

PERSPECTIVE

BECOMING A LEADER: PREPARING SCHOOL PRINCIPALS FOR TODAY'S SCHOOLS



The Wallace Foundation®

Supporting ideas.
Sharing solutions.
Expanding opportunities.®

Copyright © 2008
The Wallace Foundation

All rights reserved.

This Wallace “Perspective” is part of an occasional series that provides ideas and recommendations in the areas that the foundation is engaged with: strengthening education leadership to improve student achievement; enhancing out-of-school time learning opportunities; and building appreciation and demand for the arts. This paper reflects the thinking of program, research and communications staff engaged with Wallace’s education leadership work and was written by Lee D. Mitgang, Director of Editorial Services. The foundation also gratefully acknowledges the contributions of Gene I. Maeroff in preparing this report.

Copies of this and other Wallace reports can be downloaded for free at the Knowledge Center in our website:
www.wallacefoundation.org.

<https://doi.org/10.59656/EL-PP0949.001>

BECOMING A LEADER: PREPARING PRINCIPALS FOR TODAY'S SCHOOLS

Since 2000, The Wallace Foundation has supported a range of efforts to improve the training and conditions of education leaders to better enable them to lift student achievement, especially in high-needs schools. This paper highlights current state and district efforts to address longstanding weaknesses in principal training. It describes key attributes of effective training identified in new research. And it offers four action-oriented lessons that could help guide states, districts and universities in better preparing principals: (1) Principal training programs should be more selective, more focused on improvement of instruction, more closely tied to the needs of districts, and provide more relevant internship experiences; (2) Leadership preparation should not end when new principals are hired, but should continue with high-quality mentoring and career-long growth opportunities; (3) Because of the likely added costs, resources for improving preparation should be directed at programs with proven benefits; and (4) Better leadership training is essential, but state and districts should also address the conditions that support or undermine leadership.

FROM SOLOIST TO CONDUCTOR: A NEW PARADIGM OF SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

The importance of effective school leadership and the accompanying need to provide principals with more appropriate training to meet today's needs are getting long-overdue attention. Teachers have the most immediate in-school effect on student success. But there is growing agreement that with the national imperative for having every child succeed, it is the principal who is best positioned to ensure that teaching and learning are as good as they can be throughout entire schools, especially those with the highest needs. A landmark report, *How Leadership Influences Student Learning*, makes the point:

"...there are virtually no documented instances of troubled schools being turned around without intervention by a powerful leader. Many other factors may contribute to such turnarounds, but leadership is the catalyst."¹

Given that, two questions arise:

- First, what is expected of our school leaders in today's climate?
- Second, what are the key ingredients of effective principal training, both before and after school leaders are first hired, to prepare them for the demands of their jobs?

This paper suggests some answers, based on work since 2000 by The Wallace Foundation and its state, district and research partners to develop creative solutions to improving leadership so that all children succeed. But it's also worth saying, for starters, what good school leadership is *not*.

For too long, principals have been expected to behave as superheroes or virtuoso soloists. But if the job of leading schools is really about single-handed heroism, then how do we even approach the question of what an appropriate professional education for such a preternatural role should look like? And how can we hope to identify, much less train, enough heroes to stock more than a small number of schools?ⁱⁱ

Fortunately, a growing body of research and experience appears to be moving many states and districts away from this dead-end paradigm and toward a more promising concept of school leadership that is both attainable – and therefore “trainable” – and likelier to bring about the results that are needed in today’s schools: a school-wide focus on better teaching and learning,

led by dedicated, well-prepared individuals who know how to create a vision, share authority and are accountable for achieving the school’s goals.

Kati Haycock, president of the Education Trust, recently summarized this evolving view of leadership:

“Leadership is not about one person, it’s about building a shared commitment and building a leadership team.”

“When you meet the leaders in

the places that are really getting the job done, they are not the kind of leaders that just turn things around by the sheer force of their personality. They are regular people. They are totally focused. They are totally relentless. They are not big, outsized personalities and they are not the only leaders in their schools. Especially in the larger schools, the principals know that they can’t get it all done themselves. Those are the places that improve. Leadership is not about one person, it’s about building a shared commitment and building a leadership team.”ⁱⁱⁱ

How Leadership Influences Learning found evidence from multiple studies pointing to three broad sets of leadership practices that are consistently linked to improved student learning and that make up the essence of this new paradigm of successful school leadership:

- **Setting directions** – articulating a vision for shared organizational purpose, setting high expectations and monitoring performance;
- **Developing people** – creating stimulating opportunities and providing models of effective practice and individual support; and
- **Redesigning the organization** – strengthening the culture of the school and modifying organizational structures and practices as needed to achieve the shared vision of effective teaching and learning.^{iv}

These suggest that the successful school leader more closely resembles an orchestra conductor than a virtuoso soloist. The principal is ultimately accountable for her school’s success. But being accountable for the melodies a good school makes is not the same as playing every instrument singlehandedly, or knowing how to. To the contrary, the three sets of essential leadership practices point squarely to the need for the principal to know how to share the baton and allow leadership to flourish throughout her building. Indeed, many now believe

that the skills that leaders display, or fail to, may be as important in attracting and retaining good teachers to a school or a district as salaries. Christopher Cerf, New York City's Deputy Schools Chancellor, put it this way:

“Pick the right school leader and great teachers will come and stay. Pick the wrong one and, over time, good teachers leave, mediocre ones stay, and the school gradually (or not so gradually) declines. Reversing the impact of a poor principal can take years...Too often, however, school districts don't invest the requisite level of care, resources and hard work into the critical mission of recruiting and identifying school leaders...Most districts have neither the capacity nor data systems to infuse rigor into the principal selection process, and so they rely on their best judgment, and sometimes even pure inertia...”

TRAINING FOR THE NEW LEADERSHIP PARADIGM: PROGRESS AND CHALLENGES

The gravitation by states and districts toward this evolving paradigm of school leadership is a major accomplishment. But the related challenge is to ensure that both aspiring and sitting principals get the right preparation and support for this type of leadership. The good news is that states and districts – many with Wallace's support – have been putting unprecedented energy and resources into improving the quality and the job-relevance of principal preparation both before and after leaders take their jobs.

- Forty-six states have adopted leadership standards^v and many have begun applying them to evaluate leadership training programs and school leaders and to hold them more accountable. Missouri, for example, has identified essential leadership behaviors and has been working to implement them at every phase of leadership development – including redesigning all 17 university preparation programs for leaders in that state as well as its newly-enacted statewide principal mentoring program.
- Many states are pressing universities to redesign their leadership preparation programs by applying new accreditation guidelines and more rigorous standards and are also taking steps to spread effective training practices statewide. Georgia, for example, has adopted new university reaccreditation processes that required all university programs to sunset and reapply for accreditation in 2008. In Illinois, Chicago and Springfield have developed exemplary principal training programs and a statewide consortium of districts is working to spread those effective practices. The University of Delaware has approved a dramatically rede-

“Pick the right school leader and great teachers will come and stay. Pick the wrong one and, over time, good teachers leave, mediocre ones stay, and the school gradually (or not so gradually) declines.”

signed principal preparation program that will serve as a model for other higher education institutions in the state.

- Leadership academies are springing up in a growing number of states including Iowa, Georgia and Louisiana, and in large districts including New York City, Chicago, Boston and St. Louis. The aim is to provide high-quality alternatives that are responsive to district leadership needs and some competition to university-based leadership preparation programs. The NYC Leadership Academy^{vi}, launched in 2003, has been a model for such institutions and has provided exemplary pre-service training to some 300 aspiring principals and mentoring to about 1,000 New York City school leaders using a highly-acclaimed “blended coaching” model.^{vii} A statewide academy in Arkansas has developed criteria and measurement tools for evaluating the progress and performance of veteran principals who participate in its Master Principal Program.^{viii}
- Since 2000, about half the nation’s states have adopted mentoring requirements for newly-seated principals for the first time. This fast-spreading phenomenon marks a major shift from the “sink-or-swim” attitude that had long predominated toward fledgling principals and is also a sign of increased recognition that leadership preparation should not end abruptly with licensure and hiring.

These and many other examples of current efforts to improve principal training are encouraging. But it also should be stressed that this work is in the early stages of addressing pervasive and longstanding problems, including a chronic mismatch between the daily realities of school leadership and the training those leaders typically receive. Nearly seven of 10 principals surveyed by Public Agenda believe that the leadership training at universities is “out of touch with the realities of what it takes to run today’s school districts.”^{ix}

Indeed, a wide body of research has cited persistent weaknesses in many university-based school leadership preparation programs, including:

- Admission standards that allow leadership preparation participants to essentially “self-select” themselves without having to demonstrate either the potential or the intention to assume school leadership positions;
- Curricula and knowledge base that may not adequately take into account the needs of schools, districts and increasingly diverse student bodies;
- Weak connections between theory and practice;
- Faculty who may have little field experience as leaders; and
- Shallow or poorly designed internships and field-based experiences that are not sufficiently connected to the rest of the program.^x

Universities have taken considerable heat from critics for these program weaknesses. But a recent report by the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) also shined a light on the need for states to do more to accelerate change:

“The state is in the driver’s seat when it comes to the design and quality of principal preparation and it appears that in many states the ignition key is still in the ‘off’ position. Leaders in universities know this, and they are waiting and willing to comply when their states raise the bar.”^{xi}

As SREB argues, the state’s power to license principals can be an effective tool to ensure schools have leaders who are focused on improving instruction. Potentially, the state can determine who may enter training programs, the content of their education, certification requirements for the principal’s license and for licensure renewal, the ground rules for appointments, and requirements for professional development. But SREB found that in 13 of the 16 states it reviewed, “fewer than 40 percent of school leaders’ responsibilities, as defined by states’ standards, relate directly to student learning.”^{xii}

“The state is in the driver’s seat when it comes to the design and quality of principal preparation and it appears that in many states the ignition key is still in the ‘off’ position.”

And until recently, progress has also been held back by a lack of credible examples or “existence proofs” of districts and universities that have succeeded in developing better training and can point to actual payoffs. That evidence emerged for the first time in a 2007 report by a team of researchers led by Linda Darling-Hammond from Stanford University and The Finance Project commissioned by Wallace that showed how well-trained principals actually make a significant difference in their schools. The report, *Preparing School Leaders for a Changing World*, drew on multiple sources of evidence to produce detailed case studies of five pre-service and four district-based in-service “exemplary” principal training programs, several of which have participated in Wallace’s education leadership initiative.^{xiii} It then offered data indicating that programs with exemplary attributes are likelier to produce graduates who go on to exhibit leadership practices associated with effective schools.^{xiv}

In the following section, we describe key lessons and action implications that emerge from the research and from the collective experiences of states, districts and leadership training programs that have begun to put theory into practice.

A PATHWAY TO BETTER TRAINING: FOUR ACTION LESSONS

Neither the Stanford research nor the experiences of states, districts and universities suggest any one-size-fits-all formulas for achieving better principal training, given the range of challenges leaders confront daily in the nation’s estimated 106,000 public elementary and secondary schools.^{xv} Nonetheless, it is possible to glean four broad lessons that could provide useful guidance in lifting the quality of leadership preparation nationwide:

LESSON ONE: Successful principal training programs are significantly different from the majority of programs in existence. They are more selective, more focused on

improvement of instruction, more closely tied to the needs of districts, and provide more relevant internships with hands-on leadership experience.

Nearly two-thirds of graduates from the exemplary programs examined in the Stanford study were initially screened and identified as promising leadership candidates by their districts and had their tuition and costs subsidized. That compared with only one-third of a national sample of graduates surveyed from more traditional programs.^{xvi}

Curricula at exemplary programs tend to be more tightly focused on instructional improvement and transformational leadership than at more traditional programs. They train principals to develop and evaluate curricula, use data to diagnose student needs, coach teachers, plan professional development in their schools, and establish schoolwide norms that support high-

quality teaching and learning.^{xvii}

Successful pre-service training operates on the assumption that principals must prepare to lead their teachers to meet the accountability measures of standards-based reform. And the principal becomes the key figure leading this process.

A growing number of states, districts and universities have begun a process of reimagining leader development as a well-connected, standards-based, career-long process.

Exemplary programs also feature close integration of coursework and fieldwork, using such techniques

as case method, problem-based learning and journaling to encourage continuous reflection about the connections between theory and practice. The Bank Street College of Education's Principal's Institute, for example, stresses projects that link its coursework to field-based experiences and the curriculum heavily emphasizes teaching and learning, school redesign and collaborative decision-making.^{xviii} The strong ties between Bank Street's faculty and New York City's schools that receive its graduates are also crucial and contrast with more typical university-based programs. As one participant put it: "The fact that some of the professors that we have are actually people that work in our region not only brings in the theory but practices as well."^{xix}

The research also puts strong emphasis on the need for well-crafted internships and other opportunities for authentic leadership experience during pre-service leadership training. Internships for aspiring principals are relatively common, but too often they are fleeting and involve observation rather than hands-on leadership opportunities. And few districts provide the necessary resources to offer candidates an intense, structured experience with stipends.

One exception is the district-based program in the Jefferson County (KY) Public Schools, a participating district in Wallace's leadership initiative and one of the exemplary districts studied by the Stanford researchers. It releases a small number of leadership candidates to participate in paid, full-time, highly-structured year-long internships freed of

other duties. Each candidate is provided with a mentor principal at his or her school site as well as a retired principal who acts as a coach.^{xx}

The Stanford report found statistically significant differences between graduates of such exemplary leader preparation programs compared with those of more typical programs. Many more exemplary program graduates surveyed valued their internships as an experience for becoming a principal,^{xxi} felt well-prepared to create a coherent educational program across the school,^{xxii} and felt able to build a schoolwide vision or engage parents and manage school operations.^{xxiii}

Those self-assessments by principals were reinforced by teachers surveyed in the Stanford study. They rated leaders prepared by exemplary programs as “more likely to encourage professional collaboration, facilitate professional development for teachers, and encourage staff to use evaluation results in planning curriculum and instruction...”^{xxiv}

The Stanford team concluded that the payoffs of exemplary programs for new principals and those they eventually will lead are considerable. But their report also stressed that realizing the benefits will take collaboration and adequate resources: “We have seen that when state, district and university actors cooperate in a comprehensive plan for leader development, and provide the financial resources to sustain the programs, much can be accomplished to transform the shape of the administrator workforce and the knowledge and skills principals possess.”^{xxv}

LESSON TWO: Leadership training should not end when principals are hired. It should continue with high-quality mentoring for new principals and with professional development for all principals to promote career-long growth in line with the evolving needs of schools and districts.

The idea that it takes time beyond “basic training” to acquire the knowledge, skills and habits of effective leadership has largely been taken for granted in fields like the military, business, medicine and architecture. Not so in education. Until recently, few new principals could expect much in the way of formal mentoring or coaching support after they were hired. “You’re supposed to be a leader, so lead!” as one New York City principal characterized the prevailing attitude to us.

This is starting to change. A growing number of states, districts and universities have begun a process of reimagining leader development as a well-connected, standards-based, career-long process.

Delaware stands out in this respect. The state has revised criteria for approval of university-based leader preparation programs to make them more experienced-based and more closely tied to state standards and district needs. It also has a state-funded leadership mentoring program, and a requirement of professional development for school administrator re-licensing.

Jefferson County, KY, is an example of a large urban district that has been investing in putting together the elements of coherent, career-long school leadership preparation. Under the

14-year leadership of its recently-departed superintendent, Stephen Daeschner, the district embraced improved leadership as a key means for realizing better-quality education district-wide. The district has created no fewer than 24 separate but related leadership programs for both aspiring and practicing principals. These include: Principals for Tomorrow, a series of training sessions for potential candidates who are teachers; full-year paid internships for aspiring principals; a collaborative effort between the district and the University of Louisville to tailor its leadership curriculum around the district's needs; and an Induction Support Program that provides high-quality coaching and mentoring for newly-hired principals and assistant principals.^{xxvi}

Buttressed by changes in state policy, the Springfield (MA) Public Schools have developed a district-based licensure program for aspiring school administrators, a leadership institute for practicing administrators, mentors for new principals, a career ladder continuum for teachers and administrators, and degree granting programs through local colleges and universities. Each element is strongly anchored in the state's newly-enacted leadership standards.

As stated earlier, there has been extraordinary national growth in principal mentoring since 2000. A few of the new mentoring programs such as the NYC Leadership Academy are exemplary, providing intense coaching for a year and often more by highly-trained mentors. There is also a strong connection between the coaching and the ongoing professional development new principals receive once they are on the job through regularly scheduled workshops. But quality remains a challenge for many of the new mentoring programs, particularly because the selection and training of the mentors is often weak. A number of states such as Massachusetts and Missouri have taken steps recently to shore up the quality of their mentoring based on leadership standards.

LESSON THREE: High-quality leader development can make a real difference, but providing it can involve added costs. Resources therefore should be directed at quality programs with proven benefits.

Half-hearted or poorly funded efforts to support principals at any stage of their career-long development are likely to fall short if the goal is to prepare leaders who can significantly enhance teaching and learning. "At the most fundamental level, what programs are able to accomplish, who they are able to recruit, and the choices that enter into program designs, depend profoundly on the sources, amounts and stipulations of funding," the Stanford researchers write.^{xxvii}

A recent analysis of principal mentoring programs by The Wallace Foundation, *Getting Principal Mentoring Right: Lessons from the Field*, reached a similar finding: underfunded mentoring programs in many states and districts wind up being "buddy systems" that are too brief, provide little or no training for the mentors, and place inadequate emphasis on building instructional leadership skills.^{xxviii}

The Stanford-Finance Project report documented that quality leadership preparation before and after a principal is hired requires serious investment and reflects a range of variables and programmatic components: program design, administrative expenses, recruitment and selec-

tion, coursework, internships and mentoring, meeting and networking costs, and whether or not participants are fully compensated by their state or district during the program.^{xxix}

The report calculated that costs for pre-service coursework at the exemplary programs in its study ranged from slightly under \$20,000 to about \$42,000 per participant, depending largely on the number of required credit hours.^{xxx} Viewed in another light, however, providing high-quality training and internships to school leaders can be expected to add approximately \$10 to \$80 per pupil spending, depending on program features, the size of the district and other variables.

The key point is this: providing quality training programs to school leaders can pay big dividends compared with more traditional programs. Sixty percent of the 2002-2004 graduates from the exemplary programs in the

Fixing what's wrong with leadership preparation is essential, but not enough.

Stanford study were principals in 2005, and 81 percent of 2004-2007 graduates from the NYC Leadership Academy were principals in 2008. By contrast, only 20-30 percent of participants in typical administrator preparation programs become principals a few years after they graduate, according to the Stanford research, and fewer than half ever become school administrators.

Nonetheless, the added funding to do a better job of training principals will likely face an uphill struggle when competing with spending on teachers or other budget items perceived as “closer to classrooms” by policymakers and taxpayers. That reality underscores the importance of admitting participants in leadership preparation programs who have the intention and the ability to use that training to lead schools once they graduate. It also underscores the value of credible research and strong existence proofs such as those in the Stanford research to help policymakers make the case for better leadership training.

LESSON FOUR: Fixing what's wrong with leadership preparation is essential, but not enough. Addressing the leadership challenge also requires remedying the difficult working conditions that can undermine even the best-trained principals.

As crucial as it is to address the longstanding weaknesses of leadership training, the fact is that even well-prepared principals are unlikely to succeed for long in a system that undermines them. Fewer than one-third of principals surveyed by Public Agenda believe “the system” is on their side.^{xxxi} “Many principals don't have the organizational structure behind them,” explained Judy Jeffrey, Iowa's state school superintendent. “Until we are able to change the conditions in which principals find themselves immersed, even the best ones sometimes burn out or leave for positions that allow them to pursue their professional interest rather than the daily management issues.”^{xxxii}

Many conditions and policies affect the success of school leaders for better or worse. To cite just a few examples, principals need the time to focus on improving instruction, yet too often they find themselves dealing with the crisis of the moment or drowning in the “administrivia”

of building maintenance and lunch schedules. They need accurate, relevant and usable data to identify strengths and weaknesses in their school, set priorities, and work with teachers and other staff to meet the learning needs of individual students. Yet such data are often not as timely or useful as they might be. And states and districts need well-crafted, standards-based assessment tools to fairly evaluate school leaders so that good performance is rewarded and weak performance is addressed. But in many cases, such evaluations fail to capture whether a principal's performance is improving teaching and learning.

If there is a national imperative to improve our failing schools, then there is also a national imperative to strengthen the preparation of school leaders. We know more than ever how to provide that training.

A number of states and districts in the Wallace initiative are beginning to tackle these and other leadership conditions issues. But progress has been slower and more difficult than it has been for improving training because the politics of changing leaders' conditions frequently collide with existing contracts, unsupportive or uninformed school boards or district offices, and insufficient

attention or commitment from state legislatures or departments of education. Nonetheless, there are signs of significant recent movement on several of these "conditions" fronts. Among the more notable examples:

- ***More time for instruction*** – One response to the burdens that limit the effectiveness of principals is a program developed by the Jefferson County Public Schools that places a new administrator alongside the principal called the "school administration manager" (SAM) who has the job of relieving the principal of many of the tasks that distract them from focusing on improving teaching and learning. The SAM model also includes a new "time management" tool that can pinpoint whether leaders are actually allocating more time to instruction each day. Early results are promising: in schools with SAMs, principals' time spent weekly on instructional matters has often risen by 50 percent or more, and student test scores are also up in those schools. More than 200 schools in nine sites are piloting the SAM model on the strength of those early results.
- ***Better availability and use of data*** – Massachusetts, Michigan, Delaware, New Mexico and Ohio are among states creating better systems for providing districts and school leaders with useful information to shape instruction that meets students' needs. Iowa is providing training to lift the data analysis skills of central district office staff in order to help them provide better support to school leadership teams.
- ***Assessing leader performance*** – A number of states including Kentucky, Illinois, Massachusetts, Iowa, Delaware and Georgia have been taking steps to develop and use more effective principal evaluation tools, drawing on the results of a new team-

based school leadership assessment tool (VAL-Ed) created by Vanderbilt University researchers with Wallace support that will be widely available in 2008.

MAKING THE CONNECTIONS

Improving the training of school principals isn't the entire answer to the nation's education leadership challenge. But it is certainly a crucial part of it. It will take bold thinking, courageous action, and sustained commitment on the part of those who shape policies. It will also be a test of will and staying power for leaders in statehouses, districts, universities, others in and around public education, and for the public to embrace the need to invest not only in better teachers, but in better trained and supported school leadership. Armed with a growing body of new evidence about effective practices and their payoffs, we are optimistic that there is a firmer basis than ever for collective action and lasting progress.

Still, much remains to be done. To achieve the goal of having principals who are ready to lead in all schools, especially those who need them most, everyone concerned – states, districts, universities – will have to make new and often-unaccustomed connections. The right kind of training for this new leadership paradigm means that the content of training in universities, academies or other providers needs to be more solidly connected to leadership standards that put learning first and foremost. Training also needs to be connected far better to the realities of the districts and schools that its graduates will eventually lead. And universities and districts need to talk to each other about those needs and work more collaboratively in meeting them.

Beyond making the connections *within* training, states and districts also need to work more closely together to ensure that the policies affecting leadership standards, training and conditions are all interconnected and driving toward the same objective: principals who are both prepared and supported to provide leadership for learning.

There are no quick fixes or formulas for accomplishing these complicated goals and the path to change is strewn with obstacles, unresolved questions and difficult policy choices for all concerned. But if there is a national imperative to improve our failing schools, then there is also a national imperative to strengthen the preparation of school leaders. We know more than ever how to provide that training. The return on that investment would be priceless. ■

ENDNOTES

- ⁱ Kenneth Leithwood et al., *How Leadership Influences Student Learning: Review of Research*, University of Minnesota Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement and University of Toronto Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, commissioned by The Wallace Foundation, 2004, 4.
- ⁱⁱ A 2003 Wallace policy brief, *Beyond the Pipeline: Getting the Principals We Need, Where They Are Needed The Most*, describes the dilemma that hard-pressed schools and districts have in attracting strong school leadership. It can be downloaded for free at www.wallacefoundation.org.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Extended excerpts from Kati Haycock's keynote address can be found in *Education Leadership: A Bridge to School Reform*, a special Wallace report on the Foundation's October 22-24, 2007 National Education Conference, pp. 25-32. The report can be downloaded for free at www.wallacefoundation.org.
- ^{iv} Leithwood, 8-9.
- ^v The Interstate School Leaders Licensing Consortium (ISLLC) standards developed in 1996 have been adopted (or used as the basis for states to develop their own leadership standards) by 46 states. The standards were revised by the Council of Chief State School Officers with Wallace support, and were released in 2008.
- ^{vi} The Wallace Foundation has been a major private contributor to the NYC Leadership Academy since its founding in 2003. The spread of this innovative model to other cities including St. Louis and Chicago has also been facilitated by Wallace's work in those cities which have been participants in the Foundation's education leadership initiative.
- ^{vii} The "blended coaching" model was developed at the New Teacher Center at the University of California, Santa Cruz and leaders at the NYC Leadership Academy credit the model for many of its innovative practices that it is currently applying to the preparation of New York City principals. A full description of the model can be found in *Blended Coaching: Skills and Strategies to Support Principal Development*, by Gary Bloom et al., Corwin Press, Thousand Oaks, CA, 2005.
- ^{viii} Southern Regional Education Board, *Schools Need Good Leadership Now*, 2007, 10.
- ^{ix} Steve Farkas et al., *Trying to Stay Ahead of the Game: Superintendents and Principals Talk about School Leadership*, Public Agenda, commissioned by The Wallace Foundation, 2001, 31.
- ^x Linda Darling-Hammond, Michelle LaPointe, Debra Meyerson, Margaret Terry Orr, *Preparing School Leaders for a Changing World*, Stanford University and The Finance Project, 2007, 4-6.
- ^{xi} Southern Regional Education Board, *Schools Can't Wait*, 2006, 13.
- ^{xii} Southern Regional Education Board, *Schools Need Good Leaders Now*, 2007, 8.
- ^{xiii} A distinctive strength of the Stanford research is that it buttresses the case studies with triangulated research that included an extensive literature review, surveys of participants in both exemplary and non-exemplary training programs, and a survey of teachers who are immediately affected by the participating school leaders. The report also includes program cost data developed by The Finance Project, a partner in the research.
- ^{xiv} Darling-Hammond, 1. The exemplary pre-service programs in the Stanford study were in four universities and one school district: Delta State University in Mississippi; University of Connecticut's Administrator Preparation Program; Bank Street College of Education's Principal's Institute; the University of San Diego's Educational Leadership Development Academy; and Jefferson County, KY, Public Schools. The exemplary in-service programs for practicing principals were in four districts: Hartford, CT, Public Schools; the former Region 1 in New York City; Jefferson County Public Schools; and San Diego Unified School District. With the exception of Delta State and San Diego, all of the "exemplary" sites have participated in Wallace's leadership improvement initiative.
- ^{xv} National Center for Educational Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics*, 2006, 17, Table 5 (Number of educational institutions, by level and control of institution: Selected years, 1980-81 through 2004-05).
- ^{xvi} Darling-Hammond, 65.
- ^{xvii} Darling-Hammond, 66.
- ^{xviii} Darling-Hammond, 68-69. Bank Street College has long and extensive ties to supporting teaching and learning in New York City's school system, including its most challenging schools.
- ^{xix} Darling-Hammond, 70.
- ^{xx} Darling-Hammond, 75. The Jefferson County school district, which includes Louisville, is a participant in Wallace's education leadership initiative.

- ^{xxi} Darling-Hammond, 35. On a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the highest rating, the mean rating of 213 participants in exemplary programs who rated their internships as a learning experience was 4.53, compared with a mean rating of 3.91 among a national sample of 446 participants in more typical programs.
- ^{xxii} Darling-Hammond, 36. The mean self-assessment score among 242 exemplary program participants on this question was 4.02, compared with 3.29 among a national sample of 629 leadership program participants.
- ^{xxiii} Ibid. On developing broad agreement among staff about a school vision, exemplary program participants mean score was 3.96, compared with 3.29 for the national sample. On engaging parents and community, the mean score among exemplary program participants was 3.74, versus 3.21 for the national sample.
- ^{xxiv} Darling-Hammond, 53.
- ^{xxv} Ibid, 152.
- ^{xxvi} *Preparing School Leaders for A Changing World: Case Studies of Exemplary Programs*, edited by Michelle LaPointe, Linda Darling-Hammond and Debra Myerson, Stanford Educational Leadership Institute, commissioned by The Wallace Foundation, 2007, 89-91. The report can be downloaded at <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/KnowledgeCenter/KnowledgeTopics/CurrentAreasofFocus/EducationLeadership/Documents/preparing-school-leaders-case-studies.pdf> or: http://seli.stanford.edu/research/documents/sls_case_summaries.pdf
- ^{xxvii} Darling-Hammond, 23.
- ^{xxviii} *Getting Principal Mentoring Right: Lessons from the Field*, The Wallace Foundation, 2007, 7.
- ^{xxix} Darling-Hammond, 100. Cost estimates in the study “represent the total societal costs of the programs, including the value of both monetary and non-monetary resources.” These include, for example, salaries of participating principals and teachers as well as the cost of uncompensated time contributed by program participants, “a potentially important resource in professional development programs...”
- ^{xxx} Darling-Hammond, 107. Among the exemplary programs in the Stanford study, the lowest per participant cost for coursework, \$18,600, was at Delta State which requires 24 credits. The highest were at Bank Street – \$41,800 – which requires 36 credits.
- ^{xxxi} Farkas, 10.
- ^{xxxii} Statement at Wallace National Conference , New York, 2007, and interview.

RELATED WALLACE PRODUCTS

To learn more about preparing school principals and related topics, the following can be downloaded for free from The Wallace Foundation's website at www.wallacefoundation.org:

"Out of the Office and Into The Classroom: An Initiative to Help Principals Focus on Instruction," an article by Holly Holland commissioned by The Wallace Foundation, 2008

"Making State Accountability Count: How New Mexico Supports Principals with Data Tools," an article by Ron Feemster commissioned by The Wallace Foundation, 2007

Schools Need Good Leaders Now: State Progress in Creating a Learner-Centered School Leadership System, Southern Regional Education Board, 2007

Good Principals Aren't Born—They're Mentored: Are We Investing Enough to Get the School Leaders We Need? Southern Regional Education Board, 2007

Preparing School Leaders for A Changing World: Lessons from Exemplary Leadership Development Programs (Final Report and Executive Summary), Stanford University and The Finance Project, 2007

Getting Principal Mentoring Right: Lessons from the Field, A Wallace Perspective, 2007

SREB Leadership Curriculum Modules: Engaging Leaders in Solving Real School Problems, Southern Regional Education Board, 2007

Leadership for Learning: Making the Connections Among State, District and School Policies and Practices, A Wallace Perspective, 2006

Schools Can't Wait: Accelerating the Redesign of University Principal Preparation Programs, Southern Regional Education Board, 2006

Supporting School System Leaders: The State of Effective Training Programs for School Superintendents, Harvard Graduate School of Education and The Wallace Foundation, 2006

Developing Successful Principals: Review of Research, Stanford University, The Finance Project, 2005

The Principal Internship: How Can We Get It Right? Southern Regional Education Board, 2005



Supporting ideas.
Sharing solutions.
Expanding opportunities.®

Our mission is to enable institutions to expand learning and enrichment opportunities for all people. We do this by supporting and sharing effective ideas and practices.

To achieve our mission, we have three objectives:

- Strengthen education leadership to improve student achievement
- Enhance after-school learning opportunities
- Build appreciation and demand for the arts

The Wallace Foundation
5 Penn Plaza, 7th Floor
New York, NY 10001
212.251.9700 Telephone
info@wallacefoundation.org
www.wallacefoundation.org