



Evidence of Impact of High Quality Principal Training in Illinois
Proposal Submitted to Governor Elect Rauner Education Transition Team
On Behalf of the Center for the Study of Education Policy at Illinois State University

Illinois has been working at the forefront of innovation and improvement in principal quality for quite some time, driven by research that evidences the direct impact of principals on school-wide improvements. A large body of research supports the impact of school leadership on school and student outcomes. Research by Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004) found that the quality of the principal's leadership is second only to the impact of teachers on student learning and six years later in another research study by them, they found they are even more confident about this claim (Louis, et al. 2010). Waters, Marzano, & McNulty (2003) identified leadership practices that significantly increase student achievement, but they also found that a principal can negatively impact student achievement by focusing on dysfunctional school or classroom practices. More important than these studies; however, is the work of Bryk, Sebring, et al (2010) in *Organizing Schools for Improvement*, which evidences school leadership as part of a comprehensive set of school practices and community conditions that only collectively can result in school improvement. In other words, **while high quality instruction is necessary for improved student learning in schools, high-quality school leadership creates the conditions for improving instruction**. In a 2001 survey of 40,000 teachers nationally funded by the Gates Foundation, 96 percent of teachers ranked supportive leadership as “absolutely essential” or “very important” to retaining good teachers.

Recognized for bold policy initiatives involving principal preparation and development, Illinois has received national awards and recognitions. For example, Illinois was selected by the Education Commission of the States as the recipient of the *2014 Frank Newman Award for State Innovation*. Nominated by the National Conference of State Legislators (NCSL), Illinois was recognized with this award for the collaborative efforts of the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE), Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE), and the Center for the Study of Education Policy at Illinois State University (CSEP) to engage a broad group of stakeholder in the development of rigorous program requirements for principal preparation. These efforts led to the creation of a new P-12 Principal Endorsement and the mandate that all preparation programs throughout the state apply for program approval under the new requirements, which include intensive internship requirements and competency-based assessments evidencing that principal candidates are ready to lead before they are given the license to do so.

Further recognizing this work, the National Conference of State Legislators (NCSL) released a policy brief in 2013 titled, *Preparing a Pipeline of Effective Principals: A Legislative Approach*, that featured Illinois' work in transforming school leadership preparation and support and in 2012 a webinar hosted by the National Governors Association, NCSL, and Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) focused on using policy to improve principal preparation that also featured Illinois' work. Illinois policies were also highlighted in a recent publication titled, *What Do We Know about Principal Preparation, Licensure Requirements, and Professional Development for School Leaders?*, by the Center for Enhancing Early Learning Outcomes (CEELO), which identified Illinois as the only state that has included early childhood content specifically in their licensure and accreditation processes. In 2013, the National Governors Association (NGA) published a report titled *Leading for Early Success: Building School Principals' Capacity to Lead High-Quality Early Education*, which underscored the comprehensive approach of the P-12 principal endorsement and describes how governors can build effective school leadership to promote high-quality P-3rd education.

Innovative state policy is not the only aspect of these efforts capturing national attention. Effective programs meeting and exceeding the new requirements are also gaining accolades. For example, New Leaders Chicago was selected as the Boeing 2013 Game Changer Award Recipient in the category of Education, recognizing the program and its leadership as making a visible difference in Chicagoland communities through service, leadership, and volunteerism. In 2009, New Leaders, in partnership with Chicago Public Schools, was announced a winner of the "Innovations in American Government" award from Harvard University, the first time this honor was given to a non-profit organization. The Urban Education Leadership program at the University of Illinois – Chicago was honored as the recipient of the inaugural Exemplary Educational Leadership Preparation Program Award from the University Council for Education Administration (UCEA). In 2012, UIC's program was also honored with the Schwartz Urban Education Impact Award from the Council of the Great City Colleges of Education for developing an outstanding partnership between a university and an urban school district that has had a positive and significant impact on student learning. UIC and New Leaders are two of only five principal preparation programs nationally recognized as "Exemplary" by the George W. Bush Institute. Additionally, a report by Education Development Center (EDC) recognized the strong partnership work between Illinois State University and Springfield School District to prepare a pipeline of principals.

We believe that the results of Illinois Public Act 96-0903, enacted in 2010, will scale innovation like that seen at UIC, NLNS, and ISU, to more principal preparation programs throughout the state. The statute represents a substantial overhaul of leadership preparation requirements in Illinois and includes the following key elements:

1. A narrowing of focus from the old General Administrative Certificate that was used to prepare a wide variety of administrative positions to a targeted **P-12 Principal Endorsement** designed specifically to prepare principals capable of addressing the challenges faced by today's schools;

2. Requiring program faculty to **work in partnership** with school district officials in the selection of candidates, design, delivery and continuous improvement of principal preparation programs;
3. **Selective admissions criteria** requiring aspiring candidates to demonstrate: previous leadership experiences, inter-personal skills and leadership dispositions as evidenced in the required in-person interviews, and evidence of their instructional impact on student growth;
4. A **P-12 licensure structure** that requires coursework and internship experiences that align with local and national performance standards and provide development across the P-12 continuum, including early childhood programs, elementary, middle and high schools.
5. **Course work** that address students with special needs including students with disabilities, English Language Learners, gifted students and students in early childhood programs.
6. A **performance-based internship** designed to provide the candidate with authentic leadership experiences intended to increase their proficiency in areas shown to improve student learning for all students P-12;
7. **Collaborative oversight** of candidates by a faculty supervisor and a mentor principal, and requiring both supervisors to have experience and proven records of success as school principals.

These key elements represent a paradigm shift for preparation programs from “candidate as consumer” to “district as consumer.” Moving beyond the simple outcome of program graduates securing administrative positions, the new requirements focus much needed attention on the impact principal preparation ultimately has on school improvement and student outcomes.

Pipeline Impact of Effective Principal Preparation Programs

Program requirements outlined in P.A. 096-0903 were modeled from several successful university principal preparation programs in Illinois, including work that Chicago Public Schools has done collaboratively with area universities and not-for-profit programs with demonstrable results. In 2011, Mayor Emmanuel announced the Chicago Leadership Collaborative (CLC) with the mission to recruit, train, support and retain effective principals, creating a pipeline of highly qualified leaders to meet the District's needs well into the future. The CLC, a partnership between CPS and selected principal preparation programs, is one of the recommended routes to the principalship in CPS and prepares participants to lead a school after a one-year, full time, paid internship as a leader in a school serving CPS students. Two programs that are part of the CLC and have the longest formal partnerships for preparing principals for CPS – UIC and New Leaders – can demonstrate positive impact on teaching and learning in Chicago schools.

- Though UIC and New Leaders both offer ‘small-batch’ principal preparation programs in Chicago, each producing no more than 30 candidates annually – collectively over the years they have supplied the district with over 270 of Chicago’s principals, directly impacting over 130,000 students. Indirectly, the New Leaders/UIC leadership footprint in CPS is larger still as a number of principals

from both programs have been promoted to district leadership positions, including several Network Chief Positions directly responsible for supervising principals.

- Both programs are demonstrating measurable impact on school improvement in Chicago, as evidenced below.

UIC Urban Leadership Program

- **Aspiring Principal Demographics:** UIC principal candidates reflect the diversity of students in Chicago Public Schools.
- **Outcomes:**
 - At the elementary level, UIC-led schools significantly outperform district and Illinois averages in attendance increases and ISAT gains, with particularly strong impact on schools with high poverty, high African American student enrollments.
 - At the high school level, UIC led schools outperform CPS comparison schools in “freshmen on-track” indicators, annual dropout rates, and graduation rates, recently posting 3 of the top 12 ACT gains in CPS, including the highest gaining school, Kennedy High School.
- **Placement:** Over the past decade, UIC has a 99 percent placement rate of candidates into administrative positions, 67 percent of these as principals, with a number of assistant principals now in line for the principalship.
- **Retention:** UIC has about an 85 percent retention rate, though many UIC principals that leave do so to move onto system-level leadership positions.

New Leaders

- **Aspiring Principal Demographics:** New Leaders serves students and families in CPS’s highest need schools; eighty-six percent of students served by New Leaders qualify for free or reduced lunch. New Leaders reflect the diversity, dedication, and skill needed to transform struggling public schools into places of learning. 57 percent are African-American, 24 percent are Caucasian, and 17 percent are Latino.
- **Outcomes:** The RAND Corporation conducted a comprehensive, multi-year evaluation of New Leaders that found students attending New Leaders schools outperform their peers by a statistically significant margin.
 - 20 percent of the CPS open enrollment schools deemed “transformational” by CPS in 2013 are led by New Leaders.
 - On average, according to state data, New Leaders principals increase average proficiency gains by 39 percent during their first five years in the role.
 - New Leaders-led high schools consistently outperform the district with Freshmen on Track rates and rate of student growth that historically exceed the CPS averages (not including selective enrollment high schools) and high school drop-out rates below CPS averages.
 - Nine of the 31 Gates Millennium Scholars chosen in Illinois in 2011 were students at New Leader schools representing nearly one-third of the total Chicago awardees.

- **Placement:** 99 percent of New Leaders graduates have served in school leadership positions with nearly 75 percent of New Leaders still serving as principals within four years of finishing the program, a percentage far higher than national averages for principal training programs.
- **Retention:** On average, New Leader principals were more likely to stay in their school for three or more years as compared to other newly placed principals.
- **District Benefits:** The RAND evaluation also found that the benefits of partnering with New Leaders can extend beyond the schools led by a New Leader, improving others schools and the district as a whole. District partners reported that New Leaders provided valuable information to the district on effective management of principals and influenced their leadership standards, principal selection criteria, principal evaluation, and principal support. The same is likely true for UIC principals.

Impact on School Improvement and Student Learning

A closer examination of the work in CPS shows that CPS students at almost all grades and demographics have made gains compared to children from the rest of the state (see tables in Appendix A, which provide comparative data between CPS (CHI) and Illinois (outside of CPS data) for 3rd, 5th, and 8th grade state ISAT tests, including a breakdown by student demographics. Highlighted in green are areas where CPS students were outperforming students in other parts of the state. The pink highlighted areas show where CPS students were underperforming compared to students in other parts of the state. The tan highlighted sections show areas where there was no statistic difference. Looking at the second table, which uses the same data comparisons but with 2012 data, shows that CPS students were either outperforming students from other parts of the state or were equal.

Using this data, you cannot make a direct correlation to the impact that school leaders in CPS have had on the gains in student achievement, but this question is worth exploring and will be studied further by researchers at UIC. Is there evidence of the contribution that school principals have made with increased state test scores in CPS? If so, can we achieve similar results by placing more high quality leaders in schools throughout Illinois – a result that is possible with successful implementation of the principal preparation reform work through Public Act 096-0903? We want to know.

As universities have not yet graduated any new candidates from their new P-12 Principal Preparation programs, the full scale outcomes of the work are yet to be seen, but will be studied. In implementing this work statewide, our goal is that the teaching and learning trends that have been seen in Chicago Public School will be common place to schools throughout the state. Yet, the implementation of the new legislation cannot be left to chance.

In fall 2014, with funding from The Wallace Foundation and the McCormick Foundation, ISBE and IBHE launched a new Illinois School Leadership Advisory Council (ISLAC) that will serve as a strategic planning group to continue to strengthen leadership development and support in the state. The final product of this Council will be a statewide five-year action plan designed to support school leader preparation efforts in place and the documented impact on school performance statewide. In addition to this Council, the McCormick and Wallace Foundations are also funding a research study of the implementation of the new principal preparation programs in Illinois conducted by the Illinois Education Research Council of SIUE and the University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research. The study, Illinois Principal Preparation Implementation Review Project (I-PREP), began fall 2014 and will continue through the spring of 2016. Through the study, researchers will collect information from Illinois stakeholders in higher education, public schools, and the community who have a role in the newly redesigned principal preparation programs and policies regarding the implementation of Illinois' new principal preparation program requirements and as well as the potential strengths and challenges of the new guidelines and policies. The results of the review will help principal preparation programs and their partners improve their implementation of the new guidelines, as well as inform and strengthen education policymaking in Illinois.

Both the report and recommendations from the Illinois School Leadership Advisory Council (anticipated June 2015) and the I-PREP study (anticipated Spring 2016, though preliminary results may be available sooner) will be shared with Governor Rauner and his staff in hopes that we can forge partnerships in supporting the preparation and continued development of principals throughout the state. Any questions about content in this document may be directed to Dr. Erika Hunt, Senior Policy Analyst and Researcher at the Center for the Study of Education Policy, at elhunt@ilstu.edu or by calling 309/438-2725.

APPENDIX A: Comparative ISAT Data Between CPS students (CHI) and Students Outside of CPS (ILLxCHI)

Green = areas where CPS students are outperforming compared to students in other parts of the state

Pink = areas where CPS students were underperforming compared to students in other parts of the state

Tan = areas where there was no statistic difference

2001

Grade 3

Grade 5

Grade 8

AFRICAN AMERICAN	READING				MATH				READING				MATH				READING				MATH			
	Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male	
Free/Reduced Lunch	ILLxCHI	CHI																						
ELIGIBLE	153	147	150	147	154	148	153	149	150	150	148	147	153	150	152	148	148	150	146	148	149	150	147	148
95% Confidence Interval	0.36	0.28	0.36	0.26	0.36	0.28	0.37	0.24	0.37	0.26	0.39	0.28	0.38	0.25	0.42	0.28	0.36	0.25	0.39	0.28	0.44	0.31	0.49	0.33
Combined Confidence Interval (+/-)	0.64		0.62		0.63		0.61		0.64		0.67		0.63		0.69		0.60		0.67		0.76		0.82	
Difference in Average Scale Scores	-5.36		-3.38		-5.78		-4.50		-0.68		-0.88		-2.68		-3.28		2.35		1.73		1.00		0.75	
Free/Reduced Lunch	ILLxCHI	CHI																						
NOT ELIGIBLE	156	154	153	150	157	154	156	151	155	155	152	151	157	155	155	152	152	154	150	150	154	154	152	150
95% Confidence Level	0.44	0.84	0.42	0.86	0.44	0.82	0.43	0.81	0.43	0.88	0.43	0.86	0.45	0.91	0.46	0.85	0.35	0.67	0.37	0.69	0.47	0.90	0.49	0.88
Combined Confidence Interval (+/-)	1.3		1.3		1.3		1.2		1.3		1.3		1.4		1.3		1.0		1.1		1.4		1.4	
Difference in Mean Scale Scores	-2.8		-3.0		-3.3		-4.3		-0.5		-1.2		-2.4		-3.3		1.4		-0.5		0.7		-2.4	

LATINO	READING				MATH				READING				MATH				READING				MATH			
	Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male	
Free/Reduced Lunch	ILLxCHI	CHI																						
ELIGIBLE	154	154	153	152	157	155	159	155	150	151	150	150	155	153	155	153	149	151	148	151	153	153	153	153
95% Confidence Interval	0.58	0.47	0.58	0.47	0.57	0.45	0.60	0.46	0.47	0.34	0.46	0.36	0.49	0.34	0.51	0.38	0.47	0.32	0.47	0.34	0.59	0.40	0.60	0.43
Combined Confidence Interval (+/-)	1.06		1.05		1.02		1.06		0.81		0.82		0.83		0.89		0.78		0.81		0.99		1.04	
Difference in Mean Scale Scores	-0.20		-1.28		-2.10		-3.72		0.24		0.12		-1.78		-2.17		1.71		2.44		-0.11		0.56	
Free/Reduced Lunch	ILLxCHI	CHI																						
NOT ELIGIBLE	159	159	157	157	161	160	161	160	156	158	155	155	161	159	161	159	154	156	153	154	158	158	158	156
95% Confidence Level	0.56	1.43	0.53	1.35	0.55	1.42	0.54	1.35	0.53	1.30	0.52	1.32	0.54	1.39	0.56	1.40	0.43	1.12	0.45	1.20	0.56	1.44	0.60	1.54
Combined Confidence Interval (+/-)	1.99		1.88		1.97		1.89		1.83		1.84		1.93		1.95		1.55		1.65		2.00		2.14	
Difference in Mean Scale Scores	-0.11		-0.17		-0.69		-1.82		1.57		0.20		-1.65		-2.24		1.88		1.17		-0.09		-1.50	

WHITE	READING				MATH				READING				MATH				READING				MATH			
	Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male	
Free/Reduced Lunch	ILLxCHI	CHI																						
ELIGIBLE	159	158	157	156	161	160	161	160	157	157	156	155	160	160	161	158	153	155	152	154	158	158	157	158
95% Confidence Interval	0.33	1.06	0.33	1.04	0.33	1.07	0.33	1.09	0.36	0.97	0.36	1.00	0.36	1.01	0.38	1.09	0.35	0.83	0.37	0.84	0.47	1.12	0.49	1.17
Combined Confidence Interval (+/-)	1.39		1.37		1.39		1.42		1.33		1.37		1.38		1.47		1.18		1.21		1.59		1.66	
Difference in Mean Scale Scores	-0.80		-1.49		-0.88		-1.74		0.27		-1.02		-0.41		-2.24		1.77		1.47		0.48		1.05	
Free/Reduced Lunch	ILLxCHI	CHI																						
NOT ELIGIBLE	167	168	165	165	169	169	170	169	166	167	165	165	171	169	171	169	162	165	161	161	169	169	170	169
95% Confidence Level	0.14	1.14	0.13	1.04	0.14	1.16	0.14	1.08	0.14	1.12	0.14	1.14	0.15	1.20	0.15	1.24	0.12	1.01	0.12	0.96	0.16	1.36	0.18	1.36
Combined Confidence Interval (+/-)	1.28		1.17		1.30		1.22		1.26		1.29		1.35		1.39		1.13		1.09		1.52		1.54	
Difference in Mean Scale Scores	0.59		-0.36		0.00		-0.73		1.31		0.29		-1.17		-2.15		3.08		0.74		0.31		-0.44	

Grade 3

Grade 5

Grade 8

AFRICAN AMERICAN	READING				MATH				READING				MATH				READING				MATH			
	Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male	
Free/Reduced Lunch ELIGIBLE	ILLxCHI	CHI																						
	221	221	214	214	225	227	222	224	221	221	214	214	225	227	222	224	242	246	235	239	259	264	255	260
95% Confidence Interval	0.58	0.62	0.58	0.65	0.60	0.66	0.62	0.68	0.58	0.62	0.58	0.65	0.60	0.66	0.62	0.68	0.40	0.49	0.43	0.51	0.50	0.64	0.53	0.67
Combined Confidence Interval (+/-)	1.20		1.23		1.26		1.29		1.20		1.23		1.26		1.29		0.88		0.94		1.14		1.20	
Difference in Average Scale Scores	-0.44		-0.55		2.56		1.66		-0.44		-0.55		2.56		1.66		3.83		4.71		5.14		5.56	
Free/Reduced Lunch NOT ELIGIBLE	ILLxCHI	CHI																						
	233	241	224	232	237	246	233	242	233	241	224	232	237	246	233	242	251	259	243	252	270	279	266	274
95% Confidence Level	1.16	2.73	1.13	2.68	1.28	2.92	1.28	3.15	1.16	2.73	1.13	2.68	1.28	2.92	1.28	3.15	0.65	1.80	0.64	1.98	0.89	2.70	0.91	2.66
Combined Confidence Interval (+/-)	3.89		3.81		4.20		4.43		3.89		3.81		4.20		4.43		2.45		2.62		3.59		3.57	
Difference in Mean Scale Scores	8.53		7.60		9.24		9.42		8.53		7.60		9.24		9.42		8.69		8.76		8.84		7.77	

LATINO	READING				MATH				READING				MATH				READING				MATH			
	Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male	
Free/Reduced Lunch ELIGIBLE	ILLxCHI	CHI																						
	223	224	218	219	231	233	231	233	223	224	218	219	231	233	231	233	245	250	241	244	265	271	264	269
95% Confidence Interval	0.47	0.62	0.48	0.61	0.50	0.65	0.52	0.67	0.47	0.62	0.48	0.61	0.50	0.65	0.52	0.67	0.40	0.49	0.43	0.51	0.50	0.64	0.53	0.67
Combined Confidence Interval (+/-)	1.09		1.09		1.16		1.19		1.09		1.09		1.16		1.19		0.88		0.94		1.14		1.20	
Difference in Mean Scale Scores	0.39		0.78		1.70		1.82		0.39		0.78		1.70		1.82		4.38		3.08		5.74		4.69	
Free/Reduced Lunch NOT ELIGIBLE	ILLxCHI	CHI																						
	236	244	230	237	243	249	242	251	236	244	230	237	243	249	242	251	254	262	249	258	275	285	274	285
95% Confidence Level	0.85	2.71	0.82	2.53	0.96	2.91	0.98	2.81	0.85	2.71	0.82	2.53	0.96	2.91	0.98	2.81	0.65	1.80	0.64	1.98	0.89	2.70	0.91	2.66
Combined Confidence Interval (+/-)	3.56		3.35		3.87		3.79		3.56		3.35		3.87		3.79		2.45		2.62		3.59		3.57	
Difference in Mean Scale Scores	7.98		7.62		5.84		9.64		7.98		7.62		5.84		9.64		8.08		9.09		9.91		10.80	

WHITE	READING				MATH				READING				MATH				READING				MATH			
	Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male	
Free/Reduced Lunch ELIGIBLE	ILLxCHI	CHI																						
	231	236	226	227	236	244	237	243	231	236	226	227	236	244	237	243	249	259	243	250	268	284	267	277
95% Confidence Interval	0.46	2.58	0.46	2.16	0.50	2.53	0.51	2.49	0.46	2.58	0.46	2.16	0.50	2.53	0.51	2.49	0.38	1.89	0.43	1.78	0.48	2.58	0.53	2.40
Combined Confidence Interval (+/-)	3.04		2.62		3.03		3.00		3.04		2.62		3.03		3.00		2.27		2.21		3.06		2.94	
Difference in Mean Scale Scores	5.41		1.86		7.63		6.14		5.41		1.86		7.63		6.14		10.46		7.11		15.52		9.61	
Free/Reduced Lunch NOT ELIGIBLE	ILLxCHI	CHI																						
	248	256	241	250	256	265	256	266	248	256	241	250	256	265	256	266	262	273	256	266	288	303	287	298
95% Confidence Level	0.29	2.21	0.27	2.02	0.34	2.44	0.35	2.39	0.29	2.21	0.27	2.02	0.34	2.44	0.35	2.39	0.23	1.84	0.23	1.88	0.32	2.58	0.34	2.72
Combined Confidence Interval (+/-)	2.50		2.29		2.78		2.74		2.50		2.29		2.78		2.74		2.07		2.11		2.91		3.06	
Difference in Mean Scale Scores	8.64		8.92		9.73		10.23		8.64		8.92		9.73		10.23		10.49		9.26		15.07		11.46	