

School/University Partnerships & Selection Process Redesign Team
Minutes
Monday, September 29, 2008

Redesign Team Co-Chairs

Kathleen Sullivan Brown: Executive Director of Illinois Education Research Council (IERC) SIU Edwardsville.

Jenny Tripses: Associate Professor and Co-coordinator of Educational Leadership program Bradley University

Redesign Team Members in Attendance

Sean German: Principal, IPA, Agenta-Oreana High School

Jim Schmid: Principal, IPA, Indian Prairie School District

Toni McDonald: Professor and Director of Clinical Practicum, Lewis University

Marc Kiehna: Superintendent Regional Office of Education 45, President of Illinois ROE

Superintendents' Association

Patrick Murphy: ISBE Administrator IL State Program Approval, Public and Nonpublic Schools; Teacher Mentoring

Introductions

Following the introductions of redesign team members, the members reviewed the contents of packet provided, the redesign team charge and Providence case study.

The **charge** of the School/University Partnerships and Selection Process Redesign Team is to develop draft criteria for school/university partnerships as part of the new approval criteria for principal preparation programs. Local school districts, most particularly the students, families, teachers and other school staff in those districts, bear the most important consequences of school leader preparation programs. Recommended criteria should include the inclusion of districts to co-design, co-implement, and co-assess new principal preparation programs. Criteria must meet the revised state standards, help respond to the leadership needs of school districts throughout the entire state, and support the continuum of principal development from preservice through distinguished principal status. Recommendations from this redesign team must also consider other possible organizations qualified to contribute to these programs.

During the course of the day, we learned that by 2013 (possibly 2010), all Illinois principal preparation programs will be required to submit to ISBE accreditation materials including evidence of partnership(s) with local school districts.

Several questions emerged after the charge was reviewed including the following:

1. What needs to be included in new program approval criteria related to school district/university partnerships?
2. Who should be involved in partnerships?
3. How to develop structures for partnerships that take into consideration the diverse types of school districts and university preparation programs?
4. How to develop structures for partnerships that take to a higher level than existing advisory groups (for programs that are NCATE accredited)? The committee talked about ways to build upon existing conditions to strengthen partnerships.

5. How to include practitioner professional groups such as Illinois Principals Association, Regional Offices of Education, and Illinois Association of School Administrators?

Kathleen shared her experiences and expertise from the Holmes partnership which started in the mid 1980s. John Goodlad coined the phrase “simultaneous renewal” meaning you can’t just go in and change K-12 education unless you also change higher education and teacher and administrator preparation. We need both. But by helping principal preparation, we’re helping higher education and K-12 education overall as equal partners working together to achieve mutually defined ends.

Other considerations also came up during the morning session that related more closely to the work of other committees. They include the internship, the number of graduates eligible for Type 75 certificates, standards, residencies, and structures of certification.

Before the lunch break, the group developed a white board to present to the larger group.

Functions of a partnership

1. Advise
2. Collaborate in the design, placement of principal preparation programs and supervision of internships
 - a. Orientation of adjuncts
 - b. Collaborative service and leadership on curriculum committees, search committees, and assessment committees between universities and local school districts
 - c. Innovative course delivery
 - d. Research school-based
 - e. Recruitment of candidates
 - f. Mentoring
 - g. Resources
3. Evaluate partnership

Michele Seelbach joined the group after lunch and explained how the selection process was added to the charge of this committee. The intention was to ensure that the best possible candidates enter principal preparation programs. A discussion followed regarding ways to use school district/university partnerships towards that end. A white board that includes ideas compiled is as follows:

Partnerships and selection processes for candidates

“Highly selective admissions process” taken from the Illinois School Leader Task Force Report, p. 8, Feb. 2008:

Highly selective admissions processes that emphasize such indicators as: (1) commitment and drive in supporting all students in achieving high standards of learning; (2) evidence of accomplished classroom instruction; (3) evidence of having taken significant leadership roles in the past; (4) strong communications skills, oral and written; (5) analytic abilities and dispositions needed to collect and analyze data for school improvement; (6) demonstrated respect for family and community as essential assets in supporting student academic success; (7) strong interpersonal skills. For admissions processes to be sufficiently selective for the limited number of places in principal-specific endorsement programs, simple paper qualifications may not be enough, and candidate interviews should be strongly encouraged;

Redesign Team Recommendations for Highly Selective Admissions Process

Definite requirements

1. Teaching experience minimum of 4 years prior to “residency” or internship
2. Entry portfolio based upon 7 points from IL School Leader Task Force Report, p. 8
3. Interview

Suggested “other” requirements

1. 360 degree instrument that measures leadership potential
2. Letters of recommendation
3. Pre-requisite courses that would lead to a two-tiered admissions process
4. GPA
5. Standardized assessments designed as predictors of success in Graduate School such as GRE or MAT

Afternoon session

The group discussed ideas from other committees shared after lunch. The group had questions about involvement of universities during the extended residency idea that came from the internship group including the involvement of partnerships at that stage of a principal’s career. The group discussed the mentor program for new principals. The group was clear that mentors must not be placed in a position of evaluation for new principals.

Equity issues particularly for women and minorities were raised in the morning related to selection process. Jenny talked with Brian Schwartz to determine legal considerations. Brian stated that as long as criteria for selection were clearly defined and universally applied, there would be no legal issues.

At 2:37 p.m. the group joined the internship committee.