



Redesigning Principal Preparation and Development for the Next Generation:  
Lessons From Illinois

By:

Debra Baron and Alicia Haller  
Center for the Study of Education Policy  
at Illinois State University

2014. This publication was supported in part by grants from The Wallace Foundation, McCormick Foundation, and the U.S. Department of Education School Leadership Program. Further, this report would not have been possible without the sustained contributions of individuals and organizations involved in the statewide collaborative effort to improve leadership preparation and development in Illinois.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since 2000, Illinois has pursued an ambitious goal to strengthen principal preparation. This is a vital goal, as research has demonstrated that an effective principal is the key factor in improving schools and increasing student achievement. Through the work of numerous statewide committees and consortia, with funding support from several foundations, and with leadership at the state, regional, and institutional levels, this goal is coming to fruition in Illinois.

The multiple recommendations that emerged from collaborative efforts over time prompted the passage in 2010 of Illinois Public Act 96-0903. The statute represents a substantial overhaul of leadership preparation requirements in Illinois and includes the following key elements:

- A targeted principal endorsement, instead of a general administrative certificate;
- Formal partnerships between principal preparation programs and school districts in the design, delivery, and continuous improvement process;
- Selective admissions criteria for candidates in principal endorsement programs;
- A P-12 licensure (adding Prekindergarten to the leadership training);
- A performance-based internship with competency-based assessments; and a
- Collaborative support structure for candidates during their internship provided by both faculty supervisors and mentor principals.

This paper provides substantial detail regarding the processes and mechanisms employed, the organizations involved in various collaborative efforts, and the recommendations that led to such transformative changes. Over the past several years, preparation programs have been engaged in redesign efforts based on the new licensure requirements. Currently, many are offering robust and innovative programs that provide a broad range of authentic leadership experiences for principal candidates. Illinois has been recognized nationally for the policy reforms that have led to these improvements.

While still in the early phase of implementation, most recognize there is more work to be done. To that end, the newly convened Illinois School Leadership Advisory Council (ISLAC) will work to formulate a 5-year strategic plan, addressing outstanding implementation issues. The Council will work through five “study teams” to make recommendations regarding:

- Network supports and resources,
- Program cohesion and continuous improvement,
- Quality assurance,
- Regional and district partnerships, and
- Training and support for mentors and supervisors.

Once again, policy-makers, researchers, and practitioners from multiple stakeholder organizations will collaborate, as they have done so often and so well in the past, to continue the process of improving the capacity of principals to effectively lead schools.

### **Redesigning Principal Preparation and Development for the Next Generation: Lessons From Illinois**

## I. Introduction

Illinois has been working at the forefront of innovation and improvement in principal quality for quite some time. Recognized for bold policy initiatives involving principal preparation and development, Illinois has recently 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*<sup>1</sup>. Nominated by the National Conference of State Legislators (NCSL), the submission included a joint letter of support from two teachers unions in Illinois, noting that “both the Illinois Education Association (IEA) and Illinois Federation of Teachers (IFT) were involved and instrumental in each step of the work because we know that the success of our teachers depends greatly on the quality of the school principals that supervise and support them.” The award emphasized 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 stakeholders in the development of rigorous program requirements for principal preparation. These efforts led to the creation of a new licensure structure including a P-12 Principal Endorsement and the requirement that all preparation programs throughout the state apply for program approval under the new requirements.

Others at the national level have also highlighted the bold policy work in Illinois. The National Conference of State Legislators (NCSL) released a policy brief in 2013, *Preparing a Pipeline of Effective Principals: A Legislative Approach*<sup>2</sup>, that features Illinois’ work in transforming school leadership preparation and support. In 2012, a webinar hosted by the National Governors Association, NCSL, and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)<sup>3</sup> focused on using policy to improve principal preparation that also featured Illinois’ work. Furthermore, Illinois policies were highlighted in a recent publication, *What Do We Know about Principal Preparation, Licensure Requirements, and Professional Development for School Leaders?*<sup>4</sup> issued by the Center for Enhancing Early Learning Outcomes, which identifies 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, *Leading for Early Success: Building School Principals’ Capacity to Lead High-Quality Early Education*<sup>5</sup>, which also underscores the comprehensive approach of the P-12 principal endorsement and describes how governors can build effective school leadership to promote high-quality P-3<sup>rd</sup> 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, recently the Urban Education Leadership program at the University of Illinois – Chicago (UIC) was selected 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 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. Additionally, a report by Education Development Center (EDC)<sup>6</sup> recognizes

the strong partnership work between Illinois State University and Springfield School District to prepare a pipeline of principals.

Innovative programs can be found throughout the state, and are due in large part to Illinois Public Act 96-0903, which was enacted in 2010. 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 **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 design, delivery, and continuous improvement of principal preparation programs;
3. **Selective admissions criteria** requiring aspiring candidates to submit evidence of increasing student growth, demonstrate previous leadership experiences, and possess exemplary inter-personal skills as evidenced in the required in-person interviews;
4. **P-12 licensure structure** that requires coursework and internship experiences be aligned to local and national performance standards and provides development across the P-12 continuum;
5. **Performance-based internship** designed to provide the candidates with authentic leadership experiences intended to increase their proficiency in areas shown to improve student learning;
6. **Competency-based assessment** system aligned to both the Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards and the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) 13 critical success factors; and
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, moving them from a focus on “candidate as consumer” to “district as consumer.” These changes require programs to move beyond the focus on a single program outcome – graduates securing administrative positions – to the actual impact the principal candidate ultimately has on school improvement and student outcomes. Illinois has made significant strides and has much to be proud of in passing legislation aimed at achieving this paradigm shift. However, a great deal of work remains as we progress through the initial implementation and improvement phase.

While the recent spotlight on the significant changes made to principal preparation in Illinois may lead one to believe that these accomplishments occurred overnight, the reality is that practitioners and policymakers throughout Illinois have been engaged in these efforts for the better part of 15 years. One stakeholder interviewed cautioned those involved about celebrating too early in the process, as it is too soon to tell how implementation is going and what impact it will have. His comment drives home an important lesson that has been learned in this process: the policy implementation phase requires every bit as much effort and attention as the policy formation phase received.

In order to capitalize on the work that has previously been accomplished during the policy formation phase and support these newly resigned programs, ISBE and IBHE have convened a new group for the purpose of exploring opportunities and challenges identified during the implementation phase. The newly formed Illinois School Leadership Advisory Council (ISLAC) is funded by The Wallace Foundation and the McCormick Foundation and will be staffed by representatives from CSEP at Illinois State University. ISLAC will serve as a strategic planning group charged with strengthening school leadership through a variety of supports. The final outcome of ISLAC efforts will be the development of a statewide, five-year action plan designed to support school leader preparation and development efforts and to document the impact of the principal preparation program redesign efforts on school and leader performance.<sup>7</sup>

This paper is intended to summarize the foundation from which ISLAC is moving forward, by reflecting on the history and context in which changes in principal preparation practices have taken place over the past nearly 15 years. The paper has been developed by reviewing minutes, reports, and other artifacts from various collaborations dating back to the beginning of the reform effort in 2000. In addition, this summary incorporates reflections from 20 key people who have been instrumental to the effort. The paper describes the history and timeline of the work, including the various committees and stakeholder groups and their accomplishments, as well as an account of the legislative and rules process. The paper also brings in the voices of the stakeholders and their reflections on the levers of change that made this work successful. Finally, the paper ends by introducing the initial work to be done by ISLAC and its charge to develop an action plan to continue to strengthen and support leadership development in Illinois.

## **II. Reform Efforts In School Leader Preparation and Development 2000-2014**

In 2000, The Wallace Foundation recognized the need to better train and support principals as an important but marginalized issue and decided to commit sizable resources to move this issue up on the national education reform agenda. Wallace awarded a statewide grant to CSEP at Illinois State University, which launched the State Action for Education Leadership Project (SAELP). Because astute leaders in Illinois acted quickly, Illinois became one of the original 15 SAELP states. In 2001, Springfield Public School District #186 was selected as one of the first ten school districts to be awarded one of The Wallace Foundation Leadership for Educational Achievement in Districts (LEAD) grant. These Wallace-funded initiatives focused on the establishment of strong partnerships among school districts, state education agencies, and universities. They were specifically aimed at improving school leadership preparation and development.

In 2001, the **Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership** was convened by CSEP, to serve as the first IL-SAELP advisory body (see Appendix A). The 35-member group represented state agencies, statewide administrator and teacher organizations, business leaders, and administrators of demonstration school districts. To provide a baseline of data from which to operate, over the course of three years IL-SAELP staff conducted research regarding the condition of school leadership preparation and development in Illinois. The data collection and analysis efforts included conducting surveys and interviews of superintendents, principals, and

principal preparation program faculty members, and explored existing data reported to the state by programs and schools. Education policy options being employed or developed across the country were explored to learn more about how to strengthen leadership for learning by local school boards, superintendents, principals, and teacher leaders. In its culminating report, issued in March 2004, *Leadership for Learning: Strengthening Policies on Education Leadership on Behalf of Illinois Schools*,<sup>7</sup> the Consortium outlined an action plan that contained seven broad policy recommendations, along with nearly three-dozen program recommendations to strengthen instructional leadership for learning. With regard to principal preparation, the report states:

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

- 1) The State Board of Education, in cooperation with the Illinois Principals Association and the Illinois Council of Professors of Educational Administration, should convene a task force with representatives from practicing principals and other groups to develop a standards-based *core curriculum* that focuses on leadership for learning in schools for the preparation of beginning principals in Illinois. The core curriculum should reflect at least the criteria specified in the report.
- 2) Simultaneously, the State Board of Education, in cooperation with the Illinois Principals Association, the Illinois Council of Professors of Educational Administration, and other groups should convene a task force to design a *culminating internship* of supervised practical experiences for principal candidates that meets at least the criteria specified in the report.
- 3) At the conclusion of the first two recommendations, the State Board of Education, in cooperation with the Illinois Board of Higher Education, and the State Teacher Certification Board, should seek to *amend the Illinois School Code* (Section 21-7.1, on Administrative Certificate) to reflect the above recommendations for a core curriculum for beginning principals and the culminating principal internship and revise the state regulations for program approval accordingly.
- 4) The State Board of Education, in cooperation with the Illinois Board of Higher Education, should *establish a state system of support for full-time internship* experiences for future principals. Initial steps toward this end should include those specified in the report.
- 5) The Illinois State Board of Education, in cooperation with other groups, should *identify and disseminate models* for delivery of principal preparation programs that meet at least the criteria specified in the report.

In 2004, the **IL-SAELP Executive Committee** was convened by CSEP as part of The Wallace Foundation grant to serve as its advisory board to the statewide grant. The 14-member group was initially chaired by Dr. Stanley O. Ikenberry, President Emeritus of the University of Illinois and the American Council on Education (ACE). Norm Durflinger, CSEP Director, succeeded Ikenberry. The Executive Committee included membership from the Governor's Office, legislators from each of the four caucuses, the State Superintendent, Executive Director of the Board of Higher Education, state teachers' unions, state principals' association, Chicago

Public Schools, the business roundtable, and the Large Unit District Association (see Appendix B). The Executive Committee met annually through 2011 to provide input on moving the action plans forward. They were also briefed about upcoming IL-SAELP activities and were kept informed about all of the Wallace-funded initiatives taking place in Illinois.

In November 2004, to expand membership to a larger reach of stakeholders across the state, the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership became the **IL-SAELP Consortium**, which was made up of over 120 members representing 15 state and national K-12 and higher education organizations, 12 Illinois school districts (including Chicago Public Schools and rural districts), and 13 public and private universities located around the state (see Appendix C). Throughout the project, open invitations were made for individuals to join the Consortium, as it sought to serve as an inclusive body where information could be shared and diverse perspectives and ideas could be expressed. From its inception in late 2004, participants were divided into working groups to discuss implementation of the recommendations in the IL-SAELP report completed earlier that year. The initial IL-SAELP Consortium working committees were: 1) School Code; 2) Legislative; 3) Leadership Routes for National Board Certified Teachers; 4) Administrative Preparation; 5) Administrative Professional Development; 6) School Leadership Networks; and 7) Assessment. While the Consortium as a whole would sometimes meet monthly and at other times less frequently, much of the IL-SAELP work was accomplished through its committees. Full consortium meetings were used to share information about the work of the committees to keep everyone in this emerging network informed. Additionally, meetings generally featured guest speakers involved in Wallace-funded projects from around the country (such as Kathy O’Neil from SREB, and Lois Adams Rodgers from Council of Chief State School Officers). Also as part of this work, Chicago Public Schools and Springfield School District served as demonstration districts for the IL-SAELP work, while organizations such as the Large Unit District Association (LUDA) and Consortium for Education Change (CEC) worked with their member districts to further IL-SAELP’s strategies, including piloting a new principal coaching model and the School Administrative Manager (SAM) initiative.

At the beginning of the IL-SAELP Consortium’s work, in March 2005, Dr. Art Levine, former President of Teachers College at Columbia University, released a report—the first in a series of policy papers on the education of educators—that scrutinized university-based principal preparation programs based on a four-year study of leadership programs at schools of education across the country<sup>8</sup>. The project was funded by the Annenberg Foundation, Ford Foundation, Ewing Marion Kaufmann Foundation, and The Wallace Foundation. The report included nine criteria for judging principal preparation programs (see Table 1).

**Table 1: *Nine Criteria for Judging Principal Preparation Programs (Levine 2005)***

<b>1. Purpose</b>	The program’s purpose is explicit, focusing on the education of practicing school leaders; goals reflect the needs of today’s leaders, schools, and children; and the definition of success is tied to student learning in the schools administered by the program graduates.
<b>2. Curricular Coherence</b>	The curriculum mirrors program purposes and goals. The curriculum is rigorous, coherent, and organized to teach the skills and knowledge needed by leaders at specific types of schools and at the various stages of their careers.
<b>3. Curricular Balance</b>	The curriculum integrates the theory and practice of administration,

	balancing study in university classrooms and work in schools with successful practitioners.
<b>4. Faculty Composition</b>	The faculty includes academics and practitioners who are expert in school leadership, up to date in their field, intellectually productive, and firmly rooted in both the academy and the schools. Taken as a whole, the faculty's size and fields of expertise are aligned with the curriculum and student enrollment.
<b>5. Admissions</b>	Admissions criteria are designed to recruit students with the capacity and motivation to become successful school leaders.
<b>6. Degrees</b>	Graduation standards are high and the degrees awarded are appropriate to the profession.
<b>7. Research</b>	Research carried out in the program is of high quality, driven by practice, and useful to practitioners and/or policy makers.
<b>8. Finances</b>	Resources are adequate to support the program.
<b>9. Assessment</b>	The program engages in continuing self-assessment and improvement of its performance.

The study by Levine (2005) found that the majority of principal preparation programs suffer from curricular disarray, low admissions and graduation standards, weak faculty, inadequate clinical instruction, inappropriate degrees, and poor research. In fact, Levine described the work of education leadership programs as “a race to the bottom,” that existed as “a competition among school leadership programs to produce more degrees faster, easier, and more cheaply” (p. 24). Of the over 500 schools and departments of education offering degree-granting graduate programs for school administrators at the time of the study, Levine reported that he could locate only a small number of strong programs in the United States, although none were considered exemplary. The most promising model found in the study was the National College for School Leadership (NCSL) in England.

The release of the Levine report depicting the dismal condition of principal preparation across the country increased the sense of urgency with the IL-SAELP work. In response to that report, in August 2005, the Illinois Board of Higher Education awarded CSEP a Higher Education Cooperation Act (HECA) state grant to convene the **Commission on School Leader Preparation in Illinois Colleges and Universities**. This marked a critical shift in the efforts to improve leadership preparation in Illinois, as it was the first time a group of stakeholders was convened by a state agency, and not just as a requirement of a grant. Referred to as “the Commission,” its culminating report has been described as the Illinois Levine Study. The Commission was co-chaired by Dianne Ashby (ISU) and Dea Meyer (Civic Committee of the Commercial Club of Chicago and IBHE board member). The 26-member Commission was comprised of representatives from numerous education stakeholder groups (see Appendix D). It undertook a comprehensive analysis of the state of affairs in Illinois educational administration programs at both public and private institutions. The Commission met three times in 2005 as a working study group, bringing in national experts—Arthur Levine, Betty Hale, and Michelle Young—to provide a national perspective on the state of educational leadership programs. Commission members then considered national findings in relation to data collected on programs in Illinois. Hearings were held in Chicago and Springfield where various stakeholders presented testimonies about the state of leadership preparation programs in Illinois, the challenges faced by current programs, and suggested recommendations for improvement. In addition to testimony, the Commission was presented with findings from accreditation reviews conducted by the



National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)<sup>9</sup>. The NCATE findings included the identification of strengths and weaknesses gleaned from an exploration of data at both the national and local levels. The Commission discussed all of the information available to them and submitted its final report, *School Leader Preparation: A Blueprint for Change*<sup>10</sup>, to IBHE in August 2006. The Commission report included the following goals and recommendations (see Table 2):

**Table 2: School Leader Preparation: A Blueprint for Change - Recommendations**

<b>Goal One: Recruit Strategically</b>	Recommendation One: Restructure Admission Criteria and Recruit High Quality Principals
<b>Goal Two: Focus Preparation Programs</b>	Recommendation Two: Improve Programs Using Rigorous Assessment Data Recommendation Three: Create Meaningful Clinical and Internship Experiences
<b>Goal Three: Improve Statewide Assessment and Coordination</b>	Recommendation Four: Establish a Rigorous Certification Exam Recommendation Five: Revise the Certification and Endorsement Structure Recommendation Six: Coordinate a Rigorous Program Review and Approval Process

Funded and commissioned by IBHE, ownership and support for the Commission was mainly centered at IBHE. However, the former ISBE State Superintendent served on the Commission and staffing support was provided by IBHE and CSEP. As a result, the Commission report mainly focused on conceptual recommendations without an action plan for how the state could develop comprehensive policy changes to bring the recommendations to fruition. While IBHE’s role in convening the group was a substantial shift in terms of increasing the political will for change, the Commission lacked the full engagement of the regulatory structures found within the ISBE. Oversight of the state’s licensure structures and exams, outlined in the Illinois School Code, fell within ISBE’s purview. Without changes to the School Code, the Commission’s report would be viewed as optional recommendations. While the Commission’s recommendations were supported by research, broader stakeholder engagement and the inclusion of a much needed policy lever was required to ensure the adoption of these recommendations in the form of state regulations.

Upon taking his position as Illinois State Superintendent in December 2006, Dr. Christopher Koch suggested to the IBHE Executive Director, Judy Erwin, that collective efforts to improve school leader preparation would greatly benefit from a legislatively commissioned Task Force charged specifically with developing strategies for the implementation of the Commission recommendations. Both IBHE and ISBE leaders were instrumental in moving this work forward. Bringing the combined voice of the two regulatory agencies together to work on this issue made the topic of leadership preparation a real priority in the state. As a result, the **Illinois School Leader Task Force** was convened in 2007, after the Illinois General Assembly passed unanimous resolutions supporting its creation. HJR66 and SJR56 established that ISBE, IBHE, and the Office of the Governor would jointly appoint a task force charged with developing an action plan to improve school leader preparation in the State of Illinois. Chaired

by Steve Tozer, a professor at UIC, the Illinois School Leader Task Force was comprised of 28 members, representing public and private universities, public school districts, teachers unions, professional associations, both chambers of the state legislature, ISBE, and IBHE (see Appendix E). Operation of the Task Force (fiscal oversight, administration of meetings, management of workflow, etc.) was supported by staff from CSEP, along with staff from IBHE and ISBE. The design of the task force as a co-commissioned effort by both education agencies set the course for the future success of this work.

Agenda setting for the IL School Leader Task Force was the responsibility of the Chair, with input from the members. The Task Force began with a tension between two matters of fact: first, strong principals can have a significant impact on student learning, and second, that the learning outcomes of Illinois schools, taken as a whole, were unsatisfactory. Therefore, the question around which the Task Force organized its work was how to prepare principals who could be expected to improve student learning in Illinois. The Task Force met, in person, six times between 2007 and 2008. Members reviewed existing and emerging research and data on principal preparation practices and outcomes. Despite the variety of perspectives and roles represented, the Task Force arrived at a consensus and developed three overarching recommendations involving 1) state policy, 2) university/district partnerships, and 3) principal preparation and assessment. Specifically:

- 1) Enact **rigorous standards for certification** that provide a comprehensive approach to leadership development by aligning formal preparation programs with early career mentoring, ongoing professional development, and master principal designation in line with the new standards, so that by 2013 all new principal preparation would be taking place through programs approved under new standards.
- 2) Require **universities to formally engage school district(s)** in the design, delivery, and assessment of principal preparation programs.
- 3) Design **an approval and oversight system** to ensure programs demonstrate that they develop and rigorously assess the aspiring principals' competencies that are most likely to improve student learning in PK-12 schools.

The *Illinois School Leader Task Force Report to the Illinois General Assembly*<sup>11</sup> detailed the proposed systemic changes that aligned to the overarching recommendations. In response, the General Assembly directed ISBE and IBHE to work collaboratively with Task Force members and other stakeholders in the development of new requirements for an improved standards-based program approval process and oversight/reporting procedure for all principal preparation programs in the State of Illinois.

At the same time that the School Leader Taskforce work was being completed, CSEP was approached by the McCormick Foundation about an area they were interested in pursuing. Repeatedly in their work with schools, program officers from the McCormick Foundation had found that school leaders – primarily principals – were providing real barriers to state efforts to better align early learning and K-12 schools. According to the Director of Education Programs at the McCormick Foundation:

We [McCormick Foundation] came to this issue because research tells us that leadership is important to school climate and outcomes and research also tells us that early childhood

experiences are important to good outcomes. Illinois is a state that is rich with expertise on both of these issues but we have never integrated them. At the same time, we also knew that although the number of schools with early childhood classrooms was increasing, there were few principals with early childhood teaching degrees or experiences. We also know that we have an increasing number of ELLs [English Language Learners] and too few teachers and leaders with training to provide a quality education to those students. We searched until we found partners who had interest and experience in these issues: leadership and early childhood. We turned to UIC and ISU.

As such, the McCormick Foundation was interested in convening a statewide committee to explore the role of leadership in aligning early learning and K-12 systems and approached CSEP based on their work with school leadership. In 2008, the Leadership to Integrate the Learning Continuum (LINC) Advisory Group was convened by CSEP and funded by the McCormick Foundation. It was charged with making recommendations for bridging the state's system of early learning with the K-12 system through improved school leadership. The 50-member LINC Advisory Group included members of the Illinois General Assembly, representatives from ISBE, IBHE, Illinois Department of Human Services, Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, Illinois Community College Board, the teachers unions, early care and education organizations, and K-12 school administrator organizations (see Appendix F). The LINC Advisory Group released a report in March 2008, *Building a Seamless Learning Continuum: The Role of Leadership in Bridging the Gaps Between Early Childhood and K-12 Education Systems*<sup>12</sup>. This report is a culmination of research and discussion examining how education leaders can better bridge identified gaps in the coordination between early care and education and K-12 schools to create a seamless learning continuum. Included in the report recommendations was that "the Illinois State Board of Education should broaden its principal endorsement to PreK-12," a recommendation later followed by ISBE and IBHE in the new P-12 endorsement and its requirements.

Following the recommendations of the Illinois School Leader Task Force, **Illinois School Leader Redesign Teams** were established by ISBE and IBHE in 2008 to develop action plans (see Appendix G). The work was divided among five committees: 1) School Leadership Standards; 2) Leadership Certification and Endorsements; 3) School/University Partnerships and Selection Criteria; 4) Residencies and Internships; and 5) Assessments of Candidates and Graduates. Each team included a member of the IL School Leader Task Force, and representation from both higher education and public school districts. Membership totaled 50 representatives of public and private institutions of higher education, the Illinois Principals Association (IPA), Illinois Federation of Teachers (IFT), Illinois Association of School Boards (IASB), Illinois Council of Professors of Education Administration (ICPEA), Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA), Regional Offices of Education (ROE), Illinois Education Association (IEA), Illinois Federation of Teachers (IFT), the Illinois Education Research Council (IERC), and ISBE and IBHE staff members (see [www.illinoischoolleader.org](http://www.illinoischoolleader.org) for more information).

Noting the benefits of networking and sharing with colleagues, individuals were drawn to serve on one of the numerous committees, "because of the strong networks that were formed with other faculty in Educational Leadership Programs in the state. We continue to meet to share/discuss program and internship issues, experiences, materials, and encouragement,"

reported one private institution faculty member interviewed for this paper. Participation has even had a positive impact within institutions. “I am particularly happy that the implementation of the new principal program has led to a more collaborative, problem-solving relationship among the program faculty,” recounted a public institution faculty member interviewed. Several participants interviewed for this report made similar statements about the positive relationships they formed with new colleagues.

Four committee meetings were held in various locations around the state in an effort to encourage participation from all geographic regions. In addition, the Redesign Committees all met on the same day in the same location so that different committees could share the direction they were taking as they were building the model. This was an essential design structure for the workflow. For example, the certification or internship committees could not move forward with their work without knowing what the standards committee was working on and the assessment committee needed to know what the internship committee was working on in order to know what it was they needed to assess, and so on. Stakeholders representing the fields of early childhood, special education, and English Language Learners were also invited to later sessions to react and provide recommendations to the work being created. A web site was created to share research and policy initiatives and to house all materials from these meetings (see [www.illinoischoolleader.org](http://www.illinoischoolleader.org)). In addition to the efforts of each of the groups identified above, five statewide conferences were held with principal preparation faculty and key stakeholders across the state to share progress being made and to gather feedback on the draft principal preparation model. A summary of these activities is found in the “Illinois Principal Preparation Redesign Timeline 2001-2014” (see Appendix J).

The conclusion of the redesign team meetings resulted in a draft of recommendations for redefining principal preparation. In an effort to further vet these recommendations to a larger audience of stakeholders, ISBE and IBHE co-hosted eight dissemination meetings around the state between 2009 and 2010. This represented a clear effort by the agencies to provide timely information to all school districts and universities in the state regarding the proposed timeline and policy changes involving principal preparation programs. The meetings also provided the agencies an opportunity to gain input from those in the field regarding how the proposed changes might impact other administrative positions and licenses. The proposed phasing out of the general administrative certificate was an area that was discussed at great length at these meetings. Over 800 constituents participated in one or more of these meetings that provided information about the proposed changes and gave participants the opportunity to provide feedback to ISBE and IBHE. Presentations were also made at the following conferences and meetings: IASA conference, IASB Joint Annual Conference, the IL-SAELP Executive Committee meeting, and the Teacher Certification Board meeting. In October, a legislative briefing was also held at the Capitol to help policy makers understand the intent of the proposed legislation. During these presentations, opportunities for feedback on the proposed changes were encouraged, which resulted in modifications to the recommendations made by the redesign teams.

### **Passage of Public Act 096-0903**

On May 25, 2010, close to the end of legislative session, the recommendations of ISBE and IBHE principal preparation redesign teams were ready to be proposed in legislation. Prior to the introduction of the bill, much work occurred behind the scenes to build support for the legislation, which included conference calls with all of the key stakeholder groups, including higher education and K-12 professional organizations. During one of these calls, a representative from the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) expressed concern that they would not support the legislation unless a provision was added to allow not-for-profit organizations to prepare principals. According to committee minutes this topic was discussed during Task Force and redesign meetings but was not included as part of the final recommendations. During previous discussions, some stakeholders had expressed concern about allowing alternative routes to certification. The consensus was that an expedited route to a Principal Endorsement would undermine the importance of the framework that had been agreed upon which was designed to ensure candidates would be able to demonstrate leadership competencies to improve schools. Lengthy discussions ensued until consensus was found with CPS on this issue. In order to arrive at an agreement, an important distinction was made between alternative programs (non-traditional programs that provide expedited routes to certification) which would not be allowed and alternative providers (programs provided by not-for-profit organizations that must meet the same rigorous standards and criteria for program approval as university programs) which were deemed allowable in the final draft of the bill.

With all the legwork done ahead of time to cultivate champions, clear up misunderstandings, and make adjustments based on identified unintended consequences, SB 226 was introduced by State Representative Mike Smith, one of the legislative representatives on the IL-SAELP Executive Committee. The bill passed through both the House Elementary and Secondary Education Committee (13-4-00) and the Illinois House of Representatives (98-11-01) on May 26, 2010. The bill then went to the Senate, whose sponsor was State Senator Deana Demuzio, another legislative representative on the IL-SAELP Executive Committee, where it passed through the Senate Education Committee (11-0-0) and through the Senate (55-0-0) on May 27, 2010. The legislation was signed into law by Governor Pat Quinn as Public Act 096-0903 on June 1, 2010.

### **Development and Passage of Rules Associated with Public Act 096-0903**

With the passage of the law, rules were written to reflect the intent of the Illinois School Leader Task Force, the redesign teams, and all of the feedback that had been gathered by ISBE and IBHE during the legislative process. Development of the rules and regulations proved to be more challenging than anticipated. Shortly after the legislation was signed, ISBE staff got started on drafting the rules and regulations that would institutionalize the statute into the Illinois School Code. A conceptual draft of the rules was put together and shared with a representative group of stakeholders from higher education, professional organizations, school districts, and teacher unions at a meeting convened by ISBE on July 21, 2010. The purpose of the meeting was to hash out some sticking points that were still present with the recommendations, most prominently the required internship. To assist with these efforts, ISBE had brought in a consultant, Dr. Joe Murphy, a respected school leadership faculty member from Vanderbilt University who had led the Interstate State Leaders Licensure Consortium's development of national standards for school leadership, to facilitate the conversation. Various stakeholders offered opinions, some

supporting a state mandated minimum number of hours for the internship, while others advocated for a competency-based internship model designed to provide candidates with specific authentic leadership experiences that could be evaluated through performance-based assessments. The Internship Redesign Committee had developed a competency-based performance assessment rubric, but it only included three broad competency areas and many felt that it was not comprehensive enough to be applied with fidelity. ISBE staff believed the competency-based internship model (instead of the current hour-based requirements) would provide a better structure to support candidate development; however, they were unsure whether or not there was enough time to fully articulate all the competencies that should be included in the rules. No consensus was reached at this meeting. Instead, only suggestions and recommendations were made. After the meeting, ISBE determined that rather than recommending a number of hours for the internship it was more important to define the knowledge and skills that candidates needed to learn and demonstrate competency through authentic internship experiences. Thus, ISBE required internships that incorporated the 13 SREB Competencies and Critical Success Factors. This requirement moved the internship into a performance-based direction rather than completion of hours.

Honing the commitment of stakeholders instrumental in the school leadership recommendations and passage of the legislation, Advance Illinois, a statewide advocacy group, convened a Principal Preparation Steering Committee designed to follow the fidelity of SB 226 as it moved through the rulemaking process (see Appendix H for the membership list). Members of the Principal Preparation Steering Committee also made numerous trips to Springfield to talk with legislators on the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules (JCAR) about the importance of this work and the need to raise the rigor of principal training. This included the chair of the School Leader Task Force, Illinois State University's Dean of Education, Loyola University's Dean of Education, LUDA Executive Director, and Southern Illinois University at Carbondale's department chair. A presentation was also given to the State Educator Preparation and Licensure Board (SEPLB) to educate them on the proposed changes in principal preparation and the reason behind it. SEPLB (formerly the State Teacher Certification Board) was established by statute to serve as an independent board for reviewing new and existing educator certification programs and making recommendations to ISBE. ISBE then approves or renews the certification of programs based on the recommendation of SEPLB. As an independent body to ISBE and as the body that would be responsible for reviewing and approving the new principal preparation programs, it was important for members of SEPLB to be well informed and supportive of the new changes.

The rules for SB 226 were released by ISBE during the first week of October 2010 and the public comment period occurred for the following 60 days. A summary and analysis of statements received during the public comment period was presented at the December 15, 2010, ISBE board meeting. ISBE staff recognized that 140 public comments had been received on the rules – 46% from Illinois colleges offering principal preparation, 21% from current or retired public school district administrators and teachers, 13.6% from Illinois education associations and groups representing students, 7% from Illinois non-public schools, and the remaining comments were from other Illinois state agencies, other states, nationally-based education programs, and writers giving no affiliation. According to the board report:

Several commenters praised the shift in emphasis inherent in these proposed rules to preparing principals to be leaders held responsible for student achievement and possessing a deep knowledge of instruction. Similarly, writers expressed hopes that a redesigned program for principals would lead to increased academic success for each child in school, thereby working to eliminate achievement gaps. Commenters commended the rules' emphasis on partnerships, the broadening of endorsements to cover prekindergarten through grade 12, and the requirement for candidates to incorporate work with teachers of English language learners (ELLs) and students with disabilities.

Many writers described the proposed rules as being overly prescriptive, as micromanaging on the part of the State Board, as mandating expenditures at the university and school levers, and showing programmatic biases against candidates in some parts of the state. These commenters believed that the rules will negatively affect the right of educators to job advancement, to future employability, and to personal and professional growth. One writer stated that the rules would shrink the pool of applicants for the principalship to such an extent that small districts will have little or no chance to hire one, and he predicted school district consolidation and skyrocketing of principal salaries as consequences if the rules are enacted. A few writers stated what seems implied in several other comments – that 'genuine collaboration' from universities and school districts was lacking in the drafting of these rules. (ISBE, 2010)

This description from the public comment analysis detailed above illustrates a divide that currently still exists within the field regarding the sweeping changes to principal preparation in Illinois. Based on the public comments, ISBE staff did make some changes to the rules that were approved by its governing body. However, some feel that the recommended changes made by ISBE staff did not go far enough in honoring all of the recommendations made during the public comment period, and this has led to further consternation with the rules process.

The final step involved in establishing the rules and regulations required approval by JCAR. JCAR is a bipartisan legislative oversight committee created by the Illinois General Assembly in 1977. It is authorized to conduct systematic reviews of administrative rules promulgated by state agencies. JCAR is made up of 15 legislators from both the House and Senate and Democrats and Republicans. While the principal preparation rules and regulations had been submitted to JCAR in January 2011, on March 26, 2011, ISBE received a letter from JCAR citing concerns by representatives of Concordia University, American College of Education, University of Illinois-Springfield, McKendree University, and the Illinois Council of Professors of Educational Administration regarding the version of the rules and regulations that had been approved by the ISBE Board of Directors. According to the JCAR letter, particular concerns centered on:

- 1) Mentor principals were restricted to supervising and supporting the development of 2 principal interns in their schools during a 12-month period. This group believed that rural areas in particular would be disproportionately burdened by the limit of 2 interns due to the lack of qualified mentor principals in their area.
- 2) Face-to-face time in addition to on-line activities.

- 3) The exclusion of certification reciprocity. They expressed the desire for the state to allow reciprocity only for principal trained outside of Illinois, that had completed a program that meets the same standards required of Illinois programs. This is to avoid putting Illinois institutions at a competitive disadvantage with training programs in other states.
- 4) The requirement for four years of teaching to enter a principal preparation program. They advocated for allowing candidates to enter principal preparation programs after 2 years of teaching experience, but agreeing that they should have 4 years' teaching experience before they complete the program and qualify for a Principal Endorsement.

Legislators on JCAR cited concerns with supporting the new rules without concessions being made and for a three-month period, negotiations were held between ISBE, stakeholders, and JCAR legislators. During this time, concessions were made by ISBE, including: 1) the maximum percentage of coursework allowed to be taught by adjunct faculty was increased from the initial 50 percent to 80 percent; 2) the number of candidates mentor principals were allowed to supervise was increased from two to three candidates; and 3) requiring that the two individuals from institutions of higher education on the Principal Preparation Program Review Board would include one from a public institution and one from a nonpublic institution.

In April 2011, JCAR met and passed the rules unanimously for the principal preparation legislation (P.A. 096-0903) with two additional changes and two recommendations:

- Change One: Prohibits the requirement of four years of teaching before a candidate can enter a principal endorsement program but did not make a recommendation for what the teaching requirement should be (Section 30.70b).
- Change Two: Prohibits the appointment of two out of state individuals on the Principal Review Panel (and instead suggests that those appointments be replaced with acting in-state principals) (Section 30.80C(6)).
- Recommendation One: Recommends that ISBE move quickly on legislation that makes changes to the Teacher Leadership Endorsement.
- Recommendation Two: Recommends that ISBE move quickly to propose rules that require candidates training out of state to provide evidence that they have completed a comparable approved program in another state or holds a comparable certificate issued by another state.

Following these changes the rules had to go back to ISBE for approval by their board, which occurred at their June 2011 meeting. With the rules finally in place, universities could begin work on redesigning their programs. While the process for approving the rules and regulations took longer than anticipated, the state statute that had been passed by the General Assembly included hard and fast dates spelled out that indicated when new principal preparation programs must be redesigned and when old programs must be ended. According to the statute, by September 1, 2012, institutions of higher education and not-for-profit entities could not admit new candidates to principal preparation programs. Candidates could only be accepted to programs approved under the new rules and regulations on or after Sept. 1, 2012. Further, by June 1, 2014, all programs for the preparation of principals were to have been approved under new program rules or cease operating.



## **After the Rules - Principal Preparation Program Redesign**

With the rules in place and universities working diligently to redesign their programs, State Superintendent, Christopher Koch appointed members to the Principal Preparation Review Panel (PPRP). In an effort to support the redesign efforts, ISBE had established in the rules a requirement that a PPRP be established for the purpose of 1) examining program applications, 2) providing feedback to the program regarding whether or not they provided adequate evidence that the redesigned program met the new requirements, and 3) making recommendations for approval to the Illinois State Educator Preparation and Licensure Board (ISEPLB). Recognizing the extent of substantive changes that were required by the new statute, ISBE envisioned the Review Panel as an initial platform for programs to receive constructive feedback on their applications before it would be formally reviewed and program approval voted on by ISEPLB. Unlike ISEPLB, which makes recommendations to ISBE for approval or non-approval, the purpose of the new Principal Preparation Review Panel was only to give constructive feedback to the programs that the programs could use before submitting their proposal to ISEPLB. As such, the PPRP was made up of stakeholders with knowledge or expertise regarding leadership, as well as the various stakeholder groups that are impacting by school leadership. This included: two teachers; four principals; two superintendents; two university representatives (one public and one private); one member from a school district with a population exceeding 500,000; and 1 representative from the Illinois business community (as designed by rules). In January 2012, ISBE provided a comprehensive training for the new members of the Principal Preparation Review Panel and the Illinois State Educator Preparation and Licensure Board. The training involved an overview of the new program structure, rules and regulations, review of the application scoring rubric and guidance for determining quality program indicators.

In addition to the process ISBE established to support universities in their efforts to make the transformational changes required by the new requirements, in 2012 the McCormick Foundation granted funding to CSEP to provide technical assistance to four universities in Illinois (Western Illinois University, Loyola University Chicago, Illinois State University, and North Central College) who were implementing the new P-12 principal endorsement. These institutions were selected to serve as a representation of public and private programs in different geographic regions of the state. The work of these four universities is documented in a toolkit that includes case studies and artifacts developed by the four programs as they progressed through the redesign process. (See <http://leadershiplinc.illinoisstate.edu/symposium/documents/finalToolKit.pdf> for the toolkit). This work was also featured at a statewide symposium on April 18, 2013, that provided a platform for sharing lessons learned with all principal preparation programs in the state.

Further funding was awarded in 2012 by McCormick Foundation for CSEP to work with five principal preparation programs in Illinois (North Central College, Loyola University Chicago, New Leaders for New Schools, Southern Illinois at Edwardsville, and University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign) to support their development of formative program evaluation models around a continuous improvement process aligning the efforts of the university programs with those of their district partners. CSEP released a Request for Proposals (RFP) for this work and these five universities applied and were selected for participation in this project. The formative program evaluation work was featured in a statewide forum on May 27, 2014.

The success of these two projects led to an awareness by the McCormick Foundation in 2014 of the need to fund the development of a statewide learning community (facilitated by CSEP) to create a pre-and post-assessment tool that can measure the principal preparation program's value added to principal candidates' dispositions, skills, and behaviors, specifically aligned to the leadership competencies outlined in Illinois' new P-12 principal endorsement and the Illinois School Leader Performance Standards. CSEP staff will convene a workgroup consisting of preparation program faculty and other program stakeholders working in conjunction with experts in assessment development and validation to develop this standards-based assessment that could optionally be used to track program impact by principal preparation programs across the state. The workgroup will begin convening in Fall 2014 and conclude their work in 2016.

Illinois' new rigorous principal preparation and performance standards have also brought national attention and interest from researchers. In 2013, CSEP was awarded a \$4.6 million U.S. Department of Education School Leadership Program grant to support the Illinois Partnerships Advance Rigorous Training (IL-PART) project. IL-PART represents a collaborative effort between three high-need school districts and their university partners (East Aurora District #131/North Central College; Bloomington District #87/Illinois State University; and Quincy District #172/Western Illinois University) and the Center for Catholic School Effectiveness at Loyola University Chicago working with the diocese representing Catholic schools in East Aurora, Bloomington, and Quincy. IL-PART funds will be used to support two internship models being offered in each of the three partner districts: an intensive full time/full semester internship and a part time traditional internship. Candidates will select either the intensive or traditional internship in a partnering high-need school. The American Institutes for Research (AIR) will be conducting an evaluation of the project in which they will explore differences in outcomes between the two internship models. In addition, IL-PART will assist high-need districts in establishing a pool of highly skilled school leaders that are able to respond to partner district needs and fill projected principal and assistance principal positions. These internships will provide intensive, authentic, school-based learning opportunities for aspiring principals and mentor principals and faculty supervisors with training so that they can provide rich learning experiences and effective development practices. This will result in principal interns and school faculty focused on school improvement efforts and increased student achievement. An important IL-PART goal is to continue to foster school-university partnerships and extensive shared decision making to benefit both universities and districts, which is a key objective of the state principal preparation changes.

Additionally, in 2013, the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) also received a \$1 million U.S. Department of Education School Leadership Program grant to push the boundaries for how higher education can partner with local school districts to prepare and develop effective school leaders. Funding from the grant is currently being used to develop a model of developmental practices that grow leadership aptitudes that transform student-learning outcomes by building stronger, more sustainable learning environments. This work builds from a decade of effort at UIC to transform their principal preparation program from a conventional, course-based master's program into a comprehensive four-year continuum of intensive, practice-based, leadership development. UIC has identified three high-leverage strategies on which to focus their

work: 1) candidate selectivity; 2) intensive leadership coaching as part of a four year model; and 3) the collection and use of data for evidence based practices and continuous improvement.

The requirements established for the new Principal Endorsement in Illinois have had a significant impact on the rigor and relevance of the preparation of principals and assistant principals. Since establishing the new rules and regulations, 26 of the 31 previously approved general administrative (Type 75) programs have been approved by ISEPLB.<sup>12</sup> Opinions expressed by a number of individuals during the public comment period indicated some feared the new program requirements would eliminate existing programs. Those fears have been largely put to rest; however, the new rigor applied to candidate selection requirements has had an effect on the number of accepted applicants and some superintendents have expressed concern that there will be a shortage in the field. Addressing this fear, the Illinois Association of School Boards is surveying principal preparation programs three times a year to monitor their program enrollments.

This data shows that enrollments are increasing in programs from 430 candidates during the first year of implementation (2013) to 616 candidates in cumulative enrollments this year, according to the results of a bi-annual survey of all principal preparation programs conducted by IASB. Recognizing that supply and demand for school leaders is not only dictated by candidates in the pipeline, the new principal preparation legislation established a clause grandfathering old administrative certificate (Type 75 certificate) holders with all the rights and privileges previously afforded them. That strategy was essential to ensure an adequate supply for the pipeline during the critical transition period from the old system to the new. A white paper completed by CSEP in 2013 indicated that there were 43,569 Type 75 certificate holders in Illinois in FY2013, according to data drawn from the Illinois State Board of Education database. (See <http://education.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/csep/Principal.pdf>) The state averages about 400-450 principal vacancies a year, according to ISBE supply/demand data.

Previously, the Type 75 General Administrative Certificate was required for any administrator who had the responsibility for evaluating teachers. Under the new law, the Principal Endorsement is designed specifically for principals and assistant principals and not required for any of the other administrative positions (e.g., athletic director, dean, special education director) previously required to have it. Instead, anyone with responsibility for evaluating teachers is required to take and pass the *Growth Through Learning* teacher evaluation modules. However, to meet the need for teachers interested in obtaining leadership positions outside of the principalship, the State permitted the creation of teacher leadership endorsement programs through Public Act 097-0607. The Teacher Leader endorsement is now available for approval by the Illinois State Educator Preparation and Licensure Board (ISEPLB) and at least four programs have been approved as of July 2014, according ISBE (see <http://www.isbe.net/profprep/PDFs/directory.pdf>). Several universities are in the process of designing teacher leadership endorsement programs. The design of these new programs varies, as the program standards for the new endorsement were purposefully written to allow for innovation in design by universities and flexibility with utilization by districts.

In Fall 2013, during the initial implementation phase of the newly approved principal preparation programs, feedback was provided to ISBE from faculty involved with the Illinois

Council of Professors of Education Administration (ICPEA). This feedback demonstrated to ISBE officials that there were unintended consequences in specific areas of the rules and regulations that were proving to be challenging to some programs. This feedback led to proposed changes to the rules, which were voted on at the March 12, 2014, Board meeting and included the following changes to the standards:

- The definition of Mentor Principal was expanded beyond the requirement that they must possess a current general administrative (Type 75) or principal endorsement, to include endorsements for superintendent, assistant superintendent, and special education director, provided they are assigned to the location where the internship will take place, and possess at least two years of experience relevant to the role of principal;
- The number of years of successful experience as a principal required for all Mentor Principals was reduced from three to two. In all cases, the Mentor Principal must provide evidence of two years of successful experience as a principal (or role relevant to principal) including student growth data in at least two of the previous five years, and formal evaluations or letters of recommendation;
- Faculty Supervisors were initially required to possess a current and valid Illinois educator license indicating General Administrator (Type 75) or Principal Endorsement. That was changed to include a current and valid license that is comparable to the required Illinois professional educator license endorsed for general administrative or principal, issued by the state in which the internship site for the Illinois approved principal preparation program internship site is located;
- Deadlines for the successful completion of training and assessments qualifying candidates to conduct teacher evaluations and the successful completion of the state administered principal content exam were adjusted to include any time prior to licensure. In the initial version of the rules, the teacher evaluation training and assessments were required prior to starting the internship and the principal content exam was required before the last semester of the internship.
- The maximum number of aspiring candidates completing internships to be supervised by a single Mentor Principal was increased to no more than five. This was increased from a maximum of two. In addition, a sixth candidate may be assigned to a single Mentor Principal if prior approval is granted by the ISEPLB. Approval is based on the program providing the ISEPLB with a clear rationale for increasing the number and the request is supported with adequate documentation demonstrating the need for an exception.

In addition to the changes that ISBE made to the rules and regulations, a statutory legislative amendment was introduced during the Spring 2014 legislative session to allow educators with a Type 73 certificate (school psychologists, school counselors, speech pathologists, and school nurses) to qualify for admission to the new Principal Endorsement programs. The language of the original statute established a criterion of a minimum requirement of 4 years of teaching experience (upon the completion of the program) to be eligible to apply to new principal preparation programs. This essentially barred Type 73 holders without teaching experience from securing a Principal Endorsement in Illinois. The legislation passed both houses

in the Illinois General Assembly on May 28, 2014, and was signed by Governor Quinn as Public Act 098-0872 on August 11, 2014.

After initial revisions were made to the statute and rules, there was interest by the stakeholder in systematically studying the implementation of the new principal preparation requirements. In May 2014, the Illinois Education Research Council (IERC) at Southern Illinois University Edwardsville was awarded a two-year \$500,000 grant from the McCormick Foundation and a two-year \$50,000 grant from The Wallace Foundation that allows IERC to conduct an implementation review of Illinois' new policy for redesigning principal preparation programs, gathering both university and pre-K through 12<sup>th</sup> grade perspectives. The IERC will collaborate with the University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research on this study.

The McCormick Foundation has also issued a new grant to CSEP to work in collaboration to develop a pre-and post-assessment tool that can measure a candidate's growth in dispositions, skills, and behaviors specific to Illinois' new P-12 principal endorsement and evaluation requirements. CSEP staff will convene a workgroup consisting of preparation program faculty and other stakeholders (e.g., districts) working in conjunction with experts in assessment development and validation to develop this standard assessment that could be used in principal preparation programs across the state. The workgroup will begin convening in Fall 2014 and conclude in 2016.

### **Reflecting Back**

In the summer of 2014, interviews with individuals involved in multiple stages of the principal preparation and development redesign efforts in Illinois were conducted for this paper. Given the long history of this work, there was an extensive list of stakeholders from which to choose. Due to resource restraints, the list of individuals involved was pared down by applying the following criterion: interviews were limited to those with a leadership role in the principal preparation reform effort, representing a variety of opinions on the legislation and the rules. In order to engage the perspectives of a larger group of individuals that have been involved in this work, a survey was also conducted. Survey participants were selected to ensure representation from all stakeholder organizations, and to ensure the sample represented all geographic regions of the state. In 2014, interviews were conducted during the months of July and August and the survey was administered in August. The following represents a summary of comments from the participants (n=20).

An important common theme emerged from the data analysis: that a broad representation of stakeholders, with different backgrounds, experiences and organizational priorities, came together around a common purpose – a true desire to do what they believed was in the best interest of children. Additionally, many respondents expressed that the collaborative effort allowed the group to capitalize on specific windows of opportunity over the course of the last nearly 15 years. As one IBHE official remarked, “I believe that we were fortunate to have the right people, in the right place, at the right time to advance the work.”

Data from interviews and surveys were used to identify six levers that have influenced change in school leader preparation and development in Illinois. The six levers of change

include: 1) consistent leadership provided by IBHE, ISBE, and CSEP focused on improvement; 2) broad stakeholder representation, including leadership from key organizations interacting with policy makers; 3) resources provided to staff committees and convene stakeholders; 4) research and engagement of local and national experts that impacted various committees' understanding of the challenges and opportunities; 5) policy influences at the national (No Child Left Behind and Race to the Top) and state (New Principal Mentor Program, Performance Evaluation Reform Act, and the new educator licensure system) levels; and 6) on-going collaboration among stakeholders and opportunities to share lessons learned and best practices.

These six levers were utilized throughout the change process and emerged over time as reactions to the specific context within which the work was happening. For example, one faculty member asserted that the state had no choice but to get better and pointed to the “failure of Illinois schools to produce significant gains in student achievement required by NCLB; research from Marzano<sup>14</sup> and Leithwood<sup>15</sup> on the importance of leadership, and findings pointing to the role of principal as being the second most important influence at school impacting student achievement; and a culture of accountability that revealed teachers were not being evaluated, professional development lacked intensity and subsequent monitoring of implementation and impact, and too many principals neglecting the best practices espoused by their principal preparation programs when faced with the ‘administrivia’ of building management.” A representative from one of the teachers’ unions added that it was becoming more apparent to those within and outside education, “that school leaders were inadequately prepared for the current job of principal. I think NCLB made that more transparent.” Further, administrators working with the Chicago Public Schools stated they were facing a situation in which “nearly 300 principals were possibly retiring in the near future. Finding and developing principal candidates was urgently necessary.” Another added that there was a “significant demand for high quality principal candidates, but few were qualified for some of our most challenging schools.” Within a context of raised public awareness of the need for well-prepared effective school leaders, the six levers were utilized to bring about change.

While six levers were identified, it is important to note that individuals may have viewed a single lever as more important than another. However, no consensus was found to indicate that any one of these levers is more important than the other. Further, the importance of any one lever appears to be related to its interconnection with other identified levers. Therefore, while the following description of the levers is outlined in numerical order, no implications as to the rank order of importance should be drawn.

### **Lever 1: Consistent Leadership Focused on Improvement**

As the *Reform Efforts* section of this paper details, the initial catalyst for bringing together various stakeholders began with the initial grant awarded by The Wallace Foundation to CSEP at ISU. The process of convening stakeholders through IL-SAELP was developed by CSEP to provide direction and oversight for the grant. Although this group was not officially endorsed by ISBE or IBHE, both education agencies supported the effort by placing leaders from their organization in membership roles. Over time and through interaction with other levers, this unofficial group of stakeholders grew and became both a platform for sharing information and a source of feedback for ISBE and IBHE. Ultimately, over time, the power dynamic shifted and

those that had been working on these issues were officially convened by ISBE and IBHE in a formal effort to impact policies involving school leadership preparation and development.

The consistency in leadership of this work by ISBE, IBHE and CSEP at ISU has been essential in moving the work forward. As one department chair from higher education stated, “Accolades to the Center. The staff helped steer the boat and deal with the opposition. Without their guidance and support we wouldn’t be where we are now.” Another faculty member concurred saying that “the formal workshops, symposia, and conferences offered by the state and the many resources provided helped keep this effort moving. But the most significant levers were provided by supportive leadership at the state and local/regional levels.”

A representative from one of the teachers’ unions stressed that it was “the commitment of both ISBE and IBHE working together and the broad scope of representatives and organizations that were important to this work. Good organization, facilitation and participants’ dedication and openness to let all be heard were equally valuable.” In fact, even those that had expressed concern regarding the extent of the changes made by the state, identified the consistent involvement and commitment from ISBE and IBHE as an important factor in continuing to make progress with this work. For example, one faculty member asserted that the “state went too far with some details that made parts of the program counterproductive.” However, that same respondent reported that he had found willingness on the part of the state agency representatives to meet and address his concerns.

When the engagement of stakeholders transferred from CSEP to ISBE and IBHE and the state agencies began formally convening the group, it signaled a significant shift and indicated the state was prioritizing improvements in school leadership preparation and development. During the lengthy debate over the rules and regulations for the new principal preparation programs, one dean from a private university took the bold step of shutting down his institution’s old Type 75 program a year prior to implementing the new program. Despite the financial hardship, he determined that the redesign work was essential to preparing effective principals and he wanted the faculty focused exclusively on building new systems, structures and processes to dramatically improve outcomes. The dean indicated that without the leadership of ISBE and IBHE and their guidance in policy formation, that he would not have had the leverage to take that bold move.

## **Lever 2: Broad Stakeholder Representation**

Consistent leadership can only take a movement so far. Policy change is doomed to fail without meaningful engagement of stakeholders, especially those charged with implementing a policy with fidelity. The broad group of stakeholders that had been involved in these efforts would ultimately be impacted by any policy changes and would be tasked with implementation. Therefore, it was essential for the state agencies to continue to engage a broad base of stakeholders throughout the process, in order to ensure both successful policy formation and fidelity in policy implementation.

From the beginning, individuals with very different backgrounds and from a wide variety of organizations came together to discuss the state of school leaders preparation and development in Illinois. Focusing the work of this group involved incorporating a wide range of

perspectives on the topic. Establishing a culture focused not on individual opinions or organizational agendas, but on a common purpose that drew all the participants together was a tall task. In an effort to set the tone, one state official described the process: “at the beginning of each meeting/conference/event we always stated that this work was about doing what was in the best interest of our students – that became our mantra. This helped in taking individuals out of an institutional mentality and aligning them with a greater goal, that of raising the quality of education across the state.” Further, student perspectives did not just mean P-12 students, but also principal candidates. A conference in May 2014 hosted by CSEP featured a panel of current principal preparation candidates that led into small group discussions with the candidates. This provided the opportunity for those involved in policy formation and implementation to hear examples of the real lived experiences of candidates in new programs. The feedback was primarily positive, however an exploration of challenges also took place.

One faculty member from a public university remarked in an interview that due to the disparate views of the stakeholders involved, he did not think the redesign efforts would ever have gotten past advancing the dialogue around the state and educating others regarding the need for reform. However, regardless of differences of opinions, stakeholders remained committed - if not to the direction of the reform efforts, then to at least ensuring their voice was heard. As one former superintendent pointed out, even when people changed roles, they often continued to come to the meetings and engage in the work, as she had, because they understood the importance of leadership development. This was echoed by another school administrator who stated that the commitment stemmed from the desire of a “variety of key stakeholders to improving the pool of principal talent by giving teacher leaders the instruction and experiences they need to be effective principals.” Continuing to draw the focus back to the common purpose was effective as one state official found that “despite contentious issues, people really tried to hammer out positive and effective means to accomplish our goals. Individuals from many different sectors worked side by side for a common cause and they were all dedicated and passionate about the work. This was a model of how a state can pull together and make good things happen.”

That being said, the collaborative effort to bring about meaningful change in leadership preparation and development was not harmonious, nor were the changes universally accepted and applauded by all involved. Early indications of the on-going tension between changes that would be required versus those recommended appeared in the report from the Illinois School Leader Taskforce (2008). Despite the clear charge of the Taskforce, there were issues for which the group could not arrive at a consensus. For example, “While some Task Force members urged that residencies should be an academic year in length... others disagreed; arguing that duration of residencies should be left to program providers.” Although the vast majority of respondents to the survey and interviews supported the changes that have been made, some expressed concerns about specific details. One respondent expressed disappointment with the direction the state has taken, asserting, “I don’t agree with this model and it is bound to fail in the long run because institutions lack the capacity to do everything in the new legislation with an appropriate level of quality over the long term.” Further, “My expectations about support from the State have not been met... the efforts of the Center [CSEP] to try and bridge the lack of support has been crucial. But, I feel strongly that the State must increase responsibilities and accountability for these changes for them to be successful long term.” Even in dissent, the



commitment to this work is evident and illustrates the need for continued engagement of ISBE, IBHE, and a broad group of stakeholders in the implementation and improvement phases of the redesign work.

### **Lever 3: Funding for Staffing and Convening**

Many respondents, including district administrators, faculty members, deans, professional association representatives, and state education officials, reported the vital role that funding played in furthering this work. Grants awarded to CSEP from The Wallace Foundation and the McCormick Foundation helped to provide staffing, meeting facilitation, expertise to complete research summaries, and engagement of national experts in the field. One faculty member asserted, “the grants received by [CSEP at] ISU enabled the work to go beyond that which the state could have provided and was a compelling force that drove the effort forward.” Another faculty member stated that the support provided by external grants went beyond supporting a policy solution to the problem, by increasing stakeholders’ understanding of specific strategies that could be applied to the Illinois context. She stated “involvement with the LINC project has taken us to incredible places with our programs. We knew that we needed to cover early childcare, ELL and special education [based on Illinois regulations for principal preparation]. Principals need experience in those areas. LINC gave us a systematic approach.”

State agency officials also acknowledged the important contribution of the financial support from the foundations. One official stated a “vital component was the funding which enabled us to bring people together from across the state. Without this support we could not have developed the opportunities to convene stakeholders to undertake this work.” University faculty and professional association representatives also highlighted the importance of financial support for this work, arguing that the grants were important to this work as it allowed the group to identify and bring in speakers to provide research-based strategies and present empirical findings of effectiveness in principal preparation and development to those around the state contributing to the redesign efforts.

While there is no doubt in anyone’s mind that funding was vital to this work, it is important to also note how interconnected Lever 3 is with Lever 2. Funding for the collaborative effort was essential, as stakeholder engagement would have been greatly compromised without it. As one state agency official claimed, “We simply would never have had the personnel needed to complete the work of IL-SAELP.” Funding provided staffing to take on responsibilities such as regularly communicating with stakeholders, securing various data from state agencies, compiling research briefs, engaging national experts in the discussion, capturing and disseminating information from on-going meetings, coordinating the logistics of regular statewide meetings, facilitating consensus and drafting reports, and other administrative functions. Without funding, these responsibilities would have been spread among volunteers and would have greatly diminished the focused efforts of the collaboration. Private foundations that supported these efforts recognized the strong potential for impact based on the ability of stakeholders to work collaboratively with state agencies to bring about meaningful change. National foundations selected CSEP as a recipient of their grants because of the qualifications of CSEP staff, the organization’s ability to facilitate consensus-building among disparate stakeholder groups, and its track record of administer grants involving statewide collaborations.

More importantly, however was CSEP’s history of informing education policy in Illinois by engaging state level policy makers and stakeholders in their efforts to improve education throughout the state.

#### **Lever 4: Research and Engagement of National Experts**

As was described with previous levers, an interconnection between Lever 3 and Lever 4 was also evident. It was through funding from foundations that those working in this area were able to come together, support each other’s work, and share what they had learned. Foundation support allowed the group to identify model programs and engage local experts in the field from within Illinois. Many innovative and effective university preparation and school district development strategies were presented at IL-SAELP meetings and statewide conferences. Additionally, because CSEP had engaged national funders in the principal preparation and development redesign efforts, opportunities were afforded to the group to connect with various national networks and state agencies from around the country, in an effort to go beyond the confines of Illinois to explore bold and effective models elsewhere.

Many of the participants, who chose to become involved with IL-SAELP and/or other statewide education improvement efforts, did so in reaction to both national pressures for reform and pressing conditions within Illinois. As indicated earlier, research conducted by Levine, Marzano, Leithwood, and others served as a catalyst for educators and policymakers in Illinois to look deeper at what was happening here. A teachers’ union representative described the condition in Illinois as one in which it was becoming increasingly apparent both inside and outside of education “that school leaders were inadequately prepared for the current job of principal. I think NCLB made that more transparent.” The growing research base linking principal leadership to school improvement and increased student achievement, combined with increasing public acceptance of the need for greater accountability around student performance seemed to create a sense of urgency for improving systems of support for school leaders. According to a state education official “it seemed to be the right time and place. There was support to make change and the realization that principals needed to be leaders rather than managers was important to this change. Kids were not being helped and teachers needed support. Strong leaders were essential for change to happen and to support learning.” Another state education official noted “the results coming out from the work of researchers such as Leithwood and Levine were disturbing and raised questions as to how Illinois programs fared in contrast.”

#### **Lever 5: Policy Influences – National and State**

The efforts in Illinois to improve school leader preparation and development from 2000-2014 coincided with the explosion of the accountability movement. Federal mandates, such as the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) ushered in a new level of standards-based reform, and with it, high-stakes testing swept the country. Numerous stakeholders commented that NCLB created a sense of urgency with regard to the significant number of low performing schools throughout the state. As one faculty member put it, NCLB was a wake-up call that drove home the “failure of Illinois schools to produce significant gains in student achievement.”

The U.S. Department of Education’s Race to the Top (RTTT) grant program also provided incentives for state officials to embrace policy reform efforts aimed at school improvement. One former superintendent recalled that the federal expectations for grant funding through NCLB and RTTT were substantial levers that spurred involvement by state education officials in the statewide efforts to improve school leader preparation and development. As a former superintendent and current faculty member confirmed, “the potential for the state to receive federal Race to the Top funds also helped to move legislation through the process.” An example of the mechanism used to exert influence with these types of programs can be seen in the criteria used to score RTTT applications. There were a total of six criteria used in scoring. The highest weighted criterion, accounting for almost 30% of the total points, involved strategies to ensure great teachers and leaders. The subcategories for that criterion included: 1) improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance standards; 2) ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals; 3) providing high quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals; 4) improving effectiveness of teachers; and 5) improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs. As states competed for a portion of the over \$4 billion in grant funds, policy makers prioritized reform efforts aimed at improving the quality of our educator pipeline.

As one state education official asserted, there was tremendous “support for change nationally” spurred on by NCLB and RTTT. This resulted in local policy responses aimed at improving school leader preparation and development. Several pieces of legislation were passed to accomplish this goal, including the passage of Illinois Public Act 94-1039 - New Principal Mentor Program that required all new public school principals throughout the state to be provided with mentoring support from veteran administrators to support their induction into the position. Illinois Public Act 96-0861 - Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA) required all principals throughout the state to be evaluated annually using an evidence-based model that includes clear performance standards and student growth measures. Additionally, the work of IL-SAELP, Commission on School Leader Preparation, Illinois School Leader Task Force, and the Redesign Committees culminated in the passage, in 2010, of Illinois Public Act 096-0903 establishing new requirements for principal preparation programs.

At that point, the policy itself became the biggest driver for program redesign. As one former superintendent and current faculty member stated plainly, “it was the law. Once we met the law’s requirement for an approved program, the desire to implement effectively and with fidelity was a significant lever.”

### **Lever 6: On-Going Support with Opportunities to Share Lessons Learned and Best Practices**

Lever 6 is intimately linked to all of the levers above in that it provides the connection of all the stakeholders to the common purpose that drew them together in the first place. A state education official pointed out that the efforts of these stakeholder groups were successful in bring about meaningful change because of the “support of many stakeholders, the support for change nationally, The Wallace Foundation’s support of this work, and the strong support of the State Superintendent and the State Board of Education.”

Support from a wide variety of sources was vital in the policy formation process. However, many respondents indicated that the reason they remained engaged with this work over such a long period of time was not because they feared looming policy mandates, but instead for many it was the desire to improve both the profession in general and their institutions in particular. This desire to improve was a major motivating factor in stakeholder participation. As one department chair asserted, “we had a strong program, but wanted it to be even better. We don’t wait for change to be imposed. We valued the changes that were being made and wanted to be involved with the groundwork. We wanted to be in the forefront, helping to lead the way in the state.” A faculty member from another program expressed similar feelings, “My first hope was that by collaborating with other universities, we could identify essential understandings and proficiencies that all principals need in order to be effective building leaders.” Stakeholders were clear about the need to create a learning community among the stakeholders involved in this work. As one faculty member reflected, she wanted to tap into the experience and knowledge of others grappling with substantive change, “my expectation was, that like all changes in ‘the way we do things,’ there would be anxiety but also excitement associated with the possibility of growth and improvement.”

While numerous respondents commented on the importance of on-going support and sharing in the process, the vast majority also expressed concern that with the passage of the statute and the new rules, on-going support has not been provided by the state during this crucial implementation phase. According to one faculty member, “policy without capacity is my concern with the state initiative now. I would say that the state has moved on a prescriptive and ambitious policy initiative without universities and schools having the capacity to implement at optimal level, mostly due to limited or non-existent state financial and technical support.” A faculty member from another program also indicated a current lack of external support, “the state is in the process of trying to determine the best ways to evaluate the process. State personnel need to spend more time listening to, responding to, and supporting us in the implementation of the programs.” Another faculty member expressed disappointment in the condition of the work at this point. As he sees it “we seem to be stuck on implementation which is a problem in general in our state. We have great ideas, we do some phenomenal reshaping of programs, pass laws that have potential to truly change the landscape for children, but fall down on implementation.”

The enactment of the new law and rules was not the ultimate outcome envisioned by those involved in the redesign efforts. The substantial changes made to principal preparation and development are aimed at improving school and student outcomes. As one faculty member indicated, “Just like the birth of a baby launches the nurturing and developing process, so, too, does the state need to focus time, money, and energy for the principal redesign to become fully developed and reach its potential for improving education across the state.” Support during implantation is essential to move these efforts to the ultimate outcome.

Stakeholders had much to say about the collective efforts to improve principal preparation and development in Illinois. Although there was universal appreciation for the hard work that had gone into the policy formation phase, and many have a positive view of the focus on improving principal preparation and development, some also expressed reservations about various specific aspects of the rules and regulations. A common theme among district officials

was that they were encouraged by the authentic learning experiences that will be provided through the intensive internships. As one former superintendent indicated, as institutions “are adapting and re-developing their preparation programs for approval...districts are now perceived as the consumer and have more opportunity to influence preparation programs, align their efforts, and work collaboratively.” This enthusiasm was balanced by some representatives from higher education that expressed reservations about the prescriptive nature of the rules, the lack of financial support, supply and demand concerns, the issue of out of state licenses, delays with the development of the content area exam, and concerns about unintended consequences and the overall impact of these changes.

Now in the implementation phase, many have expressed concern that the sense of urgency that was present and prompted policy makers to enact legislation has waned. With the successful completion of the policy phase, some stakeholders fear that principal preparation and development has diminished as a priority for the state. Other pressing education reforms have created a context within which policy layering is making the implementation of this work much more difficult. As one faculty member noted, “the state is in danger of losing the momentum of this initiative due to all of the other initiatives that are also on their agenda, e.g., Teacher Leadership, Teacher Evaluation, Superintendent Redesign, and PAARC, to name a few.” A former school administrator added, “when everything is important, nothing is important.” In this current environment, there remains a need for ongoing support for program implementation.

Given the uncertainty that is inherent in a change process as extensive as the one describe in this paper, it is not surprising then that some stakeholders are very optimistic about where the state is now, while others are quite cautious and are reserving judgment until a clearer picture of the impact of these changes can be determined. As one faculty member described it, the current phase is the inquiry phase, where “we need to be asking, where is implementation taking us? Are things better or worse? Assessing impact is key at this point. Is over regulation the problem or should we be focusing on supporting organizational change?” Now is not the time to accelerate, but to step back and examine what is occurring. Pointing out how long the policy formation phase took, one former superintendent and policy maker expressed concern over the rush to implement wholesale change. “The process used to get the legislation passed was incremental. We did not move too fast. It was a good process. But the rules - not so much. Things got messy in the end. We still need to figure out how implementing the rules can be more incremental as we learn more about what works.” A faculty member concurred about the pace and sweeping changes ushered in with the rules process and indicated that some trust was lost between collaborating partners. He further suggested that the stakeholders return to a focus on the common purpose that brought them together in the first place. Further, he argues that “rebuilding trust and working toward consensus are what is needed most.”

The chair of the Illinois School Leader Task Force is encouraged by the new policy requirements involving principal preparation and believes that it demonstrates promising developments. However, he acknowledges that the impact on student achievement is unknowable at this point. Further, he asserts, “we know from organizational change theory that systems are by their nature resistant to change and will revert to pre-change ways of doing things if the changes are not nurtured, evaluated, and re-shaped to meet conditions on the

ground.” For that reason, it is essential at this time that more attention be paid to lever six in the implementation phase.

### **The Illinois School Leader Advisory Council – 2014 – 2015**

Recognizing the importance of on-going support to nurture new principal preparation programs, and in response to feedback from numerous stakeholders, the ISBE and IBHE have once again joined in a collaborative effort to engage a broad range of stakeholders to focus on improvements to principal preparation and development. The Illinois School Leader Advisory Council (ISLAC), funded by grants from The Wallace Foundation and the McCormick Foundation awarded to CSEP, will engage a broad group of educators, policy makers, business executives, and foundation officers from throughout the state. The primary purpose of convening ISLAC is to provide an ongoing forum that will focus on implementation support and the continuous improvement of policy and practice involving school leadership development in Illinois. Steve Tozer, former chair of the Illinois School Leader Task Force and current professor at the University of Illinois-Chicago, and Diane Rutledge, former superintendent of Springfield District #186 and current Executive Director of the Large Unit District Association, will co-chair ISLAC (see Appendix I). All of the work of ISLAC will be posted on the [www.illinoisschoolleader.org](http://www.illinoisschoolleader.org) web site.

ISLAC will produce a five-year strategic plan by mid-2015, with an emphasis on strategies that are collaborative, collective, and responsive to changing needs and conditions in the field. In order to engage in in-depth research and dialogue, ISLAC will conduct much of its work through five study teams designed to address key components of principal preparation and support.

### **Program Cohesion**

The Program Cohesion Team will develop strategies to support the continuous improvement of principal preparation programs, including coursework, assessment, data collection and use, and embedded program evaluation and feedback processes. The team will examine existing program improvements and identify effective practices to study and replicate or adapt.

The work of this committee is in response to feedback from the field regarding the need for on-going support and a platform for sharing best practices as programs begin the implementation and continuous improvement phase. For example, some stakeholders indicated that they felt the prescriptive nature of the rules stifled innovation. As one faculty member acknowledged “there may be some truth to the complaints that the rules are too prescriptive but the changes wouldn’t have gotten done if they were not prescriptive. It would have been too hard for schools of education to develop new programs without the detailed rules. Organizations... should be embracing the development of field experience models collaboratively. Universities outside of Chicago should be using their [Regional Offices of Education] as a clearinghouse, like the Springfield/ISU model. People need to be creative.” In another case, a faculty member expressed frustration that the rules narrow the definition of “all students” to a narrower focus on subgroups. “I think the definition in the law of ‘all students’

needs to be much more inclusive. There are other subgroups in Illinois who desperately need better teachers, principals and schools. What about black kids, poor kids and rural kids? The issue of race/ethnicity and urbanicity is not mentioned in the legislation, [social economic status] is barely mentioned in the legislation. In the case of our downstate institution that serves highly rural and increasingly poor communities, this is a huge omission that could lead to a lack of focus on several large groups of students who urgently need better opportunities.” These types of issues and collaborative approaches will be explored by the Program Cohesion committee, along with others in an effort to develop a comprehensive system of support that provides specific strategies for programs in a wide variety of contexts.

### **Quality Assurance**

The Quality Assurance Team will develop methods to facilitate coordination among different data collection and regulatory bodies (e.g., ISBE, IBHE, CAEP, and institutional data collection) and among the various requirements and processes for preparation program approval, accreditation, and compliance. Emphasis will be placed on methods to assist all stakeholders (e.g., department chairs, faculty, principals, graduate students, district office personnel) to better understand and participate in processes with regulatory bodies.

The work of this committee is in response to feedback from the field regarding the need for aligned systems and understanding of the impact of these changes. Many stakeholders have expressed concern over the lack of clarity in terms of how individual candidates and programs will be evaluated and what measures will be required by the state. For example, one faculty member raised questions about “how the new content area assessment will be evaluated. If those who do well on it are also successful in raising student achievement, is that the indicator that shall [be used to] evaluate the principal preparation program? Or, is it the more rigorous internship? It seems that we continue to put the same standard procedures in place when what we need is compelling evidence that one or both of those assessments truly predict principal success in the field.” Another underscored the importance of ensuring the new assessment demonstrates proficiency in the same way that the performance assessments have been constructed. “Without an effective alignment to actual practice these assessments will not adequately reflect what candidates learned and must do in school environments.” Beyond individual and program assessment, several stakeholders pointed to the need for evaluating the impact of the policy itself. Some stakeholders pointed out that a few rules were identified that created unintended consequences and that they were happy to see that policy makers took the necessary steps to address those issues. However, as the work progresses continued examination of the policy itself is necessary.

Implementation, evaluation, and improvement are closely linked and as such, engagement of stakeholders in this work is essential to ensure the metrics used are not only the best indicators of impact, but also assist in identifying opportunities and challenges to improvement. This does not just include program improvements, but policy improvements as well. One faculty member expressed the need for both policy and program improvements by stating that there was legitimacy in the pushback the state received on some of the rules “some changes [to the rules] did need to be made. Ongoing monitoring of the new programs will also be needed to determine whether or not the new requirements are actually creating a shortage as has

been claimed by some institutions, or whether we now have a smaller, yet better qualified and effective work force in leading our schools.” To address that need, this committee will explore factors that promote and inhibit policy implementation at both the programmatic level and the policy level and what the state or another quality assurance body might do to assure that quality levels are maintained.

## **Partnerships**

The Partnerships Team will recommend strategies to build and strengthen preparation program partnerships with school districts and Regional Offices of Education. They will address candidate recruitment, support, course content, assessments, and placement. This team will examine school district participation in shared recruitment, selection, and internship assessment in partnership with principal preparation programs as well as the ROEs (as applicable). As the paradigm shift continues toward a district as consumer model for principal preparation, it is vital that school administrators’ voices continue to be represented in the implementation and improvement process involving principal preparation.

An important factor influencing the school leaders’ pipeline that emerged from stakeholders in meetings and also in the current interview and survey data was the notion of the complexity of the principalship, particularly in under-resourced and/or poor performing schools. As one administrator commented, “we continue to hear that there are fewer people entering the new leadership programs and I believe we need to find out why. My hypothesis is that the job is not that attractive to a lot of people.” This sentiment was echoed by a representative from a professional organization, “We need to look at what the principal’s job has become. Is it a job anyone wants to do anymore?” Partnerships between universities and districts can shed light on this issue, act to improve conditions that provide disincentives for aspiring leaders, and ensure that authentic learning opportunities are provided that make available the kinds of experiences that produce principals with the skills and abilities to take on the challenging role.

Data demonstrate that enrollment in new principal preparation programs is significantly lower than it was in the former general administrative programs. The former general administrative programs leading to a Type 75 certificate have been discontinued. While new programs leading to principal or teacher leader endorsements have been developed, there may be a void left by the absence of the general administrative programs. For example, the training required to prepare individuals for positions such as athletic director, dean of students, district administrators, and such may not be adequately acquired in either the principal or teacher leader endorsement programs. Further engagement between districts and universities is necessary to shed light on what these other positions need in terms of preparing effective school administrators and/or how those competencies may or may not align with the new preparation programs. Partnerships between preparation programs and districts are crucial to identifying and addressing the potential void left by the discontinuation of general administrative programs.

There were a wide variety of perspectives expressed by stakeholders when it came to partnerships. One faculty member praised the partnership requirement and stated that the benefit exceeded her expectation. “The partnerships with the districts have been very beneficial – more than anticipated, more than when we just partnered with individual schools. We have not



experienced a dip in enrollment. The district partnerships have helped to actually increase enrollment a bit. We now have five district level partnerships.” Although there was universal support among stakeholders regarding the partnership requirement, many stressed the need for reciprocal learning between the partners. For example, one faculty member claimed, “The internship is the last thing I would give up. But, it will not be easy to do – requiring students to lead. Many principals don’t know how to do the things that we are asking the interns to do. This is a transition issue and I’m not sure how universities are going to work through this.” These comments indicate the need for more attention to be paid to improving district and university partnerships to inform the processes and structures for both the preparation and development of school leaders.

### **Training and Support**

The Training and Support Team will develop strategies to implement and support candidate internships, mentors, and supervisors. The team will study candidates, principal mentors, and programs with early completers under the new Illinois principal requirements (including the internship), and will recommend strategies for supporting principal candidates, mentors, and faculty supervisors. In doing this, the team will look at in-service support programs at the state or district level in which to align continuous support for candidates as they become new principals. One statewide principal organization, for example, is exploring if principal mentors who supervise principal candidates, can earn credits toward a Master Principal Designation. The districts and universities participating in the U.S. Department of Education funded IL-PART project are exploring some innovative strategies to match and support candidates during the internship. Team members will also explore how supports for candidates can be expanded into new principal mentor supports once they are hired as principals or assistant principals, as well as how training and supports for aspiring principals are aligned with new principal evaluation criteria and the real expectations on the job.

This work is in response to feedback on the critical supports needed for the internship, and not just for the candidate but also for principal mentors and faculty supervisors. According to one faculty member, “we are concerned that we may not have enough principal mentors who meet the qualifications and have the desired qualities to guide and nurture an intern. Our program has not gotten that far, but will this fall.” One faculty member commented that their internship supervisor has reported the value of the internship requirements on not just building the skills and knowledge for the principal candidate but also for the principal mentor. This is vital as the job of the principal becomes more complex.

Statewide association leaders recognized this. According to one association leader, “We continue to hear that there are fewer people entering the new leadership programs and I believe we need to find out why. My hypothesis is that the job is not that attractive to a lot of people.” This was reiterated by another association leader who advised, “We need to look at what the principal’s job has become. Is it a job anyone wants to do anymore?” Although it is difficult to put more demands on the already strained time of principals, the growing complexity of the principalship and increasing challenges of Illinois schools’ places even more value on providing the right, targeted training and supports to best prepare aspiring leaders for the realities of the job.

## **Network Support and Scalability**

While all teams will be concerned with how innovation can be implemented at scale in a state with approximately 4,000 schools, the Network and Scalability Team will recommend ways for preparation programs and their partners to network using a “collective impact” approach to achieve mutual benefits and the ultimate benefit of improved student learning. They will identify useful tools, address access to local and state resources, and recommend methods to share effective practices. They will examine how Chicago Public Schools, for example, has established, and is expanding, a network of principal preparation programs that is approaching the capacity to produce enough principals to fill all vacancies annually in CPS. This team will also identify resources for preparation programs, partners, and ISLAC.

Another critical piece of this team’s work will be the development of a communication plan to educate key stakeholders on the requirements of the new Principal Endorsement and its value. Several misperceptions of the new program exist – for example, that teachers are required to leave a full-time teaching position in order to complete the internship. These need to be clarified and communicated to avoid quality candidates from being discouraged to apply to programs. There is currently no statewide requirement that an individual must complete a full-time, yearlong internship in order to earn a principal endorsement. There are a few programs that have incorporated a full-time internships component. However, most have chosen to adopt a more traditional model where the candidate conducts internship activities outside of work hours. The Network Support and Scalability Team will encourage effective communication to address misconceptions and ensure potential candidates are fully informed about the state requirements for principal preparation.

Stakeholders routinely cited technical assistance and support as effective strategies that moved these efforts forward. During the implementation phase, these types of supports have proven even more crucial. Stakeholders across the board identified the need for a wide variety of supports that encompass all aspects of program delivery. As one faculty member argued “most of the implementation costs have been pushed to the universities.” Programs would like to see the state provide more technical assistance, improved and timely official communication, and financial resources to support the development of shared tools, such as a screening instrument for use during the candidate selection process, a statewide evaluation including all components of the internship, and tools to help programs identify alignment with partner districts’ talent development systems. Further, one faculty member stressed, “the efforts of CSEP to try and bridge the lack of support has been crucial. But, I feel strongly that the state must increase their responsibilities and accountability for these changes for them to be successful long term.”

## **Conclusion**

The work on principal preparation program redesign has influenced ISBE’s work to redesign other certification areas – including the superintendent and teacher leadership endorsements. Utilizing the same strategies to convene stakeholders to serve on advisory groups, representatives from various education stakeholder organizations have come together to align these program requirements with the principal endorsement. The intention is to build distributed

leadership systems within schools, which will help build support and capacity for principals. For instance, ISBE redesigned superintendent program standards that are about to be presented to its Board members; these standards were developed and recommended by the Superintendent Advisory Board. The members of this group examined the new principal preparation program standards and asked what kind of district leaders will these new principals need in order to be able to perform the work for which they were trained? Like the principal preparation programs, the recommended superintendent program rules were developed through the lens of instructional leadership. They, too, have a strong university-district partnership requirement and are also performance-based with an internship that incorporates authentic learning experiences that are consistent with a new set of district leadership competencies that align with national standards.

Similarly, conversations are continuing in the state around the teacher leader endorsement. A recent national survey of teachers and principals by MetLife found the majority of principals said that school leadership responsibilities have changed significantly over the last five years. Three out of four K-12 public school principals in all types schools and in all grade levels believe the job has become extremely complex (Harris Interactive, 2013). Numerous studies have concluded that principals alone cannot address all of the challenges facing our schools and must focus the collective efforts of the entire school community to bring about meaningful change (Elmore, R. 2004; Fullan, M. 2006; Leithwood et. al. 2007; Murphy, J. 2005; Spillane, J. & Diamond, J. 2007). These findings drive home the need for districts to utilize distributed leadership practices involving others, such as teacher leaders and peer evaluators. The importance of these practices is reflected in school improvement efforts brought about by education reforms, including teacher performance evaluations and the Common Core Standards.

When beginning the work on principal preparation, there were many discussions about the numbers of candidates in principal preparation programs versus the much smaller number of these candidates who actually intended to become principals. Therefore, the teacher leadership endorsement and programs were seen as a way for teachers who did not want to leave the teaching profession to stay in the classroom. These individuals will receive additional leadership and teaching training that will give them the knowledge and skills to support the instructional leadership role of the principal by taking some leadership responsibilities in the building or the district. The Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Committee of the Governor's Illinois P-20 Council has already recommended standards for the Teacher Leader programs, which have been written into rules. The teacher leadership endorsement is now available for approval by the ISEPLB and at least four university programs have been approved so far, with several other universities in the process of designing teacher leadership endorsements. The design of these new teacher leadership endorsement programs vary and the program standards written for the new endorsement were purposefully written to allow for innovation in design by universities and flexibility with utilization by districts.

Starting in the Fall 2014, the Illinois P-20 Council Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Committee will be conducting a study on how teacher leadership is used in the state. This will include a deeper inquiry into how districts organize and use these roles, as well as the compilation of an inventory of university-based teacher leadership endorsement programs. The inventory of university programs and district positions will also look at the congruence,

differences, and models of practice to gain an understanding of how universities are viewing these programs and what are district's practical needs for teacher leaders.

While this paper has outlined many accomplishments as well as some lingering concerns, there are likely others that have not been covered. One such major topic of concern is financial. Several of the interview and survey respondents said that they are concerned about the financial impact the changes are having on the colleges and universities. "It is a financial issue for higher education." Another said, "we've passed the reform legislation, but not the funding to implement it. We need to keep advancing our model of good mentoring and induction during the first year on the job, especially without a full year internship– but maybe even with year-long internship." One commenter reported hearing that some programs have reduced staff due to fewer candidates. This issue does not have its own study team assigned to it, but it is an issue that should be addressed by ISLAC as it deliberates needed supports and strategizes sources for financial sustenance. Moving innovation to scale always has financial implications, and all teams should try to address this along with other issues of scalability.

The principal preparation redesign process has been exciting to watch as it has unfolded. The promise, which it holds to improve not only the quality of our principals but also the quality and effectiveness of our schools, is very encouraging. Throughout this work as stakeholders debated the intricacies of the legislation and program standards, when discussions became stymied, the overriding question which pulled participants back into focus was "what is best for the students?" One of the stakeholders who reflected on this work is worried that "the state is in danger of losing the momentum of this initiative due to all of the other initiatives that are also on their agenda, e.g., Teacher Leadership, Teacher Evaluation, Superintendent Redesign, PAARC, to name a few. What is needed is a focus on evaluating the impact of the work of the last ten years. Just like the birth of a baby launches the nurturing and developing process, so, too, does the state need to focus time, money, and energy for the principal redesign to become fully developed and reach its potential for improving education across the state."

This commenter is correct that ISBE is working on many different education reforms such as new Illinois Learning Standards, new state student assessments, and a new performance evaluation system for teachers and principals. However, the research that serves as the foundation for the redesign of principal preparation and development has shown that high quality and effective school leadership is necessary for the successful implementation of these education reforms and for school improvement. In order for schools to align and improve their curricular program, teachers and staff need a strong instructional leader who can recognize the importance of research-based curriculum and use student data in their schools to choose programs that meet their students' needs. In order for teacher evaluation systems to be successful in improving teaching practice, principals are needed who can observe and identify effective teaching practices and engage with their teachers in collaborative conversations and professional learning communities to strengthen teachers' weaknesses and build upon their strengths.

It is the charge of ISLAC to keep the work of principal preparation at the forefront. This will be accomplished by studying the impact of the policy on current programs, developing a deeper understanding of what the state needs long-term to support the production of more effective school leaders, developing strategies to elevate the impact of the principal endorsement

legislation, and building the capacity of state agencies to grow support for dramatically changed partnerships between school districts and principal preparation programs. Ultimately, the effectiveness of these reforms will be evident in whether they successfully improve student learning in Illinois schools.

## Endnotes

1. For more information about the 2014 Frank Newman Award for State Innovation from the Education Commission of the States see <http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/01/13/10/11310.pdf>.
2. For a copy of *Preparing a Pipeline of Effective Principals: A Legislative Approach* see <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/state-policy/Pages/Preparing-a-Pipeline-of-Effective-Principals-A-Legislative-Approach.aspx>)
3. The brief was the result of a seminar held for legislators at the [NCSL Legislative Summit](#). For more information about the NCSL Legislative Summit see <http://www.ncsl.org/issues-research/educ/leadership-chicago.aspx>)
4. For a copy of *What Do We Know About Principal Preparation, Licensure Requirements, and Professional Development for School Leaders?* see [http://ceelo.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/ceelo\\_policy\\_report\\_ece\\_principal\\_prep.pdf](http://ceelo.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/ceelo_policy_report_ece_principal_prep.pdf).
5. For a copy of *Leading for Early Success: Building School Principals' Capacity to Lead High-Quality Early Education* see <http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/2013/1306LeadingForEarlySuccessPaper.pdf>.
6. Orr, King, and LaPointe (2010) *Districts Developing Leaders: Lessons on Consumer Actions and Program Approaches from Eight Urban Districts* can be found at: <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Documents/districts-developing-leaders-executive-summary.pdf>
7. For a copy of *Leadership for Learning: Strengthening Policies on Education Leadership on Behalf of Illinois Schools* see <http://education.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/csep/leadershipforlearning.pdf>
8. *Educating School Leaders* (Levine, 2005) <http://www.edschools.org/pdf/ESfinal313.pdf>
9. After July 1, 2014, NCATE's name has been changed to the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation.
10. A copy of the Commission's report, *School Leader Preparation: A Blueprint for Change*, can be found at <http://www.ibhe.org/Academic%20Affairs/CSLP/default.htm>
11. A copy of the *Illinois School Leader Task Force Report to the Illinois General Assembly* can be found at <http://illinoisschoolleader.org/>
12. A copy of the Center for the Study of Education Policy's white paper on Statewide *Data on the Supply and Demand of Principals in Illinois: Results of Illinois' New Principal Endorsement* can be found at

[http://education.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/csep/Principal%20Preparation%20Supply%20Demand%20White%20Paper\\_USE%20THIS.pdf](http://education.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/csep/Principal%20Preparation%20Supply%20Demand%20White%20Paper_USE%20THIS.pdf) or [http://www.isbe.net/prep-eval/pdf/prin\\_prep\\_supply\\_whitepaper-0313.pdf](http://www.isbe.net/prep-eval/pdf/prin_prep_supply_whitepaper-0313.pdf)

13. A copy of the *Building a Seamless Learning Continuum: The Role of Leadership in Bridging the Gaps Between Early Childhood and K-12 Education Systems* can be found at [http://leadershiplinc.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/FINAL\\_LINCreport.pdf](http://leadershiplinc.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/FINAL_LINCreport.pdf). All reports and meeting materials related to LINC project and technical assistance provided to principal preparation programs can be found on the LINC website at: <http://leadershiplinc.illinoisstate.edu/>
14. Waters, Marzano, and McNulty (2003), *Balanced Leadership: What 30 Years of Research Tells Us About the Effect of Leadership on Student Achievement* can be found at: [http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/ASC/5031RR\\_BalancedLeadership.pdf](http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/ASC/5031RR_BalancedLeadership.pdf)
15. Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004), *How Leadership Influences Student Learning* can be found at: <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Pages/How-Leadership-Influences-Student-Learning.aspx>

## **APPENDICES:**

- Appendix A. Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership
- Appendix B. IL-SAELP Executive Committee
- Appendix C. IL-SAELP Consortium
- Appendix D. Commission on School Leader Preparation in Illinois
- Appendix E. Illinois School Leader Task Force
- Appendix F. Leadership to Integrate the Learning Continuum (LINC) Advisory Group
- Appendix G. School Leader Redesign Team Members
- Appendix H. Principal Preparation Steering Committee
- Appendix I. Illinois School Leader Advisory Council
- Appendix J. Illinois Principal Preparation Redesign Timeline 2001-2014



## APPENDIX A

### ILLINOIS CONSORTIUM FOR EDUCATION LEADERSHIP

**Gary Alexander**

Illinois Board of Higher  
Education

**Dianne E. Ashby**

Illinois State University

**Lee Bartolini**

Illinois State Board of  
Education

**Michael Boer**

Springfield Chamber of  
Commerce

**Christy Coleman**

Illinois Association of  
School Boards

**P.J. Cross**

Illinois Association of  
Regional Superintendents

**Anne Davis**

Illinois Education  
Association

**Bruce Dennison**

Illinois Association of  
Regional Superintendents

**James Dougherty**

Illinois Federation of  
Teachers

**Bill DuBois**

Elgin School District, U-46

**Sherry R. Eagle**

Large Unit District  
Association

**Chris Everson**

House Democratic Staff

**Harold E. Ford**

Illinois Association of  
School Administrators

**Roberta Hendee**

Springfield School District  
#186

**William Kling**

Ancil, Glink, Diamond, Bush,  
DiCianni & Rolek, P. C.

**Lanita Koster**

Illinois Federation of  
Teachers

**Hazel Loucks**

Formerly, Office of the  
Governor

**Elmer (Mac) McPherson**

Decatur Public Schools # 61

**Peter Martinez**

Center for School  
Leadership  
University of Illinois at  
Chicago

**Jeff Mays**

Illinois Business  
Roundtable

**Connie Neale**

Elgin School District, U-46

**Margaret Noe**

University of Illinois at  
Springfield

**Lee Patton**

Illinois State Board of  
Education

## APPENDIX A

### ILLINOIS CONSORTIUM FOR EDUCATION LEADERSHIP

**Sallie Penman**

Chicago Public Schools,  
Chicago

**Jennifer Presley**

Illinois Education Research  
Council  
Southern Illinois University  
at Edwardsville

**Kay Royster**

Peoria Public Schools, #150

**Diane Rutledge**

Springfield School District  
#186

**Tom Ryder**

Illinois Community College  
Board

**Robert E. Schiller**

State Board of Education

**Dan Taylor**

House Republican Staff

**Jenny Tripses**

Illinois Council of  
Professors of Educational  
Administration

**Bev Turkal**

State Board of Education

**David Turner**

Illinois Principals  
Association

**Sarah Williamson**

Illinois Congress of Parents  
and Teachers

**Jonathan Wolff**

Senate Democratic Staff

**CONSORTIUM STAFF:**

**Abdenour Boukhami**

Illinois State University

**Sally Bulkley Pancrazio**

Pancrazio Education &  
Development, Inc.

**Norman D. Durflinger**

Illinois State University

**Edward R. Hines**

Illinois State University

**D. Michele Maki**

Illinois State University

**Linda Vogel**

Illinois State University

**Richard Wiggall**

Illinois State University

**John Wilson**

Illinois State University

**Dane Linn**

National Governors Assoc.

## APPENDIX B

### Illinois State Action for Education Leadership Project Executive Committee

**Stan Ikenberry, Chairman**  
University of Illinois

**Jo Anderson**  
Illinois Education Association

**Deborah Curtis**  
Illinois State University

**Senator Deanna Demuzio**  
Illinois General Assembly

**Judy Erwin**  
Illinois Board of Higher Education

**Brenda Holmes**  
Illinois State Board of Education

**Chris Koch**  
Illinois State Board of Education

**Jeff Mays**  
Illinois Business Roundtable

**Walter Milton**  
Springfield School District #186

**Representative Jerry Mitchell**  
Illinois General Assembly

**Kristin Richards**  
Office of Governor Rod Blagojevich

**Senator Dan Rutherford**  
Illinois General Assembly

**Diane Rutledge**  
Large Unit District Association

**Brian Schwartz**  
Illinois Principals Association

**Representative Michael Smith**  
Illinois General Assembly

**Gail Ward**  
Chicago Public Schools

IL-SAELP STAFF:

**Lois Adams-Rodgers**  
Council of Chief State School  
Officers

**Norman D. Durflinger**  
Illinois State University

**Erika Hunt**  
Illinois State University

**Lisa Hood**  
Illinois State University

**Lisa Guckian**  
James B. Hunt, Jr. Institute for  
Educational Leadership and Policy

## APPENDIX C

### Illinois State Action for Education Leadership Project Consortium

**Lois Adams-Rodgers**  
Council of Chief State School  
Officers

**Mary Ahillen**  
Parkside Junior High School

**Ron Alburtus**  
Newton High School

**Gary Alexander**  
Illinois Board of Higher Education

**Michael Alexander**  
Chicago Public Schools

**Jo Anderson**  
Illinois Education Association

**Nate Anderson**  
University of Illinois at Springfield

**Katie M. Anselment**  
Office of the Speaker  
Illinois General Assembly

**Kenneth Arndt**  
Large Unit District Association

**Dianne E. Ashby**  
Illinois State University

**Colleen Atterbury**  
House Republican Staff  
Illinois General Assembly

**Mike Bartlett**  
Illinois Association of School Boards

**Paul Beilfuss**  
DeKalb School District #428

**Maggie Blinn**  
Chicago Public Schools

**Gayla Boomer**  
Illinois PTA

**Barb Bonner**  
Larsen Middle School

**Cleo Boswell**  
Illinois State Board of Education

**Jacob Broncato**  
Illinois Association of School  
Administrators

**Marie Byrd-Blake**  
Southern Illinois University  
Edwardsville

**Alan Chapman**  
Normal Unit #5 School District

**Brent Clark**  
Illinois Association of School  
Administrators

**Christy Coleman**  
Illinois Association of School Boards

**Brad Colwell**  
Southern Illinois University at  
Carbondale

**Kathy Crum**  
Elizabeth Graham Elementary  
School

**Mary Beth Cunat**  
Chicago Public Schools

**Deborah Curtis**  
Illinois State University

## APPENDIX C

### Illinois State Action for Education Leadership Project Consortium

**Bruce Dennison**

Past Regional Superintendent, IARSS

**Sue Dole**

Springfield School District #186

**James Dougherty**

Illinois Federation of Teachers

**Mr. Bill DuBois,**

Elgin School District, U-46

**Sherry Eagle**

Aurora West District #129

**Marvin Edwards**

Aurora University

**Christy England-Siegerdt**

Illinois Board of Higher Education

**Allen R. Ellington**

Collinsville Middle School

**Jack Elliott**

Midwest Principals' Center

**April Ervin**

New Leaders for New Schools

**Karen Fox**

Elgin School District, U-46

**Lynn Gaddis**

Illinois NBPTS

**Lisa Gocken**

Mary Miller Junior High

**Katharine Gricevich**

Senate Democrat Staff

Illinois General Assembly

**June Grivetti**

University of St. Francis

**Lisa Guckian**

James B. Hunt, Jr. Institute for  
Educational Leadership and Policy

**Pat Halloran**

Morris High School

**Dean Halverson**

Western Illinois University

**Herschel Hannah**

Peoria Public Schools

**Linda Harris**

Wilson Intermediate School

**Dale Heidbreder**

Lexington Elementary School

**Roberta Hendee**

Springfield District #186

**Vicki Hensley**

Iroquois-Kankakee ROE

**Douglas Hesbol**

Laraway CCSD-70C

**Kristina A. Hesbol**

DeKalb Community School District 428

**Ken Hinton**

Peoria Public Schools District 150

**Brenda Holmes**

Illinois State Board of Education

**Lynda Irvin**

Illinois State University

## APPENDIX C

### Illinois State Action for Education Leadership Project Consortium

**Calvin Jackson**

IL Assoc. of School Business Officers

**Jessica Jacobson**

Illinois State Board of Education

**Elaine Johnson**

Illinois Community College Board

**Michael Johnson**

Illinois Association of School Boards

**Joyce Karon,**

Illinois State Board of Education

**Bev Kasper**

Loyola University Chicago

**Joyce Killian**

Southern Illinois University

**Cinda Klickna**

Illinois Education Association

**William Kling**

Ancil, Glink, Diamond, Bush, DiCianni  
& Rolek, P. C.

**Kim Kubatzke**

University of Illinois at Springfield

**Nancy Laho**

Chicago Public Schools

**Jason Leahy**

Illinois Principals Association

**Joyce M. Lieberman**

Northern Illinois University

**Jeanette Malafa**

Senate Republican Staff  
Illinois General Assembly

**Peter Martinez**

University of Illinois at Chicago

**Ralph Martire**

Center for Tax and Budget  
Accountability

**Jeff Mays**

Illinois Business Roundtable

**Becky McCabe**

Illinois State Board of Education

**Marilyn McConachie**

Northern Illinois University

**Elizabeth McDonald**

National-Louis University

**Kelly McKerrow**

Southern Illinois University at  
Carbondale

**John Meisinger**

Richwoods High School

**Debbie Meisner-Bertauski**

Illinois Board of Higher Education

**Stephen Midlock**

University of St. Francis

**Wilma Miranda**

Northern Illinois University

**Linda Morford**

Eastern Illinois University

**John Murphy**

Northern Illinois University

**Margaret Noe**

University of Illinois at Springfield

## APPENDIX C

### Illinois State Action for Education Leadership Project Consortium

**Nick Osborne**

Eastern Illinois University

**Robert Paolicchi**

Aurora University

**Lee Patton**

Northern Illinois University

**Sallie Penman**

Chicago Public Schools

**Karl Plank**

Aurora University

**Jennifer Presley**

Illinois Education Research Council

**Josh Quick**

Washington Elementary School

**Julie Retzlaff**

Elgin School District U-46

**Kristin Richards**

Office of Governor Rod Blagojevich

**Joanne Rooney**

National-Louis University

**Darlene Ruscitti**

DuPage Regional Office of Education

**Diane Rutledge**

Springfield School District #186

**Brian Schwartz**

Illinois Principals Association

**Fred Singleton**

Illinois Principals Association

**Audrey Soglin**

Consortium for Educational Change

**Perry Soldwedel**

Consortium for Educational Change

**Dick Spohr**

Illinois Principals Association

**Terry Stirling**

Northeastern Illinois University

**Susan Stratton**

Northern Illinois University

**Joanne Strong**

Illinois PTA

**Steve Tozer**

University of Illinois at Chicago

**Jenny Tripses**

Bradley University

**Bev Turkal**

Robinson School District #2

**David Turner**

University of Illinois at Springfield

**Bradley Warren**

The Greater Springfield Chamber of  
Commerce

**Don White**

Pekin Public Schools District #108

**John White**

Teach For America, Chicago

**Cindy Worner**

Sunset Hills Elementary School

## APPENDIX C

### Illinois State Action for Education Leadership Project Consortium

#### **CONSORTIUM STAFF:**

**Erika Hunt**

Illinois State University

**Norman D. Durflinger**

Illinois State University

**Lisa Hood**

Illinois State University

**Linda Wall**

Illinois State University



## APPENDIX D

### Member Listing COMMISSION ON STUDENT LEADER PREPARATION IN ILLINOIS COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES

*Co-chair*

**ASHBY, DIANNE**  
Illinois State University

*Co-chair*

**MEYER, DEA**  
Illinois Board of Higher Education  
Civic Committee of Commercial Club

**ALEXANDER, GARY**  
Illinois Board of Higher Education

**DEAN, DIANE**  
Illinois State University

**DUNN, RANDY**  
Illinois State Board of Education

**ELLINGTON, ALLEN**  
Collinsville Community  
Unit School District 10

**FAGAN, STU**  
Governors State University

**HALLER, JOHN**  
Southern Illinois University

**HAYES, ALICE**  
Illinois Board of Higher Education

**JONES, JERRYELYN**  
Curie Metro High School

**JONES, SCOTT**  
William Penn Elementary School

**KUCK, CYNTHIA**  
Concordia University

**MANERING, DONNA**  
Illinois Education Association

**MAYS, JEFF**  
The Illinois Business Roundtable

**MONTGOMERY, DAN**  
Illinois Federation of Teachers

**MONTGOMERY, DELLA**  
Morrisville Grade School

**OSBORNE, NICK**  
Eastern Illinois University

**RUTLEDGE, DIANE**  
Springfield Public School District 186

**SERRITELLA, VINCE**  
GL Center

**SINGLETON, FRED**  
Illinois Principals Association

**SMITH-SKRIPPS, BONNIE**  
Western Illinois University

**THOMAS, NEHEMIAH**  
Decatur School District

**TOZER, STEVE**  
University of Illinois at Chicago

**TRIPSES, JENNY**  
Bradley University

**WARFIELD, WALT**  
Illinois Assoc. of School Administrators

**WATKINS, CHERYL D.**  
John J. Pershing West

## **APPENDIX D**

### **Member Listing COMMISSION ON STUDENT LEADER PREPARATION IN ILLINOIS COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES**

#### **COMMISSION STAFF:**

**DURFLINGER, NORM**  
Illinois State University

**ENGLAND-SIEGERDT, CHRISTY**  
Illinois Board of Higher Education

**HODEL, ROSS**  
Illinois State University

**HOOD, LISA**  
Illinois State University

**HUNT, ERIKA**  
Illinois State University

**MEISNER-BERTAUSKI, DEBBIE**  
Illinois Board of Higher Education

## APPENDIX E

### Illinois School Leader Task Force Membership

**TOZER, STEVE**

Chair, Illinois School Leader Task Force  
University of Illinois at Chicago

**KOCH, CHRIS**

State Superintendent  
Illinois State Board of Education

**ANDERSON, JO**

Illinois Education Association

**LEAHY, JASON**

Illinois Principals Association

**CLARK, BRENT**

Illinois Associate of School  
Administrators

**MAYS, JEFF**

Illinois Business Roundtable

**CURTIS, DEBORAH**

Illinois State University

**MEISNER-BERTAUSKI, DEBBIE**

Illinois Board of Higher Education

**DEMUZIO, DEANNA**

Senator, IL General Assembly

**MUELLER, PEG**

Chicago Community Trust

**ERVIN, APRIL**

New Leaders for New Schools, Chicago

**MURPHY, JOHN**

Illinois Council of Professors and  
Education Administration

**ERWIN, JUDY**

Illinois Board of Higher Education

**MURPHY, PATRICK**

Illinois State Board of Education

**GEPPERT, ED**

Illinois Federation of Teachers

**PERKINS, FAYE TERRELL**

Chicago Principal and Administrators  
Association

**HACKETT, JUDITH**

Northwest Suburban Special Education  
Organization

**PRASSE, DAVID**

Loyola University Chicago

**HUTCHISON, BRAD**

Olympia C.U.S.D #16

**RUTLEDGE, DIANE**

Large Unit District Association

**JACKMAN, DIANE H.**

Eastern Illinois University

**SMITH, MICHAEL**

House of Representatives  
IL General Assembly

**JOHNSON, MICHAEL**

Illinois Association of School Boards

**WEINER, JOYCE**

Ounce of Prevention Fund

**KIEHNA, MARC**

Regional Office of Education  
Monroe and Randolph Counties

**WARD, GAIL**

Chicago Public Schools

**KNUPP, JANET**

The Chicago Public Education Fund

## APPENDIX E

### Illinois School Leader Task Force Membership

#### **TASK FORCE STAFF:**

**DURFLINGER, NORM**

Illinois State University

**HOOD, LISA**

Illinois State University

**HUNT, ERIKA**

Illinois State University

**SEELBACH, MICHELE**

Illinois Board of Higher Education

**WILLIAMS, DENNIS**

Illinois Board of Higher Education

## APPENDIX F

### LINC Advisory Members

**Senator Pamela Althoff**  
Illinois General Assembly

**Michael Barlett**  
Illinois Association of School  
Boards

**Bette Bergeron**  
Southern Illinois University -  
Edwardsville

**Paula Jorde Bloom**  
National –Louis University

**Jill Bradley-Harris**  
Illinois Action for Children

**Matthew Brue**  
Illinois Association of School  
Administrators

**Ida Butler**  
Illinois Family Childcare  
Alliance

**Emma Campbell**  
Huffman Elementary School

**Matthew Clifford**  
American Institutes for Research

**Karen Craven**  
America's Edge

**Senator Deanna Demuzio**  
Illinois General Assembly

**Norm Durflinger**  
Illinois State University

**Brian Durham**  
Illinois Community College Board

**Representative Roger Eddy**  
Illinois General Assembly

**Marina Escamilla**  
Chicago Public Schools

**June Grivetti**  
University of St. Francis

**Alicia Haller**  
Chicago Public Schools

**Ava Harston**  
Illinois Federation of Teachers

**Kay Henderson**  
Illinois State Board of Education

**Linda Hermes**  
Illinois Association for Family Child Care

**Michelle Kaplan**  
Latino Policy Forum

**Joanne Kelly**  
Illinois Department of Human Services

**Marc Kiehna**  
Monroe/Randolph Regional Office of  
Education

**Brenda Klostermann**  
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville

**Sarah Madson**  
Illinois Education Association

**Xochitl Martirosyan**  
Illinois Department of Human Services

**Jan Maruna**  
Illinois Network of Child Care Resource &  
Referral Agencies

**Debbie Meisner-Bertauski**  
Illinois Board of Higher Education

## APPENDIX F

### LINC Advisory Members

**Robin Miller Young**  
Prairie Children Preschool

**Lauri Morrison-Frichtl**  
Illinois Head Start Association

**Gary Niehaus**  
McLean County Unit District No. 5

**Sessy Nyman**  
Illinois Action for Children

**Erica Okezie-Phillps**  
McCormick Foundation

**Sheena Panoor**  
Voices for Illinois Children

**Anthony Raden**  
Chicago Department of Child and Youth

**Aisha Ray**  
Erikson Institute

**Elliot Regenstein**  
Education Counsel LLC

**Kristen Richards**  
Governor's Office

**Christopher Rosean**  
Chicago Public Schools

**Diane Rutledge**  
Large Unit District Association

**Linda Saterfield**  
Illinois Department of Human Services

**Brian Schwartz**  
Illinois Principals Association

**Jodi Scott**  
Henderson/Mercer/Warren  
Regional Office of Education

**LuAnn Shields**  
Prairie Children Preschool

**Nancy Shier**  
Ounce of Prevention Fund

**Robin Steans**  
Advance Illinois

**Deb Strauss**  
Illinois Parent Teacher Association

**Teri Talan**  
National-Louis University

**Linda Tomlinson**  
Illinois State Board of Education

**Steve Tozer**  
University of Illinois at Chicago

**Dennice Ward-Epstein**  
Illinois Alliance of Administrators  
of Special Education

**Virginia York**  
IL Dept. of Children & Family  
Services

#### **LINC Staff:**

**Lisa Hood**  
Illinois State University

**Lynne Curry**  
Illinois State University

**Erika Hunt**  
Illinois State University

**Nancy Latham**  
Illinois State University

**Diana Weekes**  
Illinois State University

## **APPENDIX F**

### **LINC Advisory Members**

**Elizabeth Foste**  
Illinois State University

**APPENDIX G**

**Illinois School Leader Redesign Team Members**

<b>Representative/ Organization</b>	<b>Leadership Certification &amp; Endorsements</b>	<b>District/Univ. Partnerships &amp; Selection Process</b>	<b>School Leadership Standards</b>	<b>Residencies &amp; Internships</b>	<b>Assessment of Candidates &amp; Graduates</b>
<b>Co-Chair Private University</b>	<i>Margaret Trybus</i> , Concordia Univ.	<i>Jenny Tripses</i> , Bradley Univ.	<i>Cynthia Kuck</i> , Argosy Univ.	<i>June Grivetti</i> , St. Francis	<i>Kristine Servais</i> , North Central
<b>Co-Chair Public University</b>	<i>Scott Day</i> , U of I - Springfield	<i>Kathleen Brown</i> , IERC - SIUE	<i>Don Hackmann</i> , Univ. of Illinois	<i>Linda Morford</i> , Eastern IL Univ.	<i>Joe Pacha</i> , Illinois State Univ.
<b>Higher Education Faculty</b>	<i>Jim Harrington</i> , Dominican Univ. <i>John Hunt</i> , SIUE <i>Nick Osborne</i> Eastern IL Univ.	<i>Antonette MacDonald</i> , Lewis Univ. <i>Norma Salazar</i> , Chicago State	<i>Ted Purinton</i> , National Louis <i>Carol Tolson</i> , St. Xavier Univ.	<i>Andrea Evans</i> , Northern IL Univ. <i>Dean Halverson</i> , Western IL Univ. <i>Don Kussmaul</i> , U of IL - Springfield <i>Jim Rosborg</i> , McKendee Univ.	<i>Judith Docekal</i> , Loyola Univ. <i>Jess House</i> , Western IL Univ. <i>Linda Sloat</i> , Univ. of IL <i>Velda Wright</i> , Lewis Univ.
<b>ISBE Certification Board Member</b>	<i>Tamara Smith</i> , Teacher Rep.	<i>Sheila Bowens</i> , Teacher Rep.			
<b>Illinois School Leader Task Force Member</b>	<i>Carlene Lutz</i> , IL Federation of Teachers <i>John Murphy</i> , Northern IL Univ. <i>Darlene Ruscitti</i> , DuPage ROE	<i>Judy Hackett</i> , Northwest Suburban Special Ed Org. <i>Marc Kiehna</i> , ROE 45	<i>Jason Leahy</i> , IL Principals Assoc. <i>Mike Johnson</i> , IL Assoc. of School Boards	<i>Brent Clark</i> , IL Assoc. of School Administrators <i>Alicia Haller</i> , Chicago Public Schools <i>Diane Rutledge</i> , Large Unit Dist. Assoc.	<i>Rich Voltz</i> , IL Assoc. of School Administrators
<b>Illinois Principals Association Member</b>	<i>Brian Schwarts</i> , IPA General Counsel	<i>Sean German</i> , Argenta-Oreana <i>Jim Schmid</i> , Waubonsie Valley		<i>Polly Dahlstrom</i> , Sherrad High School	<i>Paul Mikulcik</i> , IL Principals Assoc.
<b>ISBE and IBHE Staff</b>	<i>Linda Tomlinson</i> (ISBE), <i>Patrick Murphy</i> (ISBE), <i>Dennis Williams</i> (ISBE), <i>Debbie Meisner Bertauski</i> (IBHE), <i>Robert Hall</i> (ISBE), and <i>Michelle Seelbach</i> (IBHE)				



## APPENDIX H

### Principal Preparation Steering Committee Organization Representation

ADVANCE ILLINOIS  
CHICAGO PRINCIPALS AND ADMINISTRATORS  
ASSOCIATION  
CHICAGO PUBLIC EDUCATION FUND  
CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
CONSORTIUM FOR EDUCATIONAL CHANGE  
DUPAGE REGIONAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
ED-RED  
ILLINOIS ACTION FOR CHILDREN  
ILLINOIS ASSOCIATION OF REGIONAL  
SUPERINTENDENTS OF SCHOOLS  
ILLINOIS BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE  
ILLINOIS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION  
ILLINOIS MATH & SCIENCE ACADEMY  
ILLINOIS PARENT TEACHER ASSOCIATION  
ILLINOIS STATE ACTION FOR EDUCATION  
LEADERSHIP  
ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY  
JOHN J. PERSHING WEST MIDDLE SCHOOL

LARAWAY SCHOOL DISTRICT 70C  
LARGE UNIT DISTRICT ASSOCIATION  
LEND AND SCOPE  
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO,  
MIDWEST PRINCIPALS CENTER  
MONROE AND RANDOLPH COUNTIES  
NEW LEADERS FOR NEW SCHOOLS  
OUNCE OF PREVENTION FUND  
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY,  
ILLINOIS EDUCATION RESEARCH COUNCIL  
THE CIVIC COMMITTEE OF THE COMMERCIAL  
CLUB OF CHICAGO  
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO  
VOICES FOR ILLINOIS CHILDREN

## APPENDIX I

### Illinois School Leader Advisory Council (ISLAC) Members

**STEVE TOZER**

ISLAC Co-CHAIR  
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO

**DIANE RUTLEDGE**

ISLAC Co-CHAIR  
LARGE UNIT DISTRICT ASSOCIATION

**JO ANDERSON**

CONSORTIUM FOR EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

**HEATHER ANICHINI**

THE CHICAGO PUBLIC EDUCATION FUND

**HANNAH AUTEN**

ILAC STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE  
BENTON CONSOLIDATED HIGH SCHOOL

**CARMEN AYALA**

BERWYN NORTH SCHOOL DISTRICT 98

**STEPHANIE BANCHERO**

THE JOYCE FOUNDATION

**STEPHANIE BERNOTEIT**

ILLINOIS BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

**MAGGIE BLINN DINOVI**

NEW LEADERS - CHICAGO

**JEAN BUCKLEY**

TRACY FAMILY FOUNDATION

**JIM CARLSON**

SENECA HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

**REP. LINDA CHAPA LAVIA**

ILLINOIS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

**BENJAMIN CHURCHILL**

COMMUNITY UNIT SCHOOL DISTRICT #300

**BRENT CLARK**

ILLINOIS ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL  
ADMINISTRATORS

**STEVEN COBB**

QUINCY PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT #172

**MICHAEL DANTLEY**

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY, CHICAGO

**MIGUEL DEL VALLE**

ILLINOIS P-20 COUNCIL

**DARRELL ECHOLS**

METEA VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL

**JAN FITZSIMMONS**

ASSOCIATED COLLEGES OF ILLINOIS/  
NORTH CENTRAL COLLEGE

**JENNIFER GILL**

SPRINGFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT #186

**JUDITH HACKETT**

NORTHWEST SUBURBAN SPECIAL EDUCATION  
ORGANIZATION

**DEAN HALVERSON**

WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

**JESSICA HANDY**

STAND FOR CHILDREN

**HERSCHEL HANNAH**

BLOOMINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT #87

## APPENDIX I

### Illinois School Leader Advisory Council (ISLAC) Members

**JASON HELFER**

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

**ERIKA HUNT**

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

**DIANE JACKMAN**

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

**CLARICE JACKSON-BERRY**

CHICAGO PRINCIPALS AND ADMINISTRATORS  
ASSOCIATION

**LUANN KELLY**

MIDWEST PRINCIPALS' CENTER

**MAUREEN KINCAID**

NORTH CENTRAL COLLEGE

**JASON LEAHY**

ILLINOIS PRINCIPALS ASSOCIATION

**JEFF MAYS**

ILLINOIS BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE

**SENATOR KAREN McCONNAUGHAY**

ILLINOIS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

**CHRIS MEHOCHKO**

GRUNDY KENDALL ROE #24

**KATHY SHAEVEL**

ILLINOIS FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

**PEGGY MUELLER**

CHICAGO COMMUNITY TRUST

**SESSY NYMAN**

ILLINOIS ACTION FOR CHILDREN

**MICHAEL POPP**

EAST AURORA SCHOOL DISTRICT

**REP. BOB PRITCHARD**

ILLINOIS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

**DARLENE RUSCITTI**

DUPAGE REGIONAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION

**HEATHER SCHILD**

NAPERVILLE NORTH HIGH SCHOOL

**JOE SHOFFNER**

MCCLELLAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

**SARA SLAUGHTER**

MCCORMICK FOUNDATION

**AUDREY SOGLIN**

ILLINOIS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

**PEG STAEHLIN**

ILLINOIS PARENT TEACHER ASSOCIATION

**ROBIN STEANS**

ADVANCE ILLINOIS

**KHUSHI SINGH SURI**

ISLAC STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE  
PROVISO MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE  
ACADEMY

**LEN SUTTON**

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

**DEVIN SWARTLEY**

CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

## **APPENDIX I**

### **Illinois School Leader Advisory Council (ISLAC) Members**

**VICKI VANTUYLE**

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY AT  
EDWARDSVILLE  
(REPRESENTING ICPEA)

**STEVE WEBB**

GOREVILLE COMMUNITY UNIT SCHOOL DISTRICT #1

**JOYCE WEINER**

OUNCE OF PREVENTION

**BRAD WHITE**

ILLINOIS EDUCATION RESEARCH COUNCIL  
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY AT EDWARDSVILLE

**ISLAC STAFF:**

**LYNNE HAEFFELE**

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

**ALICIA HALLER**

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

**LISA HOOD**

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

**KRISTINE SERVAIS**

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

**ANNA FAZEKAS**

LEE CHICAGO POLICY COHORT INTERN

## APPENDIX J

### Illinois Principal Preparation Redesign Timeline 2001-2014

- 2001** Illinois State University Center for the Study of Education Policy (CSEP) received The Wallace Foundation grant and established Illinois State Action for Education Leadership Project (IL-SAELP). Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership established to serve as an advisory council
- 2004 – March** CSEP issued “Leadership for Learning: Strengthening Policies on Education Leadership on Behalf of Illinois Schools,” contained nearly three dozen (33) recommendations for state action to strengthen leadership for learning.
- 2004 – November** IL-SAELP Executive Committee established
- 2004 – November** IL-SAELP Consortium replaced the Illinois Consortium for Education Leadership and expanded it to over 120 members
- 2005 – August** Commission on School Leader Preparation convened by IBHE  
- Comprised of leaders from K-12 schools, colleges and universities, business and professional education organizations, ISBE & IBHE
- 2006 – August** Report presented to IBHE:  
*School Leader Preparation: A Blueprint for Change*  
Included 3 Major Goals:  
1. Recruit Strategically  
2. Focus Preparation Programs  
3. Improve Statewide Assessment & Coordination
- 2007 – July** House Joint Resolution 66:  
Resolved that ISBE, IBHE, and the Office of the Governor shall jointly appoint a task force to recommend a sequence of strategic steps to implement improvements in school leader preparations in Illinois, based on, but not limited to, the measures detailed in *Blueprint for Change*.
- 2007 – October –  
2008 – January** Illinois School Leader Task Force convened:  
Recommended *three primary instruments* for improving leadership  
1. **State Policies** that set high standards for school leadership certification and align principal preparation, early career development, and distinguish principal recognition with those standards;  
2. **Formal Partnerships** between school districts, institutions of higher education, and other qualified partners to support principal preparation and development;  
3. **Refocused Principal Preparation Programs** committed to developing to rigorously assessing in aspiring principals the capacities that are most likely to improve student learning in PreK-12 schools.

## APPENDIX J

### Illinois Principal Preparation Redesign Timeline 2001-2014

- 2008 – May** Two-day conference sponsored by ISBE and IBHE for the Illinois School Leader Task Force Report
- Stakeholders in higher education, professional organizations, and members of the Illinois School Leader Task Force attended to disseminate the Illinois School Leader Task Force Report.
- 2008 - August** Two-day conference for open discussions on the recommendations set forth by the Task Force report and to develop school leader redesign teams.
- 2008 – September** One-day meeting sponsored by ISBE and IBHE to convene the 5 School Leadership Redesign Teams.
- School Leader Redesign Team members consisted of 50 representatives of public and private institutions of Higher Education, the IPA, IFT, IEA, Illinois School Board of Assoc., Regional Offices of Education, ICPEA, IASA, the Illinois School Leader Task Force, and ISBE, and IBHE staff members
  - 5 School Leader Redesign Teams researched and redrafted recommendations in alignment with the *School Leader Team Charges*.
- 2008 – October - November** One- day meeting in October and November sponsored by ISBE and IBHE to convene the 5 School Leadership Redesign Teams. (See September 2008 description above.)
- 2009 – January** Invited representatives for parents, special education, early childhood education, English Language Learners, from around the State of Illinois, as well as additional ISBE and IBHE staff to attend the 4th School Leader Redesign Team Meeting.
- 2009 – February** Brought together participants from the May and August conferences to present Draft recommended changes from School Leader Redesign Teams and Special Interest Representatives.
- 2009 – March- April** Leadership to Integrate the Learning Continuum (LINC) released its report, *Building a Seamless Learning Continuum, The Role of Leadership in Bridging the Gaps Between Early Childhood and K-12 Education Systems*.
- Recommended that the new principal endorsement span from preK-grade 12
  - Presented draft recommended changes to the School Leader Advisory Council
  - Informed Illinois Board of Higher Education of New Principal Preparation Model
  - HJR42 directed ISBE and IBHE to prepare legislative recommendations.
- 2009 – July- October** Eight regional meetings were held by ISBE and IBHE to gather feedback on draft Principal Preparation Model

## APPENDIX J

### Illinois Principal Preparation Redesign Timeline 2001-2014

<b>2009 – September</b>	Presented new draft requirements to Illinois Teacher Certification Board
<b>2009 – October</b>	ISBE and IBHE hold a legislative briefing on the Newly Defined Principal Preparation Program for Illinois for members of the General Assembly
<b>2009 – November</b>	Held one-day statewide conference to discuss next steps in planning principal preparation, as well as the review of the new Illinois Professional Teaching Standards.
<b>2010 – March</b>	One-day conference to provide update on the school leader preparation reform recommendations for Illinois.
<b>2010 – June</b>	Legislation signed into law—PA 096-0903, effective July 1, 2010
<b>2010 – Sept. - Nov.</b>	Rules released for public comment. Advance Illinois, Large Unit District Assoc., IBHE, ISBE, universities, and other stakeholder groups engage legislators in series of meetings to resolve questions about the rules.
<b>2011</b>	ISBE rules passed by Joint Committee on Administrative Rules (JCAR)
<b>2012 – March</b>	Principal Preparation Review Panel established in rules is convened
<b>2012 – September</b>	By September 1st, institution of higher education or not-for-profit entities may admit new candidates only to principal preparation programs that have been approved under new rules
<b>2014</b>	By June 1st, all programs for the preparation of principals must be approved under new program rules or cease operating
<b>2014 – March</b>	Revisions made to rules – Revised rules approved at ISBE board meeting
<b>2014 – May</b>	Revision made to statute - Legislation passed that allows educators with Type 73 certificate to enroll in Principal Endorsement Programs.
<b>2014 – August</b>	Legislation signed into law – PA 098-0872

## APPENDIX J

### Illinois Principal Preparation Redesign Timeline 2001-2014

**2014 – 2015**

Illinois School Leader Advisory Council (ISLAC) convened by the Illinois State Board of Education and the Illinois Board of Higher Education

- Six statewide meetings were held from Sept 2015 – July 2015;
- ISLAC members were broken into 5 study teams (Network Support, Partnerships, Program Cohesion, Quality Assurance, and Training and Support);
- ISLAC study teams were aided by national experts, research, and practitioners involved in principal preparation and development;
- The ISLAC final report, anticipated in October 2015, will include recommendations for implementation of a 5-year plan for supporting principal preparation and development in Illinois.