

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM STANDARDS

2011 ELCC Building Level



NPBEA

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM Recognition Standards:

Building Level

For institutions undergoing NCATE Accreditation and
ELCC Program Review

For Advanced Programs at the Master, Specialist,
or Doctoral Level that Prepare Assistant Principals,
Principals, Curriculum Directors, Supervisors,
and other Education Leaders in a
School Building Environment

November 2011

National Policy Board For Educational Administration (NPBEA)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	3
ELCC Program Standard 1.0	4
ELCC Program Standard 2.0	7
ELCC Program Standard 3.0	10
ELCC Program Standard 4.0	12
ELCC Program Standard 5.0	15
ELCC Program Standard 6.0	17
ELCC Program Standard 7.0	19
Appendix 1	
Assessments Description	21
Reviewer Evaluation Rubric for Standards 1.0-6.0	21
Reviewer Evaluation Rubric for Standard 7.0	22
Policies for Making Program Report Decisions	24
Appendix 2	
Alignment of ELCC Program Standards with NCATE Standard Principles	27
Appendix 3	
Commentary and Research Support for Standards	27
References	48
Appendix 4	
Glossary	72

INTRODUCTION

Rationale

The importance of clearly defining what successful learning or performance looks like has become increasingly evident during the past decade. Without a doubt, the better one understands what excellence looks like, the greater one's chances are for achieving – or surpassing - that standard. Ensuring effective school leadership begins with the following questions:

- What do our P-12 students need to know, understand, and do?
- What do our teachers and related staff need to know, understand, and do to increase student learning?
- What do our school building leaders need to know, understand, and do to support teachers and building-level personnel to increase student learning?

Effective use of leadership preparation standards requires multiple, high integrated and highly interdependent variables and assessments. The foundation of accountability is educators' understanding of the learning standards and a deep understanding of what mastery looks like. The potential value of analyzing and disaggregating student performance data is only as good as one's understanding of the learning that data represents. Furthermore, while we yearn to assume alignment among standards, assessment, and instruction – in addition to policy, programs, and courses - its tremendous importance and potential impact demand ongoing attention. School leadership standards are no exception.

History

With the approval of the *Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008* (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium), the NPBEA (National Policy Board for Educational Administration) approved an ELCC (Educational Leadership Constituent Council) plan to revise the ELCC Standards for presentation to NCATE (National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education) in the fall of 2010. Two groups, a Technical Advisory Committee and a Steering Committee, facilitated comprehensive research, revisions, and field review of the proposed changes prior to submitting them to NPBEA and NCATE.

Assumptions

The following assumptions are embedded within the ELCC school building-level leadership preparation standards:

1. Improving student achievement is the central responsibility of school leadership.
2. The standards represent the fundamental knowledge, skills, and practices intrinsic to building leadership that improve student learning.
3. The overall leadership standards conceptually apply to a range of common school leadership positions. They are intended to define what a building-level administrator

should know and be able to do. While specific content and application details will vary depending upon the leadership role, the fundamental, enduring tenets are the same.

4. While there is a purposeful emphasis on leading student learning, an understanding and acceptance of school leaders' responsibility for managing the "business" of the school is also embedded.
5. The practice of school leadership is well-established as its own research-based body of knowledge.
6. The preparation of school leaders requires overt connections and bridging experiences between research and practice.
7. The preparation of school leaders requires comprehensive, field-based practice in and feedback from the field over an extended period time in powerful clinical learning experiences.
8. School leadership preparation programs must provide ongoing experiences for candidates to examine, refine and strengthen the ethical platform that guides their decisions – especially during difficult times.
9. While school leadership programs are ultimately an institutional responsibility, the strength of the design, delivery and effectiveness of these programs will parallel the degree to which higher education invites P-12 participation and feedback.
10. Performance-based measures are most effective in evaluating candidate outcomes.

Implementation

Improving student achievement depends on the successful and simultaneous orchestration of multiple, yet individual, variables within the context of an overall school. Given the interdependency between the execution of specific school leadership skills and the overall educational environment, universities are expected to provide candidates with school leadership experiences that connect, embed and transcend explicit leadership skills within the context of a meaningful whole.

Candidates need multiple bridging experiences between course content and the school. While life in a university is compartmentalized for the convenience of instruction, life as a school leader requires the use of specialized skills within the context of often ambiguous, demanding, and interconnected events. Relentless connections to, and emphasis on, real or simulated school experiences in regard to resources, methods and assessments will greatly facilitate graduate's ultimate success as a school leader.

Leadership preparation programs must include three dimensions:

1. Awareness – acquiring concepts, information, definitions and procedures
2. Understanding – interpreting, integrating and using knowledge and skills
3. Application – apply knowledge and skills to new or specific opportunities or problems

The overall program should represent a synthesis of key content and high impact field-based experiences extended over time that result in the school leader candidates' demonstration of the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions articulated in the ELCC standards, and, most importantly, candidates' success in improving student achievement following graduation.

ELCC BUILDING LEVEL STANDARDS

ELCC Standard 1.0: A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by collaboratively facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a shared school vision of learning through the collection and use of data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement school plans to achieve school goals; promotion of continual and sustainable school improvement; and evaluation of school progress and revision of school plans supported by school-based stakeholders.

ELCC STANDARD ELEMENTS:

ELCC 1.1: Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning for a school.

ELCC 1.2: Candidates understand and can collect and use data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement plans to achieve school goals.

ELCC 1.3: Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable school improvement.

ELCC 1.4: Candidates understand and can evaluate school progress and revise school plans supported by school stakeholders.

RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR ELCC STANDARD 1.0:

Research evidence in Appendix 2 presented in support of Standard 1 confirms that a building-level education leader must have the knowledge to promote the success of every student through understanding principles for developing, articulating, implementing, and stewarding a school vision of learning. This includes knowledge of the importance of shared school vision, mission, and goals for student success that is documented in the effective schools literature and school improvement literature. It includes the knowledge that when vision, mission, and goals are widely shared, student achievement usually increases.

The importance of the knowledge presented in evidence supporting Standard 1 was recognized in the reviews of scholarship informing the development of the *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) 2008 Policy Standards* that highlighted the importance of knowledge facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders. Formation of the *ISLLC 2008 Standards* was also based on considering the importance of knowing the theoretical foundations for leadership practice. Some reviews of scholarship highlighted the importance of knowing how to collaboratively develop and implement a shared vision and mission. The importance of knowing how to use evidence in decision making was highlighted in reports informing the formation of the *ISLLC 2008 Standards*. Other reports confirmed the importance of knowing how to create and implement plans to achieve goals.

**Acceptable Candidate Performance for
ELCC Building Level Leadership Standard 1.0**

ELCC Standard Element 1.1: Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared vision of learning for a school.

Content Knowledge

(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)

Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of

- ◆ collaborative school visioning;
- ◆ theories relevant to building, articulating, implementing, and stewarding a school vision;
- ◆ methods for involving school stakeholders in the visioning process.

Professional Leadership Skills

(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to

- ◆ design and support a collaborative process for developing and implementing a school vision;
- ◆ articulate a school vision of learning characterized by a respect for students and their families and community partnerships;
- ◆ develop a comprehensive plan for communicating the school vision to appropriate school constituencies;
- ◆ formulate plans to steward school vision statements.

ELCC Standard Element 1.2: Candidates understand and can collect and use data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and create and implement plans to achieve school goals.

Content Knowledge

(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)

Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of

- ◆ the design and use of assessment data for learning;
- ◆ organizational effectiveness and learning strategies;
- ◆ tactical and strategic program planning;
- ◆ implementation and evaluation of school improvement processes;
- ◆ variables that affect student achievement.

Professional Leadership Skills

(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to

- ◆ develop and use evidence-centered research strategies and strategic planning processes;
- ◆ create school-based strategic and tactical goals;
- ◆ collaboratively develop implementation plans to achieve those goals;
- ◆ develop a school improvement plan that aligns to district improvement plans.

<p>ELCC Standard Element 1.3: Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable school improvement.</p>	
<p><i>Content Knowledge</i> <i>(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ continual and sustained improvement models and processes; ◆ school change processes for continual and sustainable improvement; ◆ role of professional learning in continual and sustainable school improvement. 	<p><i>Professional Leadership Skills</i> <i>(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ identify strategies or practices to build organizational capacity that promote continuous and sustainable school improvement; ◆ design a transformational change plan at the school-building-level; ◆ design a comprehensive, building-level professional development program.
<p>ELCC Standard Element 1.4: Candidates understand and can evaluate school progress and revise school plans supported by school stakeholders.</p>	
<p><i>Content Knowledge</i> <i>(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ effective strategies for monitoring the implementation, revision of plans to achieve school improvement goals, and program evaluation models. 	<p><i>Professional Leadership Skills</i> <i>(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ develop a school plan to monitor program development and implementation of school goals; ◆ construct an evaluation process to assess the effectiveness of school plans and programs; ◆ interpret information and communicate progress toward achievement of school vision and goals for educators in the community and other stakeholders.

ELCC Standard 2.0: A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students; creating and evaluating a comprehensive, rigorous and coherent curricular and instructional school program; developing and supervising the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff; and promoting the

most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning within a school environment.

ELCC STANDARD ELEMENTS:

ELCC 2.1: Candidates understand and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students.

ELCC 2.2: Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program.

ELCC 2.3: Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff.

ELCC 2.4: Candidates understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning in a school environment.

RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR ELCC STANDARD 2.0:

Evidence presented in Appendix 2 in support of Standard 2 confirms that a building-level education leader must know principles for sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. This includes knowing the elements of school culture and ways it can be influenced to ensure student success; human development theories; proven learning and motivational theories; how diversity influences the learning process; effective leadership practices, including those characterized as instructional leadership, transformational leadership, or leading learning; and models of change processes.

The importance of the knowledge presented in evidence supporting Standard 2 was recognized in the empirical evidence, craft knowledge and theoretical writings that supported the development of *ISLLC 2008 Standard 2* promoting the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

Classic theories of motivation, social control, and goals are foundational sources of knowledge for education leaders seeking to nurture a culture of trust and to motivate faculty and students. Theories of human development and evidence found in case studies of how improvements in teaching and learning can be achieved confirm that both are essential to effective school leadership. A review of literature on learning-centered leadership concluded that instructionally focused leadership paired with leadership processes are required for high-performing schools.

Earlier reviews found strong evidence that knowledge of leadership approaches to developing school culture and climate is critically important. Evidence of the importance of applied knowledge of how to create a culture of trust, learning and high expectations was found in scholarship on the effect that leaders have on building learning communities. Knowledge of the nature and practices of distributive leadership was identified as essential in a number of scholarly works consulted. Other reviews highlighted the importance of knowing curriculum planning and

how to develop motivating student learning environments. Infusing technology into leadership practices has become a recognized domain of practical knowledge essential to effective instructional leadership.

Acceptable Candidate Performance for ELCC Building Level Leadership Standard 2.0	
ELCC Standard Element 2.1: Candidates understand and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students.	
<p><i>Content Knowledge</i> <i>(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ theories on human development behavior, personalized learning environment, and motivation; ◆ school culture and ways it can be influenced to ensure student success. 	<p><i>Professional Leadership Skills</i> <i>(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ collaborate with others to accomplish school improvement goals; ◆ incorporate cultural competence in development of programs, curriculum, and instructional practices; ◆ monitor school programs and activities to ensure personalized learning opportunities; ◆ recognize, celebrate, and incorporate diversity in programs, curriculum, and instructional practices; ◆ facilitate the use of appropriate content-based learning materials and learning strategies; ◆ promote trust, equity, fairness, and respect among students, parents, and school staff.
ELCC Standard Element 2.2: Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program.	
<p><i>Content Knowledge</i> <i>(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ curriculum development and instructional delivery theories; 	<p><i>Professional Leadership Skills</i> <i>(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ collaborate with faculty to plan,

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ measures of teacher performance; ◆ multiple methods of evaluation, accountability systems, data collection, and analysis of evidence; ◆ school technology and information systems to support and monitor student learning. 	<p>implement, and evaluate a coordinated, aligned, and articulated curriculum;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ use evidence-centered research in making curricular and instructional decisions; ◆ interpret information and communicate progress toward achievement; ◆ design evaluation systems and make school plans based on multiple measures of teacher performance and student outcomes, and provide feedback based on evidence.
--	--

ELCC Standard Element 2.3: Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff.

<p><i>Content Knowledge</i> <i>(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ high-quality professional development for school staff and leaders; ◆ instructional leadership practices; ◆ leadership theory, change processes, and evaluation; ◆ standards for high-quality teacher, principal, and district practice. 	<p><i>Professional Leadership Skills</i> <i>(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ work collaboratively with school staff to improve teaching and learning; ◆ design the use of differentiated instructional strategies, curriculum materials, and technologies to maximize high-quality instruction; ◆ design professional growth plans to increase the capacity of school staff and leaders that reflect national professional development standards.
--	---

ELCC Standard Element 2.4: Candidates understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning in a school-level environment.

<p><i>Content Knowledge</i> <i>(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ technology and its uses for instruction within the school; ◆ infrastructures for the ongoing support, 	<p><i>Professional Leadership Skills</i> <i>(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ use technologies for improved classroom instruction, student
---	---

<p>review, and planning of instructional technology.</p>	<p>achievement, and continuous school improvement;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ monitor instructional practices within the school and provide assistance to teachers; ◆ use technology and performance management systems to monitor, analyze, and evaluate school assessment data results for accountability reporting.
--	--

ELCC Standard 3.0: A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by ensuring the management of the school organization, operation, and resources through monitoring and evaluating the school management and operational systems; efficiently using human, fiscal, and technological resources in a school environment; promoting and protecting the welfare and safety of school students and staff; developing school capacity for distributed leadership; and ensuring that teacher and organizational time is focused to support high-quality instruction and student learning.

ELCC STANDARD ELEMENTS:

ELCC 3.1: Candidates understand and can monitor and evaluate school management and operational systems.

ELCC 3.2: Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations.

ELCC 3.3: Candidates understand and can promote school-based policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff within the school.

ELCC 3.4: Candidates understand and can develop school capacity for distributed leadership.

ELCC 3.5: Candidates understand and can ensure teacher and organizational time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning.

RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR ELCC STANDARD 3.0:

Evidence presented in Appendix 2 support of Standard 3 confirms that a building-level education leader must have knowledge of best practices regarding management of a school organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. This includes knowledge of effective management and effective leadership that are associated with improved school conditions and subsequent school outcomes. It also includes knowledge of human resource issues such as educator work redesign; educator recruitment and selection; educator induction, mentoring, and professional development; educator appraisal, supervision, and

evaluation; and educator compensation. The importance of the knowledge presented in evidence supporting Standard 3 was recognized in research informing the formation of the *ISLLC 2008 Standards* which also found an understanding distributed leadership to be essential. More recently, researchers have found in their investigation of links to student achievement that distribution of leadership to include teachers, parents, and district staff is needed in order to improve student achievement.

Acceptable Candidate Performance for ELCC Building Level Leadership Standard 3.0	
ELCC Standard Element 3.1: Candidates understand and can monitor and evaluate school management and operational systems.	
<p><i>Content Knowledge</i> <i>(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ school management of organizational, operational, and legal resources; ◆ school management of marketing and public relations functions. 	<p><i>Professional Leadership Skills</i> <i>(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ analyze school processes and operations to identify and prioritize strategic and tactical challenges for the school; ◆ develop school operational policies and procedures; ◆ develop plans to implement and manage long-range plans for the school.
ELCC Standard Element 3.2: Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources to manage school operations.	
<p><i>Content Knowledge</i> <i>(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ methods and procedures for managing school resources, including the strategic management of human capital, school operations, and school facilities; ◆ alignment of resources to building priorities and forecasting resource requirements for the school; ◆ technology and management systems. 	<p><i>Professional Skills (Assessments 3, 4, 5, 6)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ develop multi-year fiscal plans and annual budgets aligned to the school’s priorities and goals; ◆ analyze a school’s budget and financial status; ◆ develop facility and space utilization plans for a school; ◆ project long-term resource needs of a school; ◆ use technology to manage school operational systems.

ELCC Standard Element 3.3: Candidates understand and can promote school-based policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff.	
<p><i>Content Knowledge</i> <i>(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ school strategies supporting safe and secure learning environments including prevention, crisis management, and public relations; ◆ school strategies supporting student development of self-management, civic literacy, and positive leadership skills; ◆ school-based discipline management policies and plans. 	<p><i>Professional Leadership Skills</i> <i>(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ develop a comprehensive plan for providing school staff, students, and visitors with a safe and secure school building environment; ◆ plan an aligned building discipline management policies and plan; ◆ evaluate and implement discipline management plans.
ELCC Standard Element 3.4: Candidates understand and can develop school capacity for distributed leadership.	
<p><i>Content Knowledge</i> <i>(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ the meaning of distributed leadership in a school environment and how to create and sustain it. 	<p><i>Professional Leadership Skills</i> <i>(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ identify leadership capabilities of staff; ◆ model distributed leadership skills; ◆ involve school staff in decision making processes.
ELCC Standard Element 3.5: Candidates understand and can ensure that teacher and organizational time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning.	
<p><i>Content Knowledge</i> <i>(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ supervision strategies that ensure that teachers maximize time spent on high- 	<p><i>Professional Leadership Skills</i> <i>(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ develop school policies that protect time

quality instruction and student learning; ◆ management theories on effective school time, priorities, and schedules.	and schedules to maximize teacher instructional time and student learning; ◆ develop a school master schedule.
---	---

ELCC Standard 4.0: A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources on behalf of the school by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to improvement of the school’s educational environment; promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of the diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources within the school community; building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers; and cultivating productive school relationships with community partners.

ELCC STANDARD ELEMENTS:

ELCC 4.1: Candidates understand and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school’s educational environment.

ELCC 4.2: Candidates understand and can mobilize community resources by promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources within the school community.

ELCC 4.3: Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers.

ELCC 4.4: Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive school relationships with community partners.

RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR ELCC STANDARD 4.0:

Evidence presented in Appendix 2 in support of Standard 4 confirms that a building-level education leader must know strategies for collaborating with faculty and community members; diverse community interests and needs; and best practices for mobilizing community resources. This includes knowing how to collect and analyze information pertinent to the school educational environment, and understanding the needs of students, parents, and caregivers in order to develop collaboration strategies. The importance of the knowledge presented in the evidence supporting *ISLLC 2008 Standard 4* was recognized in research showing that education leaders require such knowledge when collaborating with faculty and community members and when responding to diverse community interests and needs and mobilizing community support used to support *ISLLC 2008 Standard 4*. Reports on practices using multiple types of evidence to inform decision making and highlights the importance of knowledge of strategies for evidence-centered decision making.

**Acceptable Candidate Performance for
ELCC Building Level Leadership Standard 4.0**

ELCC Standard Element 4.1: Candidates understand and can collaborate with faculty and community members by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to the improvement of the school’s educational environment.

Content Knowledge
(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)

Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of

- ◆ collaboration and communication techniques to improve the school’s educational environment;
- ◆ information pertinent to the school’s educational environment.

Professional Leadership Skills
(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to

- ◆ use collaboration strategies to collect, analyze, and interpret school, student, faculty, and community information;
- ◆ communicate information about the school within the community.

ELCC Standard Element 4.2: Candidates understand and can mobilize community resources by promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of the diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources within the school community.

Content Knowledge
(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)

Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of

- ◆ identify and mobilize effective community resources;
- ◆ school-based cultural competence;
- ◆ diverse cultural, social, and intellectual community resources.

Professional Leadership Skills
(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to

- ◆ identify and use diverse community resources to improve school programs.

ELCC Standard Element 4.3: Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive school relationships with families and caregivers.

Content Knowledge
(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)

Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of

- ◆ the needs of students, parents or

Professional Leadership Skills
(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)

Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to

- ◆ conduct needs assessments of families

<p>caregivers;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ school organizational culture that promotes open communication with families and caregivers; ◆ school strategies for effective oral and written communication with families and caregivers; ◆ approaches to collaboration with families and caregivers. 	<p>and caregivers;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ develop collaboration strategies for effective relationships with families and caregivers; ◆ involve families and caregivers in the decision-making processes at the school.
<p>ELCC Standard Element 4.4: Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining productive school relationships with community partners.</p>	
<p><i>Content Knowledge</i> <i>(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ the needs of school community partners; ◆ school organizational culture that promotes open communication with community partners; ◆ school strategies for effective oral and written communication with community partners; ◆ collaboration methods to develop and sustain productive relationships with community partners. 	<p><i>Professional Leadership Skills</i> <i>(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ conduct needs assessment of community partners; ◆ develop effective relationships with a variety of community partners; ◆ involve community partners in the decision-making processes at the school;

ELCC Standard 5.0: A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner to ensure a school system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success by modeling school principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school; safeguarding the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the school; evaluating the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school; and promoting social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

ELCC STANDARD ELEMENTS:

ELCC 5.1: Candidates understand and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure a school system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success.

ELCC 5.2: Candidates understand and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school.

ELCC 5.3: Candidates understand and can safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the school.

ELCC 5.4: Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school.

ELCC 5.5: Candidates understand and can promote social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR ELCC STANDARD 5.0:

Evidence presented in Appendix 2 in support of Standard 5 confirms that a building-level education leader must know how to act with integrity, fairness, and engage in ethical practice. This includes understanding democratic values, equity, and diversity; knowing about current ethical and moral issues facing education, government, and business; and understanding the relationship between social justice, school culture, and student achievement.

The importance of the knowledge presented in evidence supporting Standard 5 was recognized in research on practices that promote social justice identified as important in the *ISLLC 2008 Standards*. Support for the importance of this knowledge was informed by scholarship on practices of inclusive leadership, and leadership for diversity. Observations by education experts affirm the central role that knowledge of reflective practices has for education leaders if they are to model principles of self-awareness and ethical behavior. A number of theoretical and practice-focused commentaries have noted the critical need for education leaders to have knowledge of the moral and legal consequences of decision making.

Acceptable Candidate Performance for ELCC Building Level Leadership Standard 5.0	
ELCC Standard Element 5.1: Candidates understand and can act with integrity and fairness to ensure that schools are accountable for every student’s academic and social success.	
<p><i>Content Knowledge</i> <i>(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ practices demonstrating principles of integrity and fairness; ◆ federal, state, and local legal and policy guidelines that creates operational 	<p><i>Professional Leadership Skills</i> <i>(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ act with integrity and fairness in supporting school policies and staff practices that ensure every students’

<p>definitions of accountability, equity, and social justice.</p>	<p>academic and social success; ◆ create an infrastructure that helps to monitor and ensure equitable practices.</p>
<p>ELCC Standard Element 5.2: Candidates understand and can model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the school.</p>	
<p><i>Content Knowledge</i> <i>(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ the basic principles of ethical behavior established by legal and professional organizations; ◆ the relationship between ethical behavior, school culture, and student achievement; ◆ the effect of ethical behavior on one’s own leadership. 	<p><i>Professional Leadership Skills</i> <i>(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ formulate a school-level leadership platform grounded in ethical standards and practices; ◆ analyze leadership decisions in terms of established ethical practices.
<p>ELCC Standard Element 5.3: Candidates understand and can safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity.</p>	
<p><i>Content Knowledge</i> <i>(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ democratic values, equity, and diversity. 	<p><i>Professional Leadership Skills</i> <i>(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ develop, implement, and evaluate school policies and procedures that support democratic values, equity, and diversity issues; ◆ develop appropriate communication skills to advocate for democracy, equity, and diversity.
<p>ELCC Standard Element 5.4: Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the school.</p>	
<p><i>Content Knowledge</i> <i>(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)</i></p>	<p><i>Professional Leadership Skills</i> <i>(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)</i></p>

<p>Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ moral and legal consequences of decision making in schools; ◆ strategies to prevent difficulties related to moral and legal issues. 	<p>Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ formulate sound school strategies to educational dilemmas; ◆ evaluate school strategies to prevent difficulties related to moral and legal issues.
<p>ELCC Standard Element 5.5: Candidates understand and can promote social justice within a school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.</p>	
<p><i>Content Knowledge</i> <i>(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ the relationship between social justice, school culture, and student achievement; ◆ theories of efficacy. 	<p><i>Professional Leadership Skills</i> <i>(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ review and critique school policies, programs, and practices to ensure that student needs inform all aspects of schooling, including social justice, equity, confidentiality, acceptance, and respect between and among students and faculty within the school; ◆ develop the resiliency to uphold core values and persist in the face of adversity.

ELCC Standard 6.0: A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context through advocating for school students, families, and caregivers; acting to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment; and anticipating and assessing emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.

ELCC STANDARD ELEMENTS:

ELCC 6.1: Candidates understand and can advocate for school students, families, and caregivers.

ELCC 6.2: Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment.

ELCC 6.3: Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.

RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR ELCC STANDARD 6.0:

Evidence presented in Appendix 2 in support of Standard 6 confirms that a building-level education leader must know how to respond to and influence the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context within a school and district. This includes knowing policies, laws, and regulations enacted by state, local and federal authorities; knowing how to improve the social opportunities of students, particularly in contexts where issues of student marginalization demand proactive leadership; and understanding how culturally responsive educational leadership can positively influence academic achievement and student engagement.

The widespread recognition in the practice and policy community that education leaders must be prepared to understand, respond to, and influence the political, social, economic, legal and cultural context of education provided an important impetus for the formation of this domain of the *ISLLC 2008 Standards*. A recognition of the importance of mindful practices and studying how people solve difficult problems influenced the formation of the *ISLLC 2008 standards*.

Acceptable Candidate Performance for ELCC Building Level Leadership Standard 6.0	
ELCC Standard Element 6.1: Candidates understand and can advocate for school students, families, and caregivers.	
<p><i>Content Knowledge</i> <i>(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ policies, laws, and regulations enacted by state, local, and federal authorities that affect schools; ◆ the effect that poverty, disadvantages, and resources have on families, caregivers, communities, students, and learning. 	<p><i>Professional Leadership Skills</i> <i>(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ analyze how law and policy is applied consistently, fairly and ethically within the school; ◆ advocate based on an analysis of the complex causes of poverty and other disadvantages; ◆ serve as a respectful spokesperson for students and families within the school.
ELCC Standard Element 6.2: Candidates understand and can act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning in a school environment.	
<i>Content Knowledge</i>	<i>Professional Leadership Skills</i>

<p><i>(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context; ◆ ways that power and political skills can influence local, state, or federal decisions. 	<p><i>(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ advocate for school policies and programs that promote equitable learning opportunities and student success; ◆ communicate policies, laws, regulations, and procedures to appropriate school stakeholders.
<p>ELCC Standard Element 6.3: Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt school-based leadership strategies.</p>	
<p><i>Content Knowledge</i> <i>(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ future issues and trends that can affect schools (e.g., entrepreneurial approaches); ◆ contemporary and emerging leadership strategies to address trends. 	<p><i>Professional Leadership Skills</i> <i>(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)</i></p> <p>Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ identify and anticipate emerging trends and issues likely to affect the school; ◆ adapt leadership strategies and practice to address emerging school issues.

ELCC Standard 7.0: A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student through a substantial and sustained educational leadership internship experience that has school-based field experiences and clinical internship practice within a school setting and is monitored by a qualified, on-site mentor.

ELCC STANDARD ELEMENTS:

ELCC 7.1: Substantial Field and Clinical Internship Experience: The program provides significant field experiences and clinical internship practice for candidates within a school environment to synthesize and apply the content knowledge and develop professional skills identified in the other *Educational Leadership Building-Level Program Standards* through authentic, school-based leadership experiences.

ELCC 7.2: Sustained Internship Experience: Candidates are provided a six-month, concentrated (9–12 hours per week) internship that includes field experiences within a school-based environment.

ELCC 7.3: Qualified On-Site Mentor: An on-site school mentor who has demonstrated experience as an educational leader within a school and is selected collaboratively by the intern and program faculty with training by the supervising institution.

RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR ELCC STANDARD 7.0:

Evidence presented in Appendix 2 support of Standard 7 confirms the importance of a substantial and sustained educational leadership internship experience that has school-based field experiences and clinical internship practice within a school setting, monitored by a qualified, on-site mentor. The theory and research on the importance of an internship and the nature of highly effective internships dates back to the early work on experiential learning and its promotion as a highly effective means of adult learning. Internships are widely used in professional education. More current work in the field stresses the full-time, job-embedded internship as the ideal. Much of the research on internships has focused on what typically occurs. This is mixed with case-study research on innovative models and conceptualizations of more robust approaches. Limited research has compared the effects of conventional and exemplary preparation, but the results suggest that principals either report or demonstrate better leadership practices when they have had longer, more full-time internships. Many of the internship elements and descriptors in Standard 7 parallel the research findings from Danforth Foundation–funded innovations in leadership preparation in the early 1990s. Comparative case study analyses yielded strong conclusions about the nature of high-quality internships. They concluded that the critical components of field experience that have the greatest value and potential influence are

- Sufficient time on task (frequency and regularity of work across school year and day; exposure to and engagement in relevant and realistic range of site responsibilities; support of effective mentor practitioners)
- Relationship with mentors who have demonstrated skills and have been trained as mentors; focus on appropriate modeling and reflection
- Multiple and alternative internship experiences to support diverse clinical training (e.g., medical rotation model)
- Reflective seminars to support interns' analysis and integration of learning
- Field supervision—typically not given much consideration or focus within the larger internship process

- Program coordination by educators who can link district and university programs and model professional development and learning

APPENDIX 1

ELCC Program Evaluation Policies for Building-Level Standards

Introduction

Under NCATE policies adopted in 2004, five assessments are defined for program report templates. For ELCC program submission under Option A, institutions are required to submit six assessments outlined as follows: Assessment #1: a state licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment; Assessment #2: a content-based assessment; Assessment #3: a professional skills-based assessment of candidate’s leadership ability to conduct instructional leadership; Assessment #4: a professional skills-based assessment conducted in an internship setting designed to demonstrate candidate’s leadership skills; Assessment #5: a professional skills-based assessment of candidate’s leadership skills in supporting an effective P-12 student learning environment; and Assessment #6: a professional skills-based assessment of candidate’s leadership skills in the areas of organizational management and community relations. Institutions may, at their discretion, submit a seventh or eighth assessment if they believe it will further strengthen their demonstration that the ELCC standard elements are met.

ELCC Assessments focus on Content Knowledge and Professional Leadership Skills

Content Knowledge Assessments include	Professional Leadership Skill Assessments include
<p><i>ELCC Assessment 1:</i> A state licensure assessment or other assessment of candidate content knowledge of the ELCC building-level standards.</p>	<p><i>ELCC Assessment 3:</i> Demonstration of candidate application of building level leadership skills in instructional leadership.</p>
<p><i>ELCC Assessment 2:</i> Another assessment of candidate content knowledge of the ELCC building-level standards.</p>	<p><i>ELCC Assessment 4:</i> Demonstration of candidate application of building level leadership skills in a school level internship/clinical practice setting(s).</p>
	<p><i>ELCC Assessment 5:</i> Demonstration of candidate application of building level leadership skills that support an effective P-12 student learning environment</p>
	<p><i>ELCC Assessment 6:</i> Demonstration of candidate application of building level leadership skills in organizational management and community relations.</p>

ELCC reviewers will use the ELCC Standard Evaluation Rubrics to make qualitative judgments about whether a standard is “met,” “met with conditions,” or “not met” as outlined in Section B of NCATE’s National Recognition Report. Through application of this rubric, the ELCC hopes to establish a viable

and reliable evaluation system across education leadership program reviews while simultaneously creating standards that are also flexible and sensitive to a program’s localized contexts.

ELCC STANDARDS 1.0-6.0: ELCC REVIEWER EVALUATION RUBRIC: The following rubric should be used by program reviewers in making qualitative judgments about the quality of assessment evidence presented in the program report for ELCC standards 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, and 6.0:

MET	MET W/CONDITIONS	NOT MET
Assessment(s) are aligned to the standards and the depth and breadth of assessment tasks as outlined in the assessment description(s), scoring guide(s), and data table(s) is of sufficient quality to determine candidate mastery of essential content knowledge concepts and leadership skills across a preponderance of standard element areas.	Assessment(s) are somewhat aligned to the standards, but the depth and breadth of assessment tasks as outlined in the assessment description(s), scoring guide(s), and data table(s) is incomplete and only provides some evidence of candidate mastery of essential content knowledge concepts and leadership skills across a preponderance of standard element areas.	Assessment(s) are not aligned to the standards and the depth and breadth of the assessment tasks as outlined in the assessment description(s), scoring guide(s), and data table(s) is insufficient to determine any candidate mastery of essential content knowledge concepts and leadership skills across a preponderance of standard element areas.

ELCC STANDARD 7.0: ELCC REVIEWER EVALUATION RUBRIC: The following rubric should be used by program reviewers in making qualitative judgments about the quality of ELCC standard 7.0. This standard outlines elements of a high-quality internship/clinical field experiences that are the signature for programs preparing entry-level candidates for school building leadership positions. With the exception of ELCC 7.2, program report evidence addressing these signature elements is described in a one-page narrative document that describes how the internship/clinical field experiences is designed within the program. ELCC 7.2 will most likely be found described in Assessment #4. Program reviewers should use the following rubric to evaluate the degree of alignment of the program report evidence:

MET Field and Clinical Internship Program	MET W/CONDITIONS Field and Clinical Internship Program	NOT MET Field and Clinical Internship Program
The field and clinical internship program is described in a comprehensive manner and is of sufficient quality to demonstrate alignment across a preponderance of standard	The field and clinical internship program description is incomplete and only provides limited evidence of alignment across a preponderance of standard element areas (e.g, 7.1, 7.2,	The field and clinical internship program description is incomplete and lacks evidence of any alignment across a preponderance of standard element areas (e.g, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3).

<p>element areas (e.g., 7.1, 7.2, 7.3).</p>	<p>7.3).</p>	
<p>ELCC 7.1: Substantial Field and Clinical Internship Experience: The program provides significant field experiences and clinical internship practice for candidates within a school environment to synthesize and apply the content knowledge and develop professional skills identified in the other <i>Educational Leadership Building-Level Program Standards</i> through authentic, school-based leadership experiences.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Field experiences and clinical internship demonstrate a wide range of opportunities for candidate responsibility in leading, facilitating, and making decisions typical of those made by educational leaders within a school environment; ◆ Field experiences and clinical internship involve candidates in many direct interactions with school staff, students, parents, and school community leaders; ◆ Candidates are provided with opportunities to gain experiences in two or more types of school settings (e.g. elementary, middle, high, urban, suburban, rural, virtual, and alternative schools) to practice a wide range of relevant, school-based knowledge and leadership skills; ◆ Candidates are provided with many opportunities to interact with a variety of community organizations, (e.g., community and business groups, community and social service agencies, and parent groups); ◆ Candidates are able to take a leadership role in more 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Field experiences and clinical internship demonstrates one opportunity for candidate responsibility in leading, facilitating, and making decisions typical of those made by educational leaders within a school environment; ◆ Field experiences and clinical internship involve candidates in a few direct leadership interactions with school staff, students, parents, and school community leaders; ◆ Candidates are provided with an opportunity to gain experience in one different type of school setting (e.g. elementary, middle, high, urban, suburban, rural, virtual, and alternative schools) to practice relevant, school-based knowledge and leadership skills; ◆ Candidates are provided with one opportunity to interact with a community organization, (e.g., community and business groups, community and social service agencies, or parent groups); ◆ Candidates are able to demonstrate some leadership skills by taking a leadership role in one 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Field experiences and clinical internship do not demonstrate any opportunities for candidate responsibility in leading, facilitating, and making decisions typical of those made by educational leaders within a school environment; ◆ Field experiences and clinical internship do not involve candidates in direct leadership interactions with school staff, students, parents, and school community leaders; ◆ Candidates are not provided with an opportunity to gain experience in any different types of school settings (e.g. elementary, middle, high, urban, suburban, rural, virtual, and alternative schools) to practice relevant, school-based knowledge and leadership skills; ◆ Candidates are not provided with any opportunities to interact with a community organization, (e.g., community and business groups, community and social service agencies, or parent groups); ◆ Candidates are not able to demonstrate leadership skills by taking a leadership role in any capstone

<p>than one capstone leadership activity (as identified in the other <i>ELCC Building-Level Standards</i>) with supervised assistance from an On-Site Mentor that maximizes their leadership practice and refines their school-level leadership skills.</p>	<p>capstone leadership activity (as identified in the other <i>ELCC Building-Level Standards</i>) with supervised assistance from an On-Site Mentor that maximizes their leadership practice and refines their school-level leadership skills.</p>	<p>leadership activities (as identified in the other <i>ELCC Building-Level Standards</i>) even with supervised assistance from an On-Site Mentor.</p>
<p>ELCC 7.2: Sustained Internship Experience: Candidates are provided a six-month concentrated (9–12 hours per week) internship that includes field experiences within a school environment.</p>		
<p>◆ Evidence is found that shows how candidates are provided a sustained school internship with field experiences over an extended period of time (6 months, 9–12 hours per week). (Explanatory Note: The internship experience need not be consecutive and may include field experiences of different lengths. This experience may include two noncontiguous clinical internships of six months each, or two four-month clinical internships with four months of field experiences, or another equivalent combination.)</p>	<p>◆ Evidence is found that shows how candidates are provided a sustained school internship with field experiences over an extended period of time (less than 6 months, less than 9 hours per week). (Explanatory Note: The internship experience need not be consecutive and may include field experiences of different lengths. This experience may include two clinical internships of three months each, or one four-month clinical internship and two months of field experiences, or another equivalent combination.)</p>	<p>◆ No evidence is found that shows how candidates are provided a sustained school internship with field experiences over an extended period of time</p>
<p>ELCC 7.3: Qualified On-Site Mentor: An on-site school mentor who has demonstrated experience as an educational leader within a school is selected collaboratively by the intern and program faculty with training by the supervising institution.</p>		
<p>◆ Verbal or written instructions by the supervising institution are well-rounded and comprehensive in providing on-site mentors</p>	<p>◆ Verbal or written instructions by the supervising institution are vague or limited in providing on-site mentors with guidance in their</p>	<p>◆ No verbal or written instructions are provided by the supervising institution for on-site mentors to guide their ongoing supervision and evaluation of intern</p>

<p>with guidance in their ongoing supervision and evaluation of intern candidates;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ The program provides a comprehensive explanation of strategies for ensuring that on-site mentors are qualified as school-based educational leaders; ◆ Both the internship and field experiences within the courses are offered for credit to candidates according to the policies of the program. 	<p>ongoing supervision and evaluation of intern candidates;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ The program provides a vague explanation with little information for how they plan to ensure that on-site mentors are qualified as school-based educational leaders; ◆ Some evidence is found that either the internship or the field experiences within the courses are offered for credit to candidates according to the policies of the program. 	<p>candidates;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ The program fails to provide any explanation of qualifications for on-site mentors, or the evidence does not support how on-site mentors are qualified as school-based educational leaders; ◆ No evidence is found that the internship or field experiences within the courses are offered to candidates for credit.
---	--	--

MAKING ELCC PROGRAM REPORT RECOGNITION POLICIE. Based on a careful review of the program report evidence and a qualitative judgment about the extent of alignment of the evidence to the ELCC standards (please see standard evaluation rubrics criteria – noted above), program reviewers and ELCC Audit Committee members will use the following guidelines/policies for granting program recognition status.

ELCC program reviewers and Audit Committee members will evaluate the “preponderance of evidence” presented in the program report to determine whether to grant “National Recognition,” “National Recognition with Conditions,” or “Further Development Required/Recognized with Probation.” “Preponderance of evidence” means an overall confirmation of candidate performance on the standards in the strength, weight, or quality of evidence. Programs are required to submit two applications of data on all assessments for each standard. They may disaggregate data by elements to better make their case, but that is not required. This means that a standard could be met, even though evidence related to one or more elements presented in the six to eight possible assessments is weak. Program reviewers will weigh the evidence presented in the ELCC program reports, and when there is a greater weight of evidence in favor, they will conclude that a standard is met or that a program is recognized.

Program Report Decision Choices for a Program Not Previously Recognized

Programs that are going through review for the first time will have several opportunities to submit reports before a final recognition decision is applied. This will allow new programs the opportunity to receive feedback and make changes in their programs without being penalized with a “not recognized” decision. It will also allow the program review process to be more collaborative between the ELCC and the program faculty. The following decision choices would also apply to programs at continuing institutions that may have been recognized in the past but are not recognized one year prior to the state visit. A program that is being evaluated for the first time will receive one of the following three ELCC program report decisions:

a. *National Recognition contingent upon unit accreditation*

- The program substantially meets all ELCC standards 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, 6.0, and 7.0;
- No further submission required; program will receive full *National Recognition* when the unit receives accreditation;
- Program will be listed on the NCATE website as *Nationally Recognized* if the unit is already accredited. If the unit is not accredited, then the program will be listed as *Nationally Recognized* pending unit accreditation.

b. *National Recognition with Conditions contingent upon unit accreditation*

- The program substantially meets some but not all ELCC standards; therefore, a “Response to Conditions” report must be submitted within 18 months to remove the conditions. Conditions could include one or more of the following:
 - Insufficient amount of data to determine if ELCC standards are met;
 - Insufficient alignment among ELCC standards or assessments or scoring guides or data (see ELCC Standard Evaluation Rubric);
 - Lack of quality in some assessments or scoring guides;
 - The NCATE requirement for an 80 percent pass rate on state licensure tests is not met
- The program has two opportunities within 18 months after the decision to remove the conditions. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, then the program status will be changed to *Not Recognized*.
- The program is listed on the NCATE website as *Nationally Recognized with Conditions* until it achieves *National Recognition*. If its status is changed to *Not Recognized*, then the program will be removed from the list on the website.

c. *Further Development Required:*

- The program does not substantially meet all ELCC standards and the ELCC standards that are not met are critical to a high-quality program and more than a few in number, *or* are few in number but so fundamentally important that recognition is not appropriate;
- The program will have two opportunities within 12 to 14 months after the first decision to attain *National Recognition* or *National Recognition with Conditions*. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, then the program status will be changed to *Not Recognized*.

A program could receive a decision of *Not Nationally Recognized* only after two submissions within the 12 to 14 month period (from the first decision) were unsuccessful in achieving *National Recognition* or *National Recognition with Conditions*.

Program Report Decision Choices for a Currently Recognized Program

Program reports that were previously approved by the ELCC during a previous review cycle will not be in jeopardy of losing their recognition status immediately after their first review in a review cycle. These programs will receive one of the following ELCC program report decisions:

a. *Continued National Recognition*

- The program substantially meets all ELCC standards 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, 6.0, and 7.0;
- No further submission required;
- Program is listed on the NCATE website as *Nationally Recognized*

b. *Continued National Recognition with Conditions*

- The program generally meets some but not all ELCC standards; therefore, a “Response to Conditions” report must be submitted within 18 months to remove the conditions. Conditions could include one or more of the following:
 - Insufficient amount of assessment data to determine if ELCC standards are met;
 - Insufficient alignment among ELCC standards or assessments or scoring guides or data (see ELCC Standard Evaluation Rubric);
 - Lack of quality in some assessments or scoring guides;
 - The NCATE requirement for an 80 percent pass rate on state licensure tests is not met
- The program will have two opportunities within 18 months after the first decision to attain *National Recognition*. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, then the program status will be changed to *Not Recognized*.
- The program is listed on the NCATE website as *Nationally Recognized* (based on its prior review) until the UAB makes an accreditation decision for the unit. At that point, if the program *has not achieved National Recognition with Conditions or National Recognition*, its status is changed to *Not Recognized* and the program’s name will be removed from the website.

c. *Continued National Recognition with Probation*

- The program does not substantially meet all ELCC standards and the ELCC standards that are not met are critical to a high-quality program and more than a few in number, *or* are few in number but so fundamentally important that recognition is not appropriate. To remove probation, the unit may submit a revised program report addressing unmet standards within 12 to 14 months, or the unit may submit a new program report for national recognition within 12 to 14 months;
- The program will have two opportunities within 12 to 14 months after the first decision to attain *National Recognition* or *National Recognition with Conditions*. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, then the program status will be changed to *Not Recognized*;
- The program is listed on the NCATE website as *Nationally Recognized* (based on its prior review) until the UAB makes an accreditation decision for the unit. At that point, if the program is still *Recognized with Probation*, its status is changed to *Not Recognized* and the program’s name will be removed from the website.

Program could receive a decision of *Not Nationally Recognized* only after two submissions within the 12 to 14 month period (from the first decision) were unsuccessful in reaching either *National Recognition* or *Continued National Recognition with Conditions*.

APPENDIX 2: Alignment of ELCC Program Standards with NCATE Standard Principles

NCATE Standard Principles	ELCC Program Standards
PRINCIPLE 1. CONTENT KNOWLEDGE	ELCC Standard 1.0
	ELCC Standard 2.0
	ELCC Standard 3.0
	ELCC Standard 4.0
	ELCC Standard 5.0
	ELCC Standard 6.0
PRINCIPLE 2. CONTENT PEDAGOGY	ELCC Standard 1.0
	ELCC Standard 2.0
PRINCIPLE 3. LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS	ELCC Standard 3.0
	ELCC Standard 5.0
PRINCIPLE 4. PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS	ELCC Standard 4.0
	ELCC Standard 6.0
	ELCC Standard 7.0

APPENDIX 3: Building-Level Standards Commentary and Research Support

The research commentaries in Appendix 3 report on scholarly research and craft knowledge supporting elements for each of the seven ELCC standards guiding programs preparing candidates for school building level leadership. The commentaries were developed in an effort to provide guidance in specifying the knowledge and skills associated with best practice in school building leadership. They are intended to support programmatic efforts to ensure that candidates to gain knowledge of best practice as a specific approach method or procedure derived from research and/or professional consensus. The commentaries are grounded in an understanding that much of school administrative knowledge is built on the “development of skills built up through practice” and “involve[s] an...element of critical judgment as opposed to routinized competencies” (Blumberg, 1989, p. 28). As such the commentaries highlight research

informing craft knowledge that is derived from a foundation of “doing” school administration. It is knowledge gained from application and systematic practice.

Research Support for ELCC Standard 1.0:

Introduction

Evidence presented in support of Standard 1 confirms that a building-level education leader must have knowledge of how to promote the success of students by understanding principles for the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning. Stewardship is a concept of leadership as a servant-leader advanced by Robert Greenleaf, who believed that the best way to lead was by serving. Stewardship involves using foresight; employing power ethically; seeking consensus in group decisions where possible; and, envisioning leadership as employing persuasion and building relationships based on trust (Frick, 2004, pp. 338-345). Education leaders seeking to develop a school vision of learning are aware that a school culture supporting this vision is constructed of a set of “behavioral norms that exemplify the best that a school stands for. It means building an institution in which people believe strongly, with which they identify personally, and to which they gladly render their loyalty” (Razik & Swanson, 2010, p. 123). Education leaders recognize that schools do not have a culture, they *are a culture* “constructed through aesthetic means and taking aesthetic form” (Samier, 2011, p. 277). The culture of a school consists of thought, language, the use of symbols and images and such other aspects as visions, missions, logos, trophies, rituals, legends, and important celebrations and ceremonies.

To construct a school culture requires knowledge of the importance of shared school vision, mission, and goals for student success that is documented in the effective schools literature (Clark, Lotto, & Astuto, 1984; Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Purkey & Smith, 1983; Rosenholtz, 1985; Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, & Ouston, 1979), and subsequently in the school improvement literature (Chrispeels, 1992; Fullan & Miles, 1992; Kurland, Peretz, & Hertz-Lazarowitz, 2010; Lambert, 1998; Leithwood, Begley, & Cousins, 1994; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999; Murphy Elliott, Goldring, & Porter, 2007; Powell, Higgins, Aram, & Freed, 2009; Short & Greer, 1997; Silins, Mulford, & Zarins, 2002; Tillman, 2004). A school vision is a public statement that contains four elements: (a) is anchored in a future condition or state; (b) identifies a clear set of conditions which pertain; (c) is devoid of means, methods and “how-to’s but is focused on tangible results; (d) projects hope, energy, and destination” Kaufman, Herman & Watters, 1996, p. 49). The mission of a school is a general statement of the purpose of a school, which usually indicates a desired condition or destination towards which the school or personnel in the school strive to realize or attain through their collective and individualized actions. When vision, mission, and goals are widely shared, student achievement usually increases (Chrispeels, 1992; Harris, 2002; Printy & Marks, 2006; Rutter et al., 1979). This requires conditions of organizational transparency. The concept means that one can “see through” the actions, beliefs, values, and motivations of leaders. It implies being open and forthright about who is proposing what, for what purposes and to what ends. It means that leaders have no “hidden agendas” and that it is clear in their actions who benefits and who does not from change. Furthermore, it means that school leaders take actions to make sure meetings are open, agendas are announced in advance, participation is invited, and comments and recommendations from all seriously considered.

The importance of the knowledge presented in evidence supporting Standard 1 was recognized in the reviews of scholarship informing the development of the ISLLC 2008 standards highlighting the importance of knowledge “facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders” (Murphy, 1990). Formation of the ISLLC 2008 Policy Standards also was based on consideration of the importance of knowledge of the theoretical foundations for leadership practice (for example, Blanchard et al., 2007; Ulrich, Zenger & Smallwood, 1999). Some reviews of scholarship highlighted the importance of knowledge of how to collaboratively develop and implement a shared vision and mission (Clark, Lotto & Astuto, 1984). The importance of knowledge about how to use evidence and data in decision making was highlighted in reports informing the formation of the ISLLC 2008 Standards (Creighton, 2007; Knapp, Copland, Plecki, Portin, 2006; Van Houten, 2003). Other reports confirmed the importance of knowledge of creating and implementing plans to achieve goals of developing quality programs (Clark, Lotto & Astuto, 1984). Education leaders know that “quality begins with intent” (Deming, 1986, p. 5) and “must be built in at the design stage” (p. 49). A quality program is a well-designed plan to attain ambitious but realistic goals for a school that are pursued in a timely, prudent and concerted effort over a sustained period of time resulting in the realization of those goals.

ELCC 1.1: *Commentary and Research Support:*

The importance of shared school vision, mission, and goals for student success is well documented in the effective schools literature (Clark, Lotto, & Astuto, 1984; Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Purkey & Smith, 1983; Rosenholtz, 1985; Rutter et al., 1979) and subsequently in the school improvement literature (Chrispeels, 1992; Fullan & Miles, 1992; Kurland, Peretz, & Hertz-Lazarowitz, 2010; Lambert, 1998; Leithwood et al., 1994; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999 a, b; Murphy et al., 2007; Powell et al., 2009; Short & Greer, 1997; Silins et al., 2002; Tillman, 2004). When vision, mission, and goals are widely shared, student achievement is most likely to increase (Chrispeels, 1992; Harris, 2002; Printy & Marks, 2006; Rutter et al., 1979).

Vision and mission statements vary. Some include a social as well as an academic focus (Chrispeels, 1992; Lightfoot, 1986; Short & Greer, 1997; Silins et al., 2002); some refer to student learning as well as or instead of achievement-test scores (Firestone & Gonzáles, 2007; Harris, 2002; Marks & Printy, 2003). Trust extended to students (Printy & Marks, 2006; Rutter et al., 1979; Short & Greer, 1997; Silins & Mulford, 2004; Silins et al., 2002) and to teachers (Harris, 2002; Short & Greer, 1997; Silins et al., 2002; Tschannen-Moran, 2009) is reported to be important in moving toward ideals captured in vision and mission statements. Use of various techniques for involving stakeholders in the visioning process is explored in the research (Chrispeels, 1992; Chance, Copeland, Farris, & Allen, 1994; Short & Greer, 1997). Developing a shared vision and mission requires consensus-building strategies with teachers in particular, but also with other school-based personnel and external stakeholders (Chance et al., 1994; Marks & Printy, 2003; McPike, 1987; Purkey & Smith, 1983; Short & Greer, 1997; Silins & Mulford, 2004; Silins et al., 2002). Sustaining commitment to the vision and mission is enhanced when principals and others communicate them often and sometimes strategically (Short & Greer, 1997) to the appropriate constituencies (Silins & Mulford, 2004; Silins et al., 2002).

Schools are attended by students whose families come from a variety of Western and non-Western cultures. Culture is one of many types of diversity. Diversity also includes socioeconomic status, race and ethnicity, language differences, and various learning styles. Responding positively to diversity and proactively to students' learning needs enables schools to improve student learning and achievement (Casner-Lotto, 1988; Clark et al., 1984; Delpit, 1992; Gerstl-Pepin, 2006; Kohl, 2007; Rutter et al., 1979; Stedman, 1985; Tillman, 2004). Embracing diversity subsumes understanding schools as interactive social and cultural systems and necessitates cultural competence for school leaders (Aspiazu, Bauer, & Spillett, 1998; Bustamante, Nelson, & Onwuegbuzie, 2009; Institute for Educational Leadership, 2005). Several studies have noted that establishing a school culture that applauds diversity entails creating a caring community (Gerstl-Pepin, 2006; Harris, 2002; Lightfoot, 1986; Murphy, 2005; Silins & Mulford, 2004; Tschannen-Moran, 2009).

ELCC 1.2: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Data-driven decision making has become a staple in education and educational leadership (Bowers, 2009; Knapp, Copland, & Swinnerton, 2007; Luo, 2008; Moss & Piety, 2007). The importance of collecting and using relevant evidence on which to base decisions that impact student learning has been documented in the effective schools and school improvement research (Chrispeels, 1992; Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Kurland et al., 2010; Purkey & Smith, 1983). Evidence must come from multiple sources if it is to be useful for decision making with respect to identifying goals, assessing organizational effectiveness, creating and implementing plans to achieve goals, and promoting organizational learning. Such sources should include standardized tests results (Firestone & Gonzáles, 2007; Moss & Piety, 2007); grades from classroom assessments (Bowers, 2009; Firestone & Gonzáles, 2007; Guskey, 2007); observations of teaching (Halverson, Grigg, Prichett, & Thomas, 2005; Moss & Piety, 2007); critical examination by teachers of their practice (Silins et al., 2002); video, instructional artifacts, and student work samples (Moss & Piety, 2007); diagnostic assessments (Firestone & Gonzáles, 2007); survey results (Firestone & Gonzáles, 2007; Halverson et al., 2005); and performances and portfolios (Firestone & Gonzáles, 2007; Guskey, 2007).

School improvement is dependent on organizational learning and necessarily involves collaborative, sustained effort (Cardano, 2002). To reap results, this effort must be informed by evidence (Kurland et al., 2010; Silins et al., 2002). Organizational learning depends on a culture of trust in which problems can be discussed openly and effective solutions can be shared with and accepted by others (Taylor, 2009). A natural feedback loop is created by organizational learning practices as problems are identified, data are collected, solutions are implemented and evaluated through action research, and the results are disseminated (Taylor, 2009).

ELCC 1.3: *Commentary and Research Support:*

The 20th-century history of school reform is checkered. Most reforms failed to bring about substantial change, and most withered, notwithstanding a brief period of initial success (Tharp, 2008). Some of the failure occurred because professional development needed for implementation success was lacking (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1990). The nature of professional development changed in the last part of the last century. Research on both adult

learning (Knowles, 1984; Mezirow, 1991) and the effectiveness of staff development contributed to the development of standards that are now available to guide providers in use of effective practices (see the National Staff Development Council website: www.nsd.org). As a result, professional development has become a vital element of school improvement and sustained change (Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Lambert, 1998).

A comprehensive, coherently scaffolded program of professional development that offers quality learning experiences is a building block of successful improvement efforts (Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, & Orr, 2007; Harris, 2002; Fullan & Pomfret, as cited in Levine & Stark, 1981; Purkey & Smith, 1983). Professional development takes many forms, including the collaborative work of professional learning communities within schools (Hall & Hord, 2006); networking with communities external to the school (Spillane & Thompson, 1997); and similar structures, each of which focuses on improving pedagogy and thereby student learning. These heretofore nontraditional forms of professional development have gained stature, again due in part to effective schools research (Casner-Lotto, 1988; Clark et al., 1984; Levine & Stark, 1981; Little, 1982; Maeroff, 1988; L. Miller, 1988; Purkey & Smith, 1983; Sickler, 1988; Wimpelberg, Teddlie, & Stringfield, 1989; Witte & Walsh, 1990).

Effective schools research explicitly described building teachers' capacity in the context of improved instruction and implicitly described building teachers' leadership capacity. As teacher leadership became a topic of research interest in the 1990s more researchers (Harris, 2002; Muijs & Harris, 2006; Lambert, 1998, 2003; Printy & Marks, 2006; Silins & Mulford, 2004) examined it as a variable contributing to school improvement and organizational learning. Building teacher leadership capacity is foundational to sustained improvement. Noted in the improvement literature (Lambert, 1998; McLaughlin & March, 1990) is the vulnerability of seemingly successful change efforts to the loss of a few key personnel, especially a supportive principal. Where improvement efforts have become institutionalized and teachers' leadership capacity has been built, reforms are more likely to survive the loss of key individuals (Davidson & Taylor, 1999; Lambert, 1998).

As noted, professional development is essential to successful school change. Models of change processes abound (see Kidron & Darwin, 2007, for a review), many substantiated by research. While the model selected should be consistent with the vision and mission established for the school, successful change is less dependent on which model is used than it is on the commitment of the principal and teachers to change and the provision of professional development related to the model (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1990). Sustaining the school vision, mission, and improvement efforts is dependent on people as the critical resource (Murphy et al., 2007). School leaders who manage human capital well contribute substantially to the success of improvement efforts (Clark et al., 1984; Stedman, 1985).

ELCC 1.4: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Much is presented above about using data to monitor and evaluate school improvement and its implementation. Multiple sources and types of data allow for a more comprehensive understanding of the effects, strengths, and weaknesses of improvement plans. Periodic formative evaluations are needed to monitor and revise improvement plans to maintain

congruence with the vision and mission (Levine & Stark, 1981). To be useful, a culture of trust should be established and the evaluative data used collaboratively and supportively rather than punitively (Fullan, Miles, & Taylor, as cited in Levine & Stark, 1981).

Research Support for ELCC Standard 2.0:

Introduction

Evidence presented in support of Standard 2 confirms that a building-level education leader must have knowledge of principles for advocating, nurturing and sustaining a school culture and instructional programs conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. This includes knowledge of the elements of school culture and ways it can be influenced to ensure student success and human development theories, proven learning and motivational theories and knowledge of how diversity influences the learning process (Darling-Hammond, Meyerson, La Pointe, & Orr, 2009; Leithwood, Jantzi, Coffin, & Wilson, 1996). It also includes knowledge of effective leadership practices including those characterized as instructional leadership, transformational leadership or leading learning, and knowledge of models of change processes (Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Heck & Hallinger, 2005; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008; Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). Transformational leaders are interested in empowering others to transcend organizational constraints and imagine a different future. In contrast, transactional leaders work within system boundaries and stay within the organized hierarchies of subordination designated within the school or school system.

Standard 2 is informed by research highlighting the importance of knowledge of how to develop motivating student learning environments (Cotton & Savard, 1980; Murphy & Alexander, 2006). Infusing technology into leadership practices has become a recognized domain of practical knowledge essential to effective instructional leadership (Brooks-Young, 2002, 2004). Standard 2 is also informed by research underscoring the importance of knowledge of curriculum planning. This requires that education leaders be familiar with theories of curriculum. Curriculum theories are narratives that attempt to answer the age-old question, “which knowledge is of most worth?” According to Wraga (2006) there are three broad types of curriculum theories: (a) philosophical-prescriptive; (b) professional-instrumental; and (c) exegetic-academic (p. 251). The philosophical-prescriptive approach seeks to determine the most important knowledge by denoting the nature of educational purposes. The most obvious example is the traditional-academic curriculum as described by Mortimer Adler. In the second type of curriculum theory the approach is to focus on the processes or methods to make decisions about curriculum. The most famous example is that created by Ralph Tyler. The exegetic-academic is not aimed at improving curriculum practice, but rather is a way of thinking about academic texts or theoretical lenses in viewing curriculum. Education leaders draw from curriculum theories to develop a rigorous and coherent curriculum. They recognize that a curriculum, as an expression of ordered content, should be constructed or developed following an explicit design rather than simply throwing disparate elements together and hoping they fit somehow at the end. It means curriculum construction with forethought to obtain well considered outcomes where the whole is greater than the parts and not simply the parts clumped together. Education leaders support the expectation that the curriculum will contain the highest or most difficult elements to consider or to acquire in learning by all students.

The importance of the knowledge presented in evidence supporting Standard 2 was recognized in the empirical evidence, craft knowledge and theoretical writings that supported the development of ISLLC's Standard 2 (ISLLC, 2008, p. 18): "promoting the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth" (Murphy, 1990). Classic theories of motivation (Bandura, 1986; Herzberg, Mauser & Snyderman, 2004, Maslow, 1954; McClelland, 1961; Vroom, 1964; Weiner, 1986), social control (Glasser, 1986), and goals (Ames, 1992) are foundational sources of knowledge for education leaders seeking to nurture a culture of trust and to motivate faculty and students. There are three levels of educational trust according to Schmidt (2010). The first level of trust is *predictability* where individuals can rely on established and predictable behavior. The second level of trust is related to individuals such as leaders who are perceived as being *trustworthy* when they exhibit predictable behavior and are responsive to the needs of staff, parents and stakeholders. The third level of trust is *faith*, which consists of emotional security where there is the expectation that leaders and institutions will keep their promises.

Theories of human development (Armstrong, 2007) and evidence found in case studies of how improvements in teaching and learning can be achieved (Schmoker, 2006) confirm that both are essential to effective school leadership. A review of literature by Murphy et al. (2007) on learning centered leadership concluded that instructionally-focused leadership paired with leadership processes are required for high performing schools. Earlier reviews found strong evidence that knowledge of leadership approaches to developing school culture and climate is critically important (Anderson, 1982). Climate has been compared to the personality of an individual or how a school "feels" when it is experienced holistically. The differing types of climate were *invented* as opposed to *discovered* (Halpin, 1966, p. 131, 138). More recently Conley defined climate as "the conditions and shared perceptions of organizational variables thought to affect organizational functioning, such as teacher morale and principal leadership style" (2006, p. 153). Evidence of the importance of applied knowledge of how to create a culture of trust, learning and high expectations was found in scholarship on the impact that leaders have on building learning communities (Boyd & Hord, 1994). Knowledge of the nature and practices of distributive leadership was identified as essential in a number of scholarly works (Bennett, Wise, Woods & Harvey, 2003; Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom & Anderson, 2010). Education leaders strive to create a culture of continuous improvement recognizing that the quest for improvement should not end with any particular state of accomplishment, but rather involves continuing efforts to attain new or higher levels of attainment with renewed effort.

ELCC 2.1: Commentary and Research Support:

This element stresses the role of school leaders in developing an effective school culture. Candidates should have knowledge of the elements of school culture and ways it can be influenced to ensure student success and human development theories, proven learning and motivational theories, and knowledge of how diversity influences the learning process (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Leithwood et al., 1996). This dimension of leadership has been widely researched over the past 30 years through case study and survey research. An extensive body of research beginning with early effective schools research (Edmonds, 1979) continually with the most recent large-scale, multi school research study (Leithwood &

Jantzi, 2008; Louis et al., 2010; Wahlstrom & Seashore-Louis, 2008) sought to capture the leader actions that contribute most to a culture that positively influences student learning.. Much of the research focused either specifically on culture influencing actions or on those actions among other effective leadership practices. Research has described the importance of leaders setting high expectations (Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999a, b; Leithwood et al., 2004; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005), and creating a culture of collaboration and trust among staff and the larger community (Hoy, Sweetland, & Smith, 2002; Hoy, Tarter, & Bliss, 1990; Podsokoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990; Silins et al., 2002; Sweetland & Hoy, 2000; Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998). Various terms have been used to signify school or organizational culture, including fostering *organizational health* (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993), and creating a *culture of care* (Hayes, Christie, Mills, & Lingard, 2004). Findings reported in various reviews of research and large-scale multivariate analyses confirm that leaders strongly influence student learning by creating and sustaining a culture that sets high expectations and enables teachers and students to learn and work productively. A few studies have tried to differentiate leader practices by comparing similarly challenged schools that have different student outcomes (Brown, Anfara, & Roney, 2004; Watts, Campell, Gau, Jacobs, Rex, & Hess, 2006). Results of these studies similarly underscored the leaders' influence on building a supportive culture around high expectations.

ELCC 2.2: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Candidates have knowledge of the development of quality curriculum including (a) using principles/theories of learning; (b) using appropriate instructional techniques; (c) monitoring and evaluating instruction; (d) using data and technology to improve instruction; and (d) allocating resources (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Torrence, 2002; Waters et al., 2003; Weber, 2006); multiple methods of evaluation, accountability systems, data collection, and analysis of data; and program evaluation (Smith, 1999; Waters et al., 2003). Candidates are able to design comprehensive curriculum development plans; analyze instructional lessons; collaborate with faculty to plan, implement, and evaluate a coordinated and articulated curriculum (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Robinson et al., 2008); use technology to design, monitor and/or evaluate instructional programs (Waters et al., 2003; Weber, 2006); use standards-based accountability data to improve the quality of teaching and learning; provide feedback using data, assessments, and evaluation methods to improve practice and student achievement (Torrence, 2002); design evaluation systems, make plans based on assessment data, and provide feedback based on data; design, develop, and utilize school assessments for instruction and reporting; interpret information and communicate progress toward vision and goals for educators, the school community, and other stakeholders; use disaggregated data to improve instructional programs (Waters et al., 2003); use effective technology and performance management systems where appropriate to improve classroom instruction; and use technology to monitor, analyze, and evaluate assessment results for accountability reporting and to guide continuous school improvement (Robinson et al., 2008; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2004; Waters et al., 2003).

This element combines two primary knowledge and skill areas—knowledge of curriculum and instruction and capacity to work with teachers to improve these, and capacity to use data to evaluate to inform how to improve these. Many of the measures of leadership practices combine these under a more general rubric of focus on instruction or instructional leadership

(Leithwood et al., 2004; Robinson et al., 2008; Supovitz, Siridides, & May, 2010; Waters et al., 2003). For example, in an effort to unpack effective leadership practices, Robinson and others (2008) undertook a meta-analysis of leadership dimensions across 27 studies and found a moderate impact (80 indicators across nine studies) from leadership practices of planning, coordinating and evaluating teaching and the curriculum on student achievement. Waters et al. (2003) identified the correlations in their meta-analyses, finding modest association with measures on knowledge of, participation in and practice of monitoring and evaluation curriculum, instruction and assessment.

ELCC 2.3: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Candidates have knowledge of supervision strategies that ensure teachers are demonstrating research-based professional practices; individual professional development plans and continuous progress; principles of quality professional development; effective instructional techniques; evaluation of professional development; and systems that promote efficient practices in the management of people, processes, and resources (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). Candidates are able to provide feedback to improve teaching and learning (Wildy & Dimmock, 1993); work collaboratively at the building level to improve practice for teaching and learning (Goddard, Goddard, & Tschannen-Moran, 2007); monitor individual professional development and continuous improvement; participate in activities that apply principles of effective instruction to improve instructional practices and curricular materials; design building-level professional growth plans that reflect national professional development standards; use a variety of approaches to improve staff performance (Youngs, 2007; Youngs & King, 2002); and provide and monitor the use of differentiated strategies, materials, and technologies to maximize instructional time (Leithwood et al., 2004; Marzano et al., 2005).

This element combines the development of individual capacity with collective organizational capacity to improve instruction. While the element frames this in terms of time on instruction, the descriptors of practice focus more broadly on effective instructional practices that have been shown to have moderate to strong mediating effects on student learning (Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Leithwood et al., 2004; Robinson et al., 2008; Waters et al., 2003).

ELCC 2.4: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Candidates have knowledge about technology as pedagogical and administrative tools (Reale-Foley, 2003; Weber, 2006). Candidates are able to support initiatives that utilize technologies for improved teaching and student achievement and use technology for school improvement (Anderson & Dexter, 2005; Flanagan & Jacobson, 2003; Halverson et al., 2005; Isabelle & Lapointe, 2003; Weber, 2006).

Research Support for ELCC Standard 3.0:

Introduction

Evidence presented in support of Standard 3 confirms that a building-level education leader must have knowledge of best practices regarding management of a school organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. This includes knowledge

of effective practices of management and leadership that are associated with improved school conditions and subsequent school outcomes (Earthman & Lemasters, 2004; Leithwood & Riehl, 2005; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Louis et al., 2010; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Murphy et al. 2007; Portin, Alejano, Knapp, & Marzolf, 2006). School outcomes are the results that accrue from decisions or actions from those responsible for leading a school. The results can be expressed in terms of student learning measures (achievement test scores) or student categorizations such as dropouts, promotions, graduation rates, etc.

Standard 3 was informed by research confirming the importance of knowledge of human resource issues, including educator work redesign (e.g. Conley, Fauske, & Pounder, 2004; Crow & Pounder, 2000; Gerber, Finn, Achilles, & Boyd-Zaharias, 2001; Pounder, 1998; Pounder, 1999), educator recruitment-selection (Pounder, 1989; Pounder, Galvin, & Shepard, 2003; Pounder & Merrill, 2001; Pounder, King, & Hausman, 2005), educator induction-mentoring-professional development (Crow & Matthews, 1998), educator appraisal-supervision-evaluation (Stronge, & Tucker, 2003; Tucker & Stronge, 2005), and educator compensation (Odden & Kelley, 2002; Pounder, 1988). The importance of the knowledge presented in evidence supporting Standard 3 was recognized in research informing the formation of the ISLLC 2008 standards, which also found knowledge of the nature of distributed leadership to be essential (Goleman, Boyatzis & Mckee, 2002). More recently Louis et al. (2010) found that distribution of leadership to include teachers, parents and district staff is needed in order to improve student achievement. Distributive leadership is based on the idea that there is a social distribution of tasks associated with leadership in a school, specifically that leadership tasks are spread over a group of people in schools beyond the singular administrator in charge. Distributed leadership approaches do not remove the need for an effective singular leader, nor do they necessarily reduce the work of the leader. Although there are many similarities with democratic leadership, distributed leadership is different from democratic leadership as it accepts power differentials in roles within the schools even as leadership tasks are dispersed (Woods, 2005, pp. 33-45).

ELCC 3.1: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Much of the early research in the field of educational administration (1960s and 1970s) focused on management functions and operational systems of schools and other educational organizations. Since the 1980s much more of the literature has focused on instructional leadership functions and leadership for school improvement. Most recently, this leadership (vs. management) focus has narrowed to focus more specifically on leadership behaviors and functions associated with improved student outcomes, most notably student learning. In spite of this transition in educational administration scholarship, effective management of schools is still considered a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for effective schooling, as established in the 1980s effective schools research (Purkey & Smith, 1983). Recent empirical studies, meta-analyses of empirical studies, and reviews of leadership literature have suggested that both effective management and effective leadership are associated with improved school conditions and subsequent school outcomes (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Leithwood & Riehl, 2005; Marzano et al., 2005; Murphy et al., 2007; Portin et al., 2006). Louis et al. (2010) concluded that successful school-level leadership involves significant attention to classroom instructional practices and to other issues critical to the health and welfare of schools.

ELCC 3.2: *Commentary and Research Support:*

There is a considerable body of empirical literature devoted to issues of resource administration in schools or other educational organizations. These empirical studies are often highly specialized to focus on specific human resource issues, including educator work redesign (e.g., Conley et al., 2004; Crow & Pounder, 2000; Gerber et al., 2001; Pounder, 1998, 1999); educator recruitment and selection (Pounder, 1989; Pounder et al., 2003; Pounder et al., 2005; Pounder & Merrill, 2001); educator induction, mentoring, and professional development (Crow & Matthews, 1998); educator appraisal, supervision, and evaluation (Stronge & Tucker, 2003; Tucker & Stronge, 2005); and educator compensation (Odden & Kelley, 2002; Pounder, 1988). Issues of fiscal resource administration are often focused on equity (Card & Payne, 2002; Wenglinsky, 1998), adequacy (Baker & Green, 2008; Grubb, 2007) or productivity issues (Greenwald, Hedges & Laine, 1996; Monk, 1992). Technological resource research often focuses on better technology utilization, including stronger preparation and development of educators to utilize technology to improve student learning (Collins & Halverson, 2009; Halverson & Collins, 2006; McLeod, 2008). As a result of this diverse array of resource issues, it is difficult to identify literature reviews or meta-analyses that succinctly summarize findings on educational resource administration in general. Literature cited above is but a small sample of literature on resource administration in schools.

ELCC 3.3: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Much of the support for Standard 3.3 is grounded in the law and case law precedent rather than from empirical research. However, the effective schools research of the 1980s emphasized the creation of an orderly school environment as one of the critical components of effective schools—a necessary but not sufficient condition for student learning (Purkey & Smith, 1983). Similarly, research by Browne-Ferrigno, Hunt, Allan, and Rowe (2006) found that successful schools have a culture of leadership that supports a safe, orderly environment.

ELCC 3.4: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Candidates have knowledge about the meaning of distributed leadership and how to create and sustain it (Day & Leithwood, 2007; Firestone & Martinez, 2009; Gronn, 2002; Harris, 2009; Leithwood, Mascall, & Strauss, 2009; Spillane, 2006; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2001). Evidence on effective principals demonstrates the importance of understanding and practicing leadership as a network of relationships rather than “control over processes or outcomes” (Leithwood et al., 2009, p. 7). Research has demonstrated that the principal’s practice of distributed leadership can take various forms depending on school characteristics, specific leadership activities, the school’s stage of development, resources, and the leader’s personal preferences (Leithwood, Mascall, Strauss, Sacks, Memon, & Yashkina., 2007; Portin, 2003; Portin, Knapp, Dareff, Feldman, Russell, Samuelson, & Yeh, 2009; Spillane et al., 2001). Although research findings are mixed in terms of the effects of distributed leadership on student learning, evidence exists to support the claim that principals’ use of distributed leadership contributes to school change, student achievement, and organizational learning (Day & Leithwood, 2007; Leithwood et al., 2009; Seashore Louis & Marks, 1998; Stoll & Seashore Louis, 2007; Wahlstrom & Seashore Louis, 2008; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). Louis et al., (2010) concluded that leaders should, as a matter of

policy and practice, extend significant influence to others in the school community as a foundation for their efforts to improve student achievement.

Candidates are able to identify leadership capabilities of staff at various levels of the school, including teacher leaders and assistant principals (Copland, 2003; Firestone & Martinez, 2009; Gronn, 2002; Leithwood et al., 2009). In addition, effective principals model collaboration skills and are able to authentically involve faculty and staff in decision-making processes (Copland, 2003; Silins et al., 2002; Wahlstrom & Seashore Louis, 2008). Research on principal leadership has demonstrated an indirect, but significant, effect on student learning via the principal's support of teacher collaboration and communication (Supovitz et al., 2010).

ELCC 3.5: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Until recently, most of the research on principals' use of time has consisted of ethnographic studies of a few individuals or self-report studies. A recent study of principal time use (Hornig, Klasik, & Loeb, 2010), using methods that blend the strengths of both, found that for most principals almost half of their time was spent in administration or organization management and only 13% on instructional responsibilities. This study also found that increased time spent on organization management (hiring and managing staff and managing budgets) was related to positive school outcomes, including student test performance, as well as teacher and parent satisfaction.

These findings suggest that the time spent on organizational management tasks relates to instructional leadership. Managing and protecting time, setting priorities through the ethical use of power and political skills, and creating schedules contribute to school order, which is necessary for successful teaching and learning (Marzano et al., 2005; Supovitz, 2002). Research has demonstrated that the principal's ability to use time effectively and to provide time as a resource for teachers is critical to quality instruction and student learning (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Leithwood & Riehl, 2005; Morrissey, 2000; Spillane & Seashore Louis, 2002). Effective principals are also able to use power and political skills in ethical ways both inside the school and with external constituents (Crow & Weindling, 2010; Owens, 2006). To exercise power principals must have the capacity to change their environment in some way, or have the capacity to work with and through others to change an organization or a society in specific way(s) to attain desired goals or outcomes.

Research Support for ELCC Standard 4.0:

Introduction

Evidence presented in support of Standard 4 confirms that a building-level education leader must have knowledge of strategies for collaboration with faculty and community members, understanding of diverse community interests and needs, and best practices for mobilizing community resources. In order to develop strategies for collaboration (Anderson, Christenson, & Sinclair, 2004; Barnyak, & McNelly, 2009; Blue-Banning, Summers, Frankland, Nelson, & Beegle, 2004; Coalition for Community Schools, & Institute for Educational Leadership, 2003; Epstein & Sanders, 2006; Harris & Chapman, 2002; Harry, 1992), principals must have knowledge about the collection and analysis of evidence pertinent to the school educational

environment (Bustamante, Nelson, & Onwuegbuzie, 2009; Epstein, 2005; Halverson, 2010; Knapp, Swinnerton, Copland, & Monpas-Huber, 2006; Wayman & Stringfield, 2006), and knowledge of the needs of students, parents or caregivers (Catsambis, 2002; Christenson, 2004; Fuerstein, 2000; Harris & Chapman, 2002; Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005; Landsman, 2006; Louis & Miles, 1990; Patrikakou, & Weissberg, 2000; Reid, Reid, & Peterson, 2005; Ryan & Martin, 2000). Candidates understand that conducting a needs assessment requires gathering information through a process of *discovery*. This process might involve considering what the community wants the school to do. Needs assessments also involve processes of noting *discrepancies* between a current state of affairs and a desired state of affairs, as in, ‘our current levels of reading achievement are not what we want them to be.’ What actions must we take to reach the desired levels?

Research evidence used to support the ISLLC 2008, Standard 4 (p. 18) confirmed that education leaders require such knowledge when collaborating with faculty and community members, and when responding to diverse community interests and needs and mobilizing community support... Reports on practices in using evidence to inform decision making highlight the importance knowledge of strategies for data- based decision making (Creighton, 2007).

ELCC 4.1: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Candidates have knowledge about the collection and analysis of data and evidence pertinent to the school educational environment (Bustamante et al., 2009; Epstein, 2005; Halverson, 2010; Knapp, Swinnerton et al., 2006; Wayman & Stringfield, 2006). The central role of evidence in the assessment and improvement of learning for students has been well documented in the research on effective schools and in subsequent studies on school improvement and school reform (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Leithwood et al., 2004; Lezotte & Jacoby, 1992). Although the emphasis has been on use of data within schools to create formative feedback systems for improving instruction and student engagement (Halverson, 2010), evidence has also been used to facilitate the understandings that underpin relationships with families and communities. These purposes include identifying goals for partnerships with families and gauging constructs such as cultural competence (Bustamante et al., 2009; Epstein & Salinas, 2004; Epstein & Sheldon, 2002; Landsman, 2006; Sanders & Epstein, 2000). Descriptive literature (Epstein et al., 2002; Landsman, 2006) has offered strategies for collection of evidence through regular phone calls to parents, neighborhood bus tours, and home visits. Research on the ways that evidence can be used to enhance the educational environment for constituencies within schools and the communities they serve is limited. However, more targeted studies, for example, on the impact of parent involvement on reading skills (Adler & Fisher, 2001; Edwards, 2003; Fiala & Sheridan, 2003), offer guidance on more targeted ways to engage parents in specific ways to enhance schooling.

Candidates are able to use the appropriate strategies to collect, analyze and interpret data and evidence pertinent to the school environment and communicate information about the school to the community (Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Halverson, 2010; Knapp, Swinnerton, et al., 2006; Leithwood et al. 2004; Lezotte & Jacoby, 1992; Wayman & Stringfield, 2006). Substantial research supports the importance of data driven decision making in all aspects of school leadership. How evidence is used to inform the development of partnerships with families and communities is best captured by the strategies used by the National Network of

Partnership Schools, which was established in 1996 and has been guided by the work of researchers at Johns Hopkins (Epstein, 2005; Epstein & Sanders, 2006; Sanders & Epstein, 2000; Sheldon, 2005).

ELCC 4.2: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Candidates must possess cultural competence and have a basic knowledge of the communities they serve to understand, appreciate, and use the community's diverse cultural, social, and intellectual community resources (Aspiazu et al., 1998; Bustamante et al., 2009; Flanagan, Cumsille, Gill, & Gallay, 2007; Franke, Isken, & Parra, 2003; Gaitan, 2004; Harry, 1992; C. M. Tucker & Herman, 2002). Given the growing diversity of students, their families, and communities, cultural competence across a broad spectrum of constituents is viewed as critical to building a welcoming environment for learning in schools and at home.

Cultural competence refers to the ability of a leader to understand his/her own cultural background and values and work successfully with individuals of different cultures without engaging in deficit categorization of them. This capacity is sometimes referred to as engaging in leadership with cross-cultural skills. Limited research suggests that programs can enhance culturally competent practice and that the climate and culture within a school is related to school-wide cultural competence. Increased understanding and appreciation of cultural differences, as well as commonalities, serve as the foundation for "cultural relationships," which are necessary for reciprocity and collaboration within schools and with community entities (Bustamante et al., 2009; Evans, 2007; Gaitan, 2004; Harry, 1992; Nazinga-Johnson, Baker, & Aupperlee, 2009; Tucker & Herman, 2002). The importance of candidates being able to identify and match diverse community resources to meet the needs of all students has been highlighted by a number of studies looking at outreach with specific student populations (Blue-Banning et al., 2004; Christenson, 2004; Epstein & Sanders, 2006; Gaitan, 2004; Leistyna, 2002; Tucker & Herman, 2002; Zirkel, 2008).

ELCC 4.3: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Candidates have knowledge of the needs of students, parents, or caregivers (Catsambis, 2002; Christenson, 2004; Fuerstein, 2000; Harris & Chapman, 2002; Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005; Landsman, 2006; Patrikakou, & Weissberg, 2000; Reid et al., 2005; Ryan & Martin, 2000; Seashore Louis & Miles, 1990). To build trusting relationships with parents and key community members, school leaders must first understand the challenges and pressing issues in the lives of their students and their communities. Based on this knowledge, responsive outreach efforts can be undertaken that build relationships of consequence for caretakers (A. R. Anderson et al., 2004; Blank, Melaville, & Shah, 2003; Barnyak, & McNelly, 2009; Blue-Banning et al., 2004; Epstein & Sanders, 2006; Harris & Chapman, 2002; Harry, 1992). The research has described a wide range of strategies that bring parents into the school for meaningful engagement and dialogue or create events in the community, such as potluck dinners and sporting events, that create a sense of connectedness (e.g., Colombo, 2004). Efforts to engage family members in the learning environment for children and youth have been found to be related to stronger cognitive and emotional outcomes in many research studies, some of which offer compelling longitudinal evidence of impact (Catsambis, 2002; Epstein & Sheldon, 2002; Fan & Chen, 2001; Fantuzzo, McWayne, Perry, & Childs, 2004; Jeynes, 2005; Mathematica Policy Research & the Center for Children, Youth, and Families,

2001; Reynolds, 1999; Reynolds, Temple, Robertson, & Mann, 2002; Xu, Kushner Benson, Mudrey-Camino, & Steiner, 2010).

To be effective in building positive relationships with families and caregivers, the candidate understands how to build the organizational culture that promotes open communication with families and caregivers (Levin & Fullan, 2008; Miretzky, 2004). Research has indicated that cultural competence is both an individual and organizational skill and must be developed at the building level to influence how students and families respond to engagement efforts (Benson & Martin, 2003; Bustamante et al., 2009; Epstein & Sanders, 2006; Griffith, 2001; Pena, 2000; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003; Steinberg, 1992).

Research has identified factors that help schools develop meaningful partnerships with schools, which include strategies for effective oral and written communication and collaboration with families and caregivers (Berger, 2003; Cairney, 2000; Gordon & Seashore Louis, 2009; Lawson, 2003; McIntyre, Kyle, Miller, & Moore, 2002; Miretsky, 2004; Pena, 2000; Porterfield & Carnes, 2008; Smrekar & Cohen-Vogal, 2001). These partnerships are related to higher levels of family involvement in student learning at home and school (Durlak et al., 2007; Epstein, 2005; Sheldon, 2005; Sheldon & Van Voorhis, 2004; Taylor & Pearson, 2004).

Candidates are able to assess the needs of students, parents, or caregivers; articulate a vision of school leadership characterized by respect for children and their families; apply oral and written communication and collaboration strategies to develop school relationships with families and caregivers; and involve families and caregivers in decision making about their children's education (Epstein, 2005; Gordon & Seashore Louis, 2009; Jacobson, Brooks, Giles, Johnson, & Ylimaki, 2007; Miretzky, 2004). The research on the National Network of Partnership Schools provides the best evidence of how these elements work together to ensure better learning outcomes for students (Epstein, 2005; Epstein & Sanders, 2006; Sanders & Epstein, 2000; Sheldon, 2005).

ELCC 4.4: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Candidates have knowledge of the needs of school community partners, the school organizational culture that promotes open communication with community partners, and school strategies for effective oral and written communication and collaboration to develop and sustain productive relations with community partners (Cairney, 2000; Dryfoos & Maguire, 2002; Hiatt-Michael, 2006; Institute for Educational Leadership, 2002a, 2002b; Leistyna, 2002; Levin & Fullan, 2008; Miretzky, 2004; H. B. Price, 2008; Sanders, 2001, 2009; Sanders & Harvey, 2002; Sheldon, 2005; Sheldon, Epstein, & Galindo, 2010; Sommerville & McDonald, 2002; Warren, Hong, Rubin, & Uy, 2009). As educators recognize the broader set of variables that influence student success in schools, there is a greater interest in collaborating with community partners to serve a wide range of medical, emotional, and social needs of students, sometimes within full-service community schools (Dryfoos & Maguire, 2002; Institute for Educational Leadership, 2002a, 2002b; Trivette & Thompson-Drew, 2003). In addition, after-school programs are opportunities for collaboration with community resources (Cairney, 2000; Leistyna, 2002; Price, 2008).

Finally, candidates are able to assess the needs of school community partners, articulate a vision of school leadership characterized by respect for community partners, and apply oral

and written communication and collaboration strategies to develop school relationships with community partners (Dryfoos & Maguire, 2002; Institute for Educational Leadership, 2002a, 2002b; Levin & Fullan, 2008; Warren et al., 2009).

Research Support for ELCC Standard 5.0:

Introduction

Evidence presented in support of Standard 5 confirms that a building-level education leader must have knowledge of how to act with integrity, fairness, and engage in ethical practice. Ethical practice refers to the concept that the implementation of leadership actions must not only conform to adherence to the laws of the state and regulations concerning fidelity to the spirit of such laws, but must also rest on moral principles of justice and fairness. Ethical practice rests on the moral principles of building goodness and community grounded in a collective commitment to the pursuit of truth and truthfulness in operations and personal interactions with others.

Education leaders engaging in ethical practice have knowledge of democratic values, equity, and diversity (Hess, 1993; Gross & Shapiro, 2004; Lopez, 2006; Papa & Fortune, 2002; Rollow & Bryk, 1993; Theoharris, 2001; Rusch, 1998; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003).

Candidates knowledge of diversity is based on: a) the recognition that schools in a democracy serve a broad range of goals and purposes and that these are sometimes at cross-purposes; b) the recognition that the children coming to school do not all have the same family, ethnic, racial or religious upbringing or perceptions; c) the valuing of cultural, ethnic and racial difference as opposed to insisting that the values of some are promoted while differences in other are negated, undervalued or devalued. While a celebration of difference is often recognized in schools, the concept of *diversity* is more complicated and complex than mere recognition. It also means confronting the privileges some children have compared to others who are different and working to creating understanding and ways to confront the inequities involved (Lopez, 2006, pp. 297-300).

Standard 5 was informed by research confirming that education leaders must have knowledge about current ethical and moral issues facing education, government, and business and their consequences (Beck, 1994; Brennan & Brennan, 1988; Evers, 1985; Englert, 1993; Grundy, 1993; Lakomski, 1987; Militello, Schimmel & Eberwein, 2009; Nevin, 1979; Smith & Blase, 1991), and knowledge about the relationship between social justice, school culture, and student achievement (Aspiazu et al., 1998; Bustamante, Nelson, & Onwuegbuzie, 2009; Flanagan et al., 2007; Franke, Isken, & Parra, 2003; Gaitan, 2004; Harry, 1992; Papa & Fortune, 2002; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003; Theoharris, 2001; C. M. Tucker & Herman, 2002; Zirkel, 2008). Fundamentally social justice means *fairness*, and it represents a perspective in regard to how “fundamental rights and duties are assigned and on the economic opportunities and social conditions” which are established “in various sectors of society,” including but not limited to schools (Rawls, 1971, p. 7).

The importance of the knowledge presented in evidence supporting Standard 5 was recognized in research on practices that promote social justice identified as important in the 2008 ISLLC Policy Standards. Support for the importance of this knowledge was informed by scholarship on practices of inclusive leadership (Ryan, 2006) and leadership for diversity (Tillman, 2004). If

candidates are to model principles of self-awareness and ethical behavior they must be aware of the importance of reflective practice (Sparks, 2005). Reflective practice is the means by which practitioners gain a greater sense of self-awareness and perception regarding their beliefs, values, motivations and actions in relationship to desired goals or administrative decisions, which subsequently define their performance and serve as the focus for improvement over time. A number of theoretical and practice focused commentaries have also noted the critical need for candidates to have knowledge of the moral and legal consequences of decision-making (Chouhoud & Zirkel, 2008; Gavin & Zirkel, 2008; Holler & Zirkel, 2008; Lupini & Zirkel, 2003; Mawhinney, 2003; Cambron, McCarthy, Thomas, 2004; Papalwis, 2004; Stefkovich, 2006; Zirkel, 1997; Zirkel & Clark, 2008; Zirkel & D'Angelo, 2002; Zirkel & Gischlar, 2008)

ELCC 5.1: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Candidates have knowledge of federal, state, and local legal/policy guidance to create operational definitions of accountability, equity, and social justice (Leithwood, Steinbach, & Jantzi, 2002; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003). The leaders' knowledge of policy is also connected their capacity to facilitate teachers' understanding of policy and its connection to equity and social justice (Burch, Theoharis & Rauscher, 2010; Marks & Nance, 2007; Prawat, 1991; Reitzug, 1994), as well as their ability to effectively implement the policy (Burch & Spillane, 2003; Spillane, 2004). Candidates are able to plan, implement, and evaluate policies, procedures, and practices within the school that support students' academic and social successes (Burch et al., 2010; Bustamante et al., 2009; Chouhoud & Zirkel, 2008; Gavin & Zirkel, 2008; Halverson, 2010; Holler & Zirkel, 2008; Knapp, Copland, et al., 2006; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Lord & Maher, 1993; Lupini & Zirkel, 2003; Portin, Schneider, DeArmond, & Gundlach, 2003; Reitzug, 1994; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003; Theoharis, 2007; Wayman & Stringfield, 2006; Zirkel, 1997; Zirkel & Clark, 2008; Zirkel & D'Angelo, 2002; Zirkel & Gischlar, 2008). The importance of a leader's ability to use multiple sources of data in the assessment of student learning and the planning, implementation, and evaluation of school programs and policies has been well documented in the research on effective schools and in subsequent studies on school improvement and school reform (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Leithwood et al., 2004; Lezotte & Jacoby, 1992; Spillane et al., 2001).

ELCC 5.2: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Candidates have knowledge of the legal and professional organizations' information to understand the basic tenets of ethical behavior; the relationship between ethical behavior, building culture, and student achievement; and the effect of ethical behavior on one's own leadership (Beckner, 2004; Begley, 2006; Brennan & Brennan, 1988; Bustamante et al., 2009; Chouhoud & Zirkel, 2008; Gavin & Zirkel, 2008; Holler & Zirkel, 2008; Lupini & Zirkel, 2003; McGough, 2003; Webster, 1994; Zirkel, 1997; Zirkel & Clark, 2008; Zirkel & D'Angelo, 2002; Zirkel & Gischlar, 2008). Although the research literature does not specifically refer to information provided by professional organizations, it does emphasize the importance of understanding and having a set of ethical principles (Beckner, 2004; Begley, 2006; Brennan & Brennan, 1988). Candidates are able to formulate a school-level leadership platform grounded in ethical standards and practices and analyze decisions in terms of established ethical standards (Browne-Ferrigno, 2003; Bush, 2008; Huefner, 1994; Stöcklin, 2010; Walker & Shuangye, 2007; Wegenke, 2000). The empirical basis for

developing a leadership platform grounded in ethical standards is underdeveloped. Moreover, the majority of studies that specifically stress the importance of having a leadership platform are from outside of the United States (e.g., Bush, 2008; Huefner, 1994; Stöcklin, 2010; A. Walker & Shuangye, 2007). However, research that emphasizes the importance of formulating a vision or plan for the school that is grounded in a leader's ethical principals is more common in the United States and is linked to literature on building school capacity and leading change (Beck, 1994; Beckner, 2004; Begley, 2006; Browne-Ferrigno, 2003).

ELCC 5.3: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Candidates have knowledge of democratic values, equity, and diversity (Gross & Shapiro, 2004; Hess, 1993; Papa & Fortune, 2002; Rollow & Bryk, 1993; Rusch, 1998; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003; Theoharis, 2007). Moreover, school leaders play a pivotal role in shaping meaning; fostering understanding; and promoting the values of democracy, equity and diversity in their organizations through communication, symbols, structures, and routines (R. Cooper, 1996; Meyer, 1984; Strike, 1993). Candidates are able to develop, implement, and evaluate a professional development plan for a school that clearly addresses democratic values, equity, and diversity (Burch et al., 2010; Theoharis, 2007; Webster, 1994). Although much of the research on the leader's role vis-à-vis professional development (e.g., Leithwood, 1994; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Murphy & Seashore Louis, 1994) casts it as supportive, the leader is considered critical in the development of professional learning communities that support teacher growth (Fine, 1994; Seashore Louis & Kruse, 1995; Seashore Louis, Marks, & Kruse, 1996; Talbert, 1996). Furthermore, research has indicated that leaders who model democratic values and equity can develop such values and educational practice that serve the needs of diverse students among their staff members (Corson, 1995; Perry & Fraser, 1993; Rusch, 1998).

ELCC 5.4: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Candidates have knowledge about current ethical and moral issues facing education, government, and business and their consequences (Beck, 1994; Brennan & Brennan, 1988; Englert, 1993; Evers, 1985; Grundy, 1993; Lakomski, 1987; Militello et al., 2009; Nevin, 1979; Smith & Blase, 1991). Of the various moral and legal issues used as the focus of research in this area, special education was most common (e.g., Brennan & Brennan, 1988; Harry, 1992; Nevin, 1979; Rebore, 1979; Van Horn, Burrello, & DeClue, 1992; Zirkel, 1997; Zirkel & D'Angelo, 2002; Zirkel & Gischlar, 2008). Candidates are able to formulate sound solutions to educational dilemmas across a range of content areas in educational leadership (Duke & Salmonowicz, 2010; Gross & Shapiro, 2004; Kaplan & Owings, 2001; Leithwood & Steinbach, 1992; Militello et al., 2009; Portin et al., 2003; Rebore, 1979; Roche, 1999). While the majority of research on decision making emphasizes the importance of leaders using multiple data sources (e.g., Leithwood & Steinbach, 1992), a large body of research also emphasizes the importance of considering the potential consequences of different strategies and actions. Within this literature, it has been argued that principals understand the ethics and fairness of issues involved and the costly consequences for falling short even as they support raising academic standards (Duke & Salmonowicz, 2010; Gross & Shapiro, 2004; Kaplan & Owings, 2001; Leithwood & Steinbach, 1992; Militello et al., 2009; Portin et al., 2003; Roche, 1999).

ELCC 5.5: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Candidates have knowledge about the relationship between social justice, school culture, and student achievement (Aspiazu et al., 1998; Bustamante et al., 2009; Flanagan et al., 2007; Franke et al., 2003; Gaitan, 2004; Harry, 1992; Papa & Fortune, 2002; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003; Theoharis, 2007; Tucker & Herman, 2002; Zirkel, 2008). Given the growing diversity of students, their families, and communities, the ability to understand the relationship between social justice, school culture, and student achievement and to practice inclusive leadership is critical (Baptiste, 1999; Deering, 1996; Katz, 1999; Miron, 1997; Reed, 1978; Sather, 1999; Shakeshaft, 1993; E. W. Walker, 1999; Winfield, Johnson, & Manning, 1993). Increased understanding and appreciation of cultural differences, as well as commonalities, serve as the foundation for reciprocity and collaboration (Bustamante et al., 2009; Evans, 2007; Gaitan, 2004; Harry, 1992; Nazinga-Johnson et al., 2009; Tucker & Herman, 2002). Candidates are able to develop and evaluate school policies, programs, and practices that ensure social justice, equity, confidentiality, acceptance, and respect between and among students and faculty and that support student achievement (Burch et al., 2010; Nevin, 1979; Papa & Fortune, 2002; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003). Research has demonstrated that principals play essential roles in creating organizational and policy conditions that influence how teachers teach and are supported when adopting new practices (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Burch & Spillane, 2003; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Leithwood et al., 2004; Lezotte & Jacoby, 1992) as well as in providing teacher learning opportunities, the use of physical and human resources, and the design of instructional systems in improving instruction for underserved populations (Stainback, Stainback, & Forest, 1989; Theoharis, 2007; Van Horn et al., 1992). The literature also emphasized the importance of leaders promoting such ability among their teaching staff (Reitzug, 1994).

Research Support for ELCC Standard 6.0:***Introduction***

Evidence presented in support of Standard 6 confirms that a building-level education leader must have knowledge of how to respond to and influence the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context within a school and district. This includes knowledge of policies, laws, and regulations enacted by state, local, and federal authorities (Chouhoud & Zirkel, 2008; Cooper, Fusarelli & Randall, 2004; Cunningham & Corderio, 2009; Fowler, 2000; Hanson, 2003; Heck, 2004; Gavin & Zirkel, 2008; Holler & Zirkel, 2008; Hoy & Miskel, 2004; Hoyle, English & Steffy, 1998; Leithwood, 1999; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2007; Lupini & Zirkel, 2003; Murphy, 1990; Murphy et al., 2007; Murphy, Martin & Murth, 1997; Razik & Swanson, 2001; Zirkel, 1997; Zirkel & Clark, 2008; Zirkel & D'Angelo, 2002; Zirkel & Gischlar, 2008); knowledge of how to improve the social opportunities of students, particularly in contexts where issues of student marginalization demand proactive leadership (Murphy & Datnow, 2003; Brown, 2004; Frattura & Capper, 2007; Brooks, Jean-Marie, Normore, & Hodgins, 2007; Larson & Murtadha, 2002; Marshall & Oliva, 2006; McKenzie et al., 2008; Theoharis, 2007); and knowledge of how culturally responsive educational leadership can positively influence academic achievement and student engagement (Banks & McGee-Banks, 2004; Johnson, 2003, 2006; Juettner, 2003; Klingner et al., 2005; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Riehl, 2000; Skrla, Scheurich, Garcia, & Nolly, 2004). The widespread recognition in the practice and policy community that education leaders must be prepared to understand, respond to, and influence the political, social, economic, legal

and cultural context of education provided an important impetus for the formation of this domain of the ISLLC standards (see for example, Hoyle's (2007) description of leadership practices in visioning). An important focus on mindful practices influenced the formation of the ISLLC 2008 standards. The focus is reflected in craft and practice scholarship on knowledge of "habits of the mind" that are "characteristics of what intelligent people do when they are confronted with problems, the resolutions to which are not immediately apparent" (Costa & Kallick, 2008)

Standard 6 was informed by scholarship that called attention to the need for education leaders at both district and school levels to know about and respond to the social, political, and economic contexts of schooling (see Murphy, 2005). It was also informed by evidence from empirical and analytic scholarship and accounts of best practice. The analysis of these sources led to the identification of three important domains of knowledge and associated skills of leadership that must be developed by school and district leaders if they are to effectively address the socio-economic and political challenges of leading 21st century schools: a) skills in advocacy for children, families and caregivers to improve social opportunities; b) skills in influencing local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning; and c) skills in the assessment, analysis, and anticipation of emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt leadership strategies. All three skill domains reflect a new focus on the importance of proactive leadership of schools and districts. This proactive turn in both school and district leadership is informed by empirical research, and craft knowledge confirming the importance of proactive leadership skills, commitment to exercising influence, and engaging in advocacy in furthering educational change and reform.

ELCC 6.1: *Commentary and Research Support:*

That principals must have knowledge of policies, laws, and regulations enacted by state, local, and federal authorities has been a foundational principle in defining the responsibilities of the role (Chouhoud & Zirkel, 2008; B. S. Cooper et al., 2004; Cunningham & Corderio, 2009; Fowler, 2000; Gavin & Zirkel, 2008; Hanson, 2003; Heck, 2004; Holler & Zirkel, 2008; Hoy & Miskel, 2004; Hoyle et al., 1998; Leithwood, 1999; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2007; Lupini & Zirkel, 2003; Murphy et al., 1997; Murphy, 1990; Murphy et al., 2007; Razik & Swanson, 2001; Zirkel, 1997; Zirkel & Clark, 2008; Zirkel & D'Angelo, 2002; Zirkel & Gischlar, 2008). In this context candidates must be knowledgeable about students' civil liberties (Torres & Stefkovich, 2009).

In recent years scholars of policy have argued that "the logic of standards-based reform has become a fundamental part of the architecture of policy and governance in American education" in ways that "represent a fundamental shift in the relationship between policy and institutional practice" (Elmore, 2000, p. 4; see also Desimone, 2006, Forte, 2010). The importance of this shift became evident in findings of studies that examined principals' experiences in implementing state responses to the No Child Left Behind Act (McQuillan, & Salomon-Fernandez, 2008; Murphy, Beck, Knapp & Portin, 2003; Powell et al., 2009). After the passage of the legislation, state departments of education across the United States began creating or modifying school accountability systems to meet NCLB guidelines. Given the NCLB provisions and the growing number of schools not meeting performance targets, the number of state interventions in low-performing schools increased, and researchers found that principals of those schools had to develop detailed understanding of the state policies,

while also struggling to address frustration and the erosion of trust among teachers (Blasé, 2002; Conley & Glasman, 2008; Malen, Croninger, Muncey, & Redmond-Jones, 2002; Malen & Rice, 2004; McQuillan, & Salomon-Fernandez, 2008; Mintrop, 2004; Rice & Malen, 2003; Schoen & Fusarelli, 2008; Timperley & Robinson, 1998). In this context researchers found that preoccupation with meeting student assessment targets and raising test scores was an important influence on principals of rural schools in terms of their educational vision for the future and the need for professional development (Powell et al., 2009; see also Cooper, Ehrensall, & Bromme, 2005; Hochberg & Desimone, 2010; Marks & Nance, 2007). These studies suggest that candidates must have detailed knowledge of how accountability policies and regulations guide efforts to improve educational opportunities for students (Daly, 2009; Datnow & Castellano, 2001; Kirst, 2009; Lee & Wong, 2004; Mintrop & MacLellan, 2002; Mintrop & Sunderman, 2009; Mintrop & Trujillo, 2007).

There is also empirical evidence that principals are critically important in efforts at education reform that seek to improve the social opportunities of students, particularly in contexts where issues of student marginalization demand proactive leadership (J. S. Brooks et al., 2007; Brown, 2004; Frattura & Capper, 2007; Larson & Murtadha, 2002; Marshall & Oliva, 2006; McKenzie et al., 2008; Murphy & Datnow, 2003; Theoharis, 2007). In a series of articles reporting on a study of schools where traditionally marginalized students are thriving, Theoharis (2007, 2008a, 2008b, 2009, 2010) found that principals' daily practices of advocacy for children were informed by their analyses of the complex causes of marginalization. Like other researchers (Lyman & Villani, 2002; Riestler, Pursch, & Skrla, 2002; Scheurich, 1998; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003; Skrla et al., 2004), Theoharis (2010) found that principals' advocacy practices were informed by analyses of student demographic and accountability data, awareness of complex causes of marginalization, and concern for equity. These and other researchers found that principals enacted their advocacy for marginalized families by purposefully reaching out to involve families and by creating partnerships with community agencies (Mitra, Movit, & Frick, 2008; Scheurich, 1998; Theoharis, 2010; Wagstaff & Gallagher, 1990). Similarly research revealed the importance of proactive support for students and their families by principals in the success of implementing high school and college collaborative programs that provide traditionally underserved high school students with opportunities to receive college credit (White-Smith & White, 2009). Principals who practice an expanded approach to advocacy take into account the differences in the schooling experiences of marginalized students (Ares & Buendia, 2007) and create opportunities for discussions of those differences (Shields, 2004; Shields, Larocque, & Oberg, 2002). Research also suggests that engaging in advocacy to address issues of equity and marginalization requires that principals challenge traditional managerial-oriented views of the role and the various resistances and barriers to equity-oriented reforms (Bogotch, 2002; Brown, 2004; Dantley, 2002; Dantley & Tillman, 2006; Furman & Gruenewald, 2004; R. G. Johnson, 2009; Larson & Murtadha, 2002; Marshall & Ward, 2004; Rapp, 2002; Theoharis, 2008a).

ELCC 6.2: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Commentaries on the context of schooling confirm that administrators must assume different mindsets if public schools are to remain viable and functional (Crow & Weindling, 2010).

They must be aware of that federal and state courts hand down decisions that have the

potential to affect schools and school districts (Cooper et al., 2004; Cunningham & Corderio, 2009; Fowler, 2000; Lunenburg & Orienstein, 2007; Seyfarth, 2008; Smith, 2009). Candidates should have an understanding of the U.S. Constitution and the Bills of Rights as well as state constitutions and statutes. They should understand the legal rights of teachers and students, and should be aware of current legal issues and their potential impact on schools (Cambron et al. 2004; Chouhoud & Zirkel, 2008; Gavin & Zirkel, 2008; Holler & Zirkel, 2008; Lupini & Zirkel, 2003; Stefkovich, 2006; Zirkel, 1997; Zirkel & Clark, 2008; P. Zirkel & D'Angelo, 2002; Zirkel & Gischlar, 2008).

Changing demographics resulting in heterogeneous communities, the diversity of community values, and the finite resources available to meet the infinite desires of a demanding constituency have created the necessity for political acumen on the part of local educational leaders (Cooper, 2009; Murphy, 2000; Owen, 2006; Piltch & Fredericks, 2005; Searby & Williams, 2007). Empirical studies have confirmed that activist principals use knowledge of social, political, and economic contexts to develop political clarity, political capacity, political collaboration, and an ethic of risk (Feuerstein, 2001; Hoffman, 2009). Practice-informed case studies developed to support school leadership preparation confirmed the importance of such knowledge (Gause, 2008). In this paradoxical, unstable, and ethically polarized era such case studies must help candidates develop capacities for ethical leadership (Mawhinney, 2003; Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2005; Tooms, 2004).

There is broad support in scholarship and research that principals play a critical role in creating schools that are responsive to the growing heterogeneity of students, and more inclusive and responsive to the diverse needs of all students. Most broadly a growing body of research and scholarship provides evidence that culturally responsive educational leadership positively influences academic achievement and students' engagement with the school environment (Banks & McGee-Banks, 2004; Johnson, 2003, 2006; Juettner, 2003; Klingner et al., 2005; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Riehl, 2000; Skrla et al., 2004). More specifically, research has shown that principals supporting inclusion of students with disabilities are committed to the principles of diversity, social justice, and equity (K. Brooks, Adams, & Morita-Mullaney, 2010; Mayrowetz & Weinstein, 1999; Reitzug, 1994; Riehl, 2000; Salisbury, 2006; Salisbury & McGregor, 2002). Principals' commitments to these principles influence orientations to advocacy to promote equitable learning opportunities and success for students with disabilities requiring action beyond compliance with less restrictive environment provisions of the 1997 Amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (Salisbury, 2006). Researchers have reported similar commitments are important influences on principals' support for effective supports for English language learners (Brooks et al., 2010). Research suggested that candidates must develop skills in public policy advocacy, networking, organizing, community development, and scholarship (Hoffman, 2009).

ELCC 6.3: *Commentary and Research Support:*

There is widespread recognition that school building leaders must be prepared to anticipate future trends that can affect schools (Copland, 2000; Hodgkinson, 2003, Johnson & Fauske, 2000; Mawhinney, 2010; Mitchell & Boyd, 1998). It is now well recognized that technological developments demand the attention of principals (Anderson & Dexter, 2005; Brooks-Young, 2002, 2004; Gooden, 2005; Nance; 2003). Some trends are predictable and

can be addressed using modes of strategic planning (Smith, 2009). For example, some researchers suggest that as part of their approach to strategic human resources planning, principals must engage in external scanning, considering national demographic trends, populations projections, ethnic diversity, issues associated with provisions for special education, responses that may be required to violence, and to school choice (Evans, 2007; Smith, 2009). Strategic planning has been called “practical dreaming” (Kaufman, Herman & Watters, 1996, p. 49). Strategic planning is a formalized process in which, among other considerations, strategy delineation should be controlled and become a conscious process of thought; strategies should be unique and the most appropriate ones selected by a process of creative design; and strategies must be made explicit and accountability delineated in the process for implementation (see Mintzberg, 1994, pp. 36-90).

Researchers also point out that anticipating future issues arising from the complexities associated with what many view as an unstable era of war, terrorism, natural disasters, and other conditions of turbulence raises ethical dilemmas that require candidates to have knowledge of ethical descriptors of practice associated with principles of justice, critique, and care (Begley & Johansson, 2003; Shapiro & Gross, 2008).

Although scholars have long recognized that principals must know about leadership theories (Nystrand, 1981), it is only recently that knowledge of three contemporary theoretical perspectives (transactional, transformational, and distributed) have been perceived as essential (Marsh, 2000). It is agreed that principals should understand the strengths and limitations of transactional approaches (English, 2003, Shields, 2005) and transformational models (Brown, 2006; Freidman, 2004; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006, Leithwood & Sun, 2009; Somech, 2005), and the challenges of distributive approaches (Bennett et al., 2003; Gronn, 2000; Harris, 2004, 2007; MacBeath, 2005; Maxcy & Nguyen, 2006; Mayrowetz, 2008; Murphy, Smylie, Mayrowetz & Louis, 2009; Printy & Marks, 2004; Scribner, Sawyer, Watson & Myers, 2007; Spillane, 2006). Many scholars now argue that in order to address complex environments candidates must have knowledge of emerging leadership theories (Marks & Printy, 2003; Moolenaar, Daly, & Slegers, 2010; Shields, 2010; Tooms, Lugg & Bogotch, 2010; Ylimaki, 2006). For example, a mounting body of research suggests that culturally responsive educational leadership positively influences academic achievement and students’ engagement with the school environment (Banks & McGee-Banks, 2004; Johnson, 2003, 2006; Juettner, 2003; Klingner et al., 2005; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Riehl, 2000; Shields, 2005; Skrla et al., 2004).

Recent scholarship on educational change supports the critical importance for candidates to have knowledge of how to anticipate trends (Fullan, 2001, 2002; Hargreaves & Goodson, 2006; Hoyle, 2007; Huber, 2004). Based on his extensive study of change leadership, Fullan (2002) concluded “Only principals who are equipped to handle a complex, rapidly changing environment can implement the reforms that lead to sustained improvement in student achievement” (p. 16). Other researchers have found that the current landscape of change, requires leaders to be flexible, skilled, and “versed in a variety of approaches to address unique problems inherent in the multiple contexts in which school leadership finds itself (Friedman, 2004, p. 206). In this context, there is widespread understanding informed by practice that candidates must learn “how to conscientiously and accurately keep a finger on

the pulse of the community to discern the changing tides of favor and disfavor, the covert criticisms, and the coalescing groups with a single agenda” (Owen, 2007, p. 47). The realities of 21st century global interdependence require that schools effectively and appropriately respond to diverse groups in schools and communities while preparing students for positive interactions with people who are culturally different (Banks, 2008, 2009; Brooks & Normore, 2010; Foster, 2004; Mawhinney, 2008, 2009, 2010).

Research Support for ELCC Standard 7.0:

Introduction

Evidence presented in Appendix 1 support of Standard 7 confirms the importance of a substantial and sustained educational leadership internship experience that has school-based field experiences and clinical internship practice within a school setting, monitored by a qualified on-site mentor. The theory and research on the importance of an internship and the nature of highly effective internships dates back to the early work on experiential learning (Dewey, 1986) and its promotion as a highly effective means of adult learning (Kolb, 1984; Mezirow, 1991). Internships are widely used in professional education generally (LaPlant, 1988). More current work in the field stresses the full-time, job-embedded internship as the ideal (Barnett, Copland, & Shoho, 2009).

Much of the research on internships has focused on what typically occurs (Barnett et al., 2009; Copland, 2004; McKerrow, 1998). This is mixed with case study research on innovative models (Cordeiro & Sloan, 1996; Ellis, 2002; Jones, 1999; Mercado, 2002; Milstein & Kruger, 1997) and conceptualizations of more robust approaches (Frye, Bottoms, & O'Neill, 2005; Milstein, Bobroff, & Restine, 1991; Straut & Calabrese, 1999). Limited research has compared the effects of conventional and exemplary preparation, but the results suggest that principals either report (Franklin, 2006; Mercado, 2002) or demonstrate (Orr & Orphanos, 2011) better leadership practices when they have had longer, more full time internships.

Many of the internship elements and descriptors of practice in Standard 7 parallel the research findings from Danforth Foundation funded innovations in leadership preparation in the early 1990s. Comparative case study analyses yielded strong conclusions about the nature of high quality internships (Milstein & Kruger, 1997). They concluded that the critical components of field experience that have the greatest value and potential impact are:

- Sufficient time on task (frequency and regularity of work across school year and day; exposure to and engagement in relevant and realistic range of site responsibilities; support of effective mentor practitioners);
- Relationship with mentors who have demonstrated skills and have been trained as mentors: focus on appropriate modeling and reflection;
- Multiple and alternative internship experiences to support diverse clinical training (e.g., medical rotation model);
- Reflective seminars to support interns' analysis and integration of learning;
- Field supervision - typically not given much consideration/focus within larger internship process; and,

- Program coordination by educators who can link district and university programs, model professional development and learning.

ELCC 7.1: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Research on the quality of internships has shown that principals prepared in innovative preparation programs ($n = 213$) were statistically significantly more likely than those prepared in conventional programs ($n = 446$) to have an internship (89% vs. 72%) and to report that their internship gave them responsibilities for leading, facilitating, and making decisions typical of an educational leader (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). The degree of internship quality was based on three measures: (a) having had responsibilities for leading, facilitating, and making decisions typical of an educational leader; (b) being able to develop an educational leader's perspective on school improvement; and, (c) having an excellent internship that was a learning experience for becoming a principal. Further analysis of a subgroup of these principals showed that the degree of internship quality, based on those three measures, accounted for the extent to which principals learned about leadership, which in turn influenced their use of effective leadership practices and school improvement (Orr & Orphanos, 2011). Not directly addressed in the standard elements, but implied in the stress on complexity and authenticity, is the field's emphasis on the role of the internship in socializing the candidate to the principalship (Browne-Ferrigno & Muth, 2004) and transforming their perspectives (Osterman & Fishbein, 2001).

ELCC 7.2: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Based on reviews of research on internships, educational experts have argued that ideally the internship is full time and job embedded (Barnett et al., 2009; Carr, Chenoweth, & Ruhl, 2003). Research on the quality of internships showed that principals prepared in innovative preparation programs ($n = 213$) were statistically significantly more likely than those prepared in conventional programs ($n = 446$) to have longer internships (50% longer on average), averaging a full year (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). Other research on program practices showed that programs vary widely in the length of candidates' internship experiences and in whether they are released from teaching (some or all the time) for their internship work (Orr, 2011). A comparison of 17 programs in 13 institutions showed that 90% of the candidates had internships (ranging from 56–100%), 37% had full or partial release time for their internship work (ranging from 16–100%), and rated the quality of their internship as good on average (4.0 on 5-point scale), ranging from mixed to highly effective (Orr, 2011).

ELCC 7.3: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Research on the quality of internships showed that principals prepared in innovative preparation programs ($n = 213$) were statistically significantly more likely than those prepared in conventional programs ($n = 446$) to report that in their internship they were closely supervised and assisted by knowledgeable school leaders and were regularly evaluated by program faculty (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). Other research showed the importance of high-quality mentoring on participant outcomes in both corporate and educational settings (Sosik, Lee & Bouquillon, 2005).

There is limited work on mentor training for school leader internships but a common emphasis on the role of mentors and the importance of training for quality field experience

(Wallace Foundation, 2007b). There is modest evidence of the importance and influence of selecting and preparing mentors on internship experience and graduate outcomes (Cordeiro & Sloan, 1996; Ellis, 2002; Geismer, Morris, & Lieberman, 2000) and on the supervisory relationship between on-site mentors and supervising faculty for quality internship experiences (Busch, 2003).

There is no research on the benefits of earning course credit for internship experiences. Yet, many experts advocate for universities to manage these more rigorously, facilitate greater connections between coursework and field work, and provide better quality oversight (Barnett et al., 2009; Milstein et al., 1991; Milstein & Kruger, 1997).

Building-Level Standards References

- Adler, M. A., & Fisher, C. W. (2001). Early reading programs in high-poverty schools: A case of beating the odds. *The Reading Teacher*, 54(6), 616-19.
- Alexander, K. & Alexander, D. M. (2005). *American public school law*. Belmont, CA: Thomson West.
- Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84(3), 261-271.
- Anderson, A. R., Christenson, S. L., & Sinclair, M. F. (2004). Check & connect: The importance of relationships for promoting engagement with school. *Journal of School Psychology*, 42(2), 95-113.
- Anderson, R. E., & Dexter, S. (2005). School technology leadership: an empirical investigation of prevalence and effect. *Educational administration quarterly*, 41(1), 49-82.
- Ares, N., & Buendia, E. (2007). Opportunities lost: Local translations of advocacy policy conversations. *Teachers College Record*, 109(3), 561-589.
- Armstrong, T. (2006). *The best schools: How human development research should inform educational practice*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Aspiazu, G., Bauer, S. C., & Spillelt, M. D. (1998). Improving the academic performance of Hispanic youth: A community education model. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 22(2), 103-123.
- Baker, B. & Green, P. (2008). Politics, empirical evidence, and policy design: The case of school finance and the costs of educational adequacy. In B. Cooper, J. Cibulka, & L. Fusarelli (Eds), *Handbook of Educational Policy* (pp. 311-337). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social-cognition theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Banks, J. A. & McGee Banks, C. A. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Banks, J. A. (2008). *An introduction to multicultural education* (4th ed). Boston: Pearson, Allyn & Bacon.
- Banks, J. A. (2009). *The Routledge international companion to multicultural education*. London & New York: Routledge.

- Baptiste, H. P., Jr. (1999). The multicultural environment of schools: Implications to leaders. In L. W. Hughes, (Ed.), *The principal as leader* (2nd ed.) (pp. 105- 127). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Barnett, B. G., Copland, M. A., & Shoho, A. R. (2009). The use of internships in preparing school leaders. In M. D. Young, G. M. Crow, J. Murphy & R. T. Ogawa (Eds.), *Handbook on the education of school leaders*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Barnyak, N. C., & McNelly, T. A. (2009). An urban school district's parent involvement: A study of teachers' and administrators' beliefs and practices. *The School Community Journal*, 19(1), 33-58.
- Beck, L. G. (1994). *Reclaiming educational administration as a caring profession*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Beckner, W. (2004). *Ethics for educational leaders*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Begley, P. T. & Johansson, O. (2003). *The ethical dimensions of school leadership*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Begley, P. T. (2006) Self-knowledge, capacity and sensitivity: Prerequisites to authentic leadership by school principals', *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44(6), 570–89.
- Bennett, N, Wise, C., & Woods P. & Harvey, J. A. (2003). *Distributed leadership: A review of literature carried out for National College for School Leadership*. London, NCSL.
- Benson, F., & Martin, S. (2003). Organizing successful parent involvement in urban schools. *Child Study Journal*, 33(3), 187-193.
- Berger, E. H. (2003). *Parents as partners in education: Families and schools working together* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Blanchard, K. (Ed.). (2007). *Leading at a higher level: Blanchard on leadership and creating high performing organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Blase, J. (2002). The micropolitics of instructional supervision: A call for research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(1), 6-44.
- Blue-Banning, M., Summers, J., Frankland, H., Nelson, L., & Beegle, G. (2004). Dimensions of family and professional partnerships: Constructive guidelines for collaboration. *Exceptional Children*, 70(2), 167-184.
- Blumberg, A. (1989). *School administration as a craft: Foundations of practice*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bogotch, I. (2002). Educational leadership and social justice: Practice into theory. *Journal of School Leadership*, 12, 138–156.
- Bowers, A. J. (2009). Reconsidering grades as data for decision making: More than just academic knowledge. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 47(5), 609-629.
- Boyd, V., & Hord, S. (1994). Schools as learning communities. *Issues about Change*, 4(1), 1-8.
- Brennan, A., & Brennan, D. (1988). The principal, ethics and special education decisions. *NASSP Bulletin*, 72(16), 16-19.
- Brookover, W., & Lezotte, L. (1979). *Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement*. East Lansing, MI: Institute for Research on Teaching.
- Brooks, J. S., & Normore, A. H. (2010). Educational leadership and globalization: Literacy for a global perspective. *Educational Policy*, 24(1), 52-82.

- Brooks, J., Jean-Marie, G., Normore, A., & Hodgins, D. (2007). Distributed leadership for social justice: Exploring how influence and equity are stretched over an urban high school. *Journal of School Leadership, 17*, 378-408.
- Brooks, K., Adams, S. R., & Morita-Mullaney, T. (2010). Creating inclusive learning communities for ELL students: Transforming school principals' perspectives. *Theory into Practice, 49*(2), 145-151.
- Brooks-Young, S. (2002). *Self-assessment activities for school administrators: A companion to making technology standards work for you*. Eugene OR: ISTE Publication.
- Brooks-Young, S. (2004). *Making technology standards work for you: A guide for school administrators*. Eugene OR: ISTE.
- Brown, K. M. (2004). Leadership for social justice and equity: Weaving a transformative framework and pedagogy. *Educational Administrative Quarterly, 40*, 79–110.
- Brown, K. M. (2006). Leadership for social justice and equity: Evaluating a transformative framework and andragogy. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 42*(5), 700-745.
- Brown, K. M., Anfara, V. A., Jr., & Roney, K. (2004). Student achievement in high performing, suburban middle schools and low performing, urban middle schools: Plausible explanations for the differences. *Education and Urban Society, 36*(4), 428-456.
- Browne-Ferrigno, T. (2003). Becoming a principal: Role conception, initial socialization, role-identity transformation, purposeful engagement. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 39*(4), 468-503.
- Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Muth, R. (2004). Leadership mentoring in clinical practice: Role socialization, professional development, and capacity building. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*(4), 468.
- Browne-Ferrigno, T., Hunt, P., Allen, L. W., & Rowe, M. (2006). *State Action to Enhance Student Learning: Standards and Indicators for School Improvement*. NCPEA 2006 Conference Presentation.
- Burch, P., & Spillane, J. P. (2003). Elementary school leadership strategies and subject matter: Reforming mathematics and literacy instruction. *Elementary School Journal, 103*(5), 519–535.
- Burch, P., Theoharis, G. & Rauscher, E. (2010). Class Size Reduction in Practice: Investigating the Influence of the Elementary School Principal. *Educational Policy, 24*(2), 330-358.
- Busch, J. R. (2003). *School leadership formation: A multimethod evaluation study of the Southern Tier Leadership Academy*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Binghamton, –Binghamton, New York.
- Bush, T. (2008). From management to leadership: semantic or meaningful change? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 36*(2), 271-288.
- Bustamante, R. M., Nelson, J. A., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2009). Assessing school wide cultural competence: Implications for school leadership preparation. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 45*(5), 793-827.
- Cairney, T. (2000). Beyond the classroom walls: The rediscovery of the family and community as partners in education. *Education Review, 52*(2), 163-174.
- Cambron, N. H., McCarthy, M.M., & Thomas, S. B. (2004). *School law: Teachers' and students' rights*. Boston, MA: Pearson, Allyn & Bacon.

- Card, D., & Payne, A. (2002). School finance reform, the distribution of school spending, and the distribution of student test scores. *Journal of Public Economics*, 83(1), 49-82.
- Cardno, C. (2002). Team learning: Opportunities and challenges for school leaders. *School Leadership and Management*, 22(2), 211-223.
- Carr, C. S., Chenoweth, T., & Ruhl, T. (2003). Best practices in educational leadership preparation programs. In F. C. Lunenberg & C. S. Carr (Eds.), *Shaping the future: Policy, partnerships, and emerging perspectives*. The eleventh yearbook of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (pp. 204-222). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Casner-Lotto, J. (1988). Expanding the teacher's role: Hammond's school improvement process. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69, 349-353.
- Catsambis, S. (2002). Expanding knowledge of parental involvement in children's secondary education: Connections with high school seniors' academic success. *Social Psychology of Education*, 5(2), 249-177.
- Chance, E. W., Copeland, M., Farris, A., & Allen, K. (1994). *Case study of school/community collaboration: Two school districts and their efforts to develop a school district vision*. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED379794)
- Chouhoud, Y., & Zirkel, P. (2008). The Goss progeny: An empirical analysis. *San Diego Law Review*, 45(2), 353-82.
- Chrispeels, J. H. (1992). *Using an effective schools framework to build home-school partnerships for student success*. Occasional Report of the National Center for Effective Schools Research and Development. Madison: University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Christenson, S. L. (2004). The family-school partnership: An opportunity to promote the learning competence of all students. *School Psychology Review*, 33(1), 83-104.
- Clark, D. L., Lotto, L. S., & Astuto, T. A. (1984). Effective schools and school improvement: A comparative analysis of two lines of inquiry. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 20(3), 41-68.
- Coalition for Community Schools, & Institute for Educational Leadership. (2003). *Making the difference: Research and practice in community schools*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Collins, A. & Halverson, R. (2009). *Rethinking education in the age of technology: The digital revolution and the schools*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Colombo, M. W. (2004). Family literacy nights...and other home-school connections. *Educational Leadership*, 61(8), 48-51.
- Conley, S. (2006). School climate. In F. English (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 153-155) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Conley, S., & Glasman, N. S. (2008). Fear, the school organization, and teacher evaluation. *Educational Policy*, 22(1), 63-85.
- Conley, S., Fauske, J., & Pounder, D. (2004). Teacher work group effectiveness, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(5), 663-703.
- Cooper, B. S., Ehrensall, P. A. L., & Bromme, M. (2005). School-level politics and professional development: Traps in evaluating the quality of practicing teachers. *Educational Policy*, 19(1), 112-125.
- Cooper, B.S., Fusarelli, L. D., Randall, E. V. (2004). *Better policies, better schools: Theories and applications*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

- Cooper, C. W. (2009). Performing cultural work in demographically changing schools: implications for expanding transformative leadership frameworks. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(5), 694-724.
- Cooper, R. (1996). Detracking reform in an urban California high school: Improving the schooling experiences. *Education*, 65(2), 190-208.
- Copeland, S. (2004). *A study of field experiences and leadership opportunities in principal preparation programs in the 16 SREB member states*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Memphis, –Memphis, Tennessee.
- Copland, M. A. (2000). Problem-based learning and prospective principals' problem-framing ability. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(4), 585-607.
- Copland, M. A. (2003). Leadership of inquiry: building and sustaining capacity for school improvement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 24(4), 375-475.
- Cordeiro, P., & Sloan, E. S. (1996). Administrative interns as legitimate participants in the community of practice. *Journal of School Leadership*, 6(1),4-29.
- Corson, D. (1995a). Ideology and distortion in the administration of outgroup interests. In D. Corson (Ed.), *Discourse and power in educational organizations* (pp. 87-110). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.
- Corson, D. (1995b). Power and the discourses of policy and curriculum: An introduction. In D. Corson (Ed.), *Discourse and power in educational organizations* (pp. 133-148). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.
- Cotton, K., & Savard, W. G. (1980). *The principal as instructional leader: Research on School Effectiveness Project*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Creighton, T. (2007). *Schools and data: The educator's guide for using data to improve decision making* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Crow, G., & Pounder, D. G. (2000). Interdisciplinary teacher teams: Context, design, and process. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36 (2), 216-254.
- Crow, G. M., & Matthews, J. (1998). *Finding one's way: How mentoring can lead to dynamic leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Crow, G. M., & Weindling, D. (2010). Learning to be political: New English headteachers' roles. *Education Policy*, 24(1), 137-158.
- Cunningham, W., & Cordeiro, P. (2009). *Educational leadership: A bridge to improved practice*. Boston: Pearson.
- Daly, A. J. (2009). Rigid response in an age of accountability the potential of leadership and trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(2), 168-216.
- Dantley, M. (2002). Uprooting and replacing positivism, the melting pot, multiculturalism, and other impotent notions in education leadership through an African American perspective. *Education and Urban Society*, 34, 334–352.
- Dantley, M., & Tillman, L. (2006). Social justice and moral transformative leadership. In C. Marshall & M. Olivia (Eds.), *Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions happen* (pp. 16–29). Boston: Pearson.
- Darling-Hammond, L., La Pointe, M., Meyerson, D., & Orr, M. (2007). *Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Executive summary*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.

- Darling-Hammond, L., Meyerson, D., La Pointe, M. M., & Orr, M. T. (2009). *Preparing principals for a changing world*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Datnow, A., & Castellano, M. E. (2001). Managing and guiding school reform: Leadership in success for all schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(2), 219-249.
- Davidson, B. M., & Taylor, D. L. (1999). *Examining principal succession and teacher leadership in school restructuring*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.
- Day, C., & Leithwood, K. (Eds.) (2007). *Successful principal leadership in times of change*. London: Springer.
- Deering, P. D. (1996). An ethnographic study of norms of inclusion and cooperation in a multiethnic middle school. *Urban Review*, 28(1), 21-39.
- Delpit, L. (1992). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Deming, W. E. (1986). *Out of the crisis*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Desimone, L. M. (2006). Consider the source - Response differences among teachers, principals, and districts on survey questions about their education policy environment. *Educational Policy*, 20(4), 640-676.
- Dewey, J. (1986). Experience and education. *The Educational Forum*, 50(3), 241-252.
- Dryfoos, J., & Maguire, S. (2002). *Inside full-service community schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Duke, D., & Salmonowicz, M. (2010). Key decisions of a first-year 'turnaround' principal. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 38(1), 33-58.
- Durlak, J. A., et al. (2007). Effects of positive youth development programs on school, family, and community system. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 39(3-4), 269-286.
- Earthman, G. and Lemasters, L. (2004). *School maintenance & renovation: Administrator policies, practices & economics*. Lancaster, PA: Pro-Active Publications.
- Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 15-18, 20-24.
- Edwards, P. A. (2003). *Children's literacy development: Making it happen through school, family, and community involvement*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Ellis, J. C. (2002). *A study of the internship component of the innovative leadership program at the University of Alabama from 1994 to 2000*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation., The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama.
- Elmore, R. (2000). Building a new structure of school leadership. Albert Shanker Institute, Washington, D.C.
- Englert, R. M. (1993). Understanding the urban context and conditions of practice of school administration. In P. B. Forsyth & M. Tollerico (Eds.), *City schools: Leading the way* (pp. 1-63). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- English, F. (2003). *The postmodern challenge to the theory and practice of educational administration*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.
- Epstein, J. L. (2005). A case study of the Partnership Schools Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) Model. *The Elementary School Journal*, 106(2), 151-170.
- Epstein, J. L., & Sanders, M. G. (2006). Prospects for change: Preparing educators for school, family, and community partnerships. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 81(2), 81-120.

- Epstein, J. L., & Sheldon, S. B. (2002). Present and accounted for: Improving student attendance through family and community involvement. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 95(5), 308-18.
- Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., Salinas, K. C., Simon, B. S., Jansorn, N. R., & Van Voorhis, F. L. (2002). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Epstein, J. L., & Salinas, K. (2004). Partnering with families and communities. *Educational Leadership*, 61(8), 12-18.
- Evans, A. E. (2007). School leaders and their sensemaking about race and demographic change. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(2), 159-188.
- Evers, C. W. (1985). Hodgkinson on ethics and the philosophy of administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 21(4), 27-50.
- Fan, X., & Chen, M. (2001). Parental involvement and students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 13(1), 1-22.
- Fantuzzo, J., McWayne, C., Perry, M. A., & Childs, S. (2004). Multiple dimensions of family involvement and their relations to behavioral and learning competencies for urban, low-income children. *School Psychology Review*, 33(4), 467-480.
- Feuerstein, A. (2001). Selling our schools? Principals' views on schoolhouse commercialism and school-business interactions. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(3), 322-371.
- Fiala, C. L., & Sheridan, S. M. (2003). Parent involvement and reading: Using curriculum-based measurement to assess the effects of paired reading. *Psychology in the Schools*, 40(6), 613-626.
- Fine, M. (Ed.). (1994). *Chartering urban school reform: Reflections on public high schools in the midst of change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Firestone, W. A., & González, R.A. (2007). Culture and processes affecting data use in school districts. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, 106 (1), 132-154.
- Firestone, W. A., & Martinez, C. (2009). Districts, teacher leaders, and distributed leadership: Changing instructional practice. In K. Leithwood, B. Mascall, & T. Strauss (Eds.). *Distributed leadership according to the evidence* (pp. 61-86). New York: Routledge.
- Flanagan, C. A., Cumsille, P., Gill, S., & Gallay, L. S. (2007). School and community climates and civic commitments: Patterns for ethnic minority and majority students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(2), 421-431.
- Flanagan, L., & Jacobson, M. (2003). Technology leadership for the twenty-first century. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41(2), 124-142.
- Forte, E. (2010). Examining the assumptions underlying the NCLB federal accountability policy on school improvement. *Educational Psychologist*, 45(2), 76-88.
- Foster, W. P. (2004). The decline of the local: A challenge to educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(2), 176-191.
- Fowler, F. C. (2000). *Policy studies for educational leaders: An introduction*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Franke, T. M., Isken, J. A., & Parra, M. T. (2003). A pervasive school culture for the betterment of student outcomes: One school's approach to student mobility. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 72(1), 150-7.

- Franklin, S. H. (2006). *Exploratory comparative case studies of two principal preparation programs*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, –Austin, Texas.
- Frattura, E., & Capper, C.A. (2007). *Leading for social justice: Transforming schools for all learners*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.
- Freidman, A. A. (2004). Beyond mediocrity: transformational leadership within a transactional framework. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 3, 203-224.
- Frick, D. (2004). *Robert K. Greenleaf: A life of servant leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Frye, B., Bottoms, G., & O'Neill, K. (2005). *The internship. How can we get it right?* Atlanta, GA: Southern Region Educational Board.
- Fuerstein, A. (2000). School characteristics and parent involvement: Influences on participation in children's schools. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 94(1), 29-39.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fullan, M. (2002). The change leader. Educational Leadership. Downloaded from <http://secondary.newham.gov.uk/BSF/Change%20Leader%20-%20Fullan.pdf>.
- Fullan, M. G., & Miles, M. B. (1992). Getting reform right: What works and what doesn't. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 73(10), 744-752.
- Fullan, M., Miles, M., & Taylor, G. (1981). *Organization development in schools: The state of the art*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.
- Fullan, M., & Pomfret, A. (1977). Research on curriculum and instruction implementation. *Review of Educational Research*, 47(2), 335-397.
- Furman, G. C., & Gruenewald, D. A. (2004). Expanding the landscape of social justice: A critical ecological analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(1), 49-78.
- Gaitan, C. D. (2004). *Involving Latino families in schools: Raising student achievement through home-school partnerships*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Gause, C. P. (2008). Old school meets new school: unsettling times at freedom junior-senior high. *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership*. 10.1177/1555458908314504v1.pdf download from <http://jel.sagepub.com> hosted at <http://online.sagepub.co>
- Gavin, I., & Zirkel, P. (2008). An outcome analysis of school employee-initiated litigation: A comparison of 1977-81 and 1997-2001 decisions. *West's Education Law Reporter*, 232(1), 19-36.
- Geismar, T. J., Morris, J. D., & Lieberman, M. G. (2000). Selecting mentors for principal interns. *Journal of School Leadership*, 10(3), 233-247.
- Gerber, S.B., Finn, J., Achilles, C.M., & Boyd-Zaharias, J. (2001). Teacher's aides and student academic achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 23(2), 123-143.
- Gerstl-Pepin, C. I. (2006). The paradox of poverty narratives: Educators struggling with children left behind. *Educational Policy*, 20(1), 143-162.
- Glasser, W. (1986). *Control theory in the classroom*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Goddard, Y. L., Goddard, R. D., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2007). A theoretical and empirical investigation of teacher collaboration for school improvement and achievement in public elementary schools. *Teachers College Record*, 109(4), 877-896.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R. E., & Mckee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Learning to lead with emotional intelligence*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

- Gooden, M. A. (2005). The role of an African American principal in an urban information technology high school. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41(4), 630-650.
- Gordon, M. F., & Louis, K. S. (2009). Linking parent and community involvement with student achievement: Comparing principal and teacher perceptions of stakeholder influence. *American Journal of Education*, 116(1), 1-32.
- Greenwald, R., Hedges, L. & Laine, R. (1996). The effect of student resources on student achievement. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(3), 361-396.
- Griffith, J. (2001). Principal leadership of parental involvement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(2), 162-186.
- Gronn, P. (2000). Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership. *Educational Management Administration Leadership*, 28, 317-338.
- Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership. In K. Leithwood & P. Hallinger (Eds.), *Second international handbook of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 653-696). Dordrecht,: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Gross, S., & Shapiro, J. (2004). Using multiple ethical paradigms and turbulence theory in response to administrative dilemmas. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 32(2), 47-62.
- Grubb, W. N. (2007). Multiple resources, multiple outcomes: Testing the “improved” school finance with NELS88. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(1), 104-144.
- Grundy, S. (1993). Educational leadership as emancipatory praxis. In J. Blackmore and J. Kenway (Eds.), *Gender matters in educational administration and policy: A feminist introduction* (pp. 165-177). London: Falmer Press.
- Guskey, T. R. (2007). Multiple sources of evidence: An analysis of stakeholders’ perceptions of various indicators of student learning. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 26(1), 19-27.
- Hall, G., & Hord, S. (2006). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hallinger, P. H., & Heck, R. H. (1998). Exploring the principal’s contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9(2), 157-191.
- Hallinger, P. H., & Murphy, J. (1986). *Instructional leadership in effective schools*. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED309535)
- Hallinger, P. H., & Heck, R. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1995. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(1), 5-44.
- Halpin, A. (1966). *School management and organization*. New York: Macmillan
- Halverson, R. & Collins, A. (2006). Information technologies and the future of schooling in the United States. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 1(2), 145-155.
- Halverson, R. (2010). School formative feedback systems. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 85(2), 130-146.
- Halverson, R., Grigg, J., Prichett, R., & Thomas, C. (2005). *The New Instructional Leadership: Creating Data-Driven Instructional Systems in Schools*. WCER Working Paper 2005-9. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Educational Research.
- Hanson, E. M. (2003). *Educational administration and organizational behavior*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

- Hargreaves, A., & Goodson, I. (2006). Educational change over time? The sustainability and nonsustainability of three decades of secondary school change and continuity. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(1), 3-41.
- Harris, A (2004). Distributed leadership and school improvement: Leading or misleading? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 32, 11-24.
- Harris, A. (2002). *Effective leadership in schools facing challenging contexts*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association meeting, New Orleans.
- Harris, A. (2007). Distributed leadership: Conceptual confusion and empirical reticence. *International Journal Leadership in Education*, 3,315-325.
- Harris, A. (Ed.) (2009). *Distributed leadership. Different perspectives*. London: Springer.
- Harris, A., & Chapman, C. (2002). *Effective leadership in schools facing challenging circumstances*. London: National College for School Leadership.
- Harry, B. (1992). An ethnographic study of cross-cultural communication with Puerto Rican American families in the special education system. *American Educational Research Journal*, 29, 471-494.
- Hayes, D., Christie, P., Mills, M., & Lingard, B. (2004). Productive leaders and productive leadership: Schools as learning organisations. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(4/5), 520.
- Heck, R. H., & Hallinger, P. (2005). The study of educational leadership and management. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 33(2), 229.
- Heck, R. H. (2004). *Studying educational and social policy: Theoretical descriptors of practice listed below and research methods*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates..
- Herzberg, F., & Mauser, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (2004). *The motivation to work*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction. (Originally published 1959)
- Hess, G. A., Jr. (1993). Race and the liberal perspective in Chicago school reform. In C. Marshall (Ed.), *The new politics of race and gender. The 1992 Yearbook of the Politics of Education Association* (pp. 85-96). Washington, DC: Falmer Press.
- Hiatt-Michael, D. B. (2006). Reflections and directions on research related to family-community involvement in schooling. *The School Community Journal*, 16(1), 7-30.
- Hochberg, E. D., & Desimone, L. M. (2010). Professional development in the accountability context: Building capacity to achieve standards. *Educational Psychologist*, 45(2), 89-106.
- Hodgkinson, C. (2003). Conclusion: Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow: A post-postmodern purview. In P.T. Begley & O. Johansson (Eds.). *The ethical dimensions of school leadership* (pp. 221-231). Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Hoffman, L. P. (2009). Educational leadership and social activism: A call for action. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 41(4), 391-410.
- Holler, R., & Zirkel, P. (2008). Section 504 and public schools: A national survey concerning "Section 504-only" students. *NASSP Bulletin*, 92(1), 19-43.
- Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., Walker, M. T., Sandler, H. M., Whetsel, D., Green, C. L., Wilkins, A. S., et al. (2005). Why do parents become involved? Research findings and implications. *The Elementary School Journal*, 106(2), 105-130.
- Hornig, E.L., Klasik, D., & Loeb, S. (2010). Principal's time use and school effectiveness. *American Journal of Education*, 116, August, 2010. Electronically published.

- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2004). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2005). *Education leadership and reform: A volume in research and theory in educational administration*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Hoy, W. K., Sweetland, S. R., & Smith, P. A. (2002). Toward an organizational model of achievement in high schools: The significance of collective efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(1), 77-93.
- Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Bliss, J. R. (1990). Organizational climate, school health, and effectiveness: A comparative analysis *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26, 260-279.
- Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A. (1993). Teachers' sense of efficacy and the organizational health of schools. *Elementary School Journal*, 93(4), 355-372.
- Hoyle, J. (2007). *Leadership and futuring: Making visions happen*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press
- Hoyle, J., English, F., & Steffy, B. (1998). *Skills for successful 21st century school leaders*. Lanham, MD, Scarecrow Press.
- Huber, S. (2004). *Preparing school leaders for the 21st century: An international comparison of development programs in 15 countries*. London: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Huefner, D. S. (1994). The mainstreaming cases - tensions and trends for school administrators. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30(1), 27-55.
- Institute for Educational Leadership. (2002). *Community schools: Improving student learning/strengthening schools, families, and communities*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Isabelle, C., & Lapointe, C. (2003). Start at the top: successfully integrating information and communication technologies in schools by training principals. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 49(2), n/a.
- Jacobson, S. L., Brooks, S., Giles, C., Johnson, L., & Ylimaki, R. (2007). Successful leadership in three high-poverty urban elementary schools. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 6(4), 291-317.
- Jenlink, P.M. (Ed.).(2009). *Equity issues for today's educational leaders: Meeting the challenge of creating equitable schools for all*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relation of parental involvement to urban elementary school student academic achievement. *Urban Education*, 40(3), 237-269.
- Johnson, B. L., & Fauske, J. R. (2000). Principals and the political economy of environmental enactment. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(2), 159-185.
- Johnson, L. (2003). Multicultural policy as social activism: Redefining who counts in multicultural edition. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 6(2), 107-121.
- Johnson, L. (2006). Making her community a better place to live: Culturally responsive urban school leadership in historical perspective. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 5(1), 19-37.
- Johnson, R. G. (Ed.) (2009). *Educating for both advocacy and action*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Jones, J. L. H. (1999). *A qualitative analysis of collaborative, field-based principal preparation programs in Texas*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, Commerce, Texas.
- Juettner, V. (2003). Culturally responsive schools: Leadership, language, and literacy development. *Talking Points*, 14(2), 11-16.

- Kaplan, L. S., & Owings, W. A. (2001). Findings with national implications how principals can help teachers with high-stakes testing. *NASSP Bulletin*, 85(15).
- Katz, A. (1999, April). *Keepin' it real: Personalizing school experiences for diverse learners to create harmony instead of conflict*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.
- Kaufman, R., Herman, J., & Watters, K. (1996). *Educational planning: strategic, tactical, operational*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.
- Kidron, Y., & Darwin, M. J. (2007). A systematic review of whole school improvement models. *Journal of Education for Children Placed at Risk*, 12(1), 9-35.
- Kirst, M. W. (2009). Grading education: Getting accountability right. *American Journal of Education*, 116(1), 155-157.
- Kirst, M. W., & Edelman, F. (2006). The maturing mayoral role in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 76(2), 152-164.
- Klingner, J., Artiles, A. J., Kozleski, E., Harry, B., Zion, S., Tate, W., et al. (2005). Addressing the disproportionate representation of culturally and linguistically diverse students in special education through culturally responsive educational systems. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 13(38). Available at <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v13n38/>
- Knapp, M. S., Copland, M. A., Plecki, M. L., & Portin, B. S. (2006). *Leading, Learning and Leadership Support*. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.
- Knapp, M. S., Copland, M. A., & Swinnerton, J. A. (2007). Understanding the promise and dynamics of data-informed leadership. In P. Moss (Ed.), *Evidence and decision making. 106th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: Part I*. (pp. 74-104). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Knapp, M. S., Swinnerton, J. A., Copland, M. A., & Monpas-Huber, J. (2006). *Data-informed leadership in education*. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.
- Knowles, M. (1984). *The adult learner: A neglected species* (3rd ed.). Houston, TX: Gulf.
- Kohl, H. (2007). I won't learn from you! Confronting student resistance. *Rethinking our classrooms*. Vol. 1: Teaching for equity and justice (new edition), (pp. 165-166). Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools, Ltd.
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Kurland, H., Peretz, H., & Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (2010). Leadership style and organizational learning: The mediate effect of school vision. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 48(1), 7-30.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Towards a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465-491.
- Lakomski, G. (1987). Values and decision making in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 23(3), 70-82.
- Lambert, L. (1998). *Building leadership capacity in schools*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Lambert, L. (2003). *Leadership capacity for lasting school improvement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum development.
- Landsman, J. (2006). Bearers of hope. *Educational Leadership*, 63(5), 26-32.

- LaPlant, J. (1988). *An examination of approaches to field-based learning in other professions*. Paper presented at the American Education Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Larson, C. L., & Murtadha, K. (2002). Leadership for social justice. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, 101(1), 134-161.
- Lawson, M. A. (2003). School-family relations in context: Parent and teacher perceptions of parent involvement. *Urban Education*, 38(1), 77-133.
- Lee, J., & Wong, K. K. (2004). The impact of accountability on racial and socioeconomic equity: Considering both school resources and achievement outcomes. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(4), 797-832.
- Leistyna, P. (2002). Extending the possibilities of multicultural community partnerships in urban public schools. *Urban Review*, 34, 1-23.
- Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30(4), 498-518.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1999). The relative effects of principal and teacher sources of leadership on student engagement with school. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(Supplemental), 679-706.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005). A review of transformational school leadership research: 1996-2005. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4(3), 177-199.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17, 201-227.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2008). Linking leadership to student learning: The contributions of leader efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), 496-528.
- Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2005). What do we already know about educational leadership? In W. Firestone & C. Riehl (Eds.). *A new agenda for research in educational leadership* (pp. 12-27). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Leithwood, K., & Steinbach, R. (1992). Improving the problem-solving expertise of school administrators: theory and practice. *Education and Urban Society*, 24(3), 317-345.
- Leithwood, K., & Sun, J.P. (2009). Transformational school leadership effects on schools, teachers, and students. In W. K. Hoy & M. DiPaola. (2009). *Studies in school improvement: A volume in research and theory in educational administration*. (pp. 1-22). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Leithwood, K., Begley, P. T., & Cousins, J. B. (1994). *Developing expert leadership for future schools*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., Coffin, G., & Wilson, P. (1996). Preparing school leaders: What works? *Journal of School Leadership*, 6(3), 316-342.
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *Review of research: How leadership influences student learning*. New York: Wallace Foundation.
- Leithwood, K., Mascal, B., Strauss, T. (Eds.) (2009). *Distributed leadership according to the evidence*. New York: Routledge.
- Leithwood, K., Mascal, B., Strauss, T., Sacks, R., Memon, N., & Yashkina, A (2007). Distributing leadership to make schools smarter: Taking the ego out of the system. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 6(1), 37-67.
- Leithwood, K., Steinbach, R., & Jantzi, D. (2002). School leadership and teachers' motivation to implement accountability policies.

- Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(1), 94-119.
- Leithwood, K. A. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing times*. Bristol, PA: Taylor Frances Inc.
- Leithwood, K. A., & Jantzi, D. (1999). Transformational leadership effects: A replication. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement* 10(4), 451-479.
- Levin, B., & Fullan, M. (2008). Learning about system renewal. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 36(2), 289-303.
- Levine, D. U., & Stark, J. (1981). *Instructional and organizational arrangements and processes for improving academic achievement at inner city elementary schools: A study of the Chicago Mastery Reading Program and other school-wide approaches for improving reading at selected schools in Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York. Extended summary and conclusions*. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED213814)
- Lezotte, L. W., & Jacoby, B. C. (1992). *Sustainable school reform: The district context for school reform*. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products.
- Lightfoot, S. L. (1986). On goodness in schools: Themes of Empowerment. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 63(3), 9-28.
- Little, J. W. (1982). Norm of collegiality and experimentation: Work place conditions of school success. *American Educational Research Journal*, 19(3), 325-340.
- Lopez, G. (2006). Diversity. In F. English (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Educational Leadership and Administration* (pp. 297-300). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lopez, G. R. (2003). The (racially neutral) politics of education: A critical race theory perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(1), 68-94.
- Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (1993). *Leadership and information processing*. London: Routledge.
- Louis, K., & Marks, H. (1998). Does professional community affect the classroom? Teachers' work and student work in restructuring schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 33(4), 757-798.
- Louis, K., & Miles, M. (1990). *Improving the urban high school: What works and why*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Louis, K. S., Kruse, S. D., & Associates. (1995). *Professionalism and community: Perspectives on reforming urban schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K. L., Anderson, S. E. (2010). *Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings. Learning from leadership Project*. CAREI, University of Minnesota.
- Louis, K. S., Marks, H. M., & Kruse, S. (1996). Teachers' professional community in restructuring schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 33(4), 757- 798.
- Lunenburg, F., & Orenstein, A. (2007). *Educational administration: Descriptors of practice listed below and practices, 5th ed*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.
- Luo, M. (2008). Structural equation modeling for high school principals' data-driven decision making: An analysis of information use environments. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 603-634.
- Lupini, W., & Zirkel, P. (2003). An outcomes analysis of education litigation. *Educational Policy*, 17(2), 257-279.
- Lyman, L. L., & Villani, C. J. (2002). The complexity of poverty: A missing component of educational leadership programs. *Journal of School Leadership*, 12, 246-280.

- MacBeath, J. (2005). Leadership as distributed: A matter of practice. *School Leadership and Management, 25*, 349-366.
- Maeroff, G. I. (1988). *The empowerment of teachers: Overcoming the crisis of confidence*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Malen, B., & Rice, J. K. (2004). A framework for assessing the impact of education reforms on school capacity: Insights from studies of high-stakes accountability initiatives. *Educational Policy, 18*(5), 631-660.
- Malen, B., Croninger, R., Muncey, D., & Redmond-Jones, D. (2002). Reconstituting schools: "Testing" the "theory of action". *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24*(2), 113-132.
- Marks, H. M., & Nance, J. P. (2007). Contexts of accountability under systemic reform: Implications for principal influence on instruction and supervision. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43*(1), 3-37.
- Marks, H., & Printy, S. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 34*(3), 370-397.
- Marsh, D. D. (2000). Educational leadership for the twenty-first century: Integrating three essential perspectives. In *The Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership* (pp. 126-155). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Marshall, C., & Anderson, A.I. (Eds.) (2008). *Activist educators: Breaking past limits*. New York: Routledge.
- Marshall, C., & Gerstl-Pepin, C. (2005). *Re-framing educational politics: For social justice*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Marshall, C., & Oliva, M. (2006). *Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions in education*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Marshall, C., & Ward, M. (2004). "Yes, but. . .": Education leaders discuss social justice. *Journal of School Leadership, 14*, 530-563.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Mathematica Policy Research and the Center for Children and Families. (2001). *Building their futures: How early Head Start programs are enhancing the lives of infants and toddlers in low-income families*. Washington, DC: Administration on Children, Youth, and Families, Department of Health and Human Services. Available: http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/core/ongoing_research/ehs/ehs_reports.html
- Mawhinney, H. B. (2003). Resolving the dilemma of rigor or relevance in preparing educational leaders: What counts as evidence of their knowledge and ability to act ethically? In F. Lunenberg & Carr, C. (Eds.). *Shaping the future: Policy, partnerships, and emerging perspectives* (pp. 146-184), *National Council for Professors of Educational Administration Annual Yearbook*. Virginia: Scarecrow Press.
- Mawhinney, H. B. (2008). Towards a new political leadership praxis in the rescaled space of urban educational governance. In B. S. Cooper, J. G. Cibulka, & L. D. Fusarelli (Eds.).

- Handbook of Research on the Politics of Education* (pp. 411-430). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Mawhinney, H. B. (2009). Deliberative democracy in imagined communities: How the power of geometry of globalization shapes local leadership praxis. In F.W. English, (Ed.). *Educational Leadership and Administration* Vol 4. London: Sage.(Reprint)
- Mawhinney, H. B. (2010). Shifting scales of education politics in a vernacular of disruption and dislocation. *Educational Policy* 24(1), 245-263.
- Maxcy, B. D., & Nguyen, T. S. T. (2006). The politics of distributing leadership - Reconsidering leadership distribution in two Texas elementary schools. *Educational Policy*, 20(1), 163-196.
- Mayrowetz, D. (2008). Making sense of distributed leadership: Exploring the multiple usages of the concept in the field. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(3), 424-435.
- Mayrowetz, D., & Weinstein, C. S. (1999). Sources of leadership for inclusive education: Creating schools for all children. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35, 423-449.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. New York, NY: Van Nostrand.
- McGough, D. J. (2003). Principals' professional perspectives leaders as learners: An inquiry into the formation and transformation of principals' professional perspectives. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25(4), 449-471.
- McIntyre, E., Kyle, D. W., Miller, K. B., & Moore, G. H. (2002). *Connecting with families: A K-8 resource of tips, techniques, and activities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- McKenzie, K. B., Christman, D. E., Hernandez, F., Fierro, E., Capper, C. A., Dantley, M., et al. (2008). From the field: A proposal for education leaders for social justice. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44, 111-138.
- McKenzie, K. B., & Scheurich, J. J. (2004). Equity traps: A useful construct for preparing principals to lead schools that are successful with racially diverse students. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(5), 601-632.
- McKerrow, K. (1998). Administrative internships: Quality or quantity? *Journal of School Leadership*, 8(2), 171-186.
- McLaughlin, M. W., & Marsh, D. D. (1990). Staff development and school change. In A. Lieberman (Ed.). *Schools as collaborative cultures: Creating the future now* (pp. 213-232). Bristol, PA: Falmer.
- McLeod, S. (2008). Educational technology leadership. *Technology & Learning*, 28(11),551.
- McPike, L. (1987). Shared decision making at the school site: Moving toward a professional model-An interview with Patrick O'Rourke. *American Educator*, 11(1), 10-17, 46.
- McQuillan, P. J., & Salomon-Fernandez, Y. (2008). The impact of state intervention on "underperforming" schools in Massachusetts: Implications for policy and practice. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 16(18), 1-43.
- Mercado, L. P. (2002). *The Secondary Principalship Academy: A critical ethnography of the Houston Independent School District and the University of Houston's innovative principal preparation program*. Unpublished Ed.D., University of Houston, United States -- Texas.
- Meyer, J. W. (1984). Organizations as ideological systems. In T. J. Sergiovanni and J. E. Corbally, *Leadership and organizational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice* (pp. 186-205). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Militello, M., Schimmel, D., & Eberwein, H. J. (2009). If they knew, they would change: How

- legal knowledge impacts principals' practice. *NASSP Bulletin*, 93 (1), 27-52.
- Miller, S. L. (1988). Unlikely beginnings: The district office as a starting point for developing a professional culture for teaching. In A. Lieberman (Ed.). *Building a professional culture in schools*, New York: Teachers College Press.
- Milstein, M. M., Bobroff, & Restine, N. A. (1991). *Internship programs in educational administration: A guide to preparing educational leaders*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Milstein, M. M., & Kruger, J. (1997). Improving educational administration preparation programs: What we have learned over the past decade. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 72(2), 100-116.
- Mintrop, H. (2004). High-stakes accountability, state oversight, and educational equity. *Teachers College Record*, 106(11), 2128-2145.
- Mintrop, H., & MacLellan, A. M. (2002). School improvement plans in elementary and middle schools on probation. *Elementary School Journal*, 102(4), 275-300.
- Mintrop, H., & Sunderman, G. L. (2009). Predictable failure of federal sanctions-driven accountability for school improvement-and why we may retain it anyway. *Educational Researcher*, 38(5), 353-364.
- Mintrop, H., & Trujillo, T. (2007). The practical relevance of accountability systems for school improvement: A descriptive analysis of California schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 29(4), 319-352.
- Mintzberg, H. (1994). *The rise and fall of strategic planning*. New York: The Free Press.
- Miretsky, D. (2004). The communication requirements of democratic schools: Parent-teacher perspectives on their relationships. *Teachers College Record*, 106(4), 814-851.
- Miron, L. F. (1997). *Resisting discrimination: Affirmative strategies for principals and teachers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Mitchell, D. E., & Boyd, W. L. (1998). Knowledge utilization in educational policy and politics: Conceptualizing and mapping the domain. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34(1), 126-140.
- Mitra, D. L. Movit, M., & Frick, W. (2008). Brain drain in the rust belt - Can educational reform help to build civic capacity in struggling communities? *Educational Policy*, 22(5), 731-757.
- Monk, D. (1992). Educational productivity research: An update and assessment of its role in education finance reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 14(4), 307-332.
- Moolenaar, N. M., Daly, A. J., & Slegers, P. J. C. (2010). Occupying the principal position: examining relationships between transformational leadership, social network position, and schools' innovative climate. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(5), 623-670.
- Morrisey, M. (2000). *Professional learning communities: An ongoing exploration*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
- Moss, P. A., & Piety, P. J. (2007). Introduction: Evidence and decision making. In P. A. Moss (Ed.). *Evidence and decision making. 106th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: Part I* (pp. 1-14). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Muijs, D., & Harris, A. (2006). Teacher led school improvement: Teacher leadership in the UK. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22(8), 961-972.
- Murphy, J. (1990). Principal instructional leadership. In L. S. Lotto & P. Thurston (Eds.), *Advances in educational administration: Changing perspective on the school* (pp. 163-200). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- Murphy, J. (2000, February). Governing America's schools: The shifting playing field. *Teachers College Record*, 102(1), 57-84.
- Murphy, J. (2005). Unpacking the foundations of the ISLLC Standards and addressing concerns in the academic community. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41(1), 154-191.
- Murphy, J., & Datnow, A. (2003). The development of comprehensive school reform. In J. Murphy & A. Datnow (Eds.), *Leadership lessons from comprehensive school reforms* (pp. 3-18). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Murphy, J., Beck, L. G., Knapp, M. S., & Portin, B. S. (2003). KEYS and the larger school reform movement in the United States. In B. S. Portin, L. G. Beck, M. S. Knapp, & J. Murphy (Eds.), *Self-reflective renewal in schools: Lessons from a national initiative* (pp. 1-15). Norwood, NJ: Greenwood.
- Murphy, J., Elliott, S., Goldring, E., & Porter, A. C. (2007). Leadership for learning: A taxonomy and model of leadership behaviors. *School Leadership and Management*, 27(2).
- Murphy, J., & Louis, K. S. (1994). *Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Murphy, J., Smylie, M., Mayrowetz, D. & Louis, K.S. (2009). The role of the principal in fostering the development of distributed leadership. *School Leadership & Management*, 29(2), 181-214.
- Murphy, M., Martin, M. & Muth, R. (1997). Partnerships for preparing school leaders: Possibilities and practicalities. In R. Muth, & M. Martin (Eds.). *Toward the year 2000: Leadership and Quality Schools*. The sixth yearbook of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. (238-246), Lanham, MA: Scarecrow Press,
- Murphy, P. K., & Alexander, P. A. (2006). *Understanding how students learn: A guide for instructional leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Murtadha, K., & Watts, D. M. (2005). Linking the struggle for education and social justice: Historical perspectives of African American leadership in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41(4), 591-608.
- Nance, J. P. (2003). Public school administrators and technology policy making. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(4), 434-467.
- Nazinga-Johnson, S., Baker, J. A., & Aupperlee, J. (2009). Teacher-parent relationships and school involvement among racially and educationally diverse parents of kindergartners. *The Elementary School Journal*, 110(1), 81-91.
- Nevin, A. (1979). Special education administration competencies required of the general education administrator. *Exceptional Children*, 45(5), 363-365.
- Nystrand, R. (1981). Leadership theories for principals. *Theory into Practice*, 20, 260-263.
- Odden, A. & Kelley, C. (2002). *Paying teachers for what they know and do: New and smarter compensation strategies to improve schools, 2nd Edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Opfer, V.D. (2006). Evaluating equity: A framework for understanding action and inaction on social justice issues. *Educational Policy*, 20(1), 271-290.
- Orr, M. T. (2011). Pipeline to preparation to advancement: Graduates' experiences in, through, and beyond leadership preparation. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(1), 114-172.

- Orr, M. T., & Orphanos, S. (2011). Graduate-level preparation influences the effectiveness of school leaders: A comparison of the outcomes of exemplary and conventional leadership preparation programs for principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(1), 18-70.
- Osterman, K., & Fishbein, S. (2001). *Reshaping the administrative internship through research and reflective practice*. Paper presented at the The American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.
- Owen, J. (2007). Getting your political bearings. *Principal Leadership*, 8(2), 46-50.
- Owen, J. C. (2006). *The impact of politics in local education: Navigating white water*: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Papa, R., & Fortune, R. (2002). *Leadership on purpose: Promising practices for African American and Hispanic students*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Papalewis, R. (2004). Practice of theory to theory of practice: The prime directive. In C. Fulmer & C. Carr (Eds.), *The eighth yearbook of the National Council for Professors of Educational Administration*. Lancaster, PA: Economic.
- Patrikakou, E. N., & Weissberg, R. P. (2000). Parents' perceptions of teacher out-reach and parent involvement in children's education. *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community*, 20(1/2), 103-119.
- Pena, D. C. (2000). Parent involvement: Influencing factors and implications. *The Journal of Education Research*, 94(1), 42-54.
- Perry, T., & Fraser, J. W. (1993). Reconstructing schools as multiracial/multicultural democracies: Toward a theoretical perspective. In T. Perry and J. W. Fraser (Eds.). *Freedom's plow: Teaching in the multicultural classroom* (pp. 3-24). New York: Routledge.
- Piltch, B., & Fredericks, R. (2005, January/February). Politics and the principalship: A principal's guide to school politics. *Principal*, 84(3), 10-14.
- Podsokoff, P., MacKenzie, S., Moorman, R., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.
- Porterfield, K., & Carnes, M. (2008). *Why school communication matters: Strategies from PR professional*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Portin, B. (2003). *Making sense of leadership schools. A study of the school principalship*. Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education, University of Washington.
- Portin, B., Alejano, C., Knapp, M., & Marzolf, E. (2006). *Redefining roles, responsibilities, and authority of school leaders*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.
- Portin, B., Knapp, M., Dareff, S., Feldman, S., Russell, F., Samuelson, C., & Yeh, T. (2009). *Leadership for learning improvement in urban schools*. University of Washington: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.
- Portin, B., Schneider, P., DeArmond, M., & Gundlach. (2003). *Making sense of leading schools: A study of the school principalship* (Report No. EA 032 811). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED481977)
- Pounder, D. G. (1988). The male/female salary differential for school administrators: Implications for career patterns and placement of women. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 24(1), 5-19. [ERIC #EJ 481 198]

- Pounder, D. G. (1989). Improving the predictive validity of teacher selection decisions: Lessons from teacher appraisal. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation*, 2(2), 123-132.
- Pounder, D. G. (1998). Teacher teams: Redesigning teachers' work for collaboration. In D. Pounder (Ed), *Restructuring Schools for Collaboration* (pp. 65-88). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Pounder, D. G. (1999). Teacher teams: Job characteristics and work-related outcomes of work group enhancement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(3), 317-348.
- Pounder, D. G., Galvin, P., & Shepard, P. (2003). An analysis of the United States Educational Administrator Shortage, *Australian Journal of Education*, 47(2), 133-145.
- Pounder, D. G., King, D. K., Hausman, C., & Bowles, W. B. (2005). The complexity of gender-role stereotyping effects in high school principal selection. In W. Hoy and C. Miskel (Series Editors), *Educational Leadership and Reform* (pp 265-300). A volume in *Research and Theory in Educational Administration*. Greenwich, CN: Information Age Publishing.
- Pounder, D. G. & Merrill, R. (2001). Job desirability of the high school principalship: A job choice theory perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37 (2), 25-57.
- Powell, D., Higgins, H. J., Aram, R., & Freed, A. (2009). Impact of no child left behind on curriculum and instruction in rural schools. *Rural Educator*, 31(1), 19-28.
- Prawat, R. S. (1991). Conversations with self and settings: A framework for thinking about teacher empowerment. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28, 737-757.
- Price, H. B. (2008). *Mobilizing the community to help students succeed*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Printy, S. M., & Marks, H. M. (2006). Shared leadership for teacher and student learning. *Theory into Practice*, 45(2), 125-132.
- Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. S. (1983). Effective schools: A review. *Elementary School Journal*, 83(4), 427-452.
- Rapp, D. (2002). Social justice and the importance of rebellious imaginations. *Journal of School Leadership*, 12, 226-245.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press..
- Razik, T., & Swanson, A. (2001). *Fundamental descriptors of practice listed below of educational leadership*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Razik, T. & Swanson, A. (2010) *Fundamental concepts of educational leadership and management*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Reale-Foley, L. B. (2003). *How New England graduate programs in school administration are preparing aspiring school administrators to become technology leaders*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hartford, Hartford, Connecticut.
- Rebores, R. (1979). Public Law 94-142 and the building principal. *NASSP Bulletin*, 63(4), 26-30.
- Reed, R. J. (1978). Education and ethnicity. In D. A. Erickson and T. L. Reller (Eds.), *The principal in metropolitan schools* (pp. 130-155). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Reid, P. G., Reid, R. & Peterson, N. A. (2005). School engagement among Latino youth in an urban middle school context; valuing the role of social support. *Education and Urban Society*, 57(3), 257-275.
- Reitzug, U. C. (1994). A case study of empowering principal behavior *American Educational Research Journal*, 31(2), 283-307.

- Reynolds, A. J. (1999). Educational success in high-risk settings: Contributions of the Chicago Longitudinal Study. *Journal of School Psychology, 37*, 345-354.
- Reynolds, A. J., Temple, J. A., Robertson, D. L., & Mann, E. A. (2001). Age 21 cost-benefit analysis of the Title I Chicago Child-Parent Centers. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24*, 267-303.
- Rice, J. K., & Malen, B. (2003). The human costs of education reform: The case of school reconstitution. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 39*(5), 635-666.
- Riehl, C. J. (2000). The principal's role in creating inclusive schools for diverse students: A review of normative, empirical, and critical literature on the practice of educational administration. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(1), 55-81.
- Riester, A. F., Pursch, V., & Skrla, L. (2002). Principals for social justice: Leaders of school success for children from low-income homes. *Journal of School Leadership, 12*, 281-304.
- Robinson, V. M. J., 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.
- Roche, K. (1999). Moral and ethical dilemmas in Catholic school settings. In P. T. Begley (Ed.) *Values and Educational Leadership* (pp. 255-272). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Rollow, S. G., & Bryk, A. S. (1993). Democratic politics and school improvement: The potential of Chicago school reform. In C. Marshall (Ed.) *The new politics of race and gender. The 1992 Yearbook of the Politics of Education Association* (pp. 97-106). Washington, DC: Falmer Press.
- Rosenholtz, S. J. (1985). Effective schools: Interpreting the evidence. *American Journal of Education, 93*(2), 352-389.
- Rusch, E. A. (1998). Leadership in evolving democratic school communities. *Journal of School Leadership, 5*(3), 214-250.
- Russo, C. J., & Osborne, A. G. Jr. (2008). *Essential concepts and school-based cases in special education*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.
- Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., & Ouston, J. (1979). *Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ryan, D., & Martin, A. (2000). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender parents in the school systems. *School Psychology Review, 29*(2), 207-216.
- Ryan, J. (2006). *Inclusive leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Salisbury, C. L. (2006). Principals' perspectives on inclusive elementary schools. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 31*(1), 70-82.
- Salisbury, C. L., & McGregor, G. (2002). The administrative climate and context of inclusive elementary schools. *Exceptional Children, 68*, 259-281.
- Samier, E. (2011). Exploring aesthetic dimensions of leadership. In F. English (Ed.) *Sage Handbook of Educational Leadership, 2nd Ed.* (pp. 277-) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sanders, M. G. (2001). The role of "community" in comprehensive school, family, and community partnership programs. *The Elementary School Journal, 102*(1), 19-34.
- Sanders, M. G. (2009). Collaborating for change: How an urban school district and a community-based organization support and sustain school, family and community partnerships. *Teachers College Record, 111*(7), 1693-1712.

- Sanders, M. G., & Epstein, J. L. (2000). The national Network of Partnership Schools: How research influences educational practice. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)*, 5(1/2), 61-76.
- Sanders, M., & Harvey, A. (2002). Beyond the school walls: A case study of principal leadership for school-community collaboration. *Teachers College Record*, 104(7), 1345-1368.
- Sather, S. E. (1999, April). *Leading, lauding and learning: Leadership in diverse secondary schools*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.
- Scheurich, J. J. (1998). Highly successful and loving, public elementary schools populated mainly by low-SES children of color: Core beliefs and cultural characteristics. *Urban Education*, 33, 451-491.
- Scheurich, J. J., & Skrla, L. (2003). *Leadership for equity and excellence, creating high-achievement classrooms, schools, and districts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Schmidt, M. (2010). Educational trust. In E. Samier & M. Schmidt (Eds.) *Trust and betrayal in educational administration and leadership* (pp. 43-59). New York: Routledge.
- Schmoker, M. (2006). *Results now: How we can achieve unprecedented improvements in teaching and learning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Schoen, L., & Fusarelli, L. D. (2008). Innovation, NCLB, and the fear factor - The challenge of leading 21st-century schools in an era of accountability. *Educational Policy*, 22(1), 181-203.
- Scribner, J. P., Sawyer, R. K., Watson, S. T., & Myers, V. L. (2007). Teacher teams and distributed leadership: A study of group discourse and collaboration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(1), 67-100.
- Searby, L., & Williams, C. (2007). How to survive the politics of school administration. *AASA Journal of Scholarship & Practice*, 4(3), 11-19.
- Seyfarth, (2008). *Human resource leadership*. Boston: Pearson, Allyn, Bacon.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1993). Gender equity in schools. In C. A. Capper (Ed.). *Educational administration in a pluralistic society* (pp. 86-109). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Shapiro, J. P., & Gross, S. J. (2008). *Ethical leadership in turbulent times: (Re) Solving moral dilemmas*. New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Shapiro, J. P. & Stefkovich, J. A. (2005). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education: Applying theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas, 2nd ed.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, Associates
- Sheldon, S. B. (2005). Testing a structural equation model of partnership program implementation and parent involvement. *The Elementary School Journal*, 106(2), 171-187.
- Sheldon, S. B., & Epstein, J. L. (2002). Improving student behavior and school discipline with family and community involvement. *Education and Urban Society*, 35(1), 4-26.
- Sheldon, S. B., Epstein, J. L., & Galindo, C. L. (2010). Not just numbers: Creating a partnership climate to improve math proficiency in schools. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 9(1), 27-48.
- Sheldon, S. B., & Van Voorhis, F. L. (2004). Partnership programs in U.S. schools: Their development and relationship to family involvement outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 15(2), 125-148.

- Shields, C. M. (2004). Dialogic leadership for social justice: Overcoming pathologies of silence. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40, 111–134.
- Shields, C. M. (2005). School leadership in the 21st century: Broadening the base. In W. K. Hoy & C. G. Miskel (Eds.) *Education leadership and reform: A volume in research and theory in educational administration* (pp. 29-52). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Shields, C. M. (2010). Transformative leadership: Working for equity in diverse contexts. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(4), 558-589.
- Shields, C. M., Larocque, L. J., & Oberg, S. L. (2002). A dialogue about race and ethnicity in education: Struggling to understand issues in cross-cultural leadership. *Journal of School Leadership*, 12, 116–137.
- Short, P. M., & Greer, J. T. (1997). *Leadership in empowered schools: Themes from innovative efforts*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Sickler, J. L. (1988). Teachers in charge: Empowering the professionals. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69, 254-256, 375-376.
- Silins, H., & Mulford, B. (2004). Schools as learning organizations: Effects on teacher leadership and student outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 15(3-4), 443-466.
- Silins, H. C., Mulford, W. R., & Zarins, S. (2002). Organizational learning and school change. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(5), 613-642.
- Skrla, L., Scheurich, J. J., Garcia, J., & Nolly, G. (2004). Equity audits: A practical leadership tool for developing equitable and excellent schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(1), 135-163.
- Smith, B. G. (1999). *School principal programs and assessment literacy: A process of evolution*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington.
- Smith, J., & Blase, J. (1991). From empiricism to hermeneutics: Educational leadership as a practical and moral activity. *Journal of Educational Administration*. 29(1), 6-21.
- Smith, R. E. (2009). *Human resources administration: A school-based perspective*, 4th ed. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Smrekar, C., & Cohen-Vogal, L. (2001). The voices of parents: Rethinking the intersection of family and school. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 76(2), 75-100.
- Somech, A. (2005). Directive versus participative leadership: Two complementary approaches to managing school effectiveness. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41(5), 777-800.
- Sommerville, D., & McDonald, S. (2002). *Developing school and community partnerships to meet the needs of students with challenging behaviors (Case/Ccbd Mini-Library Series on Safe, Drug-Free, and Effective Schools)*. Arlington, VA: Council Exceptional Children.
- Sosik, J. J., Lee, D., & Bouquillon, E. A. (2005). Context and Mentoring: Examining Formal and Informal Relationships in High Tech Firms and K-12 Schools. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 12(2), 94.
- Sparks, D. (2005). *Leading for results: Transforming teaching, learning and relationships in schools*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Spillane, J. P. (2004). *Standards deviation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher*, 30(3), 23-28.

- Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2004). Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36(1), 3-34.
- Spillane, J. P., & Louis, K. S. (2002). School improvement processes and practices: Professional learning for building instructional capacity. In J. Murphy (Ed.) *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century* (pp. 83-104). Chicago, IL: National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook.
- Spillane, J. P., & Thompson, C. L. (1997). Reconstructing conceptions of local capacity: The local education agency's capacity for ambitious instructional reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 19(2), 185-203.
- Stainback, S., Stainback, W., & Forest, M. (Eds.). (1989). *Educating all students in the mainstream of regular education*. Baltimore: Brookes.
- Stedman, L. C. (1985). A new look at the effective school literature. *Urban Education*, 20, 295-326.
- Stefkovich, J. A. (2006). *Best interests of the student: Applying ethical constructs to legal cases in education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Steinberg, L. (1992). Impact of parenting practices on adolescent achievement: Authoritative parenting, school involvement, and encouragement to succeed. *Child Development*, 63(5), 1266-1281.
- Stöcklin, S. (2010). The initial stage of a school's capacity building. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 38(4), 443-453.
- Stoll, L., & Louis, K. (2007). *Professional learning communities*. New York: Open University Press.
- Straut, D., & Calabrese, R. L. (1999). Reconstructing the internship. *Journal of School Leadership*, 9(5), 400-421.
- Strike, K. A. (1993). Professionalism, democracy, and discursive communities: Normative reflections on restructuring. *American Educational Research Journal*, 30(2), 255-275.
- Stronge, J. H., & Tucker, P. D. (2003). *Handbook on teacher evaluation: Assessing and improving performance*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Supovitz, J. (2002). Developing communities of instructional practice. *Teachers College Record*, 104(8), 1591-1626.
- Supovitz, J., Sirinides, P., & May, H. (2010). How principals and peers influence teaching and learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(1), 31-56.
- Sweetland, S., & Hoy, W. K. (2000). School characteristics and educational outcomes: Toward an organizational model of student achievement in middle schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(5), 703-729.
- Talbert, J. E. (1996). Primacy and promise of professional development in the nation's education reform agenda: Sociological views. In K. Borman, P. Cookson, A. Sadovnik, & J. Spade (Eds.), *Implementing educational reform: Sociological perspectives on educational policy* (pp. 283-311). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Taylor D. L. (2009). The role of teacher leadership in improving student learning outcomes in schools. In M. S. Khine & I. M. Saleh (Eds.). *Transformative leadership and educational excellence*. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Taylor, B. M., & Pearson, P. D. (2004). Research on learning to read – at school, at home, and in the community. *The Elementary School Journal*, 105(2), 167-182.

- Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43, 221–251.
- Theoharis, G. (2008a). “At every turn”: The resistance public school principals face in their pursuit of equity and justice. *Journal of School Leadership*, 18, 303–343.
- Theoharis, G. (2008b). Woven in deeply: Identity and leadership of urban social justice principals. *Education and Urban Society*, 41, 3–25.
- Theoharis, G. (2009). *The leadership our children deserve: Seven keys to equity, social justice, and school reform*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Theoharis, G. (2010). Disrupting injustice: Principals narrate the strategies they use to improve their schools and advance social justice. *Teachers College Record*, 112(1), 331-373.
- Tillman, L. C. (2004). African American principals and the legacy of Brown. *Review of Research in Education*, 28, 101-146. (2004)
- Timperley, H. S., & Robinson, V. M. J. (1998). The micropolitics of accountability: The case of staff appraisal. *Educational Policy*, 12(1-2), 162-176.
- Tooms, A. (2004, Spring). Developing leadership strategies inside the politics of language, diversity, and change. *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership*, 7(1).
- Tooms, A. K., Lugg, C. A., & Bogotch, I. (2010). Rethinking the politics of fit and educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(1), 96-131.
- Torrence, V. D. (2002). *Principals' use of data: A national perspective*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksberg, Virginia.
- Torres, M. S., & Stefkovich, J. A. (2009). Demographics and police involvement implications for student civil liberties and just leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(3), 450-473.
- Trivette, P. S., & Thompson-Drew, C. (2003). Implementing a school-based health center: The Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Experience. *Psychology in the Schools*, 40(3), 289-296.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). Transformational leadership and trust. In W. K. Hoy & C. G. Miskel (Eds.), *Studies in leading and organizing schools* (pp. 157-179). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2009) Fostering teacher professionalism in schools: The role of leadership orientation and trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(2), 217-247.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Trust in schools: A conceptual and empirical analysis. *Journal of educational administration*, 36(4), 334-352.
- Tucker, C. M., & Herman, K. C. (2002). Using culturally sensitive theories and research to meet the academic needs of low-income African American children. *American Psychologist*, 57, 762-73.
- Tucker, P. D., & Stronge, J. H. (2005). *Linking teacher evaluation and student learning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Ulrich, D., Zenger, J., & Smallwood, N. (1999). *Results-based leadership: How leaders build the business and improve the bottom line*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Van Horn, G., Burrello, L., & DeClue, L. (1992). An instructional leadership framework: The principal’s leadership role in special education. *Special Education Leadership Review*, 1(1), 41–54.
- Van Houten, L. (2003). Using data for decision-making. *WestEd R&D Alert*, 8(1), 6-7.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York, NY: John Wiley.

- Wagstaff, L. H., & Gallagher, K. S. (1990). Schools, families, and communities: Idealized images and new realities. In B. Mitchell & L. L. Cunningham (Eds.), *Educational leadership and changing contexts of families, communities, and schools* (pp. 91-117). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wahlstrom, K. L., & Louis, K.S. (2008). How teachers experience principal leadership: the roles of professional community, trust, efficacy, and shared responsibility. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), 458-495.
- Walker, A., & Chen Shuangye, C. (2007). Leader authenticity in intercultural school contexts. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 35(2), 185-204.
- Walker, E. W. (1999). *Conflict in the house: Interethnic conflict as change agent, change as conflict instigator*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.
- Wallace Foundation. (2007). *A Wallace Perspective: Getting Principal Mentoring Right: Lessons from the Field*. New York City: Wallace Foundation.
- Warren, M. R., Hong, S., Rubin, C. H., & Uy, P. S. (2009). Beyond the bake sale: A community-based relational approach to parent engagement in schools. *Teachers College Record*, 111(9), 2209-2254.
- Waters, J. T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, R. A. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. Aurora, CO: McREL.
- Watts, M. J., Campell, H. E., Gau, H., Jacobs, E., Rex, T., & Hess, R. K. (2006). *Why some schools with Latino children beat the odds and others don't*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University.
- Wayman, J. C., & Stringfield, S. (2006). Data use for school improvement: School practices and research perspectives. *American Journal of Education*, 112(4), 463-468.
- Weber, M. J. (2006). *A study of computer technology use and technology leadership of Texas elementary public school principals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas, Denton, Texas.
- Webster, W. G. (1994). *Learner-centered principalship: The principal as teacher of teachers*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Wegenke, G. (2000). Principal's role in school restructuring in the Des Moines public schools. *Education and Urban Society*, 32 (4), 519-534.
- Weiner, B. (1986). *An attributional theory of motivation and emotion*. London, England: Springer-Verlag.
- Wenglinsky, H. (1998). Finance equalization and within-school equity: The relationship between education spending and the social distribution of achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 20(4), 269-283.
- White-Smith, K. A., & White, M. A. (2009). High school reform implementation principals' perceptions on their leadership role. *Urban Education*, 44(3), 259-279.
- Wildy, H., & Dimmock, C. (1993). Instructional leadership in primary and secondary schools in Western Australia. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 31(2), 43.
- Wimpelberg, R. K., Teddlie, C., & Stringfield, S. (1989). Sensitivity to context: The past and future of effective schools research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 25(7), 82-107.
- Winfield, L. F., Johnson, R., & Manning, J. B. (1993). Managing instructional diversity. In P. B. Forsyth & M. Tallerico (Eds.), *City schools: Leading the way* (pp. 97-130). Newbury Park,

CA: Corwin Press.

- Witt, J. F., & Walsh, D. J. (1990). A systematic test of the effective schools model. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 12, 188-212.
- Woods, P. (2005). *Democratic leadership in education*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Wraga, W. (2006). Theories of curriculum. In F. English (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Educational Leadership and Administration*, Vol. 1, (pp. 251-253). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Xu, M., Kushner Benson, S. N., Mudrey-Camino, R., & Steiner, R. P. (2010). The relationship between parental involvement, self-regulated learning, and reading achievement of fifth graders: A path analysis using the ECLS-K database. *Social Psychology of Education*, 13(2), 2347-269.
- Ylimaki, R. M. (2006). Toward a new conceptualization of vision in the work of educational leaders: Cases of the visionary archetype. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(4), 620-651.
- York-Barr, J., & Duke, D. (2004). What do we know about teacher leadership? Findings from two decades of scholarship. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(3), 255-316.
- Youngs, P. (2007). How elementary principals' beliefs and actions influence new teachers' experiences. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(1), 101.
- Youngs, P., & King, M. B. (2002). Principal leadership for professional development to build school capacity. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(5), 643.
- Zirkel, P. (1997). The “explosion” in education litigation: An update. *West's Education Law Reporter*, 114(2), 341-351.
- Zirkel, P., & Clark, J. (2008). School negligence case law trends. *Southern Illinois University Law Journal*, 32, 345-363.
- Zirkel, P., & D'Angelo, A. (2002). Special education case law: An empirical trends analysis. *West's Education Law Reporter*, 161(2), 731-753.
- Zirkel, P., & Gischlar, K. (2008). Due process hearings under the IDEA: A longitudinal frequency analysis. *Journal of Special Education Leadership*, 21(1), 22-31.

APPENDIX 4: GLOSSARY

Accreditation. (1) A process for assessing and enhancing academic and educational quality through voluntary peer review. NCATE accreditation informs the public that an institution has a professional education unit that has met state, professional, and institutional standards of educational quality. (2) The decision rendered by NCATE when an institution's professional education unit meets NCATE's standards and requirements.

Accuracy in Assessment. The assurance that key assessments are of the appropriate type and content such that they measure what they purport to measure. To this end, the assessments should be aligned with the standards and/or learning proficiencies that they are designed to measure.

Advanced Programs. Programs at postbaccalaureate levels for (1) the continuing education of teachers who have previously completed initial preparation or (2) the preparation of other school

professionals. Advanced programs commonly award graduate credit and include master's, specialist, and doctoral degree programs as well as non-degree licensure programs offered at the postbaccalaureate level. Examples of these programs include those for teachers who are preparing for a second license at the graduate level in a field different from the field in which they have their first license; programs for teachers who are seeking a master's degree in the field in which they teach; and programs not tied to licensure, such as programs in curriculum and instruction. In addition, advanced programs include those for other school professionals such as school counselors, school psychologists, educational administrators, and reading specialists.

Assessment System. A comprehensive and integrated set of evaluation measures that provides information for use in monitoring candidate performance and managing and improving unit operations and programs for the preparation of professional educators.

Avoidance of Bias in Assessment. The assurance that the unit has addressed any contextual distractions and/or problems with key assessment instruments that introduce sources of bias and thus adversely influence candidate performance. Contextual distractions include inappropriate noise, poor lighting, discomfort, and the lack of proper equipment. Problems with assessments include missing or vague instructions, poorly worded questions, and poorly reproduced copies that make reading difficult.

Benchmark. A description or example of candidate or institutional performance that serves as a standard of comparison for evaluation or judging quality.

Best Practices. Techniques or methodologies that, through experience and research, have proven to lead reliably to a desired result.

Board of Examiners (BOE). On-site evaluators who review institutions based on the NCATE Unit Standards. BOE members are nominated by NCATE member organizations and must successfully complete the NCATE training.

Board of Examiners Report. The report prepared by the Board of Examiners team that conducts the on-site accreditation review of a unit. The report describes how the unit meets the NCATE standards and recommends any areas for improvement in relation to the standards.

Candidate Performance Data. Information derived from assessments of candidate proficiencies, in areas of leadership knowledge, professional leadership skills, the ability to have an effect on student learning. Candidate performance data may be derived from a wide variety of sources, such as projects, essays, or tests demonstrating subject content mastery; employer evaluations; state licensure tests; and mentoring year "portfolios" as well as assessments, projects, reflections, clinical observations, and other evidence of pedagogical and professional leadership proficiencies.

Candidates. Individuals admitted to, or enrolled in, programs for the initial or advanced preparation of leaders, teachers, teachers continuing their professional development, or other professional school personnel. Candidates are distinguished from "students" in P-12 schools.

Certification. The process by which a non-governmental agency or association grants professional recognition to an individual who has met certain predetermined qualifications specified by that agency or association. (The National Board for Professional Teacher Standards grants advanced leadership certification.)

Clinical Practice. Student leadership practice or internships that provide candidates with an intensive and extensive culminating activity. Candidates are immersed in the learning community and are provided opportunities to develop and demonstrate competence in the professional roles for which they are preparing.

Conceptual Framework. An underlying structure in a professional education unit that gives conceptual meaning to the unit's operations through an articulated rationale and provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, faculty scholarship and service, and unit accountability.

Consistency in Assessment. The assurance that key assessments produce dependable results or results that would remain constant on repeated trials. Institutions can document consistency through providing training for raters that promote similar scoring patterns, using multiple raters, conducting simple studies of inter-rater reliability, and/or comparing results to other internal or external assessments that measure comparable knowledge, skills, and/or professional dispositions.

Descriptors of Practice. A series of words, phrase, or sentence that describe, identify observable actions of a person demonstrating a specific knowledge, skill, or attitude.

Dispositions. 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. Dispositions are guided by beliefs and attitudes related to values such as caring, fairness, honesty, responsibility, and social justice. For example, they might include a belief that all students can learn, a vision of high and challenging standards, or a commitment to a safe and supportive learning environment,

Elements of Standards. The major components of each standard that are described and measured in the rubrics and explanations that accompany the standards. Board of Examiners teams will look for evidence that the unit and its programs address the elements.

Field Experiences. A variety of early and ongoing field-based leadership opportunities (usually connected to a classroom assignment) in which candidates may observe, assist, tutor, instruct, and/or conduct research. Field experiences may occur in off-campus settings and include interactions with organizations such as community and business groups, community and social service agencies, parent groups, and school boards.

Institutions. Schools, colleges, or departments of education in a university, or non-university providers.

Institutional Report. A report that provides the institutional and unit contexts, a description of the unit’s conceptual framework, and evidence that the unit is meeting the NCATE unit standards. The report serves as primary documentation for Board of Examiners teams conducting on-site visits. (See the NCATE website for details.)

Internship. Generally, the post-licensure and/or graduate clinical practice under the supervision of clinical faculty; sometimes refers to the pre-service clinical experience.

Internship Length Equivalency: The six-month internship experience need not be consecutive, and may include experiences of different lengths. However, all programs must include an extended, capstone experience to maximize the candidate’s leadership opportunities to practice and refine their leadership skills and knowledge. This culminating experience may be two noncontiguous internships of three months each, a four month internship and two field practicum’s of one month each, or another equivalent combination. Full-time experience is defined as 9-12 hours per week over a six month period of time.

Institutional Standards. Standards set by the institution that reflect its mission and identify important expectations for candidate learning that may be unique to the institution’s professional education unit.

INTASC. The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, a project of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) that has developed model performance-based standards and assessments for the licensure of teachers.

Knowledge Base. Empirical research, disciplined inquiry, informed theory, and the wisdom of practice.

Licensure. The official recognition by a state governmental agency that an individual has met certain qualifications specified by the state and is, therefore, approved to practice in an occupation as a professional. (Some state agencies call their licenses certificates or credentials.)

National Program Review. The process by which NCATE, in collaboration with the specialized professional associations (SPAs), assesses the quality of teacher preparation programs offered by an institution. Institutions are required to submit their programs for review by SPAs as part of the accreditation process, unless otherwise specified by the state partnership agreement with NCATE. The following terms are used in the program review process:

- ***a. Continued National Recognition with Probation.*** *This decision is applied to programs that received National Recognition during the previous review cycle. The decision denotes that the program has not met SPA criteria for National Recognition or National Recognition with Conditions. The program will have two opportunities within the 12 to 14 months after the first decision to attain National Recognition or National Recognition with Conditions. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, the program status will be changed to Not Recognized .*

- **b. Further Development Required.** This decision is applied to programs that are undergoing program review for the very first time. The decision denotes that the program has not met SPA criteria for *National Recognition* or *National Recognition with Conditions*. The program will have two opportunities within the 12 to 14 months after the first decision to attain *National Recognition* or *National Recognition with Conditions*. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, the program status will be changed to *Not Recognized*.
- **c. Key Program assessments.** The six to eight required assessments used by a program to demonstrate candidate mastery of the professional standards.
- **d. National Recognition.** The decision made when a program has met professional standards. A program receiving this decision is recognized for five or seven years depending on the state's agreement with NCATE.
- **e. National Recognition Report.** The written findings by a specialized professional association of an institution's programs for the preparation of teachers or other school professionals.
- **f. National Recognition with Conditions.** The decision made when a program has substantially met the standards of a specialized professional association but there remain sufficient weaknesses or issues to prevent the program from receiving full national recognition. A program receiving this decision is considered nationally recognized for the subsequent 18 months. If the program does not submit acceptable information within the designated timeframe, the decision reverts to "Not Nationally Recognized."
- **g. NCATE/SPA Standards. See Professional Standards. See: www.ncate.org/institutions/process.asp.**
- **h. Not Nationally Recognized.** The program has not met SPA criteria for *National Recognition* or *National Recognition with Conditions* within the 18 months following its first submission. If the program chooses to continue to seek national recognition, it must submit a completely new report.
- **i. Program Report.** The report prepared by faculty responsible for a program (e.g., math education, elementary education) responding to specialized professional association (SPA) standards.
- **j. Response to Conditions Report.** A program's written response to a specialized professional association's review of the teacher preparation programs when the decision from that review was that the program was "Nationally Recognized with Conditions."
- **k. Revised Program Report.** A program's written response to a specialized professional association's review of the program when the decision from that review was "Further Development Required" or "Recognized with Probation."

- **I. Scoring Guide.** A tool used by faculty to evaluate an assessment such as a *rubric*, evaluation form, etc. Scoring guides should differentiate varying levels of proficiency on *performance criteria*.

Nationally Recognized Program. A program that has met the standards of a specialized professional association (SPA) such as the ELCC that is a member organization of NCATE. An institution’s state-approved program also will be considered a *nationally recognized program* if the state program standards and the state's review process have been approved by the appropriate national association. (Nationally recognized programs are listed on NCATE’s website.)

NBPTS. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, an organization of teachers and other school personnel, which has developed both standards and a system for assessing the performance of experienced teachers and school leaders seeking national board certification.

Other School Professionals. Educators who provide professional services other than teaching in schools. They include, but are not limited to, principals, reading specialists and supervisors, school library media specialists, school psychologists, school superintendents, and instructional technology specialists.

Performance Assessment. A comprehensive assessment through which candidates demonstrate their proficiencies in leadership content knowledge, professional leadership skills, and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, including their abilities to have positive effects on student learning.

Performance-Based Licensing. Licensing based on a system of multiple assessments that measure a leadership candidate’s knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to determine whether he/she can perform effectively as a school or district leader.

Performance-Based Program. A professional preparation program that systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses data for self-improvement and candidate advisement, especially data that demonstrate candidate proficiencies, including positive effects on student learning.

Performance-Based Accreditation System. A practice in accreditation that makes use of assessment information describing candidate proficiencies or actions of professional education units as evidence for determining whether professional standards are met. It contrasts with accreditation decisions based solely on course offerings, program experiences, and other “inputs” as the evidence for judging attainment of professional standards.

Performance Criteria. Qualities or levels of candidate’s leadership proficiency that are used to evaluate candidate performance, as specified in *scoring guides* such as descriptions or *rubrics*.

Performance Data. Information that describes the qualities and levels of proficiency of candidates, especially in application of their knowledge to classroom teaching and other professional situations. Sometimes the phrase is used to indicate the qualities and levels of institutional practice, for example, in making collaborative arrangements with clinical schools,

setting faculty professional development policies, or providing leadership through technical assistance to community schools.

Portfolio. An accumulation of evidence about individual candidate proficiencies, especially in relation to explicit ELCC standards and rubrics, used in evaluation of competency as a school or district leader. Contents might include end-of-course evaluations and tasks used for instructional or clinical experience purposes such as projects, journals, and observations by faculty, videos, comments by cooperating internship supervisors, and samples of candidate work.

Professional Development. Opportunities for professional education faculty to develop new knowledge and skills through activities such as inservice education, conference attendance, sabbatical leave, summer leave, intra- and inter-institutional visitations, fellowships, and work in P–12 schools.

Professional Dispositions. Professional attitudes, values, and beliefs demonstrated through both verbal and non-verbal behaviors as educators interact with students, families, colleagues, and communities. These positive behaviors support student learning and development. NCATE expects institutions to assess professional dispositions based on observable behaviors in educational settings. The two professional dispositions that NCATE expects institutions to assess are *fairness* and the belief that all students can learn. Based on their mission and conceptual framework, professional education units can identify, define, and operationalize additional professional dispositions.

Professional Knowledge. The historical, economic, sociological, philosophical, and psychological understandings of schooling and education. It also includes knowledge about learning, diversity, technology, professional ethics, legal and policy issues, pedagogy, and the roles and responsibilities of the leadership profession.

Professional Standards. Standards set by the specialized professional associations (SPAs) and adopted by NCATE for use in its accreditation review. Professional standards also refer to standards set by other recognized national organizations/accrediting agencies that evaluate professional education programs (e.g., the National Association of Schools of Music).

Proficiencies. Required knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions identified in the professional, state, or institutional standards.

Program. A planned sequence of courses and experiences for the purpose of preparing teachers, school, and district leaders to work in pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade settings. Programs may lead to a degree, a recommendation for a state license, both, or neither.

Program approval. Process by which a state governmental agency reviews a professional education program to determine if it meets the state’s standards for the preparation of school personnel.

Program Completers. NCATE uses the Higher Education Act, Title II definition for program completers. Program completers are persons who have met all the requirements of a state-

approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program's requirements.

Program Review. *See National Program Review.*

Program Report. The report prepared by faculty responsible for a program (e.g., math education, elementary education) responding to specialized professional association (SPA) standards.

Rubrics. Written and shared evaluative criteria for judging candidate performance that indicate the qualities by which levels of performance can be differentiated, and that anchor judgments about the degree of success on a candidate assessment. *See Performance Criteria and Scoring Guide.*

SASB. Specialty Area Studies Board

Scoring Guide. A tool such as a *rubric*, evaluation form, etc. used by faculty to evaluate an assessment. Scoring guides should differentiate varying levels of candidate proficiency on *performance criteria* outlined in the SPA standards.

Skills. The ability to apply and use content, professional, and pedagogical leadership knowledge effectively and readily in diverse leadership settings in a manner that ensures that all students are learning.

SPAs. Specialized Professional Associations. The national organizations such as the ELCC that represent teachers, professional education faculty, and other school professionals who teach a specific subject matter (e.g., mathematics or social studies), teach students at a specific developmental level (i.e., early childhood, elementary, middle level, or secondary), teach students with specific needs (e.g., bilingual education or special education), administer schools (e.g., principals or superintendents), or provide services to students (e.g., school counselors or school psychologists). Many of these associations are member organizations of NCATE and have standards for both students in schools and candidates preparing to work in schools.

SPA Program Review. The process by which the specialized professional associations assess the quality of teacher and leadership preparation programs offered by an institution. (Institutions are required to submit their programs for review by SPAs as part of the NCATE preconditions process, unless the state's program standards have been approved by NCATE's Specialty Area Studies Board for the review of the institution's education programs.)

SPA Program Standards. Standards developed by national professional associations that describe what professionals in the field should know and be able to do.

State Program Standards Review. The process by which specialized professional associations evaluate the degree to which a state's program standards are aligned with the NCATE and SPA

program standards. (In states where state program standards are judged to be substantially aligned with SPA standards, the state standards will be approved by NCATE's Specialty Area Studies Board, and NCATE will defer to the state's review of institutions' teacher education programs.)

Standards. Written expectations for meeting a specified level of performance. Standards exist for the content that P-12 students should know at a certain age or grade level.

State Approval. Governmental activity requiring specific professional education programs within a State to meet standards of quality so that their graduates will be eligible for state licensure.

State Program Approval Standards. The standards adopted by state agencies responsible for the approval of programs that prepare teachers and other school personnel. In most states, college and university programs must meet state standards in order to admit candidates to those programs.

State Professional Standards Response. A state's written response to a specialized professional association's review of the state's program review standards.

State Standards. The standards adopted by state agencies responsible for the approval of programs that prepare teachers and other school personnel. In most state, college and university programs must meet state Standards in order to admit candidates to those programs.

Students. Children and youth attending P-12 schools as distinguished from candidates enrolled in leadership preparation programs within higher education institutions.

Structured Field Experiences. Activities designed to introduce candidates to increasingly greater levels of responsibility in the leadership roles for which they are preparing. These activities are specifically designed to help candidates attain identified knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions outlined in ELCC, state, and institutional standards.

Technology, Use of. What candidates must know and understand about information technology in order to use it in working effectively with students and professional colleagues in (1) the delivery, development, prescription, and assessment of instruction; (2) problem solving; (3) school and classroom administration; (4) educational research; (5) electronic information access and exchange; and (6) personal and professional productivity.

Unit. The college, school, department, or other administrative body in colleges, universities, or other organizations with the responsibility for managing or coordinating all programs offered for the initial and advanced preparation of teachers and other school professionals, regardless of where these programs are administratively housed in an institution. Also known as the "professional education unit." The professional education unit must include in its accreditation review all programs offered by the institution for the purpose of preparing teachers and other school professionals to work in pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade settings.

Unit Review. The process by which NCATE applies national standards for the preparation of school personnel to the unit.