Evaluation Report

September 2006

CONSORTIUM ON
CHICAGO SCHOOL RESEARCH
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
ccsr

Principal and Teacher Leadership in Chicago

Continuing Analysis of Three Initiatives

Holly M. Hart
Stephen M. Ponisciak
Susan E. Sporte
W. David Stevens

Prepared for
The Chicago Public
Education Fund

The Chicago Public Education Fund
Better schools are everybody's business.

This report was produced by the Consortium's publications and communications staff:

Lura Forcum, *Acting Manager for Publications and Communications*
Sandra Dantzler, *Administrative Assistant*
Gabe Molina, *Copyeditor*

Graphic Design and Production, Andrea F. Bucsi Design

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

In 2004, the Consortium on Chicago School Research (CCSR) provided The Chicago Public Education Fund (The Fund) with an initial look at the performance of Leadership and Urban Network for Chicago (LAUNCH) and principals and teachers certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), two leadership programs that were just becoming established in Chicago. The aim of this formative evaluation is to provide information for continued program improvement. In this report we update previous findings and examine New Leaders for New Schools (NLNS), a more recently initiated principal training program. Results are based on data from the annual compilation of test scores and the biannual surveys conducted by CCSR.

Overall, comparisons between LAUNCH, NLNS, and comparably experienced principals show a small number of significant differences. Given an average tenure of three years for LAUNCH principals and a year and a half for NLNS principals, it may be too soon to detect differences in such outcomes as organizational climate and student learning gains. Suggestions for future work are described in our interpretive summary.

LAUNCH

The number of LAUNCH principals has nearly doubled since our last analyses to 61, though only a small number (8) work in high schools. The proportion of principals with doctorates has increased overall, but particularly among LAUNCH principals: the number with doctorates has increased by 20 percentage points since 2003. Nearly all LAUNCH principals earned their highest degree from universities in the Chicago area.

- The average age of LAUNCH principals is 51. They have served an average of three years as principal and plan to serve another seven to eight years.
- Elementary school LAUNCH principals report using data for curricular decisions—such as setting individual and schoolwide goals for students—to a greater extent than other elementary principals.
- The amount of time LAUNCH principals report spending on personal and staff professional develop-

ment has dropped considerably since 2003 to a level similar to that of other principals.

- Teachers did not rate LAUNCH principals differently than comparably experienced principals in terms of leadership, though in elementary schools with LAUNCH leaders teachers did report greater use of reformed literacy practices and more teacher-parent interaction.
- No differences in student learning gains between LAUNCH and comparably experienced or veteran principals were found.
- Only two LAUNCH elementary schools had a cluster of national-board-certified teachers (NBCTs) and participated in the survey. Yet these schools showed dramatic effects. Of 16 measures, 8 showed significantly positive differences compared to schools with similarly experienced principals. However, we must be cautious in interpreting such effects based on only two schools.
- LAUNCH principals' perceptions of roadblocks to school improvement also changed from 2003. "Pressure to raise test scores," rose from fifth to first on the list of most serious obstacles.
- LAUNCH principals reported greater satisfaction with their pre-service training than other principals and also reported greater confidence in their ability to carry out leadership tasks.

NLNS

NLNS principals are still few in number. At the time of the survey there were only 13 NLNS principals (10 in elementary and 3 in high schools). All three high schools led by NLNS principals have opened since the fall of 2001. All high school NLNS principals and 60 percent of elementary NLNS principals taught for at least six years prior to becoming a principal. Similar to LAUNCH and other CPS principals, nearly all NLNS principals earned their highest degree from universities in the Chicago area.

- NLNS principals are much younger than either LAUNCH or other comparably experienced principals, with an average age of 42 years at the elementary level and 36 at the high school level. They averaged a year and a half in their positions but expect to work more years as principals (an average of 11 and 17.5 additional years for elementary and high school prinicpals, respectively).
- On measures of leadership, NLNS principals were not rated differently than other comparably experienced principals. However, teachers in their elementary schools rated them more positively in the areas of professional capacity and instruction. Specifically, they reported greater innovation and reflective dialogue among the teaching staff and fewer traditional literacy practices and assessments.
- No differences in learning gains were found for NLNS principals, though their brief tenure at their schools may make this a premature expectation.
- While NLNS principals were very satisfied with their pre-service training, they indicated less confidence than other principals in handling operational management and budget issues.

NBPTS

Though teachers certified by the NBPTS were more likely than other teachers to work in magnet and more advantaged schools, the majority worked in regular schools. More than half taught in schools where 80 percent or more of the students came from low-income families.

- High schools with clusters of at least three national-board-certified teachers (NBCTs) scored significantly higher on several measures of professional capacity, including collective responsibility, reflective dialogue, and teacher-teacher trust.
- In elementary schools a similar trend in scores was evident, but differences did not reach statistical significance. However, elementary schools with NBCT clusters were significantly more likely to use reformed literacy practices.
- NBCTs were also more likely to report holding leadership positions than other teachers.
- Most principals report offering a variety of supports to teachers seeking national-board certification.

Those supports least likely to be offered are the most expensive for schools—providing substitute teachers, shielding candidates from extra duties, and providing stipends for extra expenses.

In conclusion, the most positive findings begin to suggest support for The Fund's theory of action, that a concentration of talented teachers and leaders in a school will move the school toward improvement, though causation cannot be established with the available cross-sectional data. Future analyses with larger numbers of LAUNCH and NLNS principals, more years of survey data for use longitudinally, and greater survey participation may yield more definitive results. A more in-depth look at schools, perhaps using in-person interviews and observations, might be required to capture early differences between LAUNCH, NLNS, and other principals before they reach the level detectable in schoolwide organizational measures and student learning gains.

Introduction

This report is a follow-up to one prepared for The Chicago Public Education Fund (The Fund) in the spring of 2004. For that baseline report, the Consortium on Chicago School Research (CCSR) analyzed standardized test-score results and data from its spring 2003 principal and teacher surveys. The intent of the analysis was to examine evidence of professional performance of principals and teachers who participated in two leadership development programs. The principal program was Leadership and Urban Network for Chicago (LAUNCH) and the teacher program was certification by the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). In the current report, we also look at the more recently initiated principal leadership program New Leaders for New Schools (NLNS).[1]

At the time of the first report these were new programs with small sample sizes. Analyses were designed to capitalize on CCSR's annual compilation of test scores and its biannual surveys to provide cost-effective initial information on these very new programs. The current report provides updated information based on more recent standardized test scores and CCSR's spring 2005 principal and teacher surveys. It is not intended to be a full-scale summative evaluation of these programs, but rather to provide evidence based on existing indicators. Possible next steps in the evaluation process are discussed in our interpretive summary.

Endnote

1 A still more recent principal training program at the University of Illinois at Chicago was not included since its graduates had been in their schools less than a year at the time of the survey.

Principal Leadership Development Programs

LAUNCH: Leadership and Urban Network for Chicago

Begun in 1998, LAUNCH is a professional development program created to accelerate, intensify, and deepen the knowledge, skills, and experience of principal candidates. LAUNCH is designed to enhance the quality of potential principal candidates by recruiting, identifying, preparing, and supporting promising individuals who aspire to be principals in the Chicago Public Schools (CPS). For these analyses we looked at the 1998 to 2003 LAUNCH cohorts, which included 188 participants. Of these, 61 were principals of schools (including interim and acting principals) at the time of the survey and therefore are included in these analyses. One principal was assigned to two different schools, so analyses are based on 62 schools.[1] Since 1999, CPS has invested $7,500,000 in LAUNCH. Since 2000, The Fund has invested $720,000.

NLNS: New Leaders for New Schools

NLNS is a national, New York City–based organization begun in 2000. It promotes high academic achievement for every child by attracting, preparing, and supporting the next generation of outstanding leaders for the nation's urban public schools. The Chicago program was too small and new to be included in the previous report (at the time of the 2003 survey, there were only three principals who had graduated from NLNS, and only one participated in the survey). However, at the time of the 2005 survey, three cohorts of graduates had joined the eligible principal pool. These three cohorts included 37 individuals, of whom 13 were principals at the time of the survey and were included in these analyses.[2] Five of the 18 principals were not included in analyses because their schools were not open in the spring of 2005 or they were not included in the survey.[3] The Fund has invested $800,000 in NLNS to date, and CPS has invested $4,000,000.

Data Sources

We draw on three broad sources of data: CCSR's 2005 survey results, scores from the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS), and in a few cases, CPS personnel records. Table 1 indicates the data used for each group. Because CCSR surveyed Chicago principals in spring 2005, our focus was LAUNCH and NLNS graduates who were the principal of their school by December 2004 and remained principal during survey administration. For LAUNCH this included 62 principals—54 in elementary schools and 8 in high schools. Of these 62 LAUNCH principals, 43 elementary and 4 high school principals completed the 2005 principal survey, yielding an overall response rate of 76 percent. Of the 13 NLNS principals who were surveyed, 5 elementary and 3 high school principals completed the survey, yielding an overall response rate of 62 percent. The overall response rate for the principal survey was 64 percent. Despite small numbers of NLNS principals in both elementary and high school (a total of 8) and small numbers of LAUNCH principals in high school (4), we disaggregate these results because the programs are relatively new and small, and it is essential to capture as much information as possible.

The principal survey provides information about principals' backgrounds, plans for the future, efforts

to recruit teachers, their own professional development and that of their staff, and the roadblocks they confront as they try to improve their schools. In addition, in order to capture teachers' views of principal leadership, we draw on the survey responses of teachers in the same schools. Our overall response rate for teachers in the 2005 survey was 60 percent of elementary teachers and 54 percent of high school teachers.[5]

Using ITBS scores from 1997 to 2005, we calculate the average learning gains made by students in the elementary schools led by LAUNCH or NLNS principals and compare these average gains to principals with a similar level of experience (up to 6 years) and veteran principals (more than 6 years).

We use CPS personnel data to provide demographic information about principals (gender, race/ethnicity, age, and experience). These data also have some limitations. First, charter schools are not included in CPS personnel data but are included in our survey. Second, the data "snapshot" the Consortium obtained from CPS for the 2004-05 school year reflects who was principal as of June 30, 2005. Besides charter schools an additional 52 regular, vocational, and magnet schools are not included in the 2004-05 personnel data. Leadership at these schools may have been in flux at the time of the June 30th snapshot. Overall we have personnel data for 85 percent of the schools included in this analysis.

Additional Details for LAUNCH and NLNS

Selection Process

Potential participants to each program begin by filling out an online application. For those considered qualified, the next step is an interview. For LAUNCH, the interview process has evolved in the last couple of years from a traditional interview into a five-part process. In addition to the traditional interview, potential fellows complete an on-site writing sample, an in-depth discussion of their writing, a role-play, and a hypothetical memo to parents.[4] Reviewers rate individuals' performance using rubrics and make final decisions. For NLNS, similar components are divided into two days. First, applicants participate in a more typical interview focusing on the person's experiences and their interest in becoming an urban school principal. Those chosen attend Finalist Selection Day. This second appearance may include a written assignment, one-on-one interviews, case studies, role-playing, and a presentation.

Programs

Each of the programs starts with a summer institute. For LAUNCH this is a four-week Leadership Academy at Northwestern University's Kellogg Graduate School of Management. LAUNCH staff, faculty from Kellogg and Northwestern's School of Education and Social Policy, and practicing principals conduct sessions. NLNS has a five-week session at their Foundations Institute. Courses are taught by academics, thought leaders, experts, and master principals from around the country.

Both programs next have a full-time yearlong internship/externship or residency with mentor principals, funded by CPS. LAUNCH participants each complete both an elementary and a high school experience. During this phase, participants meet monthly and are involved in book studies, action research, and a school case study. In addition, LAUNCH graduates are part of the Urban Network that provides ongoing professional development and support. Network activities include retreats, workshops, and social gatherings.

NLNS' residency year entails working with a mentor principal as a member of the school's leadership team. During this year NLNS participants have four weeklong seminars at the Foundations Institute scheduled throughout the year. They also have weekly meetings with Leadership Coaches. (Those NLNS participants who are developing new schools also attend a five-day New School Start-Up Workshop.)

More Information:

LAUNCH: http://www.classacademies.org/new_pages/programs/launch/launch_home.htm

NLNS: http://www.nlns.org

Lastly, personnel data does not include information on how long an individual has been a principal in CPS, only how long they have been principal at their current school. Since most of this report is based on survey data, we generally defined principal experience groups using a survey question that specifically asks principals for the total number of years they have been principal. One exception to this was in the analysis of learning gains. Here the limitation to only survey participants would have severely restricted the number of principals. In this case we used personnel data as a proxy for total years of experience. For those with both survey and personnel data, the correlation between length of time as principal (from the survey) and length of time in current school (from the personnel file) was 0.69.

In the analysis described here we compare four groups of principals separately for elementary and high school. These groups are LAUNCH, NLNS, principals of comparable experience, and veterans. In the 2004 report, the comparable experience group was called "other new principals" and contained principals with up to five years of experience. By 2005, LAUNCH principals had up to seven years of experience. Preferring not to consider a principal "new" who had this kind of experience, we decided to call this the "comparable experience group" and include principals with up to six years of experience.[6] It is important to remember, however, that this group is comparable in experience to LAUNCH and not to NLNS. Graduates of the newer NLNS program have no more than three years of experience.

TABLE 1

Percentage of Principals for Whom Data Sources Were Available

	Total Number	Personnel Data	Principal Survey Data*	Teacher and Principal Survey Data†
Elementary				
LAUNCH	54	96%	80%	57%
NLNS	10	90%	50%	30%
Principals with Comparable Experience (0-6 yrs)	119	89%	100%	81%
Veteran Principals (>6 yrs)	144	90%	100%	88%
High School				
LAUNCH	8	100%	50%	38%
NLNS	3	100%	100%	0%
Principals with Comparable Experience (0-6 yrs)	32	8%	100%	53%
Veteran Principals (>6 yrs)	14	71%	100%	43%

Note: Years experience as a principal comes from survey data. Therefore, comparable experience and veteran groups only contain those with principal survey data.

**Individual survey questions may have fewer responses than indicated here.*

†Both teacher and principal data were required for the analysis of teacher ratings of principals.

Who are the LAUNCH and NLNS principals?

- Among elementary principals, more NLNS principals are male (56 percent, n=5) and fewer LAUNCH principals are male (21 percent, n=11) than either comparison group. In high schools, NLNS also has a greater proportion of male principals (67 percent, n=2) than the other three groups. Compared to 2003, there was an overall decrease in male principals in all groups.
- Similar to principals with comparable experience, 10 percent (n=5) of elementary LAUNCH principals are Latino and 67 percent (n=35) are African-American (a 23 percentage point increase from 2003). Proportionately more NLNS principals are Latino (33 percent, n=3). Aside from NLNS principals, newer principals are increasingly African-American. Of high school principals, LAUNCH principals are predominantly African-American (75 percent, n=6) and the majority of NLNS principals are white (67 percent, n=2).
- Principals in all groups were most likely to have a master's degree but the prevalence of doctorates has increased in all groups since 2003, particularly among LAUNCH principals (20 percentage point increase). In elementary schools, LAUNCH and veteran principals are the most likely to hold a doctorate degree, 29 and 25 percent, (n=12 and 36) respectively, compared to about one-fifth of NLNS and 15 percent of comparable principals. In high schools, 43 percent (n=6) of veterans and one-third (n=1) of NLNS principals hold a doctorate compared to one-quarter of LAUNCH (n=1) and comparable principals (n=7).
- Nearly all of LAUNCH and NLNS principals earned their highest degree from universities in the Chicago area. In 2003 all LAUNCH principals had received their degree and certification from local universities.
- In elementary schools, NLNS principals seem to move from the classroom to a leadership role much more quickly than individuals who followed other paths to principal preparation. Forty percent (n=2) of NLNS principals report five or fewer years of teaching experience, while more than 90 percent of principals in the other groups taught for at least 6 years. In high schools, all LAUNCH and NLNS principals reported at least 6 years of teaching experience.
- On average, in both elementary and high schools, LAUNCH principals have been principals about twice as long as NLNS principals—a little more than three years, compared to a year and a half. (The average experience was so similar for elementary and secondary principals that we combined them for Table 7).
- NLNS principals are considerably younger than principals in other groups. On average they are 9 and 15 years younger, respectively, than their LAUNCH counterparts in elementary and high school. LAUNCH principals and those with comparable experience are in their early 50s, while veterans are reaching 60 years of age.
- On average, elementary LAUNCH principals anticipate serving an additional seven years as a principal, most of this at their current school. This means that beyond the three years, on average, they have completed at their schools, they will have spent about ten years as a school leader before moving on to another activity. NLNS principals expect to work another eleven years; this combined with an average 1.5 years they have already put in, amounts to about 12.5 years. At the high school level, the expected tenure for LAUNCH and New Leaders is even longer: 11 years (8 expected plus 3 completed) and 19 years (17.5 expected and 1.5 completed).

Tables 2 through 9 document these summary statements about LAUNCH and NLNS principals' characteristics and plans for the future, and how they compare with new principals and veteran principals.

Do LAUNCH and NLNS principals work in higher performing schools than other new principals?

- Nearly all NLNS principals went to schools with similar achievement but higher poverty than other new principals.
- While in some years (such as 1999 and 2000) LAUNCH principals are in schools with higher average achievement, in 2001 and 2004 they are in schools with lower-than-average achievement, and in other years similar achievement. However, in four of the seven years, LAUNCH principals have gone to higher-performing schools.

TABLE 2

Gender and Race/Ethnicity of Principals

	n	Percentage of Principals				
		Male	Female	African-American	Latino	White
Elementary						
LAUNCH	52	21	79	67	10	21
NLNS	9	56	44	33	33	33
Principals with Comparable Experience (0-6 yrs)	106	29	71	56	13	29
Veteran Principals (>6 yrs)	130	33	67	39	20	40
High School						
LAUNCH	8	50	50	75	0	25
NLNS	3	67	33	0	33	67
Principals with Comparable Experience (0-6 yrs)	27	52	48	59	11	26
Veteran Principals (>6 yrs)	10	50	50	60	0	40

Source: CPS personnel records.

Note: Comparable experience and veteran groups include only principals with both survey and personnel data since length of time as principal was determined by survey information.

TABLE 3

Highest Academic Degrees of Principals

	n	Percentage of Principals		
		Bachelor's Degree	Master's Degree	Doctorate
Elementary				
LAUNCH	42	0	71	29
NLNS	5	0	80	20
Principals with Comparable Experience (0-6 yrs)	117	1	84	15
Veteran Principals (>6 yrs)	143	1	74	25
High School				
LAUNCH	4	0	75	25
NLNS	3	0	67	33
Principals with Comparable Experience (0-6 yrs)	32	0	75	25
Veteran Principals (>6 yrs)	14	0	57	43

Source: CCSR 2005 principal survey.

Note: Where both survey and personnel information were available, 21.5 percent of the cases were inconsistent. We believe survey data regarding education is more current than personnel records.

TABLE 4

Universities Granting LAUNCH Principals' Highest Degrees (n=43)

Roosevelt University	8	Concordia University	2
Loyola University	7	Governors State University	2
DePaul University	5	Nova Southeastern University	2
Chicago State University	4	Columbia University	1*
Northeastern Illinois University	4	Northern Illinois University	1
National-Louis University	3	University of Chicago	1
University of Illinois at Chicago	3		

Source: CCSR 2005 principal survey.

** We cannot tell from survey response whether this is Columbia University in Chicago or New York.*

TABLE 5

Universities Granting NLNS Principals' Highest Degrees (n=7)

University of Illinois at Chicago	3	Northern Illinois University	1
DePaul University	1	Stanford University	1
Northeastern Illinois University	1		

Source: CCSR 2005 principal survey.

TABLE 6

Years of Teaching Prior to Becoming a Principal

	n	Percentage of Principals		
		0-5 Years	6-15 Years	16 Years or More
Elementary				
LAUNCH	42	2	48	50
NLNS	5	40	40	20
Principals with Comparable Experience (0-6 yrs)	118	4	41	55
Veteran Principals (>6 yrs)	144	5	46	49
High School				
LAUNCH	4	0	25	75
NLNS	3	0	100	0
Principals with Comparable Experience (0-6 yrs)	32	13	44	44
Veteran Principals (>6 yrs)	14	7	36	57

Source: CCSR 2005 principal survey.

TABLE 7

Average Number of Years as Principal (All Principals)

	n	Years
LAUNCH	40	3.3
NLNS	7	1.6
Principals with Comparable Experience (0-6 yrs)	151	3.1
Veteran Principals (>6 yrs)	158	13.0

Source: CCSR 2005 principal survey.

Note: Available personnel data does not indicate total length of time as principal.

TABLE 8

Principals' Average Age

	n	Age
Elementary		
LAUNCH	52	51
NLNS	9	42
Principals with Comparable Experience (0-6 yrs)	106	52
Veteran Principals (>6 yrs)	130	57
High School		
LAUNCH	8	51
NLNS	3	36
Principals with Comparable Experience (0-6 yrs)	27	51
Veteran Principals (>6 yrs)	10	59

Source: CCSR 2005 principal survey.

Note: Comparable experience and veteran groups include only principals with both survey and personnel data since length of time as principal determined by survey information

TABLE 9

Principals' Future Plans

	n	Average Number of Years Expect to:		
		Serve as Principal of This School	Work as a Principal	Work in Education
Elementary				
LAUNCH	43	5.7	7.1	11.9
NLNS	5	7.6	11.0	20.0
Principals with Comparable Experience (0-6 yrs)	119	6.4	7.6	9.8
Veteran Principals (>6 yrs)	144	3.7	4.1	5.9
High School				
LAUNCH	4	3.7	8.0	10.3
NLNS	3	5.3	17.5	27.5
Principals with Comparable Experience (0-6 yrs)	32	5.6	7.6	12.5
Veteran Principals (>6 yrs)	14	3.2	3.2	7.7

Source: CCSR 2005 principal survey.

Note: In each group, between 60 and 100 percent of principals answered these items.

Table 10 below shows characteristics of schools entered by new LAUNCH and NLNS principals. In each year only the newest LAUNCH and NLNS principals hired by CPS are shown. Their schools are compared to schools where other first-year principals (called "other new") and all other principals are employed.[7] From these data it appears that LAUNCH principals do not consistently enter higher- or lower-performing schools than other first-year principals or other principals. While in some years, such as 1999 and 2000, LAUNCH principals are in schools with higher achievement, in 2001 and 2004 they are in schools with considerably lower achievement. In other years they are in similar schools. However, in four of the seven years, LAUNCH principals have gone to higher-performing schools. NLNS principals appear to enter schools with higher poverty but similar achievement compared to other new principals. It is important to note that these comparisons are based on averages. This means, for example, in years where LAUNCH principals enter more-advantaged schools overall, a number may enter average or less-advantaged schools.

TABLE 10

Relative Achievement of Elementary Schools That LAUNCH, NLNS Principals Entered

	n	Percentage at National Norms (Reading)		Percentage at National Norms (Math)		Percentage Receiving Free or Reduced-Price Lunch	
		Compared to Schools of Other First-Year Principals	Compared to the Rest of Schools	Compared to Schools of Other First-Year Principals	Compared to the Rest of Schools	Compared to Schools of Other First-Year Principals	Compared to the Rest of Schools
LAUNCH							
1999	1	+	+	+	+	-	-
2000	4	+	+	+	+	-	-
2001	3	0	-	-	-	+	+
2002	7	+	0	+	0	-	-
2003	10	0	0	+	0	0	0
2004	6	-	-	-	-	+	+
2005	18	+	0	+	0	-	0
NLNS							
2003	1	0	-	0	-	+	+
2004	1	+	+	+	+	-	-
2005	8	-	-	-	-	+	+

Note: + is higher by at least 3 percentage points, - lower by at least 3 percentage points, and 0 is within 3 percentage points.

Do LAUNCH and NLNS principals use data more than other principals in making decisions about curriculum and instruction?

- Elementary school LAUNCH principals reported using data significantly more than comparable or veteran principals in their decision making. No differences were found among high school principals.
- Top four uses of standardized test data for all principals were: (1) setting school-wide goals for student achievement, (2) examining trends in school performance over time, (3) program evaluation, and (4) setting goals for individual student achievement.

Principals were asked to rate the extent to which various types of data influenced them (and their leadership team) in their efforts to promote curriculum and instructional improvement. Types of data included standardized test scores, letter grades, rubric-based scoring, attendance, walk-through reviews, and surveys. Principals rated their use of these data on a four-point scale from "not at all" to "to a great extent." These items were combined into a scale of data-driven decision making. Higher values on this measure indicate using a greater variety of data sources and using them to a greater extent. Table 11 shows the means for each group.

Among elementary principals, LAUNCH principals reported significantly more data-driven decision making than comparable or veteran principals.[8] No differences between groups were found at the high school level.

Principals were also asked to indicate the extent to which they used standardized test results (ITBS, ISAT, PSAE) when they examine school data for various purposes. Again principals rated their use of test data on a four-point scale from "not at all" to "to a great extent." Tables 12 and 13 show percentages of principals in each group responding "to a great extent" or "some."

The top four uses of standardized test data for LAUNCH and other principals were the same in elementary and high school and for all groups of principals. These were (1) setting schoolwide goals for student achievement, (2) examining trends in school performance over time, (3) program evaluation, and (4) setting goals for individual student achievement. After that patterns are quite different. For example, standardized test data are used by many elementary principals to examine trends in teachers' performance over time. For high schools this happens less often. It is important to note that the three NLNS high schools are relatively new (begun in fall 2001 or later). Since the only standardized test data available is from the Prairie State Achievement Exam (PSAE), which is given in students' junior year, these schools' ability to use this type of data has been very limited.

While self-reports on a socially desirable behavior such as using data should be put to greater scrutiny, both LAUNCH and NLNS programs as well as the system in general are pushing principals toward greater use of data. Even federal legislation such as No Child Left Behind requires some knowledge of this type of information.

TABLE 11

Extent of Data-Driven Decision Making for Curriculum and Instructional Improvement

	n	Mean
Elementary		
LAUNCH	43	2.05*
NLNS	5	1.43
Principals with Comparable Experience (0-6 yrs)	116	1.23
Veteran Principals (>6 yrs)	142	1.42
High School		
LAUNCH	4	1.08
NLNS	3	1.01
Principals with Comparable Experience (0-6 yrs)	32	1.27
Veteran principals (>6 yrs)	14	1.07

Source: CCSR 2005 principal survey.

** Elementary LAUNCH principals differed significantly from comparable and veteran principals ($p < .05$).*

Note: Means are in log-odds units.

TABLE 12

Extent to Which Elementary Principals Use Standardized Test Results

	Percentage of Principals			
	LAUNCH n=43	NLNS n=5	Principals with Comparable Experience (0-6 yrs) n=119	Veteran Principals (>6 yrs) n=144
Set schoolwide goals for student achievement				
To a great extent	81	40	74	73
Some	16	40	23	23
Examine trends in your school's performance over time				
To a great extent	71	40	65	74
Some	24	40	30	21
Program evaluation				
To a great extent	65	20	55	56
Some	30	20	39	40
Set goals for individual student achievement				
To a great extent	64	20	56	55
Some	33	20	40	37
Examine trends in teachers' performance over time				
To a great extent	44	20	46	52
Some	46	40	42	39
Compare grades and classrooms				
To a great extent	35	0	29	24
Some	55	20	50	57
Teacher evaluation				
To a great extent	32	0	33	24
Some	51	80	55	57
Compare your school to other schools				
To a great extent	28	20	28	29
Some	49	40	47	46
Compare performance of different groups of students				
To a great extent	28	0	23	27
Some	46	25	53	45

Source: CCSR 2005 principal survey.

Note: Between 94 and 98 percent of respondents answered these items. Items are listed in order percent of LAUNCH principals indicating "to a great extent."

TABLE 13

Extent to Which High School Principals Use Standardized Test Results

	Percentage of Principals			
	LAUNCH n=4	NLNS* n=3	Principals with Comparable Experience (0-6 yrs) n=32	Veteran Principals (>6 yrs) n=14
Set schoolwide goals for student achievement				
To a great extent	75	0	75	71
Some	25	100	16	21
Examine trends in your school's performance over time				
To a great extent	75	0	66	79
Some	25	0	28	7
Program evaluation				
To a great extent	50	0	26	38
Some	50	100	65	46
Set goals for individual student achievement				
To a great extent	50	0	47	31
Some	25	67	38	54
Compare your school to other schools				
To a great extent	50	0	28	31
Some	0	33	63	46
Compare performance of different groups of students				
To a great extent	25	67	13	25
Some	50	0	63	33
Compare grades and classrooms				
To a great extent	25	0	10	15
Some	25	0	58	46
Teacher evaluation				
To a great extent	0	0	9	25
Some	50	67	44	50
Examine trends in teachers' performance over time				
To a great extent	0	0	28	43
Some	25	0	53	36

Source: CCSR 2005 principal survey.

Note: Between 96 and 100 percent responded. Items are listed in order percent of LAUNCH principals indicating "to a great extent."

**Note that the three NLNS high schools have been started since fall 2001. Given that high school test data does not start until junior year, these schools have limited data with which to look at trends.*

Do LAUNCH and NLNS principals regularly obtain professional development for themselves?

- Principals in all four groups spend similar amounts of time per week on their professional development. A half an hour per week separates NLNS principals, who spend the most time on their professional development, from comparably experienced principals, who spend the least. Compared to 2003, LAUNCH principals reported only about half as much time (2.3 versus 4.1 hours) devoted to professional training. The amount of time spent by comparable experience and veteran principals has not changed.

Have LAUNCH and NLNS principals tried to reshape their faculties?

- Yes, to some extent. It appears that LAUNCH and NLNS elementary school principals are doing more to reshape their faculty. And in high schools, NLNS principals are creating new faculties in the new small school start-ups.

There are three ways principals can strengthen their faculties—through staff development, hiring new teachers, and encouraging nonperformers to leave. LAUNCH principals reported spending the most time on staff development and NLNS principals the least. However, as with principals' own professional development, only a half an hour per week separates the highest and lowest estimates (see Table 14). While comparable experience and veteran principals are reporting similar amounts of time as in 2003, LAUNCH principals' reports have decreased an hour and a half per week since 2003.

Given the large size differences in Chicago schools, particularly between traditional and new small high schools, we examined staff reshaping in terms of both overall numbers and as a percentage of total staff (Table 15). Principals were asked how many teachers they had hired and how many they had encouraged to leave during the last two years. In elementary schools, all groups look very similar in terms of number of teachers hired or encouraged to leave. However, by percentage, LAUNCH and comparably experienced principals hired the most teachers (about one-fifth of the staff) and LAUNCH and NLNS principals encouraged relatively more teachers to leave (about 10 percent). In high schools, LAUNCH principals did considerably more hiring according to raw numbers but the least according to percentages. On the other hand, NLNS secondary level principals hired a majority of their staff. This reflects the fact that all three of the NLNS principals are in new schools while three of the four LAUNCH principals participating in the survey led large traditional high schools. We also examine staff reshaping in relation to the learning gains analysis later in this chapter.

TABLE 14

Average Hours Spent Each Week on Principal and Staff Professional Development

	n	Time Spent on Principal Professional Development (Hours)	n	Time Spent on Planning and Conducting Staff Development (Hours)
LAUNCH	36	2.3	38	4.0
NLNS	7	2.6	8	3.5
Principals with Comparable Experience (0-6 yrs)	126	2.1	128	3.8
Veteran Principals (>6 yrs)	120	2.2	123	3.7

Source: CCSR 2005 principal survey.

TABLE 15

Principal Staff Reshaping Over Previous Two Years

	n	Average Number of Teachers		Percentage of Total Staff	
		Teachers You Hired	Teachers You Encouraged to Leave	Teachers You Hired	Teachers You Encouraged to Leave
Elementary					
LAUNCH	43	6	2	22	9
NLNS	5	5	3	15	10
Principals with Comparable Experience (0-6 yrs)	119	7	2	20	7
Veteran Principals (>6 yrs)	143	6	2	15	6
High School					
LAUNCH	4	27	5	27	5
NLNS	3	9	0	85	0
Principals with Comparable Experience (0-6 yrs)	32	16	4	29	8
Veteran Principals (>6 yrs)	14	18	4	40	8

Source: CCSR 2005 principal survey.

Note: Between 91 and 100 percent of elementary respondents and between 67 and 100 percent of high school respondents answered these items.

How do teachers in their schools rate LAUNCH and NLNS principals as leaders?

- LAUNCH principals were not rated significantly higher on any measures at the high school level. However, only 38 percent of LAUNCH principals had adequate teacher survey responses for this analysis. Teacher data were not available for any of the three NLNS high schools.
- In elementary schools with LAUNCH principals, teachers reported more teacher-parent interaction and greater use of reformed literacy practices. Schools with NLNS principals reported greater innovation and reflective dialogue and less use of traditional literacy practices and assessment.
- Though there were only two LAUNCH schools that also had a cluster of at least three national-board-certified teachers, these schools showed dramatic effects. Of 16 measures, 8 showed significantly positive differences compared to schools with similar principals. However, we must be cautious in interpreting such effects based on only two schools. These analyses compared principals on a number of CCSR scales that measure school leadership, professional capacity parent and community partnerships, and use of reformed literacy practices and assessment. For this analysis we used only principals with survey data so that they could be more accurately categorized as comparable experience or veteran principals. The theoretical basis for these scales comes from CCSR's Model of Essential Supports for Student Learning. For a description of the history and evidence for this model, please see the sidebar on p. 21.

In our 2004 report, we looked at four measures of principal leadership from our survey of teachers: instructional leadership, teacher influence, promoting program coherence, and teacher-principal trust. Leadership is one of five domains in our essential supports model. For this report, we added scales from three more of these supports. For professional capacity we examined school commitment, reflective dialogue, collective responsibility, teacher-teacher trust, quality professional development, and innovation. For parent and community partnerships we examined parent involvement in the school (elementary school only) and teacher-parent interaction (a new measure in 2005). For quality instructional program we looked at four measures of literacy instruction in elementary schools: reformed literacy practices, reformed literacy assessment, traditional literacy practices, and traditional literacy assessment. For each topic, there are eight to ten related questions that form a coherent measure or scale.[9] (See the Appendix for a description of each scale.)

We investigated whether, on average, there were any differences in the way that elementary and high school teachers rated LAUNCH and NLNS principals, other comparably experienced principals, and veteran principals on these measures. We conducted the analysis in a way that controlled for other factors that might influence teachers' ratings.[10] A limitation on these findings is that they are based on only the LAUNCH and NLNS schools that had both principal and teacher survey data. This was necessary since CPS personnel data could not accurately quantify principal experience. While an acceptable 57 percent of elementary LAUNCH schools had enough data, only three of the eight LAUNCH high schools had both principal and teacher survey data. For NLNS, only 30 percent of elementary schools and none of the three high schools had sufficient data. Therefore, while these are the best available data, interpretations must be cautious.

In high schools, there were no significant differences between schools with LAUNCH principals and other schools led by veteran or comparably experienced principals. As explained above, NLNS principals did not have adequate teacher survey responses to include in this analysis.

At the elementary level, schools with NLNS principals reported greater innovation and reflective dialogue and less use of traditional literacy practices and assessment. Analyses on LAUNCH principals were conducted in three ways. We first looked at all LAUNCH principals together. Here we found that teacher-parent interaction was significantly higher in elementary schools led by LAUNCH principals than those led by comparably experienced principals. Teachers in these LAUNCH schools also reported greater use of reformed literacy practices.

Our second analysis of LAUNCH principals examined more- and less-experienced LAUNCH principals separately.[11] The first group had three or more years of experience and the second had fewer than three years in their school. This division allowed us to see whether LAUNCH principals who had become more established in their schools were rated more highly by their teachers compared to other similarly experienced principals. Looking at these two groups separately, we found that schools with more-experienced LAUNCH principals reported greater reformed literacy practice, while those with less-experienced LAUNCH principals reported greater teacher-parent interaction.

Our third analysis looked at LAUNCH principals who also had a cluster of at least three national-board-certified teachers (NBCTs). None of the NLNS principals had a cluster of NBCTs. This analysis derived from The Fund's theory of action, which suggests that a concentration of talented teachers and leadership in a school will move the school toward improvement. Such a LAUNCH/NBCT cluster was only found in two elementary schools and no high schools. Results of this analysis showed a significant positive effect on 8 of 16 measures for the two LAUNCH schools with NBCT clusters compared to other schools with comparably experienced principals.[12] In terms of leadership these schools reported stronger principal instructional leadership and teacher influence. Of the measures of professional capacity, teachers in these schools reported greater school commitment, collective responsibility, quality professional development, and innovation. They also showed more teacher-parent interaction and use of reformed literacy practices. While these results are dramatic, we must be circumspect with conclusions drawn from only two schools. However, assuming the

number of such clusters grows, future analyses may lend strong support for this theory of action.

In interpreting these results it is important to keep in mind that they are cross-sectional and not longitudinal; therefore we cannot be sure of the causal relationships. Given the small number of LAUNCH and NLNS principals in 2003, analysis of the change between surveys was not possible. Instead we are looking only at the association between the principal and the presence of essential supports in their school at one point in time. For example, results for NLNS principals might be interpreted as a small number of NLNS principals who have been in their schools an average of only a year and a half and are off to a great start encouraging reformed literacy practices. However, it is also possible that schools with more innovative philosophies are seeking out NLNS principals, rather than NLNS principals causing these changes in their schools. Given the very short tenure of these principals, the former may be more likely.

The Essential Supports for Student Learning and Why They Matter

In the early 1990s CCSR researchers, along with other Chicago educators and CPS leaders, convened to develop a model of good practices that had been linked to school improvement. The initial purpose of this model was to provide a template that schools could use to guide self-assessment. Over time, that initial model evolved into the current Essential Supports for Student Learning.

Concurrent with the development of the Essential Supports model, CCSR researchers developed, tested, and refined a survey measurement system to capture the major concepts in the model. Since the mid 1990s we have collected survey information from CPS students, teachers, and principals every two years.

The model contains five essential supports for student learning: school leadership, parent and community partnerships, student-centered learning climate, professional community and workplace, and quality instruction. Within each of these supports there are multiple concepts. For example, our 2005 teacher surveys measured three concepts that fall within the school leadership support: principal instructional leadership, teacher influence, and program coherence, plus a fourth related concept, principal-teacher trust. Past surveys have included additional concepts, which are rotated in and out of the surveys in order to reduce its length.

We have accumulated a significant body of evidence relating the essential supports to improved student learning in Chicago public elementary schools. Our evidence base spans the period of decentralization in the early 1990s when the model was first developed, up to the present time. In a report that will be released in early fall of 2006, we show how composite measures of the essential supports are predictive of long-term improvements in student achievement as measured by standardized tests.[13] For example, we show that schools that were strongest in their reports of school leadership were about four times more likely to have shown substantial improvements in reading than schools that were weak in school leadership. For math, schools strong in school leadership improved about seven times more often than weak schools. We find the same connections between the other essential supports and improved achievement as well.

These relationships also hold up in more recent years. For instance, schools significantly improved their value-added outcomes between 2003 and 2005 if they had reports of high program coherence in 2003 or if their reports of program coherence improved during this time. Those schools with reports of low program coherence in 2003 and those with reports of flat or decreasing program coherence showed no such improvements. We find this pattern consistently across the measures of the essential supports that are discussed and analyzed in this report, such as instructional leadership, collective responsibility, and innovation. Given the vital role that these supports play in improving student learning, we view the associated scales as key indicators of the performance of principals and master teachers.

While LAUNCH and NLNS principals did not score significantly higher than other principals on measures of principal leadership, the system average is fairly high. For example, even in schools that scored in the bottom quartile on measures of teacher-principal trust, principal instructional leadership, and program coherence, about half of the teachers rated their principal as strong or very strong. In schools scoring in the top quartile on these measures, more than 80 to 90 percent of teachers rated their principal as strong or very strong.

Have LAUNCH and NLNS principals been able to produce higher learning gains on the ITBS than other principals?

- Our analysis shows no difference between NLNS or LAUNCH principals and principals with comparable experience or veteran principals.

To estimate learning gains in reading for each year that a principal led his or her school, we compared the learning gains on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) for each grade level with average gains in Chicago for that grade level for that year.[14] This allowed us to calculate whether students in each school were making larger or smaller gains than expected. We then analyzed differences in learning gains in two ways.[15] In both cases we conducted the analysis in such a way that we could control for other factors that usually influence learning gains.[16]

First we examined whether there were any differences in the learning gains between schools led by NLNS principals, LAUNCH principals, and comparably experienced and veteran principals. Neither LAUNCH nor NLNS principals were found to have significantly different learning gains from comparably experienced principals. However, it is probably unrealistic to expect that schools with NLNS principals would make higher-than-average gains at this point, because there are few of them and such principals have been in their positions fewer than two years on average.[17]

We conducted two additional analyses on LAUNCH principals but did not find differences in learning gains. First, we repeated the analysis splitting the LAUNCH principals into two groups (as in the analysis of teacher ratings above).[18] The first group had three or more years experience and the second had fewer than three years in their school. Again neither LAUNCH group showed different learning gains from their respective comparison groups.

We performed our next analysis to see if LAUNCH principals who had had the freedom to reconfigure or reshape their faculty were more likely to show greater learning gains than other LAUNCH principals or comparable principals.[19] We defined LAUNCH and comparable principals as "reshapers" if they were in the top quartile of schools in terms of percentage of staff hired in two years. We found LAUNCH reshapers to have slightly better learning gains than other reshapers. But this result was only marginally significant. More importantly, results showed that it was actually non-reshapers that had greater learning gains. This suggests that while hiring a larger number of new teachers at once may enable a principal to make significant positive changes to their staff, these changes likely take some time to have an effect on learning gains. In addition, such large change (or the newness of start-up schools) likely brings costs in terms of the essential supports. Trust and collegiality, for example take time to build or rebuild. In the short term, this may work against increasing learning gains.

What do LAUNCH and NLNS principals identify as the main roadblocks that impede school improvement?

- The seven most serious factors for elementary LAUNCH principals in 2005 were: pressure to get test scores up quickly, social problems in the school's community (poverty, gangs, drugs, etc.), parents apathetic or irresponsible about their children, problem students (apathetic, hostile, etc.), lack of time to evaluate teachers, pressure to constantly adopt new programs, and state or federal mandates (desegregation, special education, bilingual education, etc.).
- Five of the six most serious factors for high school LAUNCH principals overlap with those of elementary: social problems in the school's community (poverty, gangs, drugs, etc.), pressure to get test scores up quickly, state or federal mandates (desegregation, special education, bilingual education, etc.), lack of support from the school's community, lack of time to evaluate teachers, and pressure to constantly adopt new programs.

Principals responded to the following question: "Below are several factors which could be considered as 'roadblocks' that prevent a school from improving. Please indicate the extent to which each may be a factor in preventing your school from improving." They were asked to rate each of 25 items as "not a factor," "somewhat a factor," or "a serious factor." Those factors identified as "serious" or "somewhat serious" by at least two-thirds of LAUNCH principals are considered the most serious and are listed in Tables 16 and 17.

It is significant that the top two roadblocks identified in the 2003 survey—lack of time for teacher planning and professional development and difficulty removing poor teachers—were not among the top seven in 2005. Another change since the 2003 survey is greater concern about "pressure to get test scores up quickly." The percentage of LAUNCH principals considering this

TABLE 16

Roadblocks That Prevent the School from Improving (Elementary)

	Percentage of Principals			
Roadblocks	LAUNCH n=43	NLNS n=5	Principals with Comparable Experience (0-6 yrs) n=119	Veteran Principals (>6 yrs) n=144
Pressure to get test scores up quickly				
Serious factor	46	40	41	50
Somewhat a factor	36	40	42	34
Social problems in the school's community (poverty, gangs, drugs, etc.)				
Serious factor	34	20	32	34
Somewhat a factor	45	20	42	47
Parents apathetic or irresponsible about their children				
Serious factor	34	20	38	26
Somewhat a factor	40	80	47	43
Problem students (apathetic, hostile, etc.)				
Serious factor	33	20	29	25
Somewhat a factor	39	60	49	39
Lack of time to evaluate teachers				
Serious factor	34	20	26	20
Somewhat a factor	37	60	44	38
Pressure to constantly adopt new programs				
Serious factor	28	20	18	27
Somewhat a factor	39	40	42	38
State or federal mandates (desegregation, special education, bilingual education, etc.)				
Serious factor	27	40	35	35
Somewhat a factor	51	60	40	42

Source: CCSR 2005 principal survey.

Note: Principals could also mark "not a factor," which is not shown. Between 92 and 96 percent of respondents answered these items. All NLNS respondents responded to all questions. Items are displayed if at least two thirds of LAUNCH principals indicated item was a "serious factor" or "somewhat a factor." Items are ordered in terms of percentage of LAUNCH principals rating item as a "serious factor."

a "serious factor" fell below comparable and veteran principals in 2003 but has now caught up. In 2003, this roadblock was the fifth most serious for LAUNCH but has now become first.

While the small number of NLNS principals makes percentage comparisons difficult, it appears there is general agreement among LAUNCH, NLNS, comparable experience and veteran principals regarding the most serious factors. All agree that one of the most serious roadblocks is pressure to raise scores quickly. All principals' deep concerns about test scores may now be distracting them from their broader missions.

Do LAUNCH and NLNS principals feel more equipped to perform their role than other new principals?

- LAUNCH principals report greatest satisfaction with their preparation programs, followed by NLNS principals. Those who participated in local university programs report the least satisfaction.
- LAUNCH principals also report greater confidence than other new principals in their ability to perform specific tasks. NLNS principals report less confidence than local university participants and those that did not complete a preparation program.

TABLE 17

Roadblocks That Prevent the School from Improving (High School)

	Percentage of Principals			
Roadblocks	LAUNCH n=4	NLNS* n=3	Principals with Comparable Experience (0-6 yrs) n=32	Veteran Principals (>6 yrs) n=14
Social problems in the school's community (poverty, gangs, drugs, etc.)				
Serious factor	50	33	50	14
Somewhat a factor	50	33	34	57
Pressure to get test scores up quickly				
Serious factor	50	0	41	38
Somewhat a factor	25	67	38	31
State or federal mandates (desegregation, special education, bilingual education, etc.)				
Serious factor	50	0	25	33
Somewhat a factor	25	33	41	67
Lack of support from the school's community				
Serious factor	50	0	19	0
Somewhat a factor	25	0	35	42
Lack of time to evaluate teachers				
Serious factor	25	0	31	8
Somewhat a factor	75	67	47	67
Pressure to constantly adopt new programs				
Serious factor	25	0	6	31
Somewhat a factor	75	33	66	31

Source: CCSR 2005 principal survey.

Note: Principals could also mark "not a factor," which is not shown. Between 95 and 100 percent of respondents answered these items. Small NLNS group does represent all NLNS high school principals and all responded to these items. All LAUNCH respondents answered all but one item. That item was not reported here. Of the items rated as "serious" or "somewhat a factor" by at least two-thirds of LAUNCH principals, the six most common items were selected for display. Items are ordered in terms of percentage of LAUNCH principals rating item as a "serious factor."

We asked respondents who had become principals in CPS within the previous five years to answer questions about their pre-service preparation program. Respondents indicated whether they had participated in either LAUNCH, NLNS, a program at a local university (or Illinois Administrators Academy), another program, or did not complete a pre-service preparation program. They were then asked to rate the extent to which their program equipped them to perform various tasks and how confident they now feel to perform these tasks. Tables 18 and 19 list all tasks and percentage of principals responding "prepared very well, "prepared well," "prepared somewhat," and "did not prepare." Tasks are listed in order of LAUNCH principals' ratings, from most to least prepared.

While the majority of principals reported being prepared well or very well on nearly all tasks, differences did appear between groups. LAUNCH principals reported greatest satisfaction with their preparation on 13 out of 14 tasks. NLNS principals fell between LAUNCH and local university participants in terms of satisfaction on 13 of 14 tasks. LAUNCH principals reported feeling slightly less prepared than NLNS principals in terms of developing a talented faculty. However, this 5 percent difference seems unimportant considering that the majority (85 percent) felt well or very well prepared. Only 57 percent of local university participants rated their preparation this highly. NLNS principals felt particularly unprepared for managing school operations effectively. Sixty percent of NLNS principals rated their preparation as "somewhat" or "none" compared to only 11 percent of LAUNCH and 39 percent of local university participants.

We also asked new principals to rate the extent to which they felt confident to perform these tasks (see Table 19). The majority of principals reported feeling confident or very confident in their ability to perform these tasks, yet groups again differed. LAUNCH principals reported the greatest confidence of all the groups. NLNS principals reported the least confidence and particularly showed concerns in areas regarding school operations and budget. NLNS principals do have about a year less experience in their schools and are on average five or more years younger than principals in the other groups.[20] In addition, three of the ten NLNS high school principals are in new schools, which may have more operational issues to iron out.

Like reports of data-driven decision making, this analysis is based on the self-reports of socially desirable concepts: preparation and confidence. While this should be kept in mind, these particular questions ask for self-perceptions which can be useful indicators.

TABLE 18

Extent to Which Principals Believe Their Pre-Service Program Equipped Them to Perform the Following Tasks

	Percentage of Principals		
	LAUNCH n=46	NLNS n=10	Local University/ Illinois Admininstrators Academy n=76
Develop leadership within the school			
Prepared very well	75	50	32
Prepared well	18	40	42
Prepared somewhat	7	10	23
Did not prepare	0	0	3
Establish high expectations for students			
Prepared very well	70	70	33
Prepared well	25	20	42
Prepared somewhat	5	10	21
Did not prepare	0	0	4
Engage staff to work toward a common vision			
Prepared very well	70	50	27
Prepared well	23	30	41
Prepared somewhat	7	20	29
Did not prepare	0	0	3
Delegate or share responsibility			
Prepared very well	65	40	31
Prepared well	30	50	43
Prepared somewhat	5	10	21
Did not prepare	0	0	6
Foster a safe, student-centered learning environment			
Prepared very well	61	40	26
Prepared well	30	40	44
Prepared somewhat	9	20	24
Did not prepare	0	0	6
Motivate and facilitate staff to work toward whole-school improvement			
Prepared very well	60	30	27
Prepared well	35	50	44
Prepared somewhat	5	20	21
Did not prepare	0	0	7
Seek critical feedback from peers			
Prepared very well	57	70	27
Prepared well	41	10	37
Prepared somewhat	2	10	25
Did not prepare	0	10	11
Engage parents and community to work toward a common vision			
Prepared very well	53	30	24
Prepared well	33	40	40
Prepared somewhat	12	30	26
Did not prepare	2	0	10
Develop a talented faculty			
Prepared very well	52	50	25
Prepared well	33	40	32
Prepared somewhat	14	10	26
Did not prepare	2	0	17

	Percentage of Principals		
	LAUNCH n=46	NLNS n=10	Local University/ ILAA n=76
Attract and retain talented teachers			
Prepared very well	52	40	21
Prepared well	30	30	37
Prepared somewhat	18	30	28
Did not prepare	0	0	14
Lead schoolwide literacy and math initiatives			
Prepared very well	50	40	24
Prepared well	34	30	43
Prepared somewhat	16	30	22
Did not prepare	0	0	11
Manage school operations effectively			
Prepared very well	48	10	24
Prepared well	41	30	38
Prepared somewhat	11	50	25
Did not prepare	0	10	14
Develop and monitor implementation of a long-range strategic plan (such as SIPAAA)			
Prepared very well	45	40	28
Prepared well	45	40	39
Prepared somewhat	9	20	26
Did not prepare	0	0	7
Manage budget, aligning resources with instructional improvement			
Prepared very well	34	20	21
Prepared well	48	30	38
Prepared somewhat	16	50	28
Did not prepare	2	0	14

Source: CCSR 2005 principal survey.

Note: Included in this analysis were respondents who became a CPS principal within five years of the survey. and indicated they had participated in LAUNCH, NLNS or local university preparation program.

TABLE 19

Extent to Which Principals Feel Confident in Their Ability to Perform the Following Tasks Effectively

	Percentage of Principals		
	LAUNCH n=46	NLNS n=10	Local University/ Illinois Administrators Academy n=76
Establish high expectations for students			
Very confident	80	70	74
Confident	20	30	26
Somewhat confident	0	0	0
Not confident	0	0	0
Foster a safe, student-centered learning environment			
Very confident	75	40	63
Confident	23	50	36
Somewhat confident	2	10	1
Not confident	0	0	0
Develop leadership within the school			
Very confident	73	40	58
Confident	23	50	36
Somewhat confident	5	10	7
Not confident	0	0	0
Manage school operations effectively			
Very confident	73	0	61
Confident	23	50	34
Somewhat confident	5	50	4
Not confident	0	0	1
Develop and monitor implementation of a long-range strategic plan (such as SIPAAA)			
Very confident	70	40	57
Confident	26	50	37
Somewhat confident	5	10	7
Not confident	0	0	0
Develop a talented faculty			
Very confident	70	50	53
Confident	25	40	39
Somewhat confident	5	10	8
Not confident	0	0	0
Motivate and facilitate staff to work toward whole-school improvement			
Very confident	70	30	54
Confident	23	60	42
Somewhat confident	5	10	4
Not confident	2	0	0
Engage staff to work toward a common vision			
Very confident	67	60	55
Confident	30	30	42
Somewhat confident	0	10	1
Not confident	2	0	1
Lead schoolwide literacy and math initiatives			
Very confident	65	30	43
Confident	26	60	47
Somewhat confident	9	10	9
Not confident	0	0	0

	Percentage of Principals		
	LAUNCH n=46	NLNS n=10	Local University/ Illinois Administrators Academy n=76
Attract and retain talented teachers			
Very confident	61	50	47
Confident	32	20	50
Somewhat confident	7	30	3
Not confident	0	0	0
Delegate or share responsibility			
Very confident	59	30	57
Confident	36	60	41
Somewhat confident	5	10	3
Not confident	0	0	0
Seek critical feedback from peers			
Very confident	57	30	56
Confident	41	60	39
Somewhat confident	2	10	5
Not confident	0	0	0
Engage parents and community to work toward a common vision			
Very confident	57	40	41
Confident	36	30	46
Somewhat confident	5	30	13
Not confident	2	0	0

Source: CCSR 2005 principal survey.

Endnotes

1 According to LAUNCH program directors, as of September 2006, there are 107 principals, 46 assistant principals, and 30 central/area administrators.

2 According to NLNS program directors, as of September 2006, there are 42 principals and 12 assistant principals.

3 Of these five principals excluded from analysis, three were principals in planning, one was principal of an alternative school that was not included in the survey, and one was a co-principal. The co-principal was not included because the other principal answered the survey and because school characteristics could not be ascribed specifically to the NLNS principal.

4 The LAUNCH class of 2004-05 was the first to have the on-site writing sample added to the interview. The last class (2005-06) was the first to have all five components.

5 In our statistical analyses we only use data from schools with at least a 42 percent teacher response rate. Rates ranged from 42 to 100 percent. Sixty-nine percent of schools surveyed met this criterion.

6 We chose six instead of seven years of experience for the comparable experience group since only two LAUNCH principals had more than six years of experience. These individuals had six and one-half and seven years of experience.

7 After their first year, "non-new" LAUNCH and NLNS principals are then included with "all other teachers."

8 While the mean for NLNS principals was nearly the same as that of the two comparison groups, the difference between LAUNCH and NLNS was not statistically significant. This is likely due to the small number of NLNS principals.

9 The measures contained in this report were derived through Rasch rating-scale analysis. Survey items are used to define a measure based on the relative probability of a respondent choosing each category for each item. Individuals are then placed on this scale based on their particular responses to the items in the measure. The scale units—logits—constitute a linear measurement system and therefore are suitable for use in statistical procedures. See Wright and Masters (1982). Details on Consortium measures are available at www.consortium-chicago.org/surveys/pdfs/2003usersmanual.pdf.

10 For this analysis we used hierarchical linear modeling (HLM), which permits us to simultaneously account for the characteristics of individual teachers within schools and the characteristics of schools. See Raudenbush and Bryk (2002). Our analysis held constant the characteristics of teachers' gender, race/ethnicity, and years of experience. We also controlled for school characteristics: size of school; whether it was a magnet school; whether the principal served for six or fewer versus more than six years; and neighborhood demographic characteristics (using the 2000 census) which includes proportion of managers and professionals, level of education in the neighborhood, and level of crime. The elementary school analysis was based on 44 schools with LAUNCH principals, and depending on the leadership measure, 268 to 270 non-LAUNCH schools. The high school analysis was based on 6 LAUNCH principals and 36 non-LAUNCH schools.

11 Aside from the division of LAUNCH principals into two groups, this analysis was identical to the original. The more experienced LAUNCH principal group was compared to other principals with three or more years experience and those with less experience were compared to others with fewer than three years.

12 Comparably experienced principals may or may not have had clusters of national-board-certified teachers.

13 Sebring, Allensworth, Bryk, Easton, Luppescu (2006).

14 ITBS data were used in this analysis because the exam was given annually to students in all grades 3 through 8, allowing us to calculate year-to-year gains for each student (i.e., a third- to fourth-grade gain). After the 2004-05 school year, however, CPS discountinued the ITBS. Beginning the next year, CPS instead extended the Illinios Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) to include these same grades. Previously, ISAT had only been given to third, fifth and eighth grades. After the 2006-07 school year , it will be possible to caculate learning gains using ISAT scores.

15 The LAUNCH/NBCT cluster analysis conducted on teacher ratings was not applied to learning gains since only one of the two schools with such clusters had test scores.

16 We used hierarchical linear modeling (HLM), controlling for grade level; year; the interaction of grade and year; student race and gender; concentration of poverty; and whether the principal came through LAUNCH, NLNS, or is a new principal (with 6 or less years of experience) who did not participate in either program. The analysis included 565 elementary schools (including 19 branches), of which 48 schools were led by LAUNCH principals and 12 schools were led by NLNS principals in 2005, 32 and 2 in 2004, 26 and 2 in 2003, 17 and 0 in 2002, 10 and 0 in 2001, 6 and 0 in 2000, 1 and 0 in 1999. Learning gains were calculated starting in 1997, so that we could compare each school to its prior performance. This was necessary because low-achieving schools could have had more principal turnover and thus bias the estimate of the effects of a new principal.

17 While throughout this report we use 0-6 year principals as our comparison group, for the gains analyses we also compared NLNS principals to other 0-3 year principals. This did not affect results.

18 Aside from the division of LAUNCH principals into two groups this analysis was identical to the original. More experienced LAUNCH principal group was compared to other principals with three or more years experience and those with less experience were compared to others with fewer than three years of experience.

19 Aside from the addition of reshaping groups, this analysis was the same as the original gains analysis.

20 Average ages for groups are: LAUNCH, 49; NLNS, 44; local university, 51. Average years as a principal for groups are: LAUNCH, 2.7; NLNS, 1.9; local university, 2.5.

Teacher Leadership Development Program

NBPTS: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) was established to elevate the teaching profession by providing an advanced, rigorous level of certification. NBPTS began certifying teachers in 1993. Through September 2005, NBPTS has been appropriated federal funds of $149.1 million, which represents approximately 34 percent of the NBPTS budget. Nationwide, over 47,500 teachers have obtained national board certification.[1]

The process of becoming a national-board-certified teacher (NBCT) involves completing an extensive portfolio that includes unedited videotapes of the candidate's work in the classroom, analysis of student work, and evidence of the effectiveness of instructional strategies. In addition, teachers provide evidence of their successful work with students' families, the community, and their professional colleagues that impacts student learning. Candidates also sit for a series of six computer-delivered prompts at an assessment center. The prompts are designed to elicit knowledge of subject-matter content for the area of specialization. Candidates must demonstrate pedagogy and a knowledge base that meets the rigorous standards of the NBPTS.

Portfolios and content examinations are scored by highly trained classroom teachers (many, but not all, are NBCTs). The scorers receive extensive training to avoid bias and achieve reliability in scoring. Educational Testing Service created and administers the assessments.

In spring 2005, there were 377 NBCTs in Chicago. By the end of 2005, The Fund had invested $3 million in the program, CPS had provided $4.6 million, and the state had contributed more than $20 million. The Fund's investment supported preparation programs and along with the district and state offered incentives for national board certification.

Data Sources

Demographic descriptions of NBCTs and where they work were derived by matching lists of board-certified teachers from the Chicago office of NBPTS with personnel records from CPS. In addition, new survey items were added to the 2005 principal survey which asked principals about supports they provided to teachers seeking national board certification.

Teacher survey data were not used in these analyses since an unexpectedly large number of teachers incorrectly identified themselves as national board certified.[2] Since the surveys are confidential and respondents do not supply their names, there was no way to clearly distinguish surveys from NBCTs from surveys erroneously identifying teachers as board certified. Matching the list of NBCTs to personnel data was also not a perfect process since names are often inconsistently recorded or changed. However, 87 percent of NBCTs could be matched to personnel data.[3]

Who are the board-certified teachers in Chicago?

- Board certified teachers are primarily white women, though one-quarter to one-third are African-American or Latino.
- In elementary schools, a much greater percentage of board-certified teachers have master's degrees than other elementary teachers. While high school NBCTs are also more likely to have master's degrees, this difference does not meet the level of statistical significance.
- The majority of board-certified teachers have between 2 and 15 years of experience.
- In general, the vast majority of board-certified teachers work in regular schools, and the percentage teaching at elementary and high schools is similar to that for all CPS teachers. But board-certified teachers are more likely than other teachers to work at magnet schools (17 percent versus 8 percent) and more economically advantaged schools. This is consistent with the 2003 findings.
- Board-certified teachers serve a wide variety of communities. They are more likely to teach in low-poverty schools; at the same time, more than one-quarter teach in high-poverty schools (schools where more than 95 percent of the students come from low-income families).

Tables 20 through 23 document these summary statements about the characteristics of board-certified teachers and how they compare to elementary and high school teachers overall.

TABLE 20

Teachers' Gender and Race/Ethnicity

	n	Percentage of Teachers					
		Gender*		Race*			
		Male	Female	African-American	Latino	White	Other
Elementary							
Board certified	212	10	90	24	8	64	5
Others	16,220	15	85	34	16	47	4
High School							
Board certified	80	32	68	20	4	73	4
Others	6,867	40	60	35	10	51	5

Source: Chicago office of NBPTS and CPS personnel records.

Note: Only about 90 percent of the board-certified teachers' data includes information about gender.

** Differences in the distribution of board-certified and other teachers are significant using chi-square statistics.*

TABLE 21

Teachers' Highest Academic Degrees

	n	Percentage of Teachers		
		Bachelor's Degree	Master's Degree	Doctorate
Elementary*				
Board certified	187	24	75	1
Others	16,151	50	50	1
High School				
Board certified	76	32	66	3
Others	6,767	43	55	2

Source: Chicago office of NBPTS and CPS personnel records.

** Differences in the distribution of board-certified and other teachers are significant using chi-square statistics.*

TABLE 22

Teachers' Years of Experience

	n	Average Years
Elementary		
Board certified	212	13
Others	16,220	12
High School		
Board certified	80	12
Others	6,867	12

Source: Chicago office of NBPTS and CPS personnel records.

Note: Difference between board-certified and other teachers is not statistically significant using t-test statistics.

TABLE 23

Where Board-Certified Teachers Work

	n of Schools	Percentage of Teachers	
		Board certified (n=295)	Others (n=23,270)
Level			
Elementary	526	74	71
High School	94	24	25
Combo elementary-high school	13	2	4
Type*			
Regular	537	79	90
Preschool	22	<1	<1
Magnet	43	17	8
Charter†	NA	NA	NA
Special	14	4	1
Achievement Academy	8	-	<1
Alternative	9	-	1
Low Income*			
< 50	68	17	8
50-80	96	24	15
80-95	243	32	44
> 95	225	27	34

Source: Chicago office of NBPTS and CPS personnel records.

** Differences in the distribution of board-certified and other teachers are significant using chi-square statistics.*

† Personnel data does not include charter school information.

Are schools with clusters of board-certified teachers more likely to show higher levels of professional capacity than other similar schools?

- Elementary schools with NBCT clusters reported more instructional reform. Other measures indicate a positive trend, but perhaps due to the small number of schools with clusters, these differences are not statistically significant. On the other hand, high schools with clusters showed significantly more collective responsibility, innovation, and teacher-teacher trust.

We examined elementary and high schools with three or more teachers who were board certified to see whether these schools appeared stronger overall with respect to measures of professional capacity than schools without clusters of such teachers. In other words, is there any evidence that a cluster of NBCTs helps to raise the overall performance of the faculty? Specifically, we conducted an analysis that compared schools with clusters of board-certified teachers to other schools without such teachers on four measures of professional capacity, four measures of instructional reform (elementary only), two measures of participant relations, and teacher technology use (high school only).[4] See the Appendix for a description of the measures.

In addition, to ensure that our estimates were not confounded by other extraneous differences between schools, the analysis also held constant the size and type of school and the demographic characteristics of the student body.[5] There were 16 elementary schools (out of 391, or 4 percent) and nine high schools (out of 74, or 12 percent) with clusters of three or more teachers who were board certified (and who participated in the survey).

Given the very small portion of elementary schools with clusters of NBCTs, it is unlikely that we would be able to detect a statistical difference in measures of professional capacity. Analyses show no statistically significant differences for the professional capacity or participant relations measures in general, though schools with NBCT clusters scored higher in these areas. However, elementary schools with NBCT clusters did show significant differences in terms of instructional reform measures. For example, these schools reported significantly less use of traditional assessment and literacy instruction techniques than schools without clusters. They also showed greater use of reformed assessment techniques—such as portfolios and oral presentations—though this difference was only marginally significant ($p=.08$). A measure of reformed literacy techniques was not significantly different from schools without NBCT clusters.

High schools with clusters of NBCTs showed significantly more collective responsibility, innovation, and teacher-teacher trust. Results also pointed toward greater reflective dialogue and teacher-parent trust, yet these differences did not reach statistical significance ($p<.10$ and $p<.13$, respectively). It is worth noting that the high schools that had clusters of NBCTs were, on the whole, not the average CPS high school. Of the nine schools with clusters, five were magnets, one was a charter, and one was a new start-up small school with a professional development focus. This leaves only two regular high schools with at least three NBCTs. Although school achievement level and size were controlled for in this analysis, it is possible that these schools share some unique characteristics beyond those captured in our analysis that also contribute to their professional capacity. For example, these schools may more easily attract more high-quality teachers, those that are more likely to be analytical and reflective of their practice. This would in turn facilitate the development of essential supports. Thus, the cross-sectional nature of the data prevents us from being able to establish a causal relationship between NBCT clusters and professional capacity. Having a cluster of NBCTs may lead to greater professional capacity; or schools with such capacity may be better at encouraging teachers to obtain board certification, or more likely to hire and keep board-certified teachers.

TABLE 24

Average Scale Scores for Schools with and without Clusters of Board-Certified Teachers

	Elementary Schools		High Schools	
Scale	With Clusters	Without Clusters	With Clusters	Without Clusters
Collective Responsibility	6.16	5.87	5.60*	4.94
Innovation	6.29	5.93	5.96**	4.97
Parent Involvement in School	4.86	4.65	NA	NA
Reflective Dialogue	6.58	6.40	6.44	6.16
Reformed Literacy Assessment	4.85+	4.60	NA	NA
Teacher Assignment of Technology	NA	NA	4.44	4.33
Student-Centered Literacy Practices	6.00	5.96	NA	NA
Teacher-Parent Trust	5.61	5.41	5.09+	4.74
Teacher-Teacher Trust	5.57	5.49	5.68**	5.05
Traditional Literacy Assessment	4.15*	4.65	NA	NA
Traditional Literacy Practice	5.59***	6.18	NA	NA

*+p<.10,**

**p<.05,*

***p<.01,*

****p<.001*

Are board-certified teachers more likely to assume leadership roles?

- Yes, NBCTs in both elementary and high schools reported holding leadership roles at greater rates than board-certified or other teachers in the 2004 report.

In the 2003 survey, teachers were asked if they held a leadership position in their school, such as Local School Council (LSC) representative, Professional Personnel Advisory Committee (PPAC) chair, union delegate, curriculum coordinator or facilitator, reading specialist, lead teacher, or other similar roles. This question was not included on the 2005 survey. However, an email survey was conducted of board-certified teachers in February and March of 2006.[6] Of the 56 percent of NBCTs responding, 65 percent of elementary and 55 percent of high school teachers reported having held a leadership position in the survey school year (2004-05).[7] This shows a 10 percentage-point increase in leadership for elementary NBCTs compared to 2003. In addition, 2005 leadership rates are more than twice that of other teachers in 2003, 25 percent of whom reported holding leadership roles.

What types of supports do principals provide their teachers seeking board certification?

- Of the 12 types of support we asked about, 10 were reported as provided by at least half of principals. The least prevalent were those that are most costly to the school: substitute teachers, shielding candidates from extra duties, and stipends.
- Principals are not always aware of teachers' candidacy for board certification. Of the 191 principal respondents who said they had candidates, only 100 actually did (52 percent). This is perhaps partly due to teachers considering candidacy who had not officially applied for certification. However, it seems there is also some confusion about board certification.

We asked principals to indicate whether candidates in their school who were working toward certification by NBPTS received twelve different supports. Table 25 shows the responses of elementary and high school principals who had candidates in their school. Overall, the vast majority of principals reported they provided many of the supports necessary for candidates to do their work. The rarest supports were also the most costly for schools: stipends for extra expenses, shielding teachers from extra duties, and substitute teachers. In these cases, high school principals were more likely to report offering these supports than elementary principals. The biggest difference between elementary and high school principal reports, however, was in shielding candidates from extra duties: 80 percent of high school principals reported offering this support compared to only 35 percent of elementary school principals. In most areas, reports were fairly similar though high schools seem to show a slight advantage. Elementary school principals did report greater encouragement and moral support and more staff available to videotape lessons. While this is informative, it would also be wise to ask candidates themselves about whether they received such supports.

TABLE 25

Supports Candidates for National Board Certification Receive

Supports	Percentage of Elementary School Principals Reporting	Percentage of High School Principals Reporting
School building available after hours	99	100
Computers and printers readily available	99	100
Candidates receive encouragement and moral support	98	92
Meetings are predictable	96	100
Candidates' hard work is publicly acknowledged	87	92
Video equipment is available all day	85	92
Colleagues review entries	84	80
Staff available to videotape lessons	79	70
Candidates receive additional photocopy allotment	73	75
Substitute teachers available for candidates	56	64
Candidates are shielded from extra duties	35	80
Candidates receive stipends for extra expenses	16	27

Source: CCSR 2005 principal survey.

Note: The number of respondents varies between 72 and 85 for elementary school principals and 10 and 12 for high school principals. Principals could also mark "other," which is not shown.

Are principals who already have a board-certified teacher more or less likely to offer supports to candidates?

- Principals with a board-certified teacher on staff were no more likely than other principals to provide supports to candidates.

We compared principals who currently have a board-certified teacher on their staff to those who do not to determine whether having a board-certified teacher would make principals more likely to offer supports to candidates. As Tables 26 and 27 show, this was not the case. In both elementary and high schools, having a board-certified teacher did not affect access to these supports for new candidates.

TABLE 26

Comparison of Supports Candidates Receive in Elementary Schools with and without Board-Certified Teachers

Supports	Percentage of Elementary School Principals Reporting Candidate Supports in Schools with Board-Certified Teachers	Percentage of Elementary School Principals Reporting Candidate Supports in Schools without Board-Certified Teachers
School building available after hours	100	98
Candidates receive encouragement and moral support	100	98
Computers and printers readily available	97	100
Meetings are predictable	97	95
Candidates' hard work is publicly acknowledged	89	84
Colleagues review entries	86	82
Video equipment is available all day	82	87
Staff available to videotape lesson	76	81
Candidates receive additional photocopy allotment	74	71
Substitute teachers available for candidates	51	60
Candidates are shielded from extra duties	37	33
Candidates receive stipends for extra expenses	14	19

Source: CCSR 2005 principal survey.

Note: The differences between schools with and without national board certified teachers are not statistically significant using chi-square and Yate's correction statistics.

TABLE 27

Comparison of Supports Candidates Receive in High Schools with and without Board-Certified Teachers

Support	Percentage of High School Principals Reporting Candidate Supports in Schools with Board-Certified Teachers	Percentage of High School Principals Reporting Candidate Supports in Schools without Board-Certified Teachers
School building available after hours	100	100
Candidates receive additional photocopy allotment	71	80
Computers and printers readily available	100	100
Video equipment is available all day	100	80
Meetings are predictable	100	100
Staff available to videotape lessons	80	60
Substitute teachers available for candidates	67	60
Candidates receive encouragement and moral support	86	100
Candidates' hard work is publicly acknowledged	86	100
Colleagues review entries	100	60
Candidates are shielded from extra duties	80	80
Candidates receive stipends for extra expenses	17	40

Source: CCSR 2005 principal survey.

Note: The differences between schools with and without NBCTs are not statistically significant using chi-square and Yate's correction statistics.

Endnotes

1 Taken from the NBPTS official website, www.nbpts.org/pdf/quick-facts.pdf (accessed 4/11/06).

2 A total of 1,732 teachers indicated that they were National Board Certified. At the time of the survey, 339 NBCTs were employed in surveyed schools.

3 Candidate information is not presented in this report as it was in 2004 due to the time required for matching the large number of candidates to personnel data.

4 This measure was only available on the high school teacher survey.

5 For this analysis we used hierarchical linear modeling (HLM). In elementary school analysis, we controlled for several demographic characteristics of the school: average achievement (based on ITBS scores of all students adjusted for grade), school size, racial composition of the students, and the average socioeconomic status of students. For this last control variable we used neighborhood demographic characteristics of students' home neighborhoods (from the 2000 census): proportion of managers and professionals and level of education in the neighborhood, proportion of unemployed adults, and proportion of households below the poverty line. Student information was then aggregated to the school level. In the high school analysis, we controlled for school size, average achievement, and racial composition of students only since other variables did not significantly impact the analysis. Average high school achievement was based on incoming eighth-grade ITBS scores of all current students. No controls were included at the individual teacher level.

6 Due to the over identification of NBCTs, it was necessary to contact teachers by email to learn their room numbers for another part of the analysis. We therefore added the 2003 leadership question to this email.

7 Out of a list of 326 NBCTs who were currently working in the district and in surveyed units, 63 had inaccurate email addresses (19 percent). Of the remaining 263, 56 percent responded.

Interpretive Summary

The purpose of our original and this follow-up report was to use existing indicators to gain some initial understanding of the effects of these three leadership development programs in Chicago. Specifically, we were interested in whether there was evidence that these programs were building school organizational elements that would lead to improvements in student learning. In the summary below we discuss both our current findings and possible further investigations that might provide greater depth and nuance to these initial results.

LAUNCH

At the time of our last report in 2004, elementary LAUNCH principals had only been in their positions an average of two years. Most had taught at least 16 years before becoming a principal. Yet they expected, on average, to spend a total of 8 years as principal. LAUNCH principals reported spending nearly two more hours per week than other principals on professional development for themselves and their staff. On measures of leadership, teachers did not rate LAUNCH principals more highly than other new or veteran principals. However, LAUNCH principals did show a small advantage in learning gains over other new principals, looking instead more similar to veteran principals. In high schools, there were too few LAUNCH principals in 2003 to include in the previous report.

In the spring of 2005, when the data for this report were collected, the number of LAUNCH principals had nearly doubled, although their numbers in high schools remains very small (8). Their tenure as principal ranged from one to seven years with an average of three years. The proportion of LAUNCH principals teaching for at least 16 years dropped somewhat, from 57 to 50 percent. This perhaps led to the rise in expected years as principal from eight to ten years. Other demographic changes to the group included an increase in African-American principals and a dramatic 20 percent increase in those with doctorates.

Current findings point to some potential strengths and some areas which may need attention. LAUNCH principals, at least at the elementary level, seem to be using data to make curricular decisions to a greater degree than comparable and veteran principals. Satisfaction with pre-service preparation and confidence in their ability to carry out necessary leadership tasks were also highest for LAUNCH principals.

No differences in learning gains or teacher ratings of principal leadership were found. However, in elementary schools with LAUNCH principals with three or more years of experience, teachers reported greater use of reformed literacy practices. In schools with less-experienced LAUNCH principals, teachers reported greater teacher-parent interaction. Yet the two elementary LAUNCH schools that also had clusters of NBCTs scored significantly higher on 8 of 16 measures

of essential supports. This dramatic finding based on only two schools must be interpreted cautiously but may provide initial support for The Fund's theory of action, that a collection of talented teachers and leadership can move a school toward improvement.

There are potentially many reasons we did not find more differences. In-person interviews and observations may be necessary to provide a more nuanced picture of LAUNCH leaders' performance in comparison to that of other principals. Such work might suggest other areas in which LAUNCH principals excel or unexpected obstacles they face.

One specific cause for concern, however, is the drop in time spent on personal and staff professional development since 2003. It is possible that recent leadership changes and financial vicissitudes may have played some role in the ability of the program to provide the same level of offerings. Further investigation of these events might supply some insight.

LAUNCH principals also experienced a change in the obstacles they face in their work. The two most serious roadblocks LAUNCH principals reported in 2003 were no longer among the top issues for these principals in 2005. These were lack of time for teachers' professional development and difficulty removing poor teachers. These were replaced by lack of time to evaluate teachers, state and federal mandates, and pressure to constantly adopt new programs. These latter two factors may reflect the effects of No Child Left Behind legislation and the district's resulting response. Similarly, the relative importance of pressure to raise test scores has jumped from fifth to first for elementary schools (second for high schools). It may be that under these new pressures, LAUNCH principals have begun to resemble other CPS principals, both veteran and similarly experienced.

NLNS

Only three principals who had graduated from NLNS were principals at the time of the 2003 survey and they had served for less than one year as principals. Consequently they were not included in the 2004 report. For the 2005 survey they remained a small and new group, one just large enough to include but still difficult to judge, particularly since their school's participation in principal and teacher surveys was uneven.

As of the spring of 2005 NLNS participants had been principals for an average of one and a half years. Ten served as elementary school principals and only three served in high schools. All three of the high school principals served in schools opened since the fall of 2001. A relatively larger proportion of NLNS principals are Latino, a group traditionally underrepresented in CPS. One-third of elementary (three of nine) and high school (one of three) principals are Latino. Since the proportion of Latino students in CPS is 38 percent and growing, while only 14 percent of current principals are of Latino heritage, NLNS's expansion in Chicago may provide more school leaders with similar cultural heritage to their students.

Findings for NLNS, like those for LAUNCH, point to both potential strengths and weaknesses. NLNS principals were younger and more likely to have fewer than six years of teaching experience than LAUNCH and other principals. The result was a long potential tenure as principals in CPS. On average, NLNS principals planned to serve as principals for more than 12 years (up to 19 years for the high school principals).

As we found for LAUNCH principals, there were no differences in either learning gains or teacher ratings of principal leadership. However, their teachers reported greater innovation and reflective dialogue compared to schools with comparably experienced principals. Their teachers also reported using fewer traditional literacy practices and assessments. However, interpretations must be made cautiously for two reasons. First, this analysis required both principal and teacher survey data due to the inadequacy of official personnel records for determining principal experience. This brought the proportion of NLNS elementary schools in our analysis down to 30 percent, while none of the three NLNS high schools had sufficient teacher data. Second, it is unclear from our cross-sectional analysis whether these results indicate a tendency for schools favoring less traditional instruction to hire NLNS principals or if NLNS principals are encouraging these practices in their schools.

One possible concern came out of our examination of pre-service preparation programs of respondents who have spent five or fewer years in the principalship. On

one hand, NLNS graduates were more satisfied with the preparation they received than those who went to local universities. They also reported a great deal of confidence in their ability to perform the tasks of their role. However, in the areas of operations management and budget NLNS principals' ratings were distinctly more restrained. It may be that, as a national program, NLNS is providing less training on local management particulars.

An important similarity to note in both LAUNCH and NLNS is that nearly all of their principals, as well as other CPS principals, received their advanced degrees and certification through Chicago-area universities. This has not changed since 2003. As pointed out in our previous report, the strength of these programs greatly influences the strength of the principal candidate pool for CPS.

NBPTS

Similar to our findings in 2003, the majority of teachers certified by NBPTS in CPS worked in regular schools. Although they were more likely than other teachers to work in magnet and more advantaged schools, more than half taught in schools where at least 80 percent of the students come from low-income families. Education levels of high school NBCTs seem to have increased, with a greater proportion having a master's degree or higher. Other demographic comparisons between 2003 and 2005 are limited due to uncertainties in the data that affected about 10 percent of the sample in each year.

While we were unable to use survey data to directly investigate whether NBCTs demonstrated practices that historically have been important for improving student achievement, we did find evidence to suggest that schools with clusters of at least three NBCTs showed somewhat higher levels of professional capacity than other similar schools. Though results for elementary schools were not statistically significant, the positive trend found for the very small number of schools with clusters (only 4 percent) was notable. In addition, elementary schools with clusters of NBCTs showed greater use of reformed instructional practices. For example, cluster schools used significantly less traditional assessment and literacy instruction and more reformed assessment than other schools (though the latter was marginally significant).

In high schools (12 percent had clusters) results did reach statistical significance. Cluster schools showed significantly more collective responsibility, innovation, and teacher-teacher trust, as well as a trend toward more reflective dialogue and teacher-parent trust. It is important to note, however, that the high schools that had clusters of NBCTs were, for the most part, not typical CPS schools. Five of the nine cluster high schools were magnets, one was a charter, and another was a new small school start-up with a professional development focus. It is possible with such a unique group that despite statistical controls, these schools still differ in some other systematic way from other CPS high schools, which enables them to more easily foster the essential supports. For example, they may attract more high-quality teachers.

NBCTs continue to be leaders in their schools. Our results show that NBCTs were 10 percent more likely to take on leadership roles in their schools in 2005 as they were in 2003. Sixty-five percent of elementary and 55 percent of high school NBCTs reported having held such roles compared to only one-quarter of other teachers in 2003.

New to the 2005 principal survey were a set of questions on what types of supports principals provided their candidates for national board certification. While a majority of principals reported offering 10 of the 12 supports for their candidates, not surprisingly the least prevalent were those that cost the most. These included providing substitute teachers, shielding candidates from extra duties, and providing stipends for extra expenses. High school principals were more likely than elementary principals to provide these supports. However, principals who already had a NBCT on staff were no more likely than other principals to provide supports to subsequent candidates.

Available evidence continues to be encouraging for the benefits of national-board certification. The groundwork for another step in this work was collected from an email survey of NBCTs in which we asked self-contained classroom teachers to give their

room number. This will allow us to link teachers to students. We can then compare trends in the learning gains of students in board-certified teachers' classrooms compared to students in other classrooms. CCSR will conduct this work in tandem with an analysis of teacher quality funded by the Joyce Foundation.

One direction for future work would be a more direct survey of NBCTs to ensure accurate identification of these teachers. This would allow us to collect data on the specific teaching practices NBCTs report using in their classrooms and to compare these practices to those of a comparable group of teachers. Analyses on demographic trends in this program would also be greatly facilitated by more complete and reliable information on members gathered by the program itself.

Directions for Future Work

Three main challenges should be addressed in future research. First, Fund-supported programs should be required to participate in CCSR surveys (teacher participation was low). Second, greater use can be made of longitudinal data. Additional years of survey data will provide more reliable evidence about whether leaders are promoting the essential supports in their schools. Third, future analyses might also include teacher responses to confirm principal self-reports.

A more in-depth look at the schools LAUNCH and NLNS principals lead might provide more insights into effects of these programs. For example, the composition of their staff or the history of principal turnover in their schools would be possible avenues to follow.

One serious handicap in this work is the state of CPS's personnel data, which is not designed to answer fundamental human resource questions. How long has each principal been a principal in CPS? How many principals has a specific school had in the last ten years? These questions require painstaking—in many instances, case-by-case—scrutiny and matching of electronic records and even investigation of paper files. An improvement in the system's data system would greatly facilitate investigations of many important human resource questions.

Appendix

Measures of How Teachers Perceive Their Principals and Their Schools

Leadership

PRINCIPAL INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP measures whether teachers view their principal as an instructional leader with respect to teaching and learning standards, communication of a clear vision for the school, and tracking academic progress.

TEACHER INFLUENCE measures the extent of teachers' involvement in school decision-making. It assesses teachers' influence on selecting instructional materials, setting school policy, planning in-service programs, allocating discretionary funds, and hiring professional staff.

PROGRAM COHERENCE reflects the degree to which teachers feel the programs at their school are coordinated with each other and with the school's mission. Teachers are asked if instructional materials are consistent within and across grades, and if there is sustained attention to the quality of program implementation.

TEACHER-PRINCIPAL TRUST indicates the extent to which teachers feel their principal respects and supports them. Teachers responded to questions about whether the principal looks out for their welfare, has confidence in their expertise, and if they respect the principal as an educator.

Professional Capacity

SCHOOL COMMITMENT gauges the extent to which teachers feel loyal and committed to their school. Teachers report whether they look forward to working in the school, would rather work somewhere else, and would recommend the school to parents.

REFLECTIVE DIALOGUE assesses how often teachers talk with one another about curriculum and instruction, the school's goals, and the best ways to help students learn and to manage classroom behavior.

COLLECTIVE RESPONSIBILITY measures the strength of teachers' shared commitment to improve the whole school. Questions ask teachers how many colleagues feel responsible for students' academic and social development, set high standards for professional practice, and take responsibility for school improvement.

TEACHER-TEACHER TRUST measures the extent to which teachers in school have open communication with and respect for each other. We ask, for example, whether teachers in the school respect other teachers who lead school improvement efforts and whether teachers trust and respect each other.

QUALITY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT measures teachers' assessment of the degree to which professional development has influenced their teaching, helped them understand students better, and provided them with opportunities to work with colleagues and teachers from other schools.

INNOVATION captures the extent to which teachers feel they are continually learning and seeking new ideas, have a "can-do" attitude, and are encouraged to try new ideas in their teaching.

Parent and Community Partnerships

PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL (elementary school only) measures parent participation and support for the school. Teachers report how often parents pick up report cards, attend parent-teacher conferences, attend school events, and volunteer to help in the classroom or raise funds for the school.

TEACHER-PARENT INTERACTION (a new measure for 2005) measures teachers' reports of the frequency of their interactions with parents about what their students are studying and whether there are any academic or behavior problems.

Instructional Reform (elementary school only)

TRADITIONAL LITERACY PRACTICE measures teachers' reports of how often they use traditional literacy practices such as power writing, round robin, answering questions at the end of a story, or writing an essay based on the teacher's prompt.

REFORMED LITERACY PRACTICES measures teachers' reports of how often they use student-centered literacy practices such as reading workshops, having students read in small groups based on level, and having students write and revise on a topic of their own choosing.

TRADITIONAL APPROACH TO LITERACH ASSESSMENT measures teachers' reports of how important various traditional strategies for classroom assessment are to their teaching. These include chapter, basal, spelling and grammar tests, or standardized tests given for practice.

REFORMED APPROACH TO LITERACY ASSESSMENT measures teachers' reports of how important various reform strategies for classroom assessment are to their teaching. These include rubrics, running records, developmental checklists, portfolios, long-term projects, and oral presentations.

Measures Used in Comparison of Schools with and without Clusters of Board-Certified Teachers

Professional Capacity

COLLECTIVE RESPONSIBILITY measures the strength of teachers' shared commitment to improve the whole school. Questions ask teachers how many colleagues feel responsible for students' academic and social development, set high standards for professional practice, and take responsibility for school improvement.

INNOVATION captures the extent to which teachers feel they are continually learning and seeking new ideas, have a "can-do" attitude, and are encouraged to try new ideas in their teaching.

REFLECTIVE DIALOGUE assesses how often teachers talk with one another about curriculum and instruction, the school's goals, and the best ways to help students learn and to manage classroom behavior.

TEACHER-TEACHER TRUST measures the extent to which teachers in school have open communication with and respect for each other. We ask, for example, whether teachers in the school respect other teachers who lead school improvement efforts and whether teachers trust and respect each other.

Instructional Reform (elementary school only)

TRADITIONAL LITERACY PRACTICE measures teachers' reports of how often they use traditional literacy practices such as power writing, round robin, answering questions at the end of a story, or writing an essay based on the teacher's prompt.

REFORMED LITERACY PRACTICES measures teachers' reports of how often they use student-centered literacy practices such as reading workshops, having students read in small groups based on level, and having students write and revise on a topic of their own choosing.

TRADITIONAL APPROACH TO LITERACH ASSESSMENT measures teachers' reports of how important various traditional strategies for classroom assessment are to their teaching. These include chapter, basal, spelling and grammar tests, or standardized tests given for practice.

REFORMED APPROACH TO LITERACY ASSESSMENT measures teachers' reports of how important various reform strategies for classroom assessment are to their teaching. These include rubrics, running records, developmental checklists, portfolios, long-term projects, and oral presentations.

Participant Relations

PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL (elementary school only) measures parent participation and support for the school. Teachers reported how often parents picked up report cards, attended parent-teacher conferences, attended school events, volunteered to help in the classroom, or raised funds for the school.

TEACHER-PARENT TRUST measures the extent to which parents and teachers support each other to improve student learning and feel mutual respect. Teachers were asked if they feel they are partners with parents in educating children, if they receive good parental support, if the staff works hard to build trust with parents, and if teachers respect parents.

Technology Use (high school only)

STUDENT USE OF TECHNOLOGY IN THE CLASSROOM measures teachers' assessment of how frequently they include various uses of technology in their assignments. Activities include practice drills, word processing, creating presentations, and research on the Internet.

References

Raudenbush, Stephen W., and Anthony S. Bryk. 2002. *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods,* 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Sebring, Penny Bender, Elaine M. Allensworth, Anthony S. Bryk, John Q. Easton, and Stuart Luppescu. 2006. *The essential supports for school improvement.* Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research at the University of Chicago.

Smylie, Mark A., Albert Bennett, Pamela Konkol, and Carol R. Fendt. 2005. Developing school leaders: A look at existing research and next steps for new study. In W. A. Firestone & C. Reihl (Eds.) *A new agenda: Directions for research on educational leadership.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Wright, Benjamin D., and Geoff N. Masters. 1982. *Rating scale analysis.* Chicago: Mesa Press.

Consortium on Chicago School Research

Our Mission

The Consortium on Chicago School Research (CCSR) at the University of Chicago aims to conduct research of high technical quality that can inform and assess policy and practice in the Chicago Public Schools. By broadly engaging local leadership in our work, and presenting our findings to diverse audiences, we seek to expand communication among researchers, policy makers, and practitioners. CCSR encourages the use of research in policy action, but does not argue for particular policies or programs. Rather, we believe that good policy is most likely to result from a genuine competition of ideas informed by the best evidence that can be obtained.

CONSORTIUM ON
CHICAGO SCHOOL RESEARCH
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

ccsr.uchicago.edu | 1313 East 60th Street | Chicago, Illinois 60637 | T 773-702-3364 | F 773-702-2010