent involvement. (2014). *California State PTA*. Retrieved from <http://capta.org/focus-areas/lcfflcap/priority%20areas/parent-involvement/>
- Partnerships. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.caminonuevo.org/apps/pages/index.jsp?uREC_ID=268957&type=d&pREC_ID=599810
- *Peterson, K., & Deal, T. (1998). How leaders influence the culture of schools. *Educational Leadership*, 56(1), 28-30.
- *Personal and Professional Development Plan: 6 Considerations, 6 Elements. (2012, August 19). Retrieved from <https://www.goshareon.com/blog/?p=327>
- Reading Recovery. (n.d.) *Case study: Gwinnett County Public Schools*. Atlanta, GA: Reading Recovery Works! Celebrating Literary Success.

- Reeves, D. B. (2004). *Accountability for learning: How teachers and school leaders can take charge* (Vol. 160). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Reiss, K. (2007). *Leadership coaching for educators: Bringing out the best in school administrators*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- *Reiss, K. (2015). *Leadership coaching for educators: Bringing out the best in school administrators, 2nd. ed.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- *Rennie Center for Education Research & Policy. (October 2012). *Smart school budgeting: resources for districts*. Cambridge, MA: Rennie Center for Education Research & Policy.
- *Resourcing Excellence in Education (REEd) – UC Davis School of Education. (2015). Retrieved November 3, 2013, from <http://education.ucdavis.edu/resourcing-excellence-education-reed>
- Robinson, V. M., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635-674.
- *Rosenholtz, S. (1989). Workplace conditions that affect teacher quality and commitment: Implications for teacher induction programs. *Elementary School Journal*, 89(4), 421-439.
- Ross, C., Hermann, M., & Angus, M. H. (2015). *Measuring principals' effectiveness: Results from New Jersey's principal evaluation pilot* (REL 2015-089). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Mid-Atlantic.
- Saufler, C. (2011). *School climate, the brain and connection to school*. Safe Schools for All. Retrieved from <http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/Bethlehem-2012-Presentations/Bethlehem-2012-Saufler.pdf>
- * School Leaders Network. (2014). *Churn: The high cost of principal turnover*. Retrieved from connectleadsucceed.org/sites/default
- *Search Institute. (1990). *40 Developmental Assets*. Retrieved from <http://www.search-institute.org/research/developmental-assets>
- *ShareOn. (2012, August 18). Personal and professional development: 6 considerations, 6 elements [Web log post]. Retrieved from <https://www.goshareon.com/blog?p=327>
- *Shulman, L. S., & Shulman, J. H. (2004). How and what teachers learn: A shifting perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36(2), 257-271.
- *Singleton, G. E., & Linton, C. W. (2006). *Courageous conversations about race: A field guide for achieving equity in schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- *Spillane, J.P., & Burch, P. (2006). The institutional environment and instructional practice: Changing patterns of guidance and control in public schools. In H. Meir & B Rowan (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in education*. Albany: State university of New York Press.
- Spillane, J. P., & Diamond, J. B. (2007). *Distributed leadership in practice*. New York and London: Teachers College Press.
- *Spillane, J. P., & Coldren, A. F. (2011). *Diagnosis and design for school improvement: Using a distributed perspective to lead and manage change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- *Support for principals. (n.d.). National School Public Relations Association. Retrieved from <http://www.nspra.org/principals>
- *Tarter, C. J., Bliss, J. R., & Hoy, W. K. (1989). School characteristics and faculty trust in secondary schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 23(3), 294-308.
- *Theoharis, G. (2010). Disrupting injustice: Principals narrate the strategies they use to improve their schools and advance social justice. *The Teachers College Record*, 112(1), 331-373.
- Thomas-Ruzic, M., Johnson, H. L., Shanklin, N. L., Keenan, T., & DPS-UCD Research Collaborative. (2011). *DPS exemplary schools case study: Merrill Middle School*. DPS-UCD Collaborative. Denver, CO: University of Colorado & Denver Public Schools.
- Transformational leadership. (n.d.). In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved May 6, 2015, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transformational_leadership
- Travers, J., & Christiansen, B. (2010). Strategic staffing for successful schools: breaking the cycle of failure in charlotte-mecklenburg schools. *Aspen Institute*.
- Tredway, L., Stephens, D., Hedgspeth, C., Jimes, C., & Rubio, R. (2012). *A tripartite framework for leadership evaluation*. Berkeley, CA: Graduate School of Education.
- University of Washington Center for Educational Leadership. (2013). *Principal Support Framework*. Retrieved from <http://info.k-12leadership.org/principal-support-framework-download-webinar?submissionGuid=ddb69f88-bfd1-4b5c-aab1-aab8e9453994>
- Villani, S. (2005). *Mentoring and induction programs that support new principals*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Wachtel, J. (2012, August 30). Connecting the dots between brain research & restorative practices [Web log post]. Retrieved from <https://restorativeworks.net/2012/08/brain-research-restorative-practices/>
- Wahlstrom, K. L., Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., & Anderson, S. E. (2010). Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings. *New York: The Wallace Foundation*. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Documents/Investigating-the-Links-to-Improved-Student-Learning.pdf>
- *Wiggins, G. (2012). Seven keys to effective feedback. *Education Leadership*, 70(1), 10-16.
- *Wilde, M. (2015). *The ins and outs of school finance* | GreatKids. Retrieved from <http://www.greatschools.org/gk/articles/the-ins-and-outs-of-school-finance/>
- *Williams et al. v. State of California. (2000). Superior Court of the State of California, complaint filed June, 2000.
- Wiseman, L., & McKeown, G., (2010). *Multipliers: How the best leaders make everyone smarter*. New York: HarperCollins.

SECTION 11: Appendix

APPENDIX A – Terms

Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) — potentially traumatic **events** that can have negative, lasting effects on learning, health, and overall well-being. These **experiences** range from physical, emotional, or sexual abuse to parental divorce or the incarceration of a parent or guardian.

Coaching (also referred to as leadership coaching) — a collaborative process that engages site leaders in a one-to-one relationship with a coach who uses a wide range of techniques to unlock the school leader's potential. Coaching is a highly customized learning process that is designed to increase the leader's focus, broaden perspectives, improve relationships, and augment one's ability to make effective choices. Typically, the coaching experience is on-site, of-the-moment, job-embedded, and reality-based—allowing the principal to set new goals and improve results.

Collaborative Leadership — Louis, et al. (2010) defines collective leadership as the “extent of influence that organizational members and stakeholders exert on decisions in their schools. This relatively narrow but fundamental perspective on leadership focuses attention on the combined effects of all sources of leadership, along with possible difference in the contributions made by each of these sources” (p.19).

Collective leadership is also called distributed leadership, collaborative leadership, democratic leadership, or shared leadership, the key concept being multiple leaders in various roles within an organization functioning both formally and/or informally. For the purpose of this report, we have chosen to use “collaborative” because that is a construct increasingly familiar in educational settings. Implementation of the Common Core State Standards increases the need for students to work collaboratively, as well as inspiring their teachers to work together to adapt methodology and materials to more dynamic goals. This report finds no conflict among these various explanations of leadership. All describe an inclusive approach and focuses on sharing leadership and matching leadership responsibilities with the available human resources

Cross Cutting Theme(s) — a crosscutting theme is one that crosses across or should be threaded through all of the HLLPs. Essentially, a crosscutting theme has application across all HLLPs and serves to link all of the identified strategies. Additionally, the crosscutting themes provide an organizational schema for principals as they work with their respective staff to develop an academic action plan that focuses on teacher growth and increasing student academic achievement. The cross cutting themes identified by the PEP Task Force included, but were not limited to, Equity; Growth mindedness; The Inquiry Process (reflections); Culture building; and Collective responsibility.

Democratic Education — Democratic education infuses learning with these fundamental values of our society, meaningful participation, personal initiative, and equality and justice for all. Democratic education sees learners not as passive recipients of knowledge, but rather as active co-creators of their own learning, valued participants in a vibrant learning community. Democratic education supports the development of each person within a caring community, it helps people learn about themselves, engage with the world around them, and become positive and contributing members of society. (Adapted from the Institute for Democratic Education in America, <http://www.democrateducation.org/index.php/index/>.)

Disposition — The values, commitments, and professional ethics that influence behaviors toward students, families, colleagues, and communities and affect student learning, motivation, and development as well as the educator’s own professional growth.

Equity* — in education, the term **equity** refers to the principle of *fairness*. While it is often used interchangeably with the related principle of *equality*, equity encompasses a wide variety of educational models, programs, and strategies that may be considered fair, but not necessarily equal. It has been said that “equity is the process; equality is the outcome,” given that equity—what is fair and just—may not, in the process of educating students, reflect strict equality—what is applied, allocated, or distributed equally.

**Hidden curriculum* (2014, August 26). In S. Abbott (Ed.), *The glossary of education reform*. Retrieved from <http://edglossary.org/hidden-curriculum>

Growth Mindset** — is based on the belief that your basic qualities are things that your basic qualities are things that you can cultivate through your efforts. Although people may differ in every way, in their initial talents and attitudes, interests, or temperaments, everyone can change and grow through application and experience. Allows people to thrive during some of the most challenging times in their lives.*

** Dweck, C. (2006) *Mindset*, Random House, New York. p.7.

High-Leverage Leadership Practice (HLLP) — Leadership practices that are associated with higher outcomes than would normally be found in similar contexts. High-leverage leadership practices are generally viewed as the practices that underlie: (1) Effective leadership; (2) Ongoing, progressive teacher growth; and (3) Higher student achievement. An HLLP is a specific practice, behavior, or set of behaviors undertaken by a site principal that is most likely to advance continuous teacher growth and advance student learning.

Leadership — “Leadership refers to activities tied to the core work of the organization that are designed by organizational member to influence the motivation, knowledge, affect, or practices of other organizational members or that are understood by organizational members as intended to influence their motivation, knowledge, affect, or practices”(Spillane & Burch, 2006, pp.11-12).

- This definition excludes actions intended to influence relationships that are not tied to the school’s core work of teaching and learning.
- Leadership is not always about change; it can also be about resistance to change efforts.
- Leadership need not necessarily involve outcomes that are positive or beneficial. It can influence people, organizations, and entire societies in ways that are not beneficial.

Louis, *et al.* (2010) assert that leadership “can be described by reference to two core functions: providing direction and exercising influence. (p. 9), whereas Spillane and Diamond (2007) break down the functions into three areas: compass setting, human development, and organizational development (p. 3).

Mentoring — Management Mentors, Chestnut Hill, MA describes mentoring as a professional relationship in which an experienced person (the mentor) assists another (the mentee) in developing specific skills and knowledge that will enhance the less-experienced person’s professional and personal growth. Further, a mentor may coach, but a coach is not a mentor. Mentoring is “relational,” while coaching is “functional.”

Multiplier — Previously used as a term in economics to describe the effect of an infusion of money in a given situation, the term has entered educational settings recently via the work of Liz Wiseman in books investigating leadership practices. The key concept is that effective leaders increase the capacity of those around them, thus “multiplying” their influence and the collective efforts to meet a given goal.

Principal — The high-leverage leadership practices recommended in this report are flexible enough to embrace whatever structure or title a school setting uses to describe the person most responsible for the quality of the learning environment (both climate and culture), as well as the equitable delivery of the curriculum. In parochial schools, that person may be a member of the clergy with a commensurate title. Many charter schools use the title “director” to mean principal duties in addition to responsibility for innovation. DuFour and Marzano (2011) would argue that the key concept by any definition is that the principal is the “learning leader” who promotes, facilitates and monitors collaborative structures that bind teachers together in productive ways.

Principal Growth — The term principal growth is not a complex or complicated concept. Simply stated, it is the process of an individual learning and growing in the principalship. It includes the actions that principals take to support organizational learning, maintain resolve and focus, and find solutions in response to challenges.

School Climate/Culture*** — While these terms are often used interchangeably, school climate and school culture are two distinct but highly interactive aspects of a school system, and both have a profound impact on student achievement.

School Culture —

1. This is the sum total of the behaviors and interactions of all adults and children, their beliefs, attitudes, and norms, and the extent to which the school is safe, supportive, healthy, engaging, inspiring, and challenging for all.
2. Culture refers to shared beliefs, customs, and behaviors and represents people’s experiences with ceremonies, beliefs, attitudes, history, ideology, language, practices, rituals, traditions, and values.
3. The beliefs, attitudes and behaviors that characterize a school in terms of how people treat and feel about each other. Refers to the extent to which people feel included and appreciated, and reflects the school’s rituals and traditions and the staff’s level of collaboration and collegiality.

***Peterson, K. and Deal, T. (1998). *How leaders influence the culture of schools*. *Educational Leadership*, 56 (1), 28-30.

***Finnan, C. (2000). *Implementing school reform models: Why is it so hard for some schools and easy for others?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 24-28 April, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED446356)

School Climate** —**

1. The collective perception of how well a school provides suitable conditions for:
 - Learning;
 - Positive social, emotional, and character development;
 - All staff to grow professionally; and
 - Parents, families, and community resources to become engaged in the school.
2. School climate refers to the quality and character of school life as it relates to norms and values, interpersonal relations, social interactions, and organizational processes and structures. Sets the tone for all the learning and teaching done in the school environment
3. School climate refers to the quality the characteristics of school life, which includes: (1) The availability of supports for teaching and learning; and (2) The goals, values, interpersonal relationships, formal organizational structures, and organizational practices.
4. School climate may be defined as the quality and character of school life. It may be based on patterns of student, parent, and school personnel experiences within the school and reflects norms, goals, values, interpersonal relationships, teaching and learning practices, and organizational structures.
5. School climate is how students and staff “feel” about being at school each day.
6. A healthy school climate has four basic aspects:
 - A physical environment that is welcoming and conducive to learning;
 - A social environment that promotes communication and interaction;
 - An affective environment that promotes a sense of belonging and self-esteem; and
 - An academic environment that promotes learning and self-fulfillment.*

****Gonder, P. O., & Hymes, D. (1994). *Improving school climate and culture (AASA Critical Issues Report No. 27)*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

School Community — typically refers to the various individuals, groups, businesses, and institutions that are invested in the welfare and vitality of a public school and its community—i.e., the students, teachers, staff, neighborhoods, and municipalities served by the school.

Systemic Change — change that occurs in all aspects and levels of the educational process and that affects all of the people included in this process—students, teachers, parents, administrators, and community members.

Restorative Practice — Evolved from social justice or restorative justice. It is a new field of study that has the potential to positively influence human behavior and strengthen civil society around the world. The fundamental premise of restorative practices is that people are happier, more cooperative and productive, and more likely to make positive changes when those in positions of authority do things *with* them, rather than *to* them or *for* them.

Strategies — For the purpose of this report, strategies means discreet actions which, for planning purposes, can be broken down into component parts that allow for personal and organizational responsibility and the monitoring of progress; and which directly contribute to a larger construct such as a practice or goal.

APPENDIX B: Acronyms

CAPE	California Administrator Performance Expectations
CDE	California Department of Education
CPSEL	California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders
CSTP	California Standards for the Teaching Profession
CTC	California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
CTP	Continuum of Teaching Practice
DOP	Descriptions of Practice of the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELS)
EL	English Learner
GbD	Greatness by Design
HLLP	High-Leverage Leadership Practice
ILP	Individual Learning Plan
IPGP	Individualized Professional Growth Plan
IPLS	Integrated Professional Learning Systems
ISLLC	Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium
LCAP	Local Control and Accountability Plan
LCFF	Local Control Funding Formula
LEA	Local Education Agency
LSES	Low Socio-Economic Status
PEP	Principals Excellence Project
QPLS	Quality Professional Learning Standards
REEd	Resourcing Excellence in Education
TBAR	Teacher-based Reform

APPENDIX C: Links to Key Resources

California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL)

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/CPSEL-booklet-2014.pdf>

Moving Leadership Standards into Everyday Work: Descriptions of Practice, Second Edition

<http://www.wested.org/resources/descriptions-of-practice/>

California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPE)

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/SVC-Admin-Handbook-2014.pdf>

Quality Professional Learning Standards (QPLS)

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/pd/ps/qpls.asp>

California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP)

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/CSTP-2009.pdf>



REEd, School of Education

University of California, Davis
One Shields Avenue
Davis, CA 95616
Phone: (530) 752-7520
reedinfo@ucdavis.edu

<http://reed.ucdavis.edu>