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This summary of topics related to the new P-12 Principal Endorsement was put together as a resource document for the Illinois School Leadership Advisory Council (ISLAC) and ISLAC study teams. The identified topics are perceptions that have been reported by various stakeholders around the state, including a most recent Pros and Con document, put together by some members of the Illinois Council of Professors of Education Administration (ICPEA). While these are perceptions that have been reported, the authors of this topic document have no knowledge of the breadth of the concerns. In many cases, there is also not data to support or refute the perceptions. However, this topic document includes as many resources as could be found to provide greater context on the topics at hand.

Some of these perceptions are being examined through a research study of the implementation of the new principal preparation programs in Illinois conducted by the Illinois Education Research Council of SIUE, in collaboration with the University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research. The study, Illinois Principal Preparation Implementation Review Project (I-PREP), began fall 2014 and will continue through the spring of 2016. Brad White, researcher on the I-PREP project, also serves as a member of ISLAC and will keep the Council informed of any preliminary data that may inform the work of ISLAC. Where appropriate, the topic document below, highlights areas in which research is being collected for the I-PREP study.

TOPIC ONE: ASSURING A ROBUST LEADERSHIP PIPELINE

Prior to the enactment of IL Public Act 096-0903, the Type 75 General Administrative Certificate was required for any administrator who had the responsibility for evaluating teachers. Under the new law, preparation programs leading to the Principal Endorsement must be designed specifically for principals and assistant principals. The newly designed principal preparation programs are not designed or intended for any of the other administrative positions (e.g., athletic director, dean, special education director, etc.) that previously required a Type 75 General Administrative Certificate. Instead, individuals in positions, other than principal and assistant principal, with the responsibility for evaluating teachers are required to take and pass the *Growth Through Learning* teacher evaluation state pre-qualification modules and assessments. However, to meet the need for teachers interested in obtaining leadership positions outside of the principalship, the State has developed requirements for Teacher Leadership Endorsement programs through IL Public Act 097-0607. The Teacher Leadership Endorsement is now available for approval by the Illinois State Educator Preparation and Licensure Board (SEPLB) and at least four programs have been approved as of July 2014, according to an ISBE report (see in Resource section below). Two universities in Illinois (Governor’s State University and Illinois State University) also offer Director of Special Education program.

The narrowing of the focus of the preparation programs from General Administrative to Principal Endorsement resulted in significant decreases in enrollment in the first year of implementation. Data on program enrollments is being collected by ISBE (available December 2014) and also tracked through a survey conducted by Illinois Association of School Boards to Illinois principal preparation programs. The latest IASB data reported 430 candidates (December 2013) during the first year of implementation and 616 candidates (August 2014) in cumulative enrollments; however, the survey was missing data from several universities, including Concordia University, which reported 75 principal endorsement candidates in December 2013. The IASB survey also collects cumulative enrollments for teacher leadership programs, which included 124 candidates in December 2013 and 261 candidates in August 2014. It is risky to draw any conclusions about supply and demand until more data is available.

Supply and demand is currently influenced by not only the new principal preparation legislation, but also a clause “grandfathering in” current Type 75 candidates. It should be noted that the former general administrative preparation programs leading to a Type 75 certificate have been discontinued, yet those who hold a Type 75 certificate are still eligible to serve in principal and assistant principal positions. That strategy was essential to ensure 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 FY13 (according to data drawn from the Illinois State Board of Education database). The state averages about 400-450 principal vacancies annually, according to ISBE Supply/Demand data.

Data demonstrate that enrollment in new principal preparation programs has significantly decreased from those in the former general administrative programs. While new programs leading to principal or teacher leader endorsements have been developed, little is known as to if the absence of the general administrative programs creates a void for training and development of these other positions. For example, the training required to prepare individuals for positions such as athletic director, dean of students, district administrators, etc. may or may not be adequately acquired in either the principal or teacher leader endorsement programs. More information is needed on what specific skills or training is needed for these positions and if there are existing preparation programs (teacher leadership, director of special education, etc.) that might provide the needed training. Some universities have created teacher leadership endorsement programs where a teacher leadership candidate can later articulate courses into a principal endorsement, if they choose. This approach raises the question as to how does the new teacher leadership endorsement contribute to the principal pool in Illinois? 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.

1. Concern about the pipeline – Some superintendents have expressed concern about the enrollment numbers in the new P-12 Principal Endorsement programs. Although all current Type 75 certificate holders have been ‘grandfathered in’ to qualify for principal or assistant principal positions, there is a fear that the new P-12 principal endorsement programs will not be able to keep up with the demand. More data are needed here to determine if a shortage of principal candidates could occur and if so, what strategies might the state enact to counter this? The I-PREP Study, conducted by IERC and CCSR, will collect data through a scan, survey, and site visits to determine whether there is a shortage of principal candidates with the new principal endorsement. There is also a concern among rural districts that principal candidates will be harder to attract, calling for investigating strategies such as “grow your own” principal programs.
2. Maintaining a diversity of candidates –Although there are not data to support this yet, there is a growing concern among universities that the new principal preparation endorsement programs will enroll less minority and female candidates, especially as the teacher pool for diverse candidates declines due to changing admission criteria such as the TAP exam. While an individual must pass a test of basic skills (the TAP exam) prior to student teaching, ISBE has removed the five time limit to take and pass the test. Teacher candidates can now take the test as many times as needed to pass it. This particular admission criterion may be a portion of the issue; however, other factors such as cost of college and the current perception of public education by the public may also play a role in who selects to become a teacher. More data are needed here to look at what the demographics of current P-12 Principal Endorsement candidates look like, compared to past cohorts as well as student demographics, and what might be some strategies to recruit and retain more diverse candidates into the principalship and teacher leadership pipelines. However, since most new principals will come from past teachers, data collected by IERC with a teacher pipeline study (see link to study in resource section) may provide some helpful data and strategies for consideration to ensure that more diversity exists within the teacher pipeline to feed into leadership positions.
3. Building the capacity of districts to partner effectively with principal preparation programs – The new P-12 Principal Endorsement requires program faculty to work in partnership with school district officials (or in some cases Regional Offices of Education) in the design, delivery and continuous improvement of principal preparation programs and this is officiated by a Memorandum of Understanding between the district and the university. While the development is a MOU is a critical juncture to requiring universities and districts to have the tough conversations at the beginning regarding roles and responsibilities with principal preparation, monitoring needs to occur to assure that these are functioning and mutually beneficial partnerships that inform the processes and structures at both the district and university level for both the preparation and development of school leaders. Building district capacities to seek and identify potential candidates and then invest in their development is a critical notion to partnerships when it comes to “grow your own efforts”
4. Aligning a continuum of leadership development – There is a need to link pre-service preparation with in-service training and support to provide ongoing and sustained development for school leaders.
   1. The districts and universities participating with the U.S. DOE funded IL-PART project are exploring how training and support for aspiring principals are aligned with the new principal performance evaluation requirements and how supports for candidates may be expanded into new principal mentor once candidates are hired as principals or assistant principals. A summary of the IL-PART project is included in the resource section below.
   2. The Illinois Principals Association has talked about what opportunities might be available for principals that serve as mentor principals to receive credit toward a master principal designation or other professional development credits.
5. Teacher Leadership Endorsement – Program applications are now being received by Illinois State Education Program Licensure Board (ISEPLB) and programs have begun seeking state approval for these new programs. At least four university programs have been approved, with several other universities indicating they are in the process of designing Teacher Leadership Endorsement programs. However, little is known about what the university-based teacher endorsement programs entail or how they may or may not align with various districts’ practical needs for leadership positions. With the discontinuation of the Type 75 General Administrative Endorsement, further analysis is also needed on what voids, if any exist for school districts that are not met by either the Teacher Leader or Principal Endorsements. Communication between university programs and school districts are essential to increase the understanding of the teacher leader endorsement as a means to meet the needs of districts for positions outside of the role of principal and assistant principal.
6. Supporting the Superintendency: To align the more rigorous principal requirements to the superintendency, a committee called the Superintendent Advisory Committee (SAG) was convened by ISBE that developed recommendations for universities to redesign their superintendent preparation programs. The rules, which went out for public comment, are now in place. This approach was designed to devote attention to the preparation of superintendents (most often the supervisor of the principal) to carry the same vision of instructional leadership in which the new generation of principals in Illinois receive. With a similar vision, the Illinois Association of School Administrators created the Illinois School for Advanced Leadership (ISAL), which is a two-year program of training and supports (including coaching) for practicing superintendents. While increasing attention is being paid to the role of the superintendent in Illinois, little attention has yet been paid to the role of central administration in district.

Resources:

* Numerous reports on Illinois principals by IERC (found on <http://www.siue.edu/ierc/publications/index.shtml>), including:
  + *The State of Leadership: Public School Principals in Illinois*
  + ***Principal Effects in Illinois: A Research Brief***
  + ***The View from the Principal's Office: Results from the IERC Principal Survey***
  + ***Principal Turnover in Illinois Public Schools, 2001-2008***
* Illinois School Board Association Survey Data
* *Statewide Data on the Supply and Demand of Principals in Illinois as a Result of Illinois’ New Principal Endorsement* (<http://education.illinoisstate.edu/downloads/csep/Principal%20Preparation%20Supply%20Demand%20White%20Paper_USE%20THIS.pdf>)
* Directory of Approved Programs for the Preparation of Educational Personnel in Illinois Institutions of Higher Education (<http://www.isbe.net/profprep/PDFs/directory.pdf>).
* *P-20 Diverse Educator Learning Exchange Concept* Paper
* ***The Student Has Become the Teacher: Tracking the Racial Diversity and Academic Composition of the Teacher Supply Pipeline* (**<http://www.siue.edu/ierc/publications/index.shtml>**)**
* Summary of IL-PART grant
* P-20 Council Teacher Leadership Endorsement Report
* ISBE webpage housing Superintendent Advisory Committee work: <http://www.isbe.net/prep-eval/htmls/sag.htm> and revised rules for superintendent preparation programs (<http://www.isbe.net/rules/archive/pdfs/33ARK.pdf>)
* Illinois School for Advanced Leadership (ISAL) - <http://www.iasaedu.org/domain/24>

TOPIC TWO: CLARIFICATIONS AND SUPPORTS NEEDED FOR THE INTERNSHIP

The new principal endorsement requirements in Illinois requires a performance-based internship designed to provide the candidate with authentic leadership experiences intended to increase their proficiency in areas shown to improve student learning (appendix A provides a brief overview of the specific requirements of the internship). The internship has been identified as a critical component of effective principal preparation, and was widely discussed by a broad group of stakeholders involved in the decade long statewide redesign effort. The performance-based internship model involving competency-based assessments, is a paradigm shift from the traditional hour-based requirement of previous Type 75 General Administrative programs. Considering this, the performance-based internship is providing both challenges and opportunities for universities and their district partners.

1. How to create a true performance-based internship experience for candidates? – At the heart of the challenge to implementing the internship is how universities work collaboratively with districts and other partners to create true authentic learning experiences for candidates that prepare them for the realities of the principalship. The collective partnership will be a key piece of the data that will be collected by IERC/CCSR during the site visits to principal preparation programs and districts during the I-PREP study.
   1. How can the internship be truly customized for each candidate to ensure they are provided with exposure to a broad base of leadership experiences that build and demonstrate their leadership competencies? Further, if a candidate can provide evidence that he/she previously demonstrated a competency, could they focus more time during their internship on the competency areas in which they are less developed? Or, in other words, if a candidate meets a competency during a course assignment, do they have to also engage in an activity with that same competency during the internship? Many programs have designed performance-based assignments during course work to be formative in nature, but then engage the candidate in authentic experiences during their internship for summative assessment. The real question at hand here though is “how are the experiences structured in courses?” – are they merely “doing school assignments” or are the candidates engaged in schools in authentic learning experiences. Almost every program should already be doing field-based assignments aligned with classroom courses. How do we provide more support for the candidate not only in the internship but also during the entire program that includes continuous field work? It is possible that the internship would be less of a transition for schools and leadership candidates in preparation programs if it was done collaboratively from the onset. The intent of the performance-based internship for the P-12 Principal Endorsement was for the candidate to be doing activities and not just observing/learning about them.
   2. What are best practices for sharing and accessing information needed for continuous improvement and to demonstrate leadership development? What artifacts can be used to demonstrate evidence of mastery among each of the required competency areas?
   3. What supports need to be in place for principal mentors (or principal mentor teams) to provide quality development experiences during the internship that also foster principal mentors’ development needs? Presently, a faculty supervisor is assigned to each candidate from the preparation program and this person is required to make a minimum of four site visits during the internship. Aligned with this, what systems or processes need to be in place ensuring that reflection and mentoring occur (not just compliance with assessment) between the intern, the host principal, and the faculty supervisor? This area will also be examined during the I-PREP study.
2. How can the state better allocate support and resources for the internship?
3. While the Illinois School Leader Task Force did not specify a time period for the internship, the report did recommend that universities provide, “Extended, closely supervised residencies designed to do the following: 1) integrate theory, research and practice by immersing candidates in full-time administrative duties with the support of an accomplished mentor while at the same time engaging in rigorous coursework; 2) develop and demonstrate candidates’ ability to improve student learning outcomes in schools by engaging the candidate in significant instructional leadership responsibilities and by regularly supervising and assessing the candidate by university-based personnel experienced in school leadership”. Other organizations, such as the Illinois Association of School Administrators (IASA) in their IASA Vision 2020 make the recommendation to “Find funding sources to ensure there is money to pay principal candidates for a yearlong internship.”
4. The IL-PART funds (U.S. DOE grant) is presently examining two models in three Illinois principal preparation programs:  a full time/full semester internship and a traditional internship at each of the partnering institutions.  Candidates will select either a traditional internship or a full-time/full semester internship in a partnering high needs school.  An evaluation conducted by the American Institutes for Research (AIR) will explore differences in outcomes between the two internship models. The project 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 assistant principal positions by:  providing intensive, authentic, school-based learning opportunities for aspiring principals and by providing mentor principals and faculty supervisors with training so that they provide rich learning experiences for principal interns focused on school improvement efforts and increased student achievement.
5. The DuPage Regional Office of Education has created a day-long professional development session for mentor principals designed not only to educate them on the rules and requirements for the principal internship, but also to train them on coaching techniques. The session counts for one Illinois Administrator Academy (IAA) credit and at the end of the day, mentor principals have developed a plan of action for working with principal candidates.
6. The DuPage ROE also provides partner universities in their regions with a database of principals who meet qualifications to be mentors and with coordinating placements of candidates with districts for the internship experiences (e.g., the possible placements for bilingual experiences, early childhood, PK-12 grade span, etc.).
7. In addition to providing more supports for the internship for both candidates and mentors, there is a need to create more wide spread communication among teachers that debunks myths about the internship, such as the myth that a teacher will need to quit his/her job to complete the internship. This might stem from an official document released by ISBE that lays out the specific internship requirements.
8. One further challenge to the new internship requirements is that candidates must experience and show competency in areas PreK-12. While the intent of this requirement is to broaden the skills and understanding of the principal to a larger scope of students developmentally, it also provides a challenge for candidates to complete internship requirements in sites outside of their home school.

Resources:

* Summary of Principal Preparation Internship Requirements
* North Central College Matrix of Internship Requirements and Evidence
* IASA Vision 20/20 Document (see <http://illinoisvision2020.org/>)
* Illinois School Leader Task Force Report (<http://www.ibhe.state.il.us/SchoolLeadership/FinalReport.pdf>)

TOPIC THREE: OUT OF STATE CANDIDATES AND RECIPROCITY

A concern expressed by universities throughout the conversations regarding the new P-12 Principal Endorsement focused on the need for quality assurances for out-of-state universities that prepare administrative candidates for Illinois’ schools. To address this, ISBE recently passed rules that require individuals holding out-of-state principal licenses to apply to an Illinois program approved under the new P-12 Principal Endorsement requirements to determine if and what is needed for the out-of-state educator to receive an Illinois Principal Endorsement. This approach, while an adequate quality control measure, could create challenges for the districts. Superintendents and program faculty have expressed concern that this approach could create a hardship for districts that want to hire principals from out of state, especially districts that are located near Illinois borders, or districts like Chicago that recruit candidates from large urban districts across the country.

In addition to the out-of-state requirement for principal certification, the rules state that to qualify for the Illinois P-12 Principal Endorsement, a candidate must have an Illinois teaching certificate. This presents a barrier as candidates from border states (e.g., Missouri, Iowa, etc.) that attend Illinois Principal Endorsement programs must also obtain an Illinois teaching certificate to receive their Illinois principal endorsement. This requires these candidates to take the Illinois Teaching Academic Proficiency (TAP) exam as well as the Illinois content test for teaching.

1. Through a member initiative, legislative language has been drafted to allow candidates for an Illinois P-12 Principal Endorsement with the appropriate number of years of teaching on any state teaching certificate (not just Illinois) to qualify for the endorsement. The legislation will be amended to SB 2711 sponsored by Representative Chapa LaVia and Senator Delgado this fall veto session or spring legislative session.
2. Exploration is needed to determine how other states have crafted out-of-state reciprocity policies or agreements that Illinois might consider allowing easier recruitments of candidates while assuring quality controls are met?

Resources:

* Section of rules that stipulate restrictions for out of state candidates (21B-35 and 25.25)

TOPIC FOUR: QUALITY OF SUPPORTS

In addition to course and internship requirements, principal preparation candidates and faculty are required to complete and pass the assessments for the Illinois Growth Through Learning teacher evaluation modules. The Growth Through Learning (GTL) training and assessments are also required for anyone who is responsible for evaluating teachers. Principal preparation candidates are required to complete the training prior to receiving their Principal Endorsement.

In addition to the training and assessment for the evaluation of teachers, the state also requires candidates to pass a new Principal Endorsement Exam. This was based on a recommendation of the Illinois School Leader Task Force that urged “the State Board of Education should establish a new licensure exam for principals, based on newly designed school leadership standards and rigorous, state-of-the-field model exams developed at the state and national levels. This exam…may incorporate elements of performance-based and portfolio assessments such as are currently in use in Chicago Public Schools, the Illinois Master Principal assessments, and some existing state certification systems.” Similar to the direction in which other states like New York and districts like CPS are moving, Illinois’ new content exam is a rigorous 8 hour exam that is now available by computer as of September 8, 2014.

1. High Costs for Candidates Required by GTL and Content Area Test: Universities and principal candidates have expressed concern about the increased cost of the license. The two-day Content Area Test (195/196) is $360 total ($180 per subtest) and the state required Growth Through Learning Teacher Evaluation Pre-Qualification Training ($650) increases the cost to the candidate by over $1,000 in fees. In the past, school districts paid for the teacher evaluation training once a candidate was hired into an administrative position responsible for teacher supervision. Shifting this requirement for this training to the preparation program results in candidates having to absorb that added cost. Additionally, some faculty have questioned the usefulness of principal candidates taking the evaluation training if they do not get an administrative position right away after receiving their endorsement. However, other stakeholders have stated they believe the training should be required during the internship because the new competency-based assessments require candidates to gain authentic leadership and not just observational experiences involving classroom observations of teachers and providing evidence-based feedback. Many districts, as well as teacher unions, want to be assured that principal candidates have sufficient training in teacher performance evaluation before engaging in internship activities involving teacher observation or conferencing activities.
2. In addition to more authentic learning and assessment requirements for candidates, the state has increased its annual program review requirements for universities. The new annual program review requires programs to update any information previously reported and summarize data about the program’s overall structure, faculty, and candidates and the results of various assessments (content test). report on enrollment numbers as well as faculty to student ratios, among other things. University faculty have expressed concern with the amount of time it takes to complete the annual reports recommending that annual reports be limited in data required and in response to this, ISBE has streamlined the reporting requirements.
3. In addition to the state requirements, many universities are accredited by national accreditation bodies. NCATE, the former education leadership accreditation has now become the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). This has raised the question as to how methods will be developed to coordinate among different data collection and regulatory bodies (e.g., ISBE, IBHE, CAEP, institutional data collection) and among the various requirements and processes for preparation program approval, accreditation, and compliance. Emphasis should be placed on methods to assist all stakeholders (e.g., department chairs, faculty, principals, principal candidates, district office personnel) to better understand and participate in processes with regulatory bodies and for the state to consider how to align their requirements with other program reporting structures.
4. Much work has been done in the state to implement the new principal preparation programs, align the requirements to a new state certification exam, and build up program accreditation efforts (through the state program review process or the national CAEP process). The Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC) has also been working since 2010 to develop guidelines and support implementation of the new state mandated teacher and principal evaluation requirements. This work has included the development of a model Principal Evaluation Framework that districts are required to use if they do not design their own. In all cases, Illinois school districts must align their principal performance evaluation systems to the Illinois Performance Standards for School Leaders, which is aligned to the 2008 Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards.
   1. All of this work has resulted in the development of targeted policy levers for developing and supporting principals at various stages of development (aspiring to continuing); however, the alignment of the various supports and reporting requirements is not known.
   2. A national committee headed by CCSSO and funded by The Wallace Foundation is exploring a ‘refresh’ of the national Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards (ISLLC). As many of Illinois’ requirements and supports are aligned to the 2008 ISLLC standards (principal preparation requirements, principal endorsement content exam, principal preparation program accreditation, Illinois State Model for Principal Evaluation, etc.), it is unclear as to how Illinois might respond as a state to the new updated leadership standards. Although ISLLC and the Illinois Performance standards are considered to be aligned, the differences in these two existing standards have resulted in some confusion and questions regarding which standards should be used in assessing the competency of the candidate during the internship between the candidate and their principal mentors.

Resources:

* Web page for Illinois’ new certification exam:

<http://www.il.nesinc.com/IL_testinfo.asp?t=195>

* Website for CPS Principal Eligibility Process: <http://www.cpsleaders.com/prospective.html>
* New certification exam for Building School Leaders: <http://www.nystce.nesinc.com/NY_testinfo_SLA.asp?t=107>
* The School Leader Licensure Assessment currently offered in 16 states, allowing for testing reciprocity among participating states: <https://www.ets.org/sls/prepare/materials/slla_prep>
* Sample ISBE Annual Program Report requirements
* CAEP web site: <http://caepnet.org/>
* Illinois State Model for Principal Evaluation: <http://www.isbe.net/peac/> (see principal evaluation resources and information section)
* Web site for Growth Through Learning: <http://www.growththroughlearningillinois.org/>
* Draft 2014 ISLLC Standards: <http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/District_Dossier/2014/09/new_school_leaders_standards_f.html>
* Crosswalk of Standards