PROGRAM EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP STANDARDS

2011 ELCC District Level

NPBEA

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM Recognition

Standards:

District 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

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 district leadership begins with the following questions:

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

Effective use of district leadership 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. District 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 district-level leadership preparation standards:

1. Improving student achievement is the central responsibility of district leadership.

2. The standards represent the fundamental knowledge, skills and practices intrinsic to district leadership that improves student learning.
3. The overall leadership standards conceptually apply to a range of common, district leadership positions. They are intended to define what a district-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 district leaders' responsibility for managing the "business" of the district is also embedded.
5. The practice of district leadership is well-established as its own research-based body of knowledge.
6. The preparation of district leaders requires overt connections and bridging experiences between research and practice.
7. The preparation of district leaders requires comprehensive, practice in and feedback from the field over an extended period of time in powerful clinical learning experiences.
8. District 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 district 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 student outcomes.

Implementation

Improving K-12 student achievement depends on the successful and simultaneous orchestration of multiple, yet individual, variables within the context of an overall district. Given the interdependency between the execution of specific district leadership skills and the overall educational environment, universities are expected to provide candidates with district 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 district. While life in a university is compartmentalized for the convenience of instruction, life as a district 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 district experiences in regard to resources, methods and assessments will greatly facilitate graduate's ultimate success as a district leader.

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 district level candidates' demonstration of the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions articulated in the ELCC district standards, and, most importantly, candidates' success in improving student achievement within a district environment following graduation.

ELCC DISTRICT LEVEL STANDARDS

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

ELCC STANDARD ELEMENTS:

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

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

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

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

RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR ELCC STANDARD 1.0:

Evidence presented in Appendix 2 in support of Standard 1 confirms that a district-level education leader must have the knowledge to promote the success of every student through understanding principles for developing, articulating, implementing, and stewarding a district vision of learning. This includes knowledge of how to develop a broadly shared vision and mission to guide district decisions and to support change at the school level and knowledge of how to develop trust, which is a requisite variable in shared visioning, for school improvement. It also includes knowledge of how to use evidence to inform district decisions, and knowledge of the importance of professional

development in developing the organizational capacity needed to support continuous and sustainable district improvement.

Formation of the *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC 2008 Policy 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 considered confirmed the importance of knowing how to create and implement plans to achieve goals.

Acceptable Candidate Performance for **ELCC District Level Leadership Standard 1.0**	
ELCC Standard Element 1.1: Candidates understand and can collaboratively develop, articulate, implement, and steward a shared district vision of learning for a school district.	
Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)* Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of ♦ collaborative district visioning; ♦ theories relevant to building, articulating, implementing, and stewarding a district vision; ♦ methods for involving district 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 district vision; ♦ articulating a district vision of learning characterized by a respect for students and their families and community partnerships; ♦ develop a comprehensive plan for communicating the district vision to appropriate district constituencies; ♦ formulate plans to steward district vision statements.
ELCC Standard Element 1.2: Candidates understand and can collect and use data to identify district goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement district plans to achieve district goals.	
Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)* Programs provide evidence of candidate	*Professional Leadership Skills* *(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)*

knowledge of	Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to
♦ the purposes and processes for collecting, analyzing, and using appropriate district data to drive decision making that effects student learning; ♦ designing and using assessment data for learning; ♦ organizational effectiveness and learning strategies; ♦ tactical and strategic program planning; ♦ implementation and evaluation of district improvement processes; ♦ variables that affect student achievement.	♦ develop and use evidence-centered research strategies and strategic planning processes; ♦ create district-based strategic, tactical, and strategic goals; ♦ collaboratively develop implementation plans to achieve those goals; ♦ evaluate district improvement processes.

ELCC Standard Element 1.3: Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable district improvement.

Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)*	*Professional Leadership Skills* *(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)*
Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of ♦ continual and sustained district improvement models and processes; ♦ strategic district management of human capital and its effect on continual and sustainable improvement; ♦ district change processes for continual and sustainable improvement.	Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to ♦ identify strategies or practices to build organizational capacity to support continual and sustainable district improvement; ♦ identify strategies for developing district leadership capacity; ♦ create a district plan to implement transformational change; ♦ design a comprehensive, district-level professional development program.

ELCC Standard Element 1.4: Candidates understand and can evaluate district progress and revise district plans supported by district stakeholders.

Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)*	*Professional Leadership Skills* *(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)*
Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of	Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to

♦ effective strategies for monitoring the implementation and revision of plans to achieve district improvement goals and program evaluation models.	♦ develop a district plan to monitor program development and implementation of district goals; ♦ construct evaluation processes to assess the effectiveness of district plans and programs; ♦ interpret information and communicate progress toward achievement of district vision and goals for educators in the district community and other stakeholders.

ELCC Standard 2.0: A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by sustaining a district culture conducive to collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students; creating and evaluating a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional district program; developing and supervising the instructional and leadership capacity across the district; and promoting the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning within the district.

ELCC STANDARD ELEMENTS:

ELCC 2.1: Candidates understand and can advocate, nurture, and sustain a district 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 district program.

ELCC 2.3: Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity across the district.

ELCC 2.4: Candidates understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate district technologies to support teaching and learning within the district.

RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR ELCC STANDARD 2.0:

Evidence presented in Appendix 2 in support of Standard 2 confirms that a district-level education leader must know principles for sustaining a district culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. This includes knowing how to align and focus work to focus on student learning, and knowing the elements of district culture and ways it can be influenced to ensure student success; how district culture influences school culture; and human development theories, proven learning and motivational theories, and how diversity influences the learning process. 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 (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.

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 is 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 influence 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 District Level Leadership Standard 2.0	
ELCC Standard Element 2.1: Candidates understand and can sustain a district culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students.	
Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)* Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of	*Professional Leadership Skills* *(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)* Programs provide evidence that candidates

	demonstrate skills required to
♦ theories on human development behavior, personalized learning environment, and motivation; ♦ district culture and ways it can be influenced to ensure student success.	♦ lead district change and collaboration that focuses on improvements to district practices, student outcomes, curriculum, and instruction; ♦ incorporate cultural competence in development of programs, curriculum, and instructional practices; ♦ use learning management systems to support personalized learning across the district; ♦ develop comprehensive programs that meet the unique learning needs and interests of diverse student populations and school personnel across the district; ♦ promote trust, equity, fairness, and respect among school board members, school administrators, faculty, parents, students, and the district community.

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

Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)*	*Professional Leadership Skills* *(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)*
Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of ♦ curriculum development and instructional delivery theories; ♦ measures of teacher performance; ♦ multiple methods of program evaluation, accountability systems, data collection, and analysis of evidence. ♦ district technology and information systems to support and monitor student learning.	Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to ♦ align curriculum and instruction with district assessments; ♦ collaborate with faculty across the district to plan, implement, and evaluate a coordinated, aligned, and articulated curriculum; ♦ use evidence-centered research in making curricular and instructional decisions; ♦ provide district resources to support quality curriculum and instruction; ♦ design district evaluation systems, make district 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 across the district.

Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)*	*Professional Leadership Skills* *(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)*
Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of ♦ high-quality professional development for school staff and leaders; ♦ instructional leadership practices; ♦ leadership theory, change processes, and evaluation; ♦ district systems that promote effective and efficient practices in the management of people, processes, and resources.	Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to ♦ collaboratively develop plans to improve the district's effect on teaching and learning; ♦ design the use of differentiated instructional strategies, curriculum materials, and technologies to maximize high-quality instruction within the district; ♦ facilitate school leadership through development of district activities that focus on teaching and student learning; ♦ design district-level professional growth plans to increase the capacity of school staff and leaders that reflect national professional development standards; ♦ use a variety of district approaches to improve school staff performance; ♦ develop district systems for effective and efficient management of policies, procedures, and practices.

ELCC Standard Element 2.4: Candidates understand and can promote the most effective and appropriate district technologies to support teaching and learning within the district.

Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)*	*Professional Leadership Skills* *(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)*
Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of ♦ technology and its uses for instruction within the district; ♦ infrastructures for the ongoing support, review, and planning of district instructional technology.	Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to ♦ use technologies to enrich district curriculum and instruction; ♦ monitor instructional practices across the district and provide assistance to

	school administrators; ◆ use district technology and performance management systems to monitor, analyze, and evaluate district data results for accountability reporting.

ELCC Standard 3.0: A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by ensuring the management of the district's organization, operation, and resources through monitoring and evaluating district management and operational systems; efficiently using human, fiscal, and technological resources within the district; promoting district-level policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff across the district; developing district capacity for distributed leadership; and ensuring that district time focuses on high-quality instruction and student learning.

ELCC STANDARD ELEMENTS:

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

ELCC 3.2: Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources within the district.

ELCC 3.3: Candidates understand and can promote district-level policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff across the district.

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

ELCC 3.5: Candidates understand and can ensure that district 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 district-level education leader must have knowledge of best practices regarding management of a district organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. This includes knowing how to create systemic management and operations, organize education improvement efforts, coordinate accountability systems, and create policy coherence that influences school outcomes and student learning. It also includes knowing the importance of creating systems that focus school personnel and other resources on common goals and creating processes that facilitate effective teaching and learning. 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 knowing the nature of distributed leadership to be essential.

Acceptable Candidate Performance for ELCC District Level Leadership Standard 3.0	
ELCC Standard Element 3.1: Candidates understand and can monitor and evaluate district management and operational systems.	
Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)* Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of ◆ district management of organizational, operational, and legal resources; ◆ district management of marketing and public relations functions.	*Professional Leadership Skills* *(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)* Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to ◆ analyze district processes and operations to identify and prioritize strategic and tactical challenges for the district; ◆ develop district operational policies and procedures; ◆ develop plans to implement and manage long-range goals for the district; ◆ develop plans to create and sustain strategic alignment throughout the district.
ELCC Standard Element 3.2: Candidates understand and can efficiently use human, fiscal, and technological resources within the district.	
Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)* Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of ◆ methods and procedures for managing district resources, including the strategic management of human capital, district operations, and facilities; ◆ alignment of resources to district priorities and forecasting resource requirements for the district; ◆ technology and management systems.	*Professional Leadership Skills* *(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)* Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to ◆ develop multi-year fiscal plans and annual budgets aligned to the district's priorities and goals; ◆ analyze a district's budget and financial status; ◆ develop facility and space utilization plans for the district; ◆ project long-term resource needs of a district; ◆ use technology to manage district

operational systems.

ELCC Standard Element 3.3: Candidates understand and can promote district-level policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff across the district.

Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)*	*Professional Leadership Skills* *(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)*
Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of ♦ district strategies supporting safe and secure learning environments including prevention, crisis management, and public relations; ♦ district strategies supporting student development of self-management, civic literacy, and positive leadership skills; ♦ district-based discipline management policies and plans.	Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to ♦ improve and implement district policies and procedures for safe and secure central office and school-work environments (including district office, school personnel, students, and visitors) that encompass crisis planning and management; ♦ evaluate and implement district-wide discipline management plan.

ELCC Standard Element 3.4: Candidates understand and can develop district capacity for distributed leadership.

Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)*	*Professional Leadership Skills* *(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)*
Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of ♦ the meaning of distributed leadership in a district environment and how to create and sustain it.	Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to ♦ identify leadership capabilities of staff at various levels within the district; ♦ model distributed leadership skills; ♦ involve district and school personnel in decision making processes.

ELCC Standard Element 3.5: Candidates understand and can ensure that district time focuses on supporting high-quality school instruction and student learning.

Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)*	*Professional Leadership Skills* *(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)*
Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of	Programs provide evidence that candidates

	demonstrate skills required to
♦ supervision strategies that ensure that teachers across the district maximize time spent on high-quality instruction and student learning; ♦ management theories on effective district time, priorities, and schedules.	♦ develop district policies that protect instructional time and schedules; ♦ develop district calendars and schedules.

ELCC Standard 4.0: A district-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 for the district by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to improvement of the district's educational environment; promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of the community's diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources throughout the district; building and sustaining positive district relationships with families and caregivers; and cultivating productive district 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 district's educational environment.

ELCC 4.2: Candidates understand and can mobilize community resources by promoting understanding, appreciation, and use of the community's diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources throughout the district.

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

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

RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR ELCC STANDARD 4.0:

Evidence presented in Appendix 2 in support of Standard 4 confirms that a district-level education leader must know district strategies for collaborating with faculty, faculty, families and caregivers, and district community partners; understanding of diverse community interests and needs; and best practice for mobilizing district community resources. This includes knowing how to collect and analyze information pertinent to the district educational environment, and using the appropriate strategies to collect, analyze

and interpret the information, and communicating information about the district to the community. The importance of the knowledge presented in the evidence supporting 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 (p. 18). Reports on practices in using multiple types of evidence to inform decision making highlights the importance of knowing strategies for evidence centered decision making.

Acceptable Candidate Performance for **ELCC District 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 district'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 district's educational environment; ♦ information pertinent to the district'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 information pertinent to the district environment; ♦ communicate information about the district environment to the community.
ELCC Standard Element 4.2: Candidates understand and can mobilize community resources by promoting understanding, appreciation, and use of the community's diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources throughout the district.	
Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)* Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of ♦ district cultural competence; ♦ diverse cultural, social and intellectual resources within a district community.	***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 district programs.
ELCC Standard Element 4.3: Candidates understand and can respond to community interests and needs by building and sustaining positive district relationships with families and caregivers.	

Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)*	Professional Leadership Skills *(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)*
Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of: ♦ the needs of students, parents, and caregivers; ♦ district organizational culture that promotes open communication with families and caregivers; ♦ district strategies for effective oral and written communication with families and caregivers; ♦ district collaboration methods for productive relationships with families and caregivers.	Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to: ♦ conduct needs assessments of families and caregivers within the district; ♦ develop collaboration strategies for effective district relationships with families and caregivers; ♦ involve families and caregivers in district decision making about their student's education.

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

Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)*	Professional Leadership Skills *(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)*
Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of ♦ the needs of district community partners; ♦ district organizational culture that promotes open communication with community partners; ♦ district strategies for effective oral and written communication with community partners; ♦ district collaboration methods for productive relationships with community partners.	Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to ♦ conduct needs assessment of district community partners; ♦ develop effective relationships with a variety of district community partners; ♦ involve community partners in the decision making processes within the district.

ELCC Standard 5.0: A district-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 district system of accountability for every student's academic and social success by modeling district principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the district; safeguarding the values of democracy, equity, and diversity

within the district; evaluating the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the district; and promoting social justice within the district to ensure 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 district 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 district.

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

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

ELCC 5.5: Candidates understand and can promote social justice within the district to ensure 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 district-level education leader must know how to act with integrity, fairness, and engage in ethical practice. This includes knowing federal, state, and local legal and policy guidelines to create operational definitions of accountability, equity, and social justice; knowing how to effectively implement the policy; knowing how to formulate sound solutions to education dilemmas across a range of content areas in education leadership; and knowing the relationship between social justice, district 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 is 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 District Level Leadership Standard 5.0
ELCC Standard Element 5.1: Candidates understand and can act with integrity and

fairness to ensure a district system of accountability for every student's academic and social success.

Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)*	Professional Leadership Skills *(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)*
Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of ♦ practices demonstrating principles of integrity and fairness; ♦ federal, state, and local legal and policy guidelines to create operational definitions of accountability, equity, and social justice within the district.	Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to ♦ act with integrity and fairness in supporting district policies and staff practices that ensure every student's academic and social success; ♦ create an infrastructure that helps to monitor and ensure equitable district practices.

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 district.

Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)*	Professional Leadership Skills *(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)*
Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of ♦ the basic principles of ethical behavior established by legal and professional organizations; ♦ the relationship between ethical behavior, district culture, and student achievement; ♦ the effect of ethical behavior on one's own leadership.	Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to ♦ formulate a district-level leadership platform grounded in ethical standards and practices; ♦ analyze district leadership decisions in terms of established ethical practices.

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

Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)*	Professional Leadership Skills *(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)*
Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of ♦ democratic values, equity, and diversity.	Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to

	◆ develop, implement, and evaluate district policies and procedures that support democratic values, equity, and diversity issues; ◆ develop appropriate communication skills to advocate for democracy, equity, and diversity.
ELCC Standard Element 5.4: Candidates understand and can evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in a district.	
Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)* Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of ◆ moral and legal consequences of decision making in districts; ◆ strategies to prevent difficulties related to moral and legal issues.	*Professional Leadership Skills* *(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)* Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to ◆ formulate sound district strategies to educational dilemmas; ◆ evaluate district strategies to prevent difficulties related to moral and legal issues.
ELCC Standard Element 5.5: Candidates understand and can promote social justice within the district to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.	
Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)* Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of ◆ the relationship between social justice, district culture, and student achievement; ◆ theories of efficacy.	*Professional Leadership Skills* *(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)* Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to ◆ review and critique district 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 district; ◆ develop the resiliency to uphold core values and persist in the face of adversity.

ELCC Standard 6.0: A district-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 within the district through advocating for district students, families, and caregivers; acting to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning; and anticipating and assessing emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt district-level leadership strategies.

ELCC STANDARD ELEMENTS:

ELCC 6.1: Candidates understand and can advocate for district 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 district environment.

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

RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR ELCC STANDARD 6.0:

Evidence presented in Appendix 2 support of Standard 6 confirms that a district-level education leader must know how to respond to and influence the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context within a district. This includes knowing policies, laws, and regulations enacted by state, local and federal authorities that affect school districts; knowing key concepts in school law and current legal issues that could affect the district; and knowing teachers' and students' rights. It also includes knowing how to apply policies consistently and fairly across districts, including those focused on accountability, budgeting, special education, or legal issues, and knowing how to respond to the changing cultural context of the district.

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 creating 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 District Level Leadership Standard 6.0
ELCC Standard Element 6.1: Candidates understand and can advocate for district students, families, and caregivers.

Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)*	*Professional Leadership Skills* *(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5,*

Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of ♦ policies, laws, and regulations enacted by state, local, and federal authorities that affect districts; ♦ the effect that poverty, disadvantages, and lack of resources have on families, caregivers, communities, students, and learning.	*#6)* Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to ♦ analyze how district law and policy is applied consistently, fairly, and ethically; ♦ advocate based on an analysis of the complex causes of poverty and other disadvantages; ♦ serve as a respectful spokesperson for students and families served by the district.

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

Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)*	*Professional Leadership Skills* *(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)*
Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of ♦ the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context; ♦ ways that power and political skills can influence local, state, and federal decisions.	Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to ♦ advocate for district policies and programs that promote equitable learning opportunities for student success; ♦ communicate policies, laws/regulations, and procedures to appropriate district stakeholders.

ELCC Standard Element 6.3: Candidates understand and can anticipate and assess emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt district-level leadership strategies.

Content Knowledge *(Mostly likely to be met in Assessments #1, #2)*	*Professional Leadership Skills* *(Most likely to be met in Assessments #3, #4, #5, #6)*
Programs provide evidence of candidate knowledge of ♦ future issues and trends that can affect districts (e.g., entrepreneurial approaches); ♦ contemporary and emerging district leadership strategies to address trends.	Programs provide evidence that candidates demonstrate skills required to ♦ identify and anticipate emerging trends and issues likely to affect the district; ♦ adapt district leadership strategies and practice to address emerging district issues.

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

ELCC STANDARD ELEMENTS:

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

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

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

RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR ELCC STANDARD 7.0:

Much of the research on leadership preparation field work and clinical practice is focused on preparation for school leader or education leader generally. There is some commentary and expert opinion about the nature of superintendent preparation and need for reform, such as including applied learning opportunities and clinical experience, and references to field applications. In fact, the call for internships as central to superintendent preparation dates back to early in the field's formation. There is no research or conceptualization about preparation for district leaders more generally, however. There are a few case studies of program models for superintendent preparation and development that include or stress the inclusion of clinical experience. There are also some surveys and focus group interviews of superintendents in the late 1990s and early 2000s about what was effective in their superintendent preparation programs that speak generally to the value of clinical experience, but frequently without elaboration on any particular element or attribute. Some dissertation research has begun to investigate this area. One study, for example, collected program description information from 28 superintendent certification programs in Texas and found that the majority included internships as part of preparation. In another example, 22 career and technical educational superintendents were surveyed about the value of different aspects of their preparation, including their internships and other field-based experiences and recommendations for future candidates.

APPENDIX 1
ELCC Program Evaluation Policies
for District-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 district-level instructional leadership; Assessment #4: a professional skills-based assessment conducted in an internship setting designed to demonstrate candidate's district leadership skills; Assessment #5: a professional skills-based assessment of candidate's leadership skills in supporting an effective P-12 student learning environment within a district; and Assessment #6: a professional skills-based assessment of candidate's district-level 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
ELCC Assessment 1: A state licensure assessment, or other assessment of candidate content knowledge of concepts contained in the ELCC district-level standards.	*ELCC Assessment 3:* Demonstration of candidate application of leadership skills in instructional leadership within a district.
ELCC Assessment 2: Another assessment of candidate content knowledge of concepts contained in the ELCC district-level standards.	*ELCC Assessment 4:* Demonstration of candidate application of leadership skills in a district level internship/clinical practice setting(s).
	ELCC Assessment 5: Demonstration of candidate application of leadership skills that support an effective P-12 student learning environment within a district.

	ELCC Assessment 6: Demonstration of candidate application of leadership skills in organizational management and community relations within a district.

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 district 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 element areas (e.g, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3).	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, 7.3).	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).
ELCC 7.1: Substantial Field and Clinical Internship Experience: The program provides significant field experiences and clinical internship practice for candidates within a district environment to synthesize and apply the content knowledge and develop professional skills identified in the other *Educational Leadership District-Level Program Standards* through authentic, district-based leadership experiences.		
◆ 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 district environment; ◆ Field experiences and clinical internship involve candidates in many direct interactions with district staff, principals, faculty, students, parents, board members, and district community leaders; ◆ Candidates are provided with opportunities to gain experiences in two or more types of district	◆ 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 district environment; ◆ Field experiences and clinical internship involve candidates in a few direct leadership interactions with district staff, principals, faculty, students, parents, board members, and district community leaders; ◆ Candidates are provided with an opportunity to gain experience in one different type of district setting (e.g., urban, suburban, rural, virtual,	◆ 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 district environment; ◆ Field experiences and clinical internship do not involve candidates in direct leadership interactions with district staff, principals, faculty, students, parents, board members, and district community leaders; ◆ Candidates are not provided with an opportunity to gain experience in any different types of school

settings (e.g. urban, suburban, rural, virtual, and alternative districts) to practice a wide range of relevant, district-based knowledge and leadership skills; ♦ Candidates are provided with many opportunities to interact with a variety of district-wide 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 than one capstone leadership activity (as identified in the other *ELCC District-Level Standards)* with supervised assistance from an On-Site Mentor that maximizes their leadership practice and refines their district-level leadership skills.	and alternative districts) to practice relevant, district-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 capstone leadership activity (as identified in the other *ELCC District-Level Standards)* with supervised assistance from an On-Site Mentor that maximizes their leadership practice and refines their district-level leadership skills.	settings (e.g. urban, suburban, rural, virtual, and alternative district) to practice relevant, district-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 leadership activities (as identified in the other *ELCC District-Level Standards)* even with supervised assistance from an On-Site Mentor that maximizes their leadership practice and refines their district-level leadership skills.
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 district environment.		
♦ Evidence is found that shows how candidates are provided a sustained district internship with field experiences over an extended period of time (6 months, 9–12 hours per week). (Explanatory Note: This	♦ Evidence is found that shows how candidates are provided a sustained district internship with field experiences over an extended period of time (less than 6 months, less than 9 hours per week). (Explanatory Note: This internship experience need	♦ No evidence is found that shows how candidates are provided a sustained district internship with field experiences over an extended period of time (6 months, 9–12 hours per week).

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.)	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.)	

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

◆ Verbal or written instructions by the supervising institution are well-rounded and comprehensive in providing on-site mentors with guidance in their ongoing supervision and evaluation of intern candidates; ◆ The program provides a comprehensive explanation of strategies for ensuring that on-site mentors are qualified as district-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.	◆ Verbal or written instructions by the supervising institution are vague or limited in providing on-site mentors with guidance in their ongoing supervision and evaluation of intern candidates; ◆ The program provides a vague explanation with little information for how they plan to ensure that on-site mentors are qualified as district-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.	◆ No verbal or written instructions are provided by the supervising institution for on-site mentors to guide their ongoing supervision and evaluation of intern candidates; ◆ 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 district-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 DECISIONS. 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

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: District-Level Standards
Commentary and Research Support

The research commentaries in Appendix 3 report on scholarly research and craft knowledge supporting elements of each of the seven ELCC standards guiding programs preparing candidates for school district level leadership. The commentaries were developed in an effort to provide guidance in specifying the knowledge and skills associated with best practice in school district 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 district 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 district 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 district-level education leader must have knowledge of how to promote the success of every student by understanding principles for the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a district vision of learning. Stewardship is a concept 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).

To exercise stewardship candidates must have knowledge of how to develop a broadly shared vision and mission to guide district decisions and to support change at the school level (Fullan & Miles, 1992; Honig, Copland, Rainey, Lorton, & Newton, 2010; King, 2004; Kissinger, 2007; Knapp, Copland, & Swinnerton, 2007; Levine & Stark, 1981; Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom & Anderson, 2010; McLaughlin & Marsh, 1990; Pajak & Glickman, 1989; Purkey & Smith, 1983; Spillane & Thompson, 1997; Togneri & Anderson, 2003, in King, 2004; Wimpelberg, Teddlie, & Stringfield, 1989), and knowledge of how to develop trust as a requisite variable in shared visioning and school improvement (Casner-Lotto, 1989; Honig et al., 2010; Louis & Kruse, 1996, in Firestone & González, 2007; Spillane & Thompson, 1997). A district vision is a public statement containing four elements: (a) it is anchored in a future condition or state; (b) it identifies a clear set of conditions which pertain; (c) it is devoid of means, methods, and "how-to's but is focused on tangible results; (d) it projects hope, energy, and destination" (Kaufman, Herman &. Watters, 1996, p. 49). The mission of a district is a general statement indicating a desired condition or destination towards, which the district or personnel in the district strive to realize or attain through their collective and individualized actions.

Candidates must also know how to use evidence to inform district decisions, particularly as decisions related to learning become standard practice (see Fullan, 1985; Hoyle, English & Steffy, 1998; Knapp et al., 2007; Pajak & Glickman, 1989), and knowledge of the importance of professional development to building the organizational capacity needed to support continuous and sustainable district improvement realized at the school level by teachers and principals (CASS Framework for School System Success, 2009; Clark, Lotto & Astuto, 1984; Cuban, 1983; Hallinger & Edwards, 1992; Honig et al., 2010; Hoyle et al., 1998; King, 2004; Kissinger, 2007; Knapp et al., 2007; Levine & Stark, 1981; McLaughlin, 1990; Pajak & Glickman, 1989; Pink, 1986; Rorrer, Skrla, & Scheurich, 2008; Spillane & Thompson, 1997).

Formation of Standard 1 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 et al., 1984). The importance of knowledge about how to use evidence 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 et al., 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:*

Districts are more successful when a broadly shared vision and mission exist and both are used to guide district decisions (Kissinger, 2007; Togneri & Anderson, 2003, in King, 2004). Fullan and Miles (1992) noted that district leaders are responsible for setting an improvement agenda and supporting change at the school level. Support is an operative word (Honig et al., 2010; King, 2004; Kissinger, 2007; Knapp et al., 2007; Levine & Stark, 1981; McLaughlin & Marsh, 1990; Pajak & Glickman, 1989; Purkey & Smith, 1983; Spillane & Thompson, 1997; Wimpelberg et al., 1989) and can include removing bureaucratic obstacles that obstruct school based improvement efforts (Fullan & Miles, 1992; Hoyle et al., 1998) and changing the district's orientation from one of monitoring schools to one of providing service to schools (Hallinger & Edwards, 1992; Honig et al., 2010). In distinguishing between districts focused on accountability versus those focused on organizational learning, Firestone and González (2007) reported that vision statements for the former emphasized improving student achievement on standardized tests while vision statements for the latter emphasized improving student learning and classroom instruction.

To provide district wide coherence regarding vision and mission, the development of the district vision precedes and provides a framework for vision development at the school level. Support for and the sustainability of a district vision is enhanced when consensus building is structured and community input is sought in framing the vision (Chance, Copeland, Farris, & Allen, 1994; Pajak & Glickman, 1989). The more broadly the net is cast to reflect the diversity of parents and community members, the more likely people are to feel ownership of and commitment to the vision (Chance et al., 1994; Hoyle et al., 1998). According to Chance et al. (1994) the process of establishing the vision and building consensus through that process is more important than the wording of the vision itself. Trust among district leaders, school personnel, and the larger community is a requisite variable in shared visioning, school improvement (Casner-Lotto, 1989; Honig et al., 2010; Louis & Kruse, 1996, in Firestone & González, 2007; Spillane & Thompson, 1997), and in educators' acceptance of evaluation outcomes (Ikemoto & Marsh, 2007). Absent trust, suspicion and tension reign (Spillane & Thompson, 1997).

The superintendent's role involves designing, implementing, and supporting the district vision and mission (Hallinger & Edwards, 1992; Pajak & Glickman, 1989). Effective superintendents communicate the vision and mission to multiple constituencies (Chance et al., 1994; Hallinger & Edwards, 1992; Honig et al., 2010; Jacobson, 1986, in Rorrer et al., 2008; King, 2004; Knapp et al., 2007; Lambert, 2004) and enact both by establishing procedures that keep the vision alive across the district and within individual schools (Chance et al., 1994; Lambert 2003), such as using the vision and mission to guide hiring processes (Hallinger & Edwards, 1992; Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Spillane & Thompson, 1997).

ELCC 1.2: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Using evidence to inform district decisions particularly as decisions relate to learning has become standard practice (see Fullan, 1985; Hoyle et al., 1998; Knapp et al., 2007; Pajak & Glickman, 1989). Evidence is used to inform vision and mission development, establish district goals, select/develop improvement initiatives and make revisions to each as needed. While Knapp et al. (2007) acknowledged that data-driven decision making is part of the parlance associated with accountability, they preferred the term "data-informed," arguing that wisely made educational decisions are not "single-mindedly 'driven'" by data, but involve the interpretation of evidence informed by "core values and insights" (p. 76). To guide decisions that impact student learning, multiple sources of data (Knapp et al., 2007) collected at various points in time (Ikemoto & Marsh, 2007) provide the most accurate evidence.

To augment district effectiveness regarding student learning and the implementation of the mission, vision, and goals, monitoring and evaluation are needed (Fullan, 1985; Hoyle et al., 1998; King, 2004; Knapp et al., 2007; Levine & Stark, 1981; Pajak & Glickman, 1989; Stringfield, Reynolds, & Schaffer, 2008). In larger districts, district leaders may be unaware of specific conditions at individual schools but can overcome this lacuna through collaboration with school level personnel.

District leaders can help school based personnel analyze evidence and conduct root cause analyses about hypothesized causes of problems that emerge from the analysis. When root cause analyses are not used, solutions are likely to be wrongheaded (Ikemoto & Marsh, 2007; Knapp et al., 2007; Taylor, 2009). Effective districts use various kinds of evidence (e.g., quantitative and qualitative) (Stringfield et al., 2008) collected at different points in time (e.g., periodic walkthroughs of schools and classrooms, annual test scores, document analysis) (Honig et al., 2010; Ikemoto & Marsh, 2007) and analyzed in multiple ways (e.g., triangulation, disaggregation, group comparisons, item analyses, longitudinal analyses) (Firestone & González, 2007; Ikemoto & Marsh, 2007). Where districts do not have in-house experts to analyze data, contracted external experts can be used (Ikemoto & Marsh, 2007). Empirical evidence regarding involving community members in using data to assess district decisions or programs was reported, but not extensively discussed, by Ikemoto and Marsh (2007)

ELCC 1.3: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Research clearly establishes the importance of professional development to building the organizational capacity needed to support continuous and sustainable district improvement realized at the school level, that is, by teachers and principals (Clark et al, 1984; Cuban, 1983; Hallinger & Edwards, 1992; Honig et al., 2010; Hoyle et al., 1998; King, 2004; Kissinger, 2007; Knapp et al., 2007; Levine & Stark, 1981; McLaughlin, 1990; Pajak & Glickman, 1989; Pink, 1986; Rorrer et al., 2008; Spillane & Thompson, 1997). Building such capacity is particularly needed when

transformational change is undertaken at the district level (Honig et al., 2010; Spillane & Thompson, 1997). Professional development, both formal and informal, is the fulcrum for capacity building and is needed at all levels within the district. Professional development can be targeted and district wide, even in large districts (for example, targeting the district wide establishment of professional learning communities), and at the same time can support school needs (Hallinger & Edwards, 1992; Honig et al., 2010). Building leaders benefit from professional development designed to augment their instructional knowledge. However, providing such learning opportunities is often overlooked by districts (Barnes, Camburn, Sanders, & Sebastian, 2010; Togneri, 2003, in King, 2004), despite its importance to enacting and sustaining the district vision, mission, and improvement initiatives (Fullan, 1985; Hoyle et al., 1998; Kissinger, 2007).

Necessary to sustained improvement is the sustained commitment from district administrators (Spillane & Thompson, 1997). Where a strong district wide commitment to the vision and mission exists, superintendents can use the vision and mission to mold state, and sometimes federal, policies to preclude the interruption or dilution of local improvement initiatives that would otherwise result (Rorrer et al., 2008). District leaders are also instrumental in aligning the district vision, mission, goals, and resources with those at each school. Among the most important resources a district has are people and time. Implicit in resource alignment is how human resources are used (Honig et al., 2010; Lambert, 2003; Rorrer et al., 2008; Schlechty, 1988; Spillane & Thompson, 1997) and how present capacities of individuals are valued and supported (Spillane & Thompson, 1997).

ELCC 1.4: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Districts vary in size and therefore in the number and responsibilities of district leaders. Larger districts usually have the needed staff to monitor implementation supportively and to formative evaluations. Smaller districts may need to hire outside experts (Honig et al., 2010; Ikemoto & Marsh, 2007; Pink, 1986) if financial resources exist (Spillane, & Thompson, 1997). Seldom are substantive change initiatives undertaken that do not require revision (Cook, 2001; Honig et al., 2010); therefore, district leaders need to be able develop plans to monitor program implementation and assess their effectiveness in the context of the district vision and mission (Hoyle et al., 1998; Stringfield et al., 2008).

Research Support for ELCC Standard 2.0:

Introduction
Evidence presented in support of Standard 2 confirms that a district-level education leader must have knowledge of principles for advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a district culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. Earlier reviews found strong evidence that knowledge of leadership approaches to developing school culture and climate is critically important (Anderson, 1982). This is supported by more recent scholarship confirming that candidates must

have knowledge of the elements of district culture and ways it can be influenced to develop school culture and to ensure student success. Culture is constructed from a set of "behavioral norms that exemplify the best that a district 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 districts 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 district 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. Candidates must also understand the relationship of culture to climate. Climate has been compared to the personality of an individual or how a district "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).

To develop a district culture and climate supportive of enhanced student learning requires knowledge of creating 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 district 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.

Research on the role of district-level educational leaders in developing a district culture and instructional program is fairly recent. Much of the historical research has focused on districts as the context for principals' work or narrowly on the superintendent's role, but not on the role of district leaders more generally. A growing body of research, however, shows that when district leaders align and focus their work in all these areas, they have a strongly positive effect on student learning (Honig et al., 2010; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, Wahlsrom, 2004; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2002; Togneri & Anderson, 2003; Waters & Marzano, 2006). The research confirms that candidates must have knowledge of how to align and focus work on student learning (Honig et al., 2010; Leithwood et al., 2004; Louis et al., 2010; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2002; Togneri & Anderson, 2003; Waters & Marzano, 2006). This requires understanding of knowledge of human development theories, proven learning, and motivational theories, and of how diversity influences the learning process (Glass, Bjork & Bruner, 2000; Honig et al., 2010; Leithwood et al., 2004; Orr, 2006; Resnick & Glennan, 2003; Wallace, 1994). Candidates for district level leadership must know how to develop motivating student learning environments (Cotton & Savard, 1980; Murphy & Alexander, 2006). 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 education leadership. A review of literature by Murphy,

Elliott, Goldring and Porter (2006) on learning-centered leadership concluded that instructionally-focused leadership paired with leadership processes are required for high performing schools and districts.

Infusing technology into leadership practices has become a recognized domain of practical knowledge essential to effective instructional leadership (Brooks-Young, 2002, 2004). Central to instructional leadership is knowledge of curriculum planning. This requires that candidates 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, 1959, Maslow, 1954; McClelland, 1961; Vroom, 1964; Weiner, 1986), social control (Glasser, 1986), and goals (Ames, 1992) are foundational sources of knowledge for candidates 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. 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).

Finally, much of the research on what candidates know (and need to know) about the role and effects of district-level leadership is reflected in survey research about challenges facing the superintendency (Farkas, Johnson, Duffett, & Foleno, 2001; Glass et al.,2000), and findings from meta-analyses and case study research on how district leadership matters to school improvement (Leithwood et al., 2004; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2002; Togneri & Anderson, 2003; Waters & Marzano, 2006). This research confirms that candidates must know how 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:*

Candidates have knowledge of the elements of district culture and ways it can be influenced to ensure student success; the ways district culture influences school culture; and the ways human development theories, proven learning and motivational theories, and knowledge of how diversity influences the learning process (Glass et al., 2000; Honig et al., 2010; Leithwood et al., 2004; Orr, 2006; Resnick & Glennan, 2002; Wallace, 1994). Candidates are able to work collaboratively with others (school board, the community, etc.) to accomplish district improvement goals (Murphy & Hallinger, 1988; Rorrer et al., 2008; Waters & Marzano, 2006); lead change and collaboration that improves district practices and student outcomes (Cohen & Ball, 1999; Hightower, 2002; Leithwood & Prestine, 2002; Resnick & Glennan, 2002; Togneri & Anderson, 2003); incorporate cultural competence in development of programs, curriculum, and instruction (Bustamante, Nelson, & Onwuegbuzie, 2009); recognize, celebrate, and incorporate diversity in policies, programs, and practices; apply human development theory, proven learning and motivational theories, and the influences of diversity to the learning process (Cohen & Ball, 1999; Wallace, 1994); use learning management systems to support personalized learning (Snyder, 2002); develop district-wide comprehensive programs that meet the diverse learning needs and interests of students and school personnel (Elmore & Burney, 1997; Massell & Goertz, 2002; Snipes, Doolittle, & Herlihy, 2002; Togneri & Anderson, 2003); and, promote equity, fairness, and respect among school board members, administrators, faculty, parents, students, and the community (Marsh, 2002; Plecki, Knapp, Castaneda, Halverson, LaSorta & Lochmiller, 2009; Rorrer et al., 2008; Shannon & Bylsma, 2004; Waters & Marzano, 2006).

Several researchers report on ways that districts can best strengthen their organizational and leadership practices to improve schools. Waters and Marzano (2006) synthesized available research to identify four district leader practices that most contributed to district improvement and performance: (a) establishing nonnegotiable goals for instruction and achievement; (b) monitoring these goals; (c) providing sufficient resources; and, (d) decentralizing authority to principals while holding them accountable. Other researchers identified systemic strategies and practices to support urban district reform. These strategies include: (a) developing systemic coherence; (b) redefining the role of the principal; (c) taking a systems perspective; and, (d) supporting leadership development (Madda, Halverson &

Gomez, 2007). These researchers concluded that districts that pursued coherence through their reform-initiative design processes created better alignment and support, and were more likely to achieve successful implementation of those initiatives at the school level. McLaughlin and Talbert (2002), using survey and case study research, found that reforming districts requires a focus on the whole system as the unit of change. Other multi case-study research suggested district leaders seeking to enhance student learning outcomes should undertake district wide reform in five areas that require: (a) redefining the role of principals; (b) focusing on instructional leadership; (c) delegating responsibility; (d) using data to guide instructional decisions; and, (e) supporting the professional development of teachers (Honig et al., 2010; Resnick & Glennan, 2002; Togneri & Anderson, 2003).

ELCC 2.2: *Commentary and Research Support:*
Candidates have knowledge of the development of quality curriculum including knowledge of: (a) principles and theories of learning; (b) appropriate instructional techniques; and, (d) monitoring and evaluating instruction (Leithwood et al., 2004; Murphy & Hallinger, 1986); the use of benchmarks, indicators, research methods, technology, and information systems to assess alignment of the curriculum; the acquirement and allocation of resources (Waters & Marzano, 2006); multiple methods of evaluation, accountability systems, data collection, and analysis of data (Kowalski, 2009); and, program evaluation (Farkas et al., 2001; Glass et al., 2000; Leithwood et al., 2004). Candidates are able to use data to analyze the state of district curriculum and instruction (Massell & Goertz, 2002); provide district resources to support quality curriculum and instruction (McLaughlin & Talbert, 2002; Plecki et al., 2009; Rorrer et al., 2008; Stein & D'Amico, 2002; Waters & Marzano, 2006); use technology to monitor and improve curriculum and instruction; align curriculum and instruction with assessment (Resnick & Glennan, 2003; Waters & Marzano, 2006); design evaluation systems, make district plans based on assessment data, and provide feedback based on data (Plecki et al., 2009; Waters & Marzano, 2006); use technology to profile student and personnel performance in a district and analyze differences among subgroups (Plecki et al., 2009); design, develop, and utilize district assessments for instruction and reporting (Plecki et al., 2009; Togneri & Anderson, 2003); interpret information and communicate progress toward vision and goals for educators, the district community, and other stakeholders (Leithwood & Steinbach, 1995); use disaggregated data to improve instructional programs within the district (Plecki et al., 2009); use effective technology and performance management systems where appropriate to improve instructional programs within the district (Snyder, 2002); and use technology to monitor, analyze, and evaluate assessment results for accountability reporting and to guide continuous district improvement (Plecki et al., 2009).

ELCC 2.3: *Commentary and Research Support:*
Candidates have knowledge of standards for high quality teacher, principal, and district practice; principles of quality professional development; leadership theories; change processes; evaluation of change and professional development; and district systems that promote efficient practices in the management of people, processes, and resources (Glass et al., 2000; Leithwood et al., 2004; Murphy & Hallinger, 1988;

Plecki et al., 2009). Candidates are able to provide feedback to improve district teaching and learning; work collaboratively at the district-level to improve practice (Massell & Goertz, 2002; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2002); monitor professional development and continuous improvement programs (Corcoran, Fuhrman, & Belcher, 2001; Massell & Goertz, 2002; Plecki et al., 2009; Stein & D'Amico, 2002); facilitate leadership through development activities that focus on growth and student learning (McLaughlin & Talbert, 2002; Plecki et al., 2009; Resnick & Glennan, 2003); design district-level professional growth plans that reflect national professional development standards (Campbell, DeArmond, & Schumwinger, 2004; Massell & Goertz, 2002); use a variety of approaches to improve staff performance (Firestone, Mangin, Martinez, & Polovsky, 2005; Massell & Goertz, 2002; Odden & Kelly, 2008; Stein & D'Amico, 2002); and, develop district systems for efficient management of policies, procedures, and practices to optimize instructional time (Miles & Frank, 2008; Murphy & Hallinger, 1988; Snyder, 2002; Waters & Marzano, 2006).

ELCC 2.4: *Commentary and Research Support:*
Candidates have knowledge about technology as pedagogical and administrative tools (Zoeller, 2002). Candidates are able to use and promote technology to enrich district curriculum and instruction, monitor instructional practices, and provide assistance to administrators; and use technology for district improvement (Campbell et al., 2004; Plecki et al., 2009; Snyder, 2002).

Research Support for ELCC Standard 3.0:

Introduction
Evidence presented in support of Standard 3 confirms that a district-level education leader must have knowledge of best practices regarding management of a district organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. This includes knowledge of how to create systemic management and operations, organize educational improvement efforts, coordinate accountability systems, and create policy coherence that influences school outcomes and student learning (Earthman & Lemasters, 2004; Rorrer et al., 2008; Honig, 2010; Louis et al., 2010). School outcomes are the results accruing 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, and graduation rates. In order to improve school outcomes candidates must gain knowledge of the importance of creating systems that focus school personnel and other resources on common goals and create processes that facilitate effective teaching and learning (Earthman & Lemasters, 2009; Firestone & Martinez, 2009; Louis et al., 2010; Sipple & Killeen, 2004; Waters and Marzano, 2006).

The importance of the knowledge presented in evidence supporting Standard 3 was recognized in research informing the formation of the ISLLC 2008 which also found knowledge of the nature of distributed leadership to be essential (Goleman, Boyatzis & Mckee, 2002). Distributive leadership is based on the idea that there is a social distribution of tasks associated with leadership, 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:*

For many years, researchers and others largely dismissed the role of district administrators in school improvement efforts and student outcomes. However, more recent research has revealed the potency of effective district level leadership in creating systemic management and operations, organized educational improvement efforts, coordinated accountability systems, and policy coherence that influence school outcomes and student learning (Brandon, Morrow & Schmold, 2011; Honig et al., 2010; Leithwood, 2008; Rorrer et al., 2008;). District leaders can particularly play an important role in creating systems that focus school personnel and other resources on common goals and creating processes that facilitate effective teaching and learning (Earthman & Lemasters, 2004; Firestone & Martinez, 2009; Sipple & Killeen, 2004; Waters and Marzano, 2006;). Louis et al. (2010) concluded from their investigation of links to student achievement that productive forms of distributed leadership in schools create new challenges for principals, and without sustained encouragement and support from district leaders they are unlikely to become common practice.

ELCC 3.2: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Resource administration (e.g. human resource administration functions, fiscal management, and technology utilization) can be highly centralized at the district level or highly decentralized among schools within a district--or typically some combination of the two. Thus, the research support for district-level resource administration is largely the same as the research support for building-level resource administration. Louis et al., (2010) underlined the importance of district leadership in ensuring coordination and coherence in support for schools across different organizational units at the district level.

ELCC 3.3: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Although school-level leaders are often the 'first-responders' to a school safety or security incident, it is the district leaders who bear much of the responsibility for proactively developing health, safety, and security policies, procedural guidelines, and interventions for all schools, school personnel, and students within a district. Given some of the more dramatic school violence, health, and crisis management incidents occurring in schools over the past decade, more scholarship has emerged emphasizing the role of district leadership in preparing for or preventing health, safety and security crises. For example, Knox and Roberts (2005) summarized literature on crisis intervention and management and articulate specific responsibilities at the school, district, and community level for effective health and

safety crisis prevention, intervention, and management. Further, research on school safety and security is becoming more rigorous and conceptually-grounded as researchers develop this knowledge base (e.g. Mayer & Furlong, 2010).

ELCC 3.4: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Candidates have knowledge about the meaning of distributed leadership and how to create and sustain it (Harris, 2009; Leithwood, Mascall, & Strauss, 2009; Louis et al., 2010; Spillane, 2006; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2001). Although most of the research on distributed leadership has focused on the school level, recent research at the district level suggests that district administrators play a significant role in supporting distributed leadership by building the capacity of principals, teachers, and central office staff through such actions as aligning curriculum, instruction, and assessment; creating policy coherence; maintaining an equity focus; and reorienting the organization (Rorrer et al., 2008; Sipple & Killeen, 2004). More specifically, research demonstrates that districts support teacher leadership through monitoring, procuring, and distributing resources, providing professional development, and developing appropriate curriculum mandates (Firestone & Martinez, 2009; Gigante, 2006). Louis et al. (2010) concluded that student learning is enhanced when district leaders use distributed leadership support to help create a stronger sense of stability in the improvement agenda for the school and district.

Candidates are able to identify leadership capabilities of staff at various levels of the district. Evidence suggests that effective district administrators view the school and district relationship as a partnership and have the skills to include all district office units to support school reform efforts toward improving teaching and learning (Honig, et al., 2010). Effective district administrators model collaboration skills and authentically involve district and school personnel in decision-making processes. In their meta-analysis of research on district leadership, Waters and Marzano (2006) found that among those leadership responsibilities significantly related to an increase in student achievement is collaborative goal setting, where superintendents involve all relevant stakeholders, including board members, district office staff, and building-level administrators in establishing non-negotiable goals related to achievement and instruction. Similarly Louis et al. (2010) report that schools benefit from coordinated support of district leaders provided in relation to district goals and based on shared understandings of school improvement plans and needs.

ELCC 3.5: *Commentary and Research Support:*
Candidates have knowledge about how to manage personal managerial and leadership responsibilities; manage time and priorities; and create and manage district schedules. Candidates are also able to use power and political skills in ethical ways; serve as a role model for effective management and leadership; write district policies that protect instructional time and schedules; and develop a master schedule for the district. To exercise power district leaders 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.

Districts impact the complexity of school leaders' management responsibilities and the potential for distracting them from instructional efforts and agendas. Effective district administrators, however, are also a source for supporting school leaders' efforts and efficacy toward instructional leadership by creating district support systems that protect principals' time, provide role models for being instructional leaders and effective managers, and focus priorities on school-based instructional leadership (Earthman & Lemasters, 2004; Honig et al., 2010; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Louis et al., 2010; Portin, Knapp, Dareff, Feldman, Russell, Samuelson & Yeh, 2009). These effective district administrators also ensure that teacher and organizational time are focused on quality instruction and student learning by setting priorities that align goals for achievement and instruction; finding necessary resources such as time, money, personnel and materials; modeling an understanding of instructional design; and developing the types of political skills necessary to align the work of boards and the commitment of the community with non-negotiable goals for achievement and instruction (Waters & Marzano, 2006). Louis et al. (2010) confirmed the importance of district leadership in providing a wide range of intensive opportunities for teachers and school-level leaders to develop the capacities they need to accomplish the district's student-learning agenda.

Research Support for ELCC Standard 4.0:

Introduction
Evidence presented in support of Standard 4 confirms that a district-level education leader must have knowledge of: (a) district strategies for collaboration with faculty, families, and caregivers and district community partners; (b) diverse community interests and needs; and, (c) best practice for mobilizing district community resources. Candidates must have knowledge about (a) the collection and analysis of evidence pertinent to the district educational environment (Bulkley, Christman, Goertz, Lawrence, 2010; Sanders, 2008); (b) the use of appropriate strategies to collect, analyze and interpret evidence pertinent to the district environment; and, (c) how to communicate information about the district to the community (Kowalski, 2003, 2006; Madda et al., 2007; Sanders, 2008). 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 involves 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?

The importance of the knowledge presented in evidence supporting Standard 4 was recognized in research showing that education leaders require such knowledge when collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing the community. Reports on practices in using evidence to inform decision making highlighted 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 district educational environment (Bulkley et al., 2010; Sanders, 2008). They are able to use the appropriate strategies to collect, analyze, and interpret data and evidence pertinent to the district environment, and communicate information about the district to the community (Kowalski, 2003, 2006; Louis et al., 2010; Madda et al., 2007; Sanders, 2008). Although there are few empirical studies on the use of evidence by districts to communicate with the community, there is evidence from case studies, particularly on the National Network of Partnership Schools which support the value of fully understanding the community served by a school district (Epstein, 2005; Koschoreck, 2001; Sanders, 2008; Sanders & Epstein, 2000). Studies such as one by Madda et al., (2007) on the development and dissemination of student achievement reports are beginning to explore the complexity of coordinating district initiatives with reform efforts in local schools. The need for coherence in goals and design of tools to support local implementation of new practices is clear. The use of evidence to drive improvement efforts must be coordinated among leaders in the central office and at the building-level through authentic partnerships (Honig et al. 2010; Louis et al., 2010). Louis et al. (2010) underscored the importance of district leadership in providing assistance for teachers and school-level leaders in accessing, interpreting, and making use of evidence for their decisions about teaching and learning.

ELCC 4.2: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Candidates have knowledge of cultural competence and diverse cultural, social and intellectual community resources. 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. Candidates are able to identify and use diverse community resources to improve district programs and meet the needs of all students. The empirical basis for this knowledge of community resources and the skill to use this knowledge to enhance education is richly developed at the building level but is largely absent at the district level (Crowson, 1998). The importance of district leadership for encouraging community outreach, communication, and engagement, however, is strongly advocated in the literature (Epstein, 2009; Hoyle, Bjork, Collier, & Glass, 2005; Knapp et al., 2003; Kowalski, 2003, 2006; Sanders et al., 2009), but there is a need for studies that examine the effectiveness and appropriateness of various strategies based on the needs and values of different contexts.

ELCC 4.3: *Commentary and Research Support:*

Candidates have knowledge of the needs of students, parents or caregivers; the organizational culture that promotes open communication with families and caregivers; and, the strategies for effective oral and written communication and collaboration with families and caregivers. Little research has been conducted on the practices of superintendents' work in building positive relationships with families and their effectiveness (Crowson, 1998), but there is ample guidance on the important role

they play in establishing goals for family engagement, facilitating communication with families and communities, and creating structures and mechanisms to support engagement (Epstein et al., 2009; Hoyle et al., 2005; Kowalski, 2004, 2006; Sanders, 2008, 2009). The actual development of ongoing relationships with families, however, is often done by school leaders (Barnyak & McNelly, 2009; Crowson, 1998; Kowalski, 2004) and parent liaisons (Howland, Anderson, Smiley, & Abbott, 2006; Sanders, 2008). Due to multiple factors, including more site-based management and decentralization, school leadership has assumed more responsibility for engagement with families and caregivers (Crowson, 1998; Epstein et al., 2005).

Candidates are able to assess the needs of students, parents, or caregivers; articulate a vision of district leadership characterized by respect for children and their families; apply oral and written communication and collaboration strategies to develop district relationships with families and caregivers; and, involve families and caregivers in decision making about their children's education (Hoyle et al., 2005; Kowalski, 2006; Kronley & Handley, 2003).

ELCC 4.4: *Commentary and Research Support:*
Candidates have knowledge of the needs of district community partners; the district organizational culture that promotes open communication with community partners; and, district strategies for effective oral and written communication and collaboration to develop and sustain productive relations with community partners (Honig et al., 2010; Hoyle et al., 2005; Kowalski, 2006; Kronley & Handley, 2003). Contrary to the traditional pathway of influence, there is some literature on the role of schools in the revitalization of communities, which surround them, and the different approaches that can be taken to school and community collaboration, which support urban education reform (Crowson, 1998; Warren, 2008).

Candidates are able to assess the needs of district community partners; articulate a vision of district leadership characterized by respect for community partners; and apply oral and written communication and collaboration strategies to develop district relationships with community partners. Communication with internal and external partners is considered integral to the stewardship of central office transformation efforts to improve teaching and learning (Honig et al., 2010). Guidance exists on the importance of district level leaders developing relationships with board members, the media, parents, community-based leaders, and state legislators (Anderson-Butcher, Lawson, Bean, Falspohler, Boone, & Kwiatkowski, 2008; Epstein, 2009; Honig et al., 2010; Hoyle et al., 2005; Knapp et al., 2003; Kowalski, 2006; Kronley & Handley, 2003), but little empirical research exists on the nature of these relationships, their impact on district activities, or the relationship to school-based partnerships. The best evidence available, which comes from the National Network of Partnership Schools (Sanders, 2009), indicates that support by district leadership and school board members was critical to program viability of the various partnerships developed by each of the schools.

Research Support for ELCC Standard 5.0:

Introduction

Evidence presented in support of Standard 5 confirms that a district-level education leader must have knowledge of how to act with integrity, fairness, and how to engage in ethical practice. Ethnical 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 also must 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. In order to engage in ethical practice candidates must have knowledge of federal, state, and local legal/policy guidance to create operational definitions of accountability, equity, and social justice (Chouhoud & Zirkel, 2008; Gavin & Zirkel, 2008; Holler & Zirkel, 2008; Lupini & Zirkel, 2003; McLaughlin, & Talbert, 2002; Rorrer et al., 2008; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003; Theoharris, 2001; Zirkel, 1997; Zirkel & Clark, 2008; Zirkel & D'Angelo, 2002; Zirkel & Gischlar, 2008). Candidates understand that 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).

Candidates must also have knowledge of (a) how to effectively implement policy (Bulkley et al., 2010; Bush, 2008; Center for Educational Leadership, 2007; Honig et al., 2010; Waters, & Marzano, 2006; Spillane, 2004); (b) how formulate sound solutions to educational dilemmas across a range of content areas in educational leadership (Gross & Shapiro, 2004; Langlois, 2004; Smith & Blase, 1991); and, (c) the relationship between social justice, district culture, and student achievement (Koschoreck, 2001; Lopez, 2003; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003; Stringfield, Datnow, Ross, & Snively, 1998; Theoharris, 2001; Tucker & Herman, 2002).

The importance of the knowledge presented in evidence supporting Standard 5 was recognized in research on practices that promote social justice identified as important supports for 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). 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; and, (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).

Observations by education experts affirm the importance of knowledge of reflective practices for education leaders if they are to model principles of self-awareness and

ethical behavior (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 that subsequently define their performance and serve as the focus for improvement over time.

Theoretical and practice-focused commentaries noted the need for candidates for district leadership to have knowledge of the moral and legal consequences of decision-making (Chouhoud & Zirkel, 2008; Gavin & Zirkel, 2008; Holler & Zirkel, 2008; Lupini & Zirkel, 2003; Papalwis, 2004; Mawhinney, 2005; 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 (Chouhoud & Zirkel, 2008; Gavin & Zirkel, 2008; Holler & Zirkel, 2008; Lupini & Zirkel, 2003; McLaughlin, & Talbert, 2002; Rorrer et al., 2008; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003; Theoharris, 2001; Zirkel, 1997; Zirkel & Clark, 2008; Zirkel & D'Angelo, 2002; Zirkel & Gischlar, 2008). The importance of a district leader's knowledge of policy also is connected to their ability to facilitate their leadership team's understanding of policy and its connection to equity and social justice (Scheurich & Skrla, 2003), as well as their ability to effectively implement the policy (Bulkley et al., 2010; Bush, 2008; Center for Educational Leadership, 2007; Honig et al., 2010; Waters, & Marzano, 2006; Spillane, 2004).

Candidates are able to plan, implement, and evaluate policies, procedures, and practices within the district that support equity and students' academic and social successes (Bulkley et al., 2010; Bush, 2008; Center for Educational Leadership, 2007; Hoyle & Collier, 2006; Koschoreck, 2001; Leithwood, Steinbach & Raun, 1993; Lopez, 2003; Lord & Maher, 1993; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2002). They are able to use appropriate strategies to collect, analyze, and interpret evidence on school and student performance, needs, and communities and to use that information to develop district policies, programs, and practices designed to support equitable, appropriate and excellent educational opportunities for all students (Kowalski, 2003, 2006; Madda et al., 2007; Stringfield et al., 1998; Waters, & Marzano, 2006; Spillane, 2004). Studies also make clear that coherence in program goals, design, and implementation is essential for supporting local implementation of new practices (Rorrer et al., 2008; Waters, & Marzano, 2006; Spillane, 2004). Limited research, such as Madda et al. (2007) on the development and dissemination of student achievement reports, elucidates the complexity of coordinating district initiatives with reform efforts in local schools. The use of evidence to drive improvement efforts must be coordinated among leaders in the central office and at the building-level (Honig et al., 2010; Leithwood et al., 1993).

ELCC 5.2: *Commentary and Research Support:*
Candidates have knowledge of the legal and professional organizations' information to understand the basic tenants of ethical behavior, the relationship between ethical

behavior, district culture, and student achievement and the effect of ethical behavior on one's own leadership (Chouhoud & Zirkel, 2008; Gavin & Zirkel, 2008; Holler & Zirkel, 2008; Lupini & Zirkel, 2003; Zirkel, 1997; Zirkel & Clark, 2008; Zirkel & D'Angelo, 2002; Zirkel & Gischlar, 2008). While scholarship frequently asserts the importance of leaders affiliating with and accessing the knowledge of professional associations (Hoyle et al., 2005; Kowalski, 2003), little empirical research has examined this issue directly. However, research does indicate that educational leaders need to have a basic understanding of ethics to inform their work (Beckner, 2004; Evers, 1985; Gross & Shapiro, 2004; Meyer, 1984; Smith & Blase, 1991), particularly work that involves complex decision-making (Langlois, 2004). Candidates are able to formulate a district-level leadership platform grounded in ethical standards and practices and to analyze decisions in terms of established ethical standards. The empirical basis for developing a district-level leadership platform grounded in ethical standards, like at the building-level, is underdeveloped. However, empirical research does support the idea that district leaders should understand and work from a personal or professional code of ethics (Hoyle et al., 2005; Knapp et al., 2003; Kowalski, 2003, 2006). There is a need for research that examines the relationship between district leaders' ethical codes and practices and the effectiveness and appropriateness of their leadership practices on student achievement in a variety of contexts.

ELCC 5.3: *Commentary and Research Support:*
Candidates have knowledge of democratic values, equity, and diversity (Lopez, 2003; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2002; Theoharris, 2001). Candidates are able to develop, implement, and evaluate district policies and procedures that support democratic values, equitable practices, and a respect for diversity district-wide (Koschoreck, 2001). Little research has been conducted on the practices of superintendents' work in building democratic communities, but there is research on the important role they play in establishing fostering district culture (Meyer, 1984; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003; Theoharris, 2001). Furthermore, research indicates that district leaders' understanding of equity influences their planning and decision-making (Lopez, 2003; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003; Theoharris, 2001) making knowledge development around equity and diversity particularly important. It appears that district leaders' understanding of equity is connected to their ability to facilitate their leadership team's understanding of policy and its connection to equity and social justice (Scheurich & Skrla, 2003) as well as their ability to effectively implement the policy (Bulkley et al., 2010; Bush, 2008; Center for Educational Leadership, 2007; Honig et al., 2010; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2002; Stringfield et al., 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. While scholarship does suggest that district leaders stay informed of current events and their impact on their schools, community and the education field in general (Beck, 1994; Evers, 1985; Smith & Blase, 1991), there is little empirical research that ties this level of knowledge to effective practice. That said, research focused on district-level decision-making emphasizes the importance of gathering and analyzing data from a variety of

perspectives and modeling possible outcomes, prior to making a decision (Gross & Shapiro, 2004; Hoyle & Collier, 2006; Kowalski, 2003, 2006; Koschoreck, 2001; Langlois, 2004; Madda et al., 2007;; Waters, & Marzano, 2006). Candidates are able to formulate sound solutions to educational dilemmas across a range of content areas in educational leadership (Gross & Shapiro, 2004; Langlois, 2004; Smith & Blase, 1991). Leithwood et al., (1993) noted that district leaders' problem solving and decision-making can be improved when undertaken within a group context. Moreover, communication is considered integral to the stewardship of district-led reform efforts (Honig et al., Newton, 2010).

ELCC 5.5: *Commentary and Research Support:*
Candidates have knowledge about the relationship between social justice, district culture, and student achievement (Koschoreck, 2001; Lopez, 2003; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003; Stringfield et al., 1998; Theoharris, 2001; Tucker & Herman, 2002). The research in this area stresses the importance of district leaders understanding the culture and needs of the communities and students they serve (Kowalski, 2003, 2006; Madda et al., 2007; Sanders, 2008). Candidates are able to develop and evaluate district policies, programs, and practices that ensure social justice, equity, confidentiality, acceptance, and respect between and among students and faculty that support student achievement (Bulkley et al., 2010; Lopez, 2003; Center for Educational Leadership, 2007; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2002). They are able to use appropriate strategies to collect, analyze and interpret data on school and student performance, needs and communities and to use that information to develop district policies, programs, and practices designed to support equitable, appropriate, and excellent educational opportunities for all students (Hoyle & Collier, 2006; Kowalski, 2003, 2006; Koschoreck, 2001; Madda et al., 2007; Stringfield et al., 1998; Waters, & Marzano, 2006; Spillane, 2004). Studies also make clear that coherence in program goals, design, and implementation is essential for supporting local implementation of new practices (Rorrer et al., 2008). Research also emphasizes that improvement efforts must be coordinated among leaders in the central district office and at the building-level (Honig et al., 2010; Leithwood et al., 1993).

Research Support for ELCC Standard 6.0:

Introduction
Evidence presented in support of Standard 6 confirms that a district-level education leader must have knowledge of how to respond to and influence the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context within a district. This includes knowledge of: (a) policies, laws and regulations enacted by state, local and federal authorities that affect school districts (Cooper, Fusarelli & Randall, 2004; Fowler, 2000; Kowalski, 2006; Mawhinney, 2008; Resnick & Glennan, 2003; Rorrer et al., 2008; Sipple & Killeen, 2004; Stringfield et al., ,1998); (b) key concepts in school law and current legal issues that could impact the district (Chouhoud & Zirkel, 2008; Cooper et al., 2004; Cunningham & Corderio, 2009; Gavin & Zirkel, 2008; Holler & Zirkel, 2008; Lupini & Zirkel, 2003; Seyfarth, 2008; Zirkel, 1997; Zirkel & Clark, 2008; Zirkel & D'Angelo, 2002; Zirkel & Gischlar, 2008); (c) teachers' and students' rights (Cambron-McCable, McCarthy, Thomas, 2004; Stefkovich, 2006). It also includes knowledge of how to apply

policies consistently and fairly across districts. Candidates must gain knowledge of the fair and consistent application of policies focused on: (a) accountability (Sipple & Killeen, 2004; Firestone, 2009; Rorrer et al., 2008; (b) budgeting (Bird, Wang & Murray, 2009; Johnson & & Ingle, 2009; Rodosky, & Munoz, 2009; Slosson, 2000); (c) special education (Russo & Osborne, 2008c); and, (d) legal issues (Cambron, McCarthy & Thomas, 2004). Candidates must also have knowledge of how to respond to the changing cultural context of the district (Bolman & Deal, 2002; Lytle, 2009; Falmer, 2009; Fullan, 2005; Glass et al., 2000; Marsh, 2002; Rorrer et al., 2008; Searby & Williams, 2007, Mawhinney, 2010).

The widespread recognition in the practice and policy community that district level 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. The ISLLC standards were also informed by craft and practice scholarship on the importance of 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)..

ELCC 6.1: *Commentary and Research Support:*
   One of the functions of school boards is to adopt policies in accordance with state and federal legislation and the decisions that are handed down almost weekly by federal and state courts (Chouhoud & Zirkel, 2008; Cooper et al., 2004; Cunningham & Corderio, 2009; Fowler, 2000; Gavin & Zirkel, 2008; Holler & Zirkel, 2008; Hoy & Miskel, 2004; Kowalski, 2006; Lupini & Zirkel, 2003; Rorrer et al., 2008; Sipple & Killeen, 2004; Zirkel, 1997; Zirkel & Clark, 2008; Zirkel & D'Angelo, 2002; Zirkel & Gischlar, 2008). In addition school districts are typically involved in a number of major litigation areas (Alexander & Alexander, 2005; Kowalski, 2006). As a result it is important for candidates for school district leadership to have knowledge of key concepts in school law and be familiar with current legal issues that could impact districts (Chouhoud & Zirkel, 2008; Cooper et al., 2004; Cunningham & Corderio, 2009; Gavin & Zirkel, 2008; Holler & Zirkel, 2008; Lupini & Zirkel, 2003; Seyfarth, 2008; Zirkel, 1997; Zirkel & Clark, 2008; Zirkel & D'Angelo, 2002; Zirkel & Gischlar, 2008). They should also be familiar with teachers' and students' rights (Cambron-McCable, McCarthy, Thomas, 2004; Stefkovich, 2006).

   Scholarship on school district leadership confirms that the superintendent plays the pivotal role in the political organization of a school district as the key person who has the positional authority to access the power domains of the board of education, central office staff, principals, teacher associations, parental groups, community groups, and local/state governmental structures (Cooper et al., 2004; Fowler, 2000; Farkus, Johnson, Duffett & Foleno, 2001; Hoy & Miskel, 2004; Kronley & Handley, 2003; Kowalski, 2006; Orr, 2006; Marsh, 2002; Mawhinney, 2008; Mawhinney, Haas & Wood, 2005; Sanders, 2009). Johnson (1996) identified three aspects of district leadership in fulfilling this role: political, managerial, and instructional. All three aspects require knowledge of policies, laws, and regulations enacted by state, local,

and federal authorities that affect school districts (Cooper et al., 2004; Fowler, 2000; Kowalski, 2006; Mawhinney, 2008; Resnick & Glennan, 2003; Rorrer et al., 2008; Sipple & Killeen, 2004; Stringfield et al., 1998). It is hardly surprising that researchers have found that ever-multiplying job responsibilities associated with environmental, political, organizational, and personal factors (contexts) affect the job performance of district leaders (Glass et al., 2000; Firestone, 2009).   Research underscores the particularly important influence of the political context on district leadership (Kowalski, Petersen & Fusarelli, 2005: Kronley & Handley, 2003).

Putting knowledge of policies and laws to the service of district constituents is viewed as central to effective district leadership practice (Cunningham & Corderio, 2009; Lunenburg & Orenstein, 2007; Sanders, 2009).   Researchers report on the importance of leadership skills in applying policies consistently and fairly across the district whether they focus on accountability (Sipple & Killeen, 2004; Firestone, 2009; Rorrer et al., 2008), budgeting (Bird et al., 2009; Johnson & & Ingle, 2009; Rodosky, & Munoz, 2009; Slosson, 2000), special education (Russo & Osborne, 2008), or legal issues (Cambron, McCarthy & Thomas, 2004; Chouhoud & Zirkel, 2008; Gavin & Zirkel, 2008; Holler & Zirkel, 2008; Lupini & Zirkel, 2003; Zirkel, 1997; Zirkel & Clark, 2008; Zirkel & D'Angelo, 2002; Zirkel & Gischlar, 2008).   For example, research confirms that school district leaders are responsible for serving as spokespersons for their districts when questions have arisen over who should pay for public education and at what level. Similarly studies confirm that candidates for district leadership must understand how to represent the interests of the district taking into account the new economic, political, and legal context in which school levies are determined (Johnson & Ingle, 2009), while also leading the district in budget ideation, adoption, and execution (Bird et al. 2009).

Researchers report that that the constantly increasing financial burden on local school districts coupled with the simultaneous increase in state control and accountability pressures resulted in challenges to the traditional notion of local control, and placed additional political demands on school district leaders (Brimley & Garfield, 2005; Mawhinney, 2008). The accountability measures in the *No Child Left Behind Act* were one example of federal and state influences on school district leadership (Hickey, 2006; Rodosky, & Munoz, 2009; Honig et al., 2010; Koschoreck, 2001, Mawhinney et al., 2005; Rorrer et al., 2008). Other researchers found that questions of the equity and adequacy in funding required that school district leaders be knowledgeable about and actively engaged in debates in both courtrooms and local political arenas (Falmer, 2009, McFadden, 2006; Quo, 2006). In this context, it is not surprising that researchers found that the playing field of school finance provided school district leaders with unique opportunities to exert effective leadership and to build trust among stakeholders by engaging in fair and open budgeting processes (Bird et al., 2009; Slosson, 2000).

Similarly, scholars studying the results of the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in 2004, reported that this law and its regulations

have "generated more litigation than any other education law" – underscoring how critically important it was that school district leaders be able to apply special education law and policy consistently, fairly and ethically (Russo & Osborne, 2008, p. viii).

These examples underscore why proactive engagement and advocacy for children is described as a cornerstone of district leadership in commentaries on best practice (Pascopella, 2009; Reeves, 2009; Sanders, 2009). Accounts of advocacy efforts by district leaders suggests that candidates must learn how to promote community change by collecting, analyzing, and producing evidence to inform the decision making on the part of community service agencies that offer programs to children and youths (Rodosky & Munoz, 2009).

ELCC 6.2: Commentary and Research Support:

That district leaders face increasingly complex environments that demand political skills is well documented in commentaries on the role (Kamler, 2009; Kowalski et al.,2005). The intersections of influences of the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural contexts of school districts are complex and often give rise to highly charged but common place conflicts that permeate the work of school district leaders (Marshall & Gerstel-Pepin, 2005; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003). Empirical research and analytic scholarship (Bolman & Deal, 2002; Fullan, 2005; Glass et al., 2000; Marsh, 2002; Rorrer et al., 2008), as well as commentaries on practices (Lytle, 2009; Falmer, 2009; Searby & Williams, 2007) confirm that candidates must understand the influence of the larger political, social, economic, legal and cultural contexts. Commentators underscore the value of efforts by candidates for district leadership to "learn the context" of their districts (Lytle, 2009), and to understand differences in local district accommodations to larger political, social, and economic contexts (Duffy, 2006; Farmer, 2009). For example, decisions by the Supreme Court on politically charged issues such as prayer in school or teaching of evolution may lead to politically charged issues that district leaders must address when responding to local educational politics (Spring, 2005). Although value laden conflicts can occur over reading materials in libraries, student dress codes, codes of conduct, and a host of other issues, the conflicts facing school district leaders are also highly contextualized, influenced by varying political opinions that exist in a local community (Cooper et al., 2004; Farmer, 2009; Hentschke, Nayfack & Wohlstetter, 2009; Kowalski, 2004, 2006; Lytle, 2009). Similarly research suggests that the behaviors and associated operating processes (strategies and tactics for execution) used by superintendents in smaller districts appear to be remarkably distinct from what superintendents do (or are expected to do) in very large urban school districts (Hentschke et al., 2009).

In this context candidates for district leadership must learn to exercise varying form of influence and power to make changes in their districts (Miller, Salsberry & Devin, 2009). For example, research suggests that effective rural district leadership requires political competency including interpersonal and communication skills to form

alliances, coalitions, and partnerships in order to develop proactive solutions to emerging conflicts (Searby & Williams, 2007; Falmer, 2009). Such political skills have been found to be critical in working with school boards (Price, 2001), and other district stakeholders. Research suggests that district leaders access evidence to gain informational power, and then use it as a basis to connect with stakeholder groups to make decisions, thus increasing their referent power (Miller et al., 2009). Case studies drawn from documented problems of practices and developed to foster understanding of issues facing school districts underscore the need for candidates for district leadership to develop political prowess (Gause, 2008; McConnell & Rorrer, 2009).

ELCC 6.3: Commentary and Research Support:
Analytic scholarship and commentaries on best practices highlight the importance of candidates for district leadership learning how to address emerging issues. Anticipating sources of support and resistance around emerging issues should inform strategies for networking and alliance formation (Falmer, 2009; Searby & Williams, 2007). Best practice commentaries report that "A gradual transformation occurs in which the school leader moves away from seeing political forces as obstructions to progress and toward visualizing political forces as integral stakeholders in the local educational process whose contributions are essential in the quest to achieve organizational objectives" (Falmer, 2009, p. 32).

Craft knowledge in district leadership suggests that capacity to anticipate future issues is a critically important skill. Theoretical support is provided in Fullan's (2005) exploration of sustainable leadership, which requires systems thinking to promote sustainable change by (a) leading with a driving conceptualization and moral purpose; (b) building capacity, especially laterally; (c) advocating a commitment to ongoing learning; and, (d) developing external partners. Sustainable leadership is based on proactive anticipatory actions also requiring that leaders take time to analyze and reflect on what is going on in the district (Rodosky, & Munoz, 2009; Searby & Williams, 2007).

Recognition of the importance of assessment and analysis led researchers to explore the effectiveness of a model of leadership that combined strategic leadership (i.e., developing explicit improvement strategies for teaching and learning); developing a culture of collaboration, high expectations, and accountability; building support among stakeholders (especially the school board); and managing the school environment and resources (Childress, Elmore & Grossman, 2006). Other studies on district reform highlight effective evidence-based decision making as a key component to improved student achievement (Anderson, 2003; Bainbridge & Lashley & Sundre, 2003; Fullan, 2005; Honig et al., 2010; Ikemoto & Marsh, 2007; Kercheval & Newbill, 2001; Louis et al., 2010; Marsh, Kerr, Ikemoto, Darilek, Suttorp, Zimmer, & Barney, 2005; Ragland, Asera, & Johnson, 1999; Rorrer et al., 2008; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003). Candidates seeking to practice strategic leadership using evidence based decision making understand that strategic planning has been called "practical dreaming" (Kaufman et al., 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).

The current landscape of change requires that district leaders 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 for district leadership 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). District leaders are expected to respond effectively and appropriately to diverse groups in the district community, and to ensure that young people are prepared to have positive interactions with people, who are culturally different than themselves (Banks, 2008; Mawhinney, 2008, 2009, 2010).

Research Support for ELCC Standard 7.0:

Introduction
Much of the research on leadership preparation field work and clinical practice is focused on preparation for the school leader or educational leader generally. There is some commentary and expert opinion about the nature of superintendent preparation and need for reform, including the inclusion of applied learning opportunities and clinical experience (Cooper, Fusarelli, Jackson, & Poster, 2002; Douglas, 1992; Grogan & Andrews, 2002; Wendel & Bryant, 1988) and references to field applications (Alsbury & Ivory, 2006). In fact, the call for internships as central to superintendent preparation dates back to early in the field's formation (Strayer, 1944). There is no research or conceptualization about preparation for district leaders more generally; however, there are a few case studies of program models for superintendent preparation and development that include or stress the inclusion of clinical experience (Boone, 2001; Dalton, 2007; Humbaugh, 2000; McCauley & Hughes-James, 1996). There are also some surveys and focus group interviews of superintendents in the late 1990s and early 2000s about what was effective in their superintendent preparation programs, which speak generally to the value of clinical experience, but frequently without elaboration on any particular element or attribute (Bjork, 2000; Cox, 2007; Crain, 2004; Haynes, 1997; Iselt, 1999; Kowalski et al. 2005; Kowalski, Petersen, & Fusarelli, 2009; Orr, 2006).

Some dissertation research has begun to investigate this area. Lawrence (2008), for example, collected program description information from 28 superintendent certification programs in Texas, and found that the majority included internships as part of preparation (Lawrence, 2008). In another example, Howard surveyed 22 career and technical educational superintendents about the value of different aspects of their preparation, including their internships and other field-based experiences and recommendations for future candidates (Howard, 2007).

The research presented in the building level leadership standard 7, is applicable here. 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; Copeland, 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 internships shows 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, Meyerson, La Pointe, & Orr, 2009). Further analysis of a subgroup of these principals showed that the degree of internship quality, based on three measures—having had responsibilities for leading, facilitating, and making decisions typical of an educational leader; being able to develop an educational leader's perspective on school improvement; and,

having an excellent that was an learning experience for becoming a principal—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).

While 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, it is full-time and job embedded (Barnett et al., 2009; Carr, Chenoweth, & Ruhl, 2003). Research on the quality internships shows that principals prepared in innovative preparation programs (n=213) were statistically significantly more likely than those prepared in conventional programs (n=446) were more likely to have longer internships (50% longer on average), averaging a full year (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). Other research on program practices shows 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 shows 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.

ELCC 7.3: *Commentary and Research Support:*
Research on the quality internships shows 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 shows 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, 2007). 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; Geismar, 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, but 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).

District-Level Standards References

Alsbury, T. A., & Ivory, G. (2006). Justifying a pragmatic theoretical approach to superintendent preparation, *University Council of Educational Administration*. San Antonio, TX.

Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*(3), 261-271.

Anderson, C. S. (1982). The search for school climate: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research, 52*, 368-460.

Anderson, S. E. (2003). *The school district role in educational change: A review of the literature.* Toronto, Ontario, Canada: International Centre for Educational Change, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Anderson-Butcher, D., Lawson, H. A., Bean, J., Falspohler, P., Boone, B., & Kwiatkowski, A. (2008). Community collaboration to improve schools: Introducing a new model form Ohio. *Children and Schools, 30*(3), 161-172.

Anthes, K. (2005). *Highlights: Leader standards.* Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Armstrong, T. (2006). *The best schools: How human development research should inform educational practice*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Bainbridge, W. L., Lasley, T. J., & Sundre, S. M. (2003). Policy initiatives to improve urban schools - An agenda. *Education and Urban Society, 35*(3), 292-299.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social-cognition theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall

Barnes, C. A., Camburn, E., Sanders, B. R., & Sebastian, J. (2010). Developing instructional leaders: Using mixed methods to explore the black box of planned change in principals' professional practice. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 46*(2), 241-279.

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: 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: Pearson Education.

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.

Bird, J. J., Wang, C., & Murray, L. M. (2009). Building budgets and trust through superintendent leadership. *Journal of Education Finance, 35*(2), 140-156.

Bjork, L. (2000). Professional preparation and training. In T. E. Glass, L. Bjork & C. C. Brunner (Eds.), *The study of the American school superintendency* (pp. 127-166). Alexandria, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Blanchard, K. et.al. (2007). *Leading at a higher level*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: FT Press.

Blumberg, A. (1989). *School administration as a craft: Foundations of practice*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boone, M. (2001). *Preparing superintendents through standards-based instruction.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, Houston, TX.

Boyd, V., & Hord, S. (1994). Schools as learning communities. *Issues about Change, 4*(1), 1-8.

Brandon, J., Morrow, R. & Schmold, S. (2011). *A framework for school system success*. Edmonton, AB: The College of Alberta School Superintendents.

Brimley, V., Jr., & Garfield, R. R. (2005). *Financing education in a climate of change, 9th ed*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

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 Publication.

Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Muth, R. (2004). Leadership mentoring in clinical practice: Role socialization, professional development, and capacity building. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*(4), 468.

Brunner, C. C. (2000). *Principles of power: Women superintendents and the riddle of the heart*. SUNY Press.

Bulkley, K. E., Christman, J. B., Goertz, M. E., Lawrence, N. R. (2010). Building with benchmarks: The role of the district in Philadelphia's benchmark assessment system. *Peabody Journal of Education, 85*(2), 186-204.

Busch, J. R. (2003). *School leadership formation: A multimethod evaluation study of the Southern Tier Leadership Academy.* Unpublished Ed.D., State University of New York at Binghamton, New York, U.S.A.

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 schoolwide cultural competence: Implications for school leadership preparation. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 45*(5), 793-827.

Campbell, C., DeArmond, M., & Schumwinger, A. (2004). *From bystander to ally*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington.

Carr, C. S., Chenoweth, T., & Ruhl, T. (2003). Best practices in educational leadership preparation programs. In F. C. Lunnenberg & 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.

Center for Educational Leadership. (2007). *Aiming high: Leadership for district-wide instructional improvement*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington.

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)

Childress, S., Elmore, R., & Grossman, A. (2006, November). How to manage urban school districts. *Harvard Business Review, 84*, 55-68.

Chouhoud, Y., & Zirkel, P. (2008). The Goss progeny: An empirical analysis. *San Diego Law Review, 45*(2), 353-82.

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.

Cohen, D. K., & Ball, D. L. (1999). *Instruction, capacity, and improvement*. Philadelphia, PA: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

College of Alberta School Superintendents (CASS) (2009). *The CASS Framework for school system success: Moving and improving building system leadership capacity*. Edmonton, AB: Author.

Conley, S. (2006). In F. English (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 153) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cook, W. J., Jr. (2001). *Strategic planning for America's schools*. Montgomery, AL: The Cambridge Group.

Cooper, B. S., Fusarelli, L. D., Jackson, B. L., & Poster, J. (2002). Is "superintendent preparation" an oxymoron? Analyzing changes in programs, certification, and control. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 1*(3), 242-255.

Cooper, B. S., Fusarelli, L. D., Randall, E. V. (2004). *Better policies, better schools: Theories and applications*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

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.

Corcoran, T., Fuhrman, S. H., & Belcher, C. (2001). The district role in instructional improvement. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82*(1), 78-84.

Cordeiro, P., & Sloan, E. S. (1996). Administrative interns as legitimate participants in the community of practice. *Journal of School Leadership, 6*.

Costa, A. L., & Kallick, B. (2008). *Learning and leading with habits of mind: 16 essential characteristics for success*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Cotton, K., & Savard, W. G. (1980). *The principal as instructional leader: Research on school effectiveness project*. Regional Educational Laboratory.

Cox, E. P. (2007). Assessing the relevance of the educational specialist program. *AASA Journal of Scholarship & Practice, 3*(4), 22-30.

Crain, J. K. (2004). *Perceptions of career and technical education superintendents and secondary directors in Ohio on leadership preparation experiences.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio.

Creighton, T. (2007). *Schools and data: The educator's guide for using data to improve decision making (2nd ed.).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Crowson, R. L. (1998). *School-community relations, under reform* (2ⁿᵈ ed.). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.

Cuban, L. (1983). Effective schools: A friendly but cautionary note. *Phi Delta Kappan, 64*(10), 695-696.

Cunningham, W., & Cordeiro, P. (2009). *Educational leadership: A bridge to improved practice.* Boston: Pearson.

D'Angelo, A., & Zirkel, P. (2008). An outcomes analysis of student-initiated litigation. *West's Education Law Reporter, 226*(2), 539-555.

Dalton, M. H. (2007). internship and portfolio for superintendent preparation. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal, 25*, 1-5.

Darling-Hammond, L., Meyerson, D., La Pointe, M. M., & Orr, M. T. (2009). *Preparing principals for a changing world*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Deal, T., & Peterson, K. (2009). *Shaping school culture* (2nd ed.)*.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Deming, W. E. (1986). *Out of the crisis.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Dewey, J. (1986). Experience and education. *The Educational Forum, 50*(3), 241-252.

Douglas, D. C. (1992). Challenging the conventional assumptions about the preparation programs for aspiring superintendents. In F. C. Wendel (Ed.), *Reforming administrator preparation programs* (pp. 45-56). University Park, PA: University Council of Educational Administration.

Duffy, F. M. (Ed.) (2006). *Power, politics. and ethics in school districts: Dynamic leadership for systemic change*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littleton Publishers, Inc.

Earthman, G. I., & Lemasters, L. K. (2004). *School maintenance and renovation: Administrative policies, practices and economics*. Lancaster, PA: Pro-Active Publications.

Earthman, G. I., & Lemasters, L. K. (2009). Teacher attitudes about classroom conditions. *Journal of Educational Administration, 47*(3), 321-333.

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 Ph.D., The University of Alabama, United States -- Alabama.

Elmore, R., & Burney, D. (1997). *Investing in teacher learning: Staff development and instructional improvement in Community School District #2,* New York City. New York: Teachers College Columbia University.

English, F. W. (Editor) (2006). *Encyclopedia of educational leadership and administration Vol. 1&2*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

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. et al. (2009). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Evers. C. W. (1985). Hodgkinson on ethics and the philosophy of administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 21*(4), 27-50.

Farkas, S., Johnson, J., Duffett, A., & Foleno, T. (2001). *Trying to stay ahead of the game: Superintendents and principals talk about school leadership*. New York, NY: Public Agenda

Farmer, T. A. (2009). Unique rural district politics. *Rural Educator, 30*(2), 29-33.

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.

Firestone, W. A. (2009). Culture and process in effective school districts. In W. K. Hoy & M. DiPaola. (2009). *Studies in school improvement: A volume in research and theory in educational administration*. (pp. 138-177). Information Age Publishing.

Firestone, W. A., & Gonzáles, R. A. (2007). Culture and processes affecting data use in school districts. In P. A. Moss (Ed.). *Evidence and decision making. 106th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: Part I* (pp. 132-154). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Firestone, W. A., Mangin, M. M., Martinez, M. C., & Polovsky, T. (2005). Leading coherent professional development: A comparison of three districts. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 41*(3), 413.

Franklin, S. H. (2006). *Exploratory comparative case studies of two principal preparation programs*. Unpublished Ph.D., The University of Texas at Austin, United States -- Texas.

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.

Fullan, M. (1985). Change process and strategies at the local level. *Elementary School Journal, 85*(3), 391-421.

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

Fullan, M. (2005). *Leadership and sustainability: System thinkers in action*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Fullan, M. G., & Miles, M. B. (1992). Getting reform right: What works and what doesn't. *Phi Delta Kappan, 73*(10), 744-752.

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.

Gigante, N. (2006). *Teacher leadership in context: Its relationship with social, material, and human resources in schools implementing reform.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ.

Glass, T. E., Bjork, L., & Bruner, C. C. (2000). *The study of the American school superintendency: A look at the superintendent of education in the new millennium.* Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Glasser, W. (1986). *Control theory in the classroom.* New York: Harper & Row.*.*

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R. E., & Mckee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Learning to lead with emotional intelligence.* Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.

Grogan, M., & Andrews, R. (2002). Defining preparation and professional development for the future. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(2), 233.

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.

Hallinger, P., & Edwards, M. A. (1992). The paradox of superintendent leadership in school restructuring. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 3*(2), 131-149.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy. J. (1986). *Instructional leadership in effective schools.* Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED309535)

Halpin, A. (1966). *School management and organization.* New York: Macmillan

Harris, A. (Ed.) (2009). *Distributed leadership. Different perspectives.* London: Springer.

Haynes, P. O. (1997). *Public school superintendents' perceptions of American Association of School Administrators professional standards and superintendent preparation programs in the state of Illinois.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois.

Hentschke, G. C., Nayfack, M. B., & Wohlstetter, P. (2009). Exploring superintendent leadership in smaller urban districts: Does district size influence superintendent behavior? *Education and Urban Society, 41*(3), 317-337.

Herzberg, F., & Mauser, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (2004). *The motivation to work.(originally published in 1959).* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishing.

Hickey, M. E. (2006). Parents, power, and the politics of school reform. In F. M. Duffy (Ed.), *Power, politics. and ethics in school districts: Dynamic leadership for systemic change* (pp. 193-206). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littleton Publishers, Inc.

Hightower, A. (2002). *San Diego's big boom: District bureaucracy supports culture of learning* (Research Report). Seattle: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.

Holler, R., & Zirkel, P. (2008). Section 504 and public schools: A national survey concerning "Section 504-only" students. *NASSP Bulletin, 92*(1), 19-43.

Honig, M. I., Copland, M. A., Rainey, L., Lorton, H. A., & Newton, M. (2010). *Central office transformation for district-wide teaching and learning improvement.* Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.

Howard, M. K. (2007). *Oklahoma's career and technical center superintendents' preception of the their preparation and the preparation of future superintendents*. Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK.

Howland, A., Anderson, J. A., Smiley, A. D., & Abbott, D. J. (2006). School liaisons: Bridging the gap between home and school. *The School Community Journal, 16*(2), 47-68.

Hoyle, J. (2007). *Leadership and futuring: Making visions happen*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press

Hoyle, J. (2005a). The standards movement in educational administration: The quest for respect. In T. Creighton, S. Harris, & J. Coleman (Eds.) *Crediting the past, challenging the present, and creating the future*. National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, Summit on the Preparation of School Leaders, Flagstaff, Arizona: Northern Arizona University Press.

Hoyle, J. (2005b, Summer). The good news about the preparation of school leaders: A professor's view. *School Leadership Review, 1*(1), 2-19.

Hoyle, J. R., Bjork, L. G., Collier, V., & Glass, T. (2005). *The superintendent as CEO: Standards-based performance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hoyle, J., & Collier, V. (2006). Urban CEO Superintendents' Alternative Strategies in Reducing School Dropouts. *Education and Urban Society, 39*(1) 69-90.

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.

Humbaugh, S. S. (2000). *A case study of the impact of the Indiana School Executive Leadership Academy as perceived by its graduates*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Ikemoto, G. S., & Marsh, J. A. (2007). Cutting through the "data-driven" mantra: Different conceptions of data-driven 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. 105-131). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Ingvarson, L. C., Anderson, M., Gronn, P., & Jackson, A. (2006). *Standards for school leadership: A critical review of the literature*. Canberra: Teaching Australia. Downloaded July 5, 2010 from www.teachingaustralia.edu.au/ta/go/home/publications/pid/301.

Iselt, C. C. (1999). *Texas superintendents' perceptions of their superintendent preparation programs: In general and by gender*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Sam Houston State University, –Huntsville, Texas.

Johnson, P. A., & Ingle, W. K. (2009). Campaign strategies and voter approval of school referenda: A mixed methods analysis. *Journal of School Public Relations, 30*(1), 51-71.

Johnson, S. M. (1996). *Leading to change: The challenge of the new superintendency*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

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.

Kamler, E. (2009). Decade of Difference (1995-2005): An examination of the superintendent search consultants' process on Long Island. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 45*(1), 115-144.

Kaufman, R., Herman, J., & Watters, K. (1996). *Educational planning: strategic, tactical, operational*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.

Kercheval, A., & Newbill, S. L. (2001). *A case study of key effective practices in Ohio's improved school districts*. Bloomington: Indiana Center for Evaluation.

King, M. B. (2004). School- and district-level leadership for teacher workforce development: Enhancing teacher learning and capacity. In M. A. Smylie & D. Miretzky (Eds.). *Developing the teacher workforce: 103rd yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I* (pp. 303-325). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Kissinger, A. (2007). Strengthening school improvement plans through district sponsorship. In D. W. Lick & C. U. Murphy (Eds.). *The whole-faculty study groups fieldbook: Lessons learned and best practices from classrooms, districts, and schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Knapp, M. S. et al. (2003). *Leading for learning sourcebook: Concepts and examples*. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.

Knapp, M. S., Copland, M. A., & Swinnerton, J. A. (2007). Understanding the promise and dynamics of data-informed leadership. In P. A. 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., Copland, M. A., Plecki, M. L. & Portin, B. S. (2006). *Leading, learning and leadership support*. Seattle: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.

Knox, K. S., & Roberts, A. R. (2005). Crisis intervention and crisis team models in schools. *Children and Schools*, *27*(2), pp 93-100.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Koschoreck, J. W. (2001). Accountability and educational equity in the transformation of an urban district. *Education and Urban Society, 33*(3), 284-304.

Kowalski, T. J. (2003). *Contemporary school administration* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Kowalski, T. J. (2004). School public relations: A new agenda. In T. J. Kowalski (Ed.), *Public relations in schools* (3rd ed., pp. 3-29) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill, Prentice Hall.

Kowalski, T. J. (2006). *The school superintendent: Theory, practice and cases*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Kowalski, T. J. (2009). Need to address evidence-based practice in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 45*(3), 351-374.

Kowalski, T., Petersen, G. J., & Fusarelli, L. (2005). *Facing an uncertain future: An investigation of the preparation and readiness of first-time superintendents to lead in a democratic society.* Retrieved on-line July 15, 2010: http://digitalcommons.calpoly.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1019&context=gse_fac

Kowalski, T., Petersen, G. J., & Fusarelli, L. D. (2009). Novice superintendents and the efficacy of professional preparation. *AASA Journal of Scholarship & Practice, 5*(4), 16-26.

Kronley, R. A., & Handley, C. (2003). *Reforming relationships: School districts, external organizations, and systemic change*. New York: School Communities That Work.

Lambert, L. (2003). *Leadership capacity for lasting school improvement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Langlois, L. (2004) Responding ethically: Complex decision-making by school district superintendents. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 32*(2), 78–93.

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.

Lawrence, S. E. (2008). *An analysis of various university-based superintendent preparation programs and their alignment with research findings, scholars' opinions, and practitioners' experience.* University of Texas, Austin, Austin, TX.

Leithwood, K. (2008). *Characteristics of high performing school districts: A review of empirical evidence.* Edmonton, AB: College of Alberta School Superintendents.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2008). Linking leadership to student learning: The contribution of leader efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(4), 496-528.

Leithwood, K., & Prestine, N. (2002). Unpacking the chllenges of leadership at the school and district level. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *Challenges of school leadership (NSSE Yearbook)*. Chicago, Il: Univesrity of Chicago Press.

Leithwood, K., & Steinbach, R. (1995). *Expert problem-solving: Evidence from school and district leaders*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. Toronto, Canada: Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement & Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Leithwood, K., Mascall, B., Strauss, T. (Eds.) (2009). *Distributed leadership according to the evidence*. New York: Routledge.

Leithwood, K., Steinbach, R., & Raun, T. (1993). Superintendents' group problem-solving processes. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 29*(3), 364-391.

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)

Lopez, G. (2006). Diversity. In F. English (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 297-300). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lopez, R. A. (2003). The Long Beach Unified School District uniform initiative: A prevention-intervention strategy for urban schools. *The Journal of Negro Education, 72*(4), 396-405.

Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (1993). *Leadership and information processing.* London: Routledge.

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.

Lupini, W., & Zirkel, P. (2003). An outcomes analysis of education litigation. *Educational Policy, 17*(2), 257-279.

Lytle, J. H. (2009). The context of superintendent entry. *School Administrator, 66*(5), 8-9.

Madda, C. L., Halverson, R. R., & Gomez, L. M. (2007). Exploring coherence as an organizational resource for carrying out reform initiatives. *Teachers College Record, 109*(8), 1957-1979.

Marsh, J. A. (2002). How districts relate to states, schools and communities: A review of emerging literature. In A. M. Hightower, M. S. Knapp, J. A. Marsh & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), *School districts and instructional renewal*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Marsh, J. A., Kerr, K. A., Ikemoto, G. S., Darilek, H., Suttorp, M., Zimmer, R. W., & Barney, H. (2005). *The role of districts in fostering instructional improvement: Lessons from three urban districts partnered with the Institute for Learning.* Santa Monica, CA: Rand Education.

Marshall, C., & Gerstl-Pepin, C. (2005). *Re-framing educational politics for social justice*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty. B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD

Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York, NY: Harper Row.

Massell, D., & Goertz, M. (2002). District strategies for building instructional capacity. In A. M. Hightower, M. Knapp, J. A. Marsh & M. McLaughlin (Eds.), *School districts and instructional renewal*. New York City, NY: Teachers College 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.

Mawhinney, H. B., Haas, J., & Wood, C. (2005). Teachers' perceptions of collective efficacy and school conditions for professional learning. Second Annual UCEA

Refereed Conference Proceedings: Convention 2005: *Democracy in Educational Leadership: The Unfinished Journey Toward Justice: http://coe.ksu.edu/ucea*.

Mayer, M. J., & Furlong, M. J. (2010). How safe are our schools? *Educational Researcher*, *39*(1), 7-15.

McCauley, C., & Hughes-James, M. W. (1996). *An evaluation of the outcomes of a leadership development program*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. New York: D. Van Nostrand.

McConnell, T. J., & Rorrer, A. K. (2009). Professional Behavior: Crossing the Line. *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership, 12*(2), 19-43.

McFadden, B. W. (2006, January/February). *The politics of adequate funding. Leadership*, 35(3), 12-15.

McKerrow, K. (1998). Administrative internships: Quality or quantity? *Journal of School Leadership, 8*(2), 171-186.

McLaughlin, M. (1990). The Rand Change Agent Study revisited: Macro perspectives and micro realities. *Educational Researcher*, *19*(9), 11-16.

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.

McLaughlin, M., & Talbert, J. (2002). Reforming districts. In A. M. Hightower, M. Knapp, J. A. Marsh & M. McLaughlin (Eds.), *School districts and instructional renewal*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

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.

Miles, K., & Frank, S. (2008). *The strategic school: Making the most of people, time and money*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Miller, 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* (pp. 167-184). New York: Teachers College Press.

Miller, T. N., Salsberry, T. A., & Devin, M. A. (2009). Power and the role of the superintendent. *Educational Considerations, 36*(2), 26-34.

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.

Milstein, M. M., Bobroff, & Restine, N. A. (1991). *Internship programs in educational administration: A guide to preparing educational leaders*. NY: Teachers College Press.

Mintzberg, H. (1994). *The rise and fall of strategic planning*. New York: The Free Press.

Murphy, J. (1990). Principal instructional leadership. In L. S. Lotto & P. Thurston (Eds.), *Advances in educational administration: Changing perspective on the school* (163-200), Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1986). The superintendent as instructional leader: Findings from effective school districts. *Journal of Educational Administration, 24*(2), 213-236.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1988). Characteristics of instructionally effective school districs. *Journal of Educational Research, 81*(3), 175-181.

Murphy, J., Elliott, S. N., Goldring, E., & Porter, A. C. (2006). *Learning-centered leadership: A conceptual foundation.* New York: The Wallace Foundation.

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.

Odden, A., & Kelly, J. (2008). *Strategic management of human capital in education*. Madison, WI: Center for Policy Research in Education.

Orr, M. T. (2006). Learning the superintendency: Socialization, negotiation, and determination. *Teachers College Record, 108*(7), 1362.

Orr, M. T. (2011).Pipeline to preparation to advancement: Graduates' experiences in, through, and beyond leadership preparation. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 47*(1), pp. 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), pp-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.

Pajak, E. F., & Glickman, C. D. (1989). Dimensions of school district improvement. *Educational Leadership,* 61-34.

Papalewis, R. (2004). T*he practice of theory to theory of practice: The prime directive.* In C. Fulmer and C. Carr (Eds) 8th Yearbook of NCPEA.

Pascopella, A. (2009). A superintendent's high expectations. *District Administration, 45*(5), 34-36.

Pink, W. T. (1986). Facilitating change at the school level: A mission factor in school reform. *Urban Review, 18*(1), 19-30.

Plecki, M. L., Knapp, M. S., Castaneda, R., Halverson, T., LaSorta, R., & Lochmiller, C. (2009). *How leaders invest staffing resources for learning improvement*. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.

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.

Price, W. J. (2001). Policy governance revisited. *School Administrator, 58*(2), 46-48,50.

Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. S. (1983). Effective schools: A review. *Elementary School Journal, 83*(4), 427-452.

Quon, P. (2006, January/February). Adequate funding: A matter of political will. *Leadership, 55*(3), 11.

Ragland, M. A., Asera, R. & Johnson, J. F. Jr. (1999). *Urgency, responsibility, efficacy: Preliminary findings of a study of high-performing Texas school districts.* Austin, TX: Charles A. Dana Center. Web site: http://www.starcenter.org/services/main.htm#product

Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press..

Razik, T., & Swanson, A. (2010) *Fundamental concepts of educational leadership and management.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Reeves, P. (2009). Permeating the culture of a state association. *School Administrator, 66*(6), 34-35.

Resnick, L., & Glennan, T. K. (2003). Leadership for learning: A theory of action for urban school districts. In A. M. Hightower, M. Knapp, J. A. Marsh & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), *School districts and instructional renewal*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Rodosky, R. J., & Munoz, M. A. (2009). Slaying myths, eliminating excuses: managing for accountability by putting kids first. *New Directions for Evaluation, 121*, 43-54.

Rorrer, A. K., Skrla, L., & Scheurich, J. J. (2008). Districts as institutional actors in educational reform. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(3), 307-358.

Ryan, J. (2006). *Inclusive leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

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. (2008). How parent liaisons can help bridge the home-school gap. The *Journal of Educational Research, 101*(5), 287-298.

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.

Scheurich, J. J., & Skrla, L. (2003). *Leadership for equity and excellence, creating high-achievement classrooms, schools, and districts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Schlechty, P. C. (1988). Leading cultural change: The CMS case. In A. Leiberman (Ed.). *Building a professional culture in schools* (pp. 185-221). New York: Teachers College 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: ASCD.

Searby, L., & Williams, C. (2007). How to survive the politics of school administration. *AASA Journal of Scholarship & Practice, 4*(3), 11-19.

Shannon, G. S., & Bylsma, P. (2004). *Characteristics of improved school districts. Themes from research*. Olympia, WA: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Sheldon, S. B. (2005). Testing a structural equation model of partnership program implementation and parent involvement. *The Elementary School Journal, 106*(2), 171-187.

Sipple, J., & Killeen, K. (2004). Context, capacity, and concern: A district-level analysis of the implementation of standards-based reform in New York State. *Educational Policy*, *18*, 456-490.

Slosson, J. (2000).Taming the budget process. *Principal Leadership 1*(3):54-57.

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.

Snipes, J., Doolittle, F., & Herlihy, C. (2002). *Foundations for success: Case studies of how urban school systems improve student achievement*. New York: MDRC, Inc.

Snyder, J. (2002). New Haven Unified School District: A teaching quality system for excellence and equity. In A. M. Hightower, M. S. Knapp, J. A. Marsh & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), *School districts and instructional renewal*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

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: ASCD.

Spillane, J. P. (2004). *Standards deviation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. CA: Corwin Press.

Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

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.

Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J.B. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher, 30*(3), 23-27.

Spring, J. H. (2005). *Political agendas for education: From the religious right to the Green Party.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Stein, M. K., & D'Amico, L. (2002). The district as a professional learning laboratory. In A. M. Hightower, M. S. Knapp, J. A. Marsh & M. W. Mclaughlin (Eds.), *School districts and instructional renewal*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Straut, D., & Calabrese, R. L. (1999). Reconstructing the internship. *Journal of School Leadership, 9*(5), 400-421.

Strayer, G. D. (1944). Professional preparation--Past and future: the education of the superintendent of schools. *Teachers College Record, 46*(3), 169-176.

Stringfield, S., Datnow, A., Ross, S. M., & Snively, F. (1998). Scaling up school restructuring in multicultural, multilingual contexts: Early observations from Sunland County. *Education and Urban Society, 3*(3), 326.

Stringfield, S., Reynolds, D., & Schaffer, E. C. (2008). Improving secondary students' academic achievement through a focus on reform reliability: 4- and 9-year findings from the High Reliability Schools Project. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 19*(4), 409-428.

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.

Theoharris, G. (2001). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *43*(2), 221-258.

Tillman, L. C. (2004). African American principals and the legacy of Brown. *Review of Research in Education*, 28, 101-146.

Togneri, W., & Anderson, S. E. (2003). *Beyond islands of excellence: What districts can do to improve instruction and achievement in all schools*. Washington, D.C.: Learning First Alliance.

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.

Ulrich, D., Zenger, J., & Smallwood, N. (1999). *Results-based leadership: How leaders build the business and improve the bottom line*. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press.

Van Houten, L. (2003). Using data for decision-making. *WestEd R&D Alert, 8* (1)

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: John Wiley.

Wallace Foundation. (2007). *A Wallace perspective: Getting principal mentoring right: Lessons from the field*. New York City: Wallace Foundation.

Wallace, R. C. (1994). Linking practice and the preparation of school administrators. In T. A. Mulkeen, N. H. Cambron-McCabe & B. J. Anderson (Eds.), *Democratic leadership: The changing context of administrative preparation* (pp. 189-200). Oxford: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Warren, M. R. (2008). Communities and schools: A new view of urban education reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 75*(2), 133-173.

Waters, J. T., & Marzano, R. J. (2006). *School district leadership that works: The effect of superintendent leadership on student achievement*. Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

Waters, T., Marzano, R. J. & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement* (Working paper). McREL.

Weiner, B. (1986). *An attributional theory of motivation and emotion.* London: Springer-Verlag.

Wendel, F. C., & Bryant, M. T. (1988). *New directions for administrator preparation.* Tempe, AZ: The University Council for Educational Administration.

West Ed (2003). *Moving leadership standards into every day work: Descriptions of practice.* San Francisco: West Ed

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.

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.

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.

Zoeller, M. F. (2002). *Leadership practices and technology competencies critical to an effective superintendent preparation program.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, Commerce, Texas.

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 competed 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."

- *l.* **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.