

Instructions to Implement

*Standards for  
Advanced Programs in  
Educational Leadership*



for

Principals, Superintendents,

Curriculum Directors, and Supervisors

NATIONAL POLICY BOARD FOR EDUCATIONAL  
ADMINISTRATION

# NATIONAL POLICY BOARD FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

• 1801 North Moore Street • Arlington, VA • 22209-1813 • (703) 875-0771



Copyright © 2002 National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA)

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced without permission in writing from the National Policy Board for Educational Administration.

Printed in the United States of America

This document can be found on the National Policy Board for Educational Administration website: [www.npbea.org](http://www.npbea.org) as well as the website for the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education: [www.ncate.org](http://www.ncate.org).

NPBEA Executive Secretary: E. Joseph Schneider  
Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) Coordinator: Honor E. Fede

Published 1/15/02

## **National Policy Board for Educational Administration Members**

American Association of Colleges  
for Teacher Education (AACTE)

David G. Imig  
Chief Executive Officer

American Association of  
School Administrators (AASA)

Paul D. Houston  
Executive Director

Association for Supervision  
And Curriculum Development (ASCD)

Gene R. Carter (NPBEA Chair)  
Executive Director

Council of Chief State  
School Officers (CCSSO)

G. Thomas Houlihan  
Executive Director

National Association of Elementary  
School Principals (NAESP)

Vincent L. Ferrandino  
Executive Director

National Association of Secondary  
School Principals (NASSP)

Gerald N. Tirozzi  
Executive Director

National Council for Accreditation of  
Teacher Education (NCATE)

Arthur E. Wise  
President

National Council of Professors  
Of Educational Administration (NCPEA)

Theodore B. Creighton  
Executive Director

National School Boards  
Association (NSBA)

Julie Underwood  
Associate Executive Director

University Council for  
Educational Administration (UCEA)

Michelle D. Young  
Executive Director

## **Educational Leadership Constituent Council Members**

American Association of  
School Administrators (AASA)

E. Joseph Schneider (Chair)  
Deputy Executive Director

Association for Supervision and  
Curriculum Development (ASCD)

Agnes R. Crawford  
Assistant Executive Director

National Association of Elementary  
School Principals (NAESP)

Frederick N. Brown  
Associate Executive Director

National Association of Secondary  
School Principals (NASSP)

Richard A. Flanary  
Director, Office of Leadership  
Development and Assessment

***Instructions to Implement Standards for  
Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership***

Introduction and History .....	Page 1
Program Overview .....	Page 7
Assumptions Underlying the Standards.....	Page 8
Instructions for Preparing the Program Report.....	Page 10
Cover Sheet.....	Page 15
Program Description.....	Page 15
Faculty Qualifications.....	Page 16
Candidate Qualifications.....	Page 17
Compliance with Program Criteria .....	Page 18
Program Matrix .....	Page 20
Appendix .....	Page 24
Candidate Performance Section.....	Page 25
Examples of Candidate Performance.....	Page 25
Candidate and Program Assessment Section.....	Page 28
Program Outcome Effectiveness Section.....	Page 31
Glossary of Selected Definitions.....	Page 32
Bibliography.....	Page 38
Members of NPBEA Working Group.....	Page 45
<b><i>Standards</i></b> (Separate Document)	
Standard 1.....	Page 2
Standard 2.....	Page 4
Standard 3.....	Page 7
Standard 4.....	Page 9
Standard 5.....	Page 13
Standard 6.....	Page 14
Standard 7.....	Page 16

# INTRODUCTION

## Rationale<sup>1</sup>

A constellation of social, economic, demographic, and structural factors are changing the world within which schools operate, leading to new expectations for the entire school community. Major forces in determining these new conditions and expectations include:

***Our global economy:*** Schools are directly affected when transnational corporations finance projects, manufacture products, market goods, and recruit workers across sovereign boundaries. American high school graduates from even the most rural locations now step into a worldwide work skills market. They find themselves face to face with the manpower pool of the entire industrialized world. Student levels of content knowledge and cognition and applied skills must meet international standards. Furthermore, because unskilled labor in a system of international free trade will ordinarily be performed where it can be most cheaply obtained, American graduates must be highly skilled to command good salaries.

***Demographic changes:*** Schools in states and cities are accommodating successive waves of legal and illegal immigrants, with the volume of this immigration greater than at any time since the early 1900s. Increasing human diversity, both immigrant and domestic, offers new challenges to the schools, which must respond to differences as well as similarities among students and their families. Despite obvious disparities in the educational, cultural, and social backgrounds of students, the school's mission is to provide opportunity for all.

***Changing expectations for student results:*** Concurrent with increasing student diversity has come the emerging expectation that all students should succeed in school. Educational leaders are held accountable for student achievement. When students are not succeeding, society now expects the schools to find the resources and methodologies to create success. These expectations for student achievement require schools to increasing pay attention to individualizing and personalizing education, to remediating deficient cognitive skills or motivation levels, and to reducing cultural barriers to learning.

***Social and family modifications:*** Economic forces, the movement toward gender equity in the workplace, and a high divorce rate have changed the American family and its relationship with schools. About 80% of women with children work out of the home now, causing major modifications in home-school relationships ranging from demands for childcare before and after classes to changed communications patterns between families and schools. Other social developments have created demands for schools to coordinate family and health services, and to provide for parental education, home and school partnerships, AIDS education, drug prevention programs, crime control, and classes for pregnant girls and teen parents, among others.

***New technologies:*** Never before have schools and their communities faced such rapid

---

<sup>1</sup>Thanks to Scott Thomson, past executive secretary of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration for this explication of the rationale.

technological change. Never before has technology so directly affected teaching and learning, as do computers and telecommunications systems. Never before have schools been so challenged as the

chief seat of learning, as do the new technologically based independent information systems. The World Wide Web has become a pervasive fact of life in homes and schools. Incorporating technology for instruction, management, and evaluation requires that schools be alert, flexible, and committed to student results rather than to institutional structures and traditions.

***Leadership and management systems:*** The theory and practice of leadership and management is in transition. Decentralized organizational systems are replacing bureaucratic hierarchies, collegial leadership is supplanting authoritarian procedures, delegation and empowerment are displacing top-down directives, talent pools from the total organization are replacing talent oligarchies, and quality is viewed as a generic process involving customer focus, worker expertise, process, data-based decision-making, and feedback. These developments substantially change role expectations for school leaders, and require of these leaders strong planning, organizational, communication, interpersonal, group process, problem-solving, and change process skills.

***Privatization and deregulation:*** Some state and local policymakers have deregulated schools from state mandates and provided for the support of charter schools and private schools with public funds. These challenges to traditional notions of public school governance and financing create a new competitive environment for public schools. In response to this challenge, public schools must attend to a range of factors, including marketing, fiscal efficiency, student achievement, student safety, accountability, and other opportunities for improvement afforded by state deregulation.

### **Implications for Leaders**

The changing school and community contexts create unusual demands as well as exceptional opportunities for school leaders. Schools must adopt new missions, structures, and relationships in response. A better use of resources, especially human talent and initiative, is required. Expectations will increase for small units to solve problems with minimal oversight, which, with the constant stream of change, will require maximum organizational flexibility. Schools, therefore, must be agile as well as team oriented.

Under these conditions, educational leaders must possess the capacity to manage change and to create collaborative action on behalf of student results. More centrally, the challenge for educational leaders is to marshal local talent to identify and accomplish the mission of the changing, globally-driven school. Few principals, superintendents, curriculum directors, or supervisors are prepared for this formidable task.

Every educational reform report of the last decade concludes that the United States cannot have excellent schools without excellent leaders. A key leverage point for meeting major challenges facing the nation's schools, therefore, is effective leadership. The immediate task is to develop competent professionals to lead the changing schools by, in part, making certain the new conditions facing school leaders are reflected in redesigned preparation and certification programs.

Traditionally, educational administration programs have focused on abstractions in an attempt to unify the field conceptually rather than examining the changing contexts and functions of educational leaders. Today's school leaders, however, must combine the skills of both the generalist and the specialist. They must be adroit at identifying and solving specific functional problems as well as analyzing broad issues.

Tomorrow's educational leaders must be able to work with diverse groups and to integrate ideas to solve a continuous flow of problems. They must study their craft as they practice their craft, reflecting and then applying what they have learned to people and institutions and the achievement of tasks. This requires patience and perspective, the exercise of judgment and wisdom, and the development of new technical and analytical skills. It also demands sensitivities to other cultures and highly developed communications skills. Finally, it requires personal values that integrate the ethical dimensions of decision-making with those of a more technical variety.

These conditions require an "outward looking," environmentally influenced vision of school leadership, moving away from the traditional inward looking, content dominated format. Defining the practice of leadership in contemporary school settings, identifying the knowledge and skills essential to effective practice, integrating theory, and practice, and designing a quality accreditation process all reflect a useful direction for the field.

More specifically, there appear to be five broad shifts in the knowledge and skills required of educational leaders today compared to the traditional knowledge base. These include:

1. From technical skills to interpersonal skills: Working with people defines the contemporary leader as well as do financial or administrative expertise. Gaining a common vision, generating a school culture for learning, working with staff to improve instruction, developing collaborative action, identifying and solving problems, and responding to ethnic and gender differences all require strong interpersonal skills.
2. From director to consensus builder and motivator: Common goals rather than edicts optimize results. Leaders will continue to be responsible for decisions but the path to determining those decisions has broadened to include significant numbers of persons affected by the decisions. This inclusive process ordinarily improves the quality of a decision as well as the motivation of stakeholders to achieve the related goal. Thus, principals and others may "lead from the middle" as well as from other points on the organizational compass to gain agreement for action. Consensus building requires effective communication, problem analysis, delegation, implementation, and oversight skills.
3. From resource allocation to accountability for learning processes and results: No longer can leaders allocate resources independent of results. With the current national and state emphasis on improving student achievement, educational leaders must focus on performance. They will, therefore, become involved in the design and management of instruction, in analyses of program results, and in the redesign of programs based on results. These actions require familiarity with curriculum planning, instructional methodologies and technologies, and measurement and evaluation, and the capacity to build a school culture for learning.

4. From campus administrator to integrator of school and community services: The expanding needs of students caused by family and social problems and by the growing heterogeneity of the student body require that community resources be added to traditional school resources on behalf of students. These resources include health services, family counseling services, ethnic organizations, youth agencies, religious bodies, and special interest groups, among others. To use these resources, educational leaders need planning and interpersonal skills, multicultural and political sophistication, an awareness of value systems, and a clear understanding of the role schools play in American society.
5. From policy recipient to policy participant: A chorus of disagreement about purposes and priorities for schools can lead to policy turmoil, and policy turmoil makes successful operations difficult. School leaders, therefore, must be involved in policy development to ensure that policy guidelines reflect consensus or compromise rather than contradiction. Especially in a society of competing interests and values educators require clear policy direction to pursue their work. The outcome is less conflict at the school site, which enhances the learning environment for students. Policy development requires a broad understanding of social and political issues, familiarity with legal and administrative codes, strong communication and consensus-building skills, keen analytical abilities, and a value system grounded in a desire to promote the welfare of students.

### **New Directions**

These revised standards, the way these standards will be implemented by universities, and the way they will be reviewed for accreditation reflect a new direction for educational leadership programs. Seven fundamental differences separate these standards from those that have preceded them:

1. The knowledge, skills, and concepts are viewed holistically. They are generic and integrated for all school leaders though the emphasis of each may shift for the various leadership roles.
2. The standards reflect an emphasis on program outcome effectiveness rather than being limited to numeric computations of courses and printed reports of content offered.
3. Program reports require evidence of knowledge and skills learned and applied in simulated and real contexts rather than solely exhibits of content offered (see Glossary of Selected NCATE Terms at the end of this document).
4. Program reports will be examined by teams of reviewers composed of university professors, and district administrators or school level administrators depending upon the program.
5. An internship component is required in all programs.
6. For the first time in the review process, institutions are required to submit evidence of candidate and program assessments aligned with the standards and provide evidence of overall program outcome effectiveness to demonstrate program quality.



7. The program report review process will continue to be managed by four educational organizations working together to strengthen educational leadership programs: American Association of School Administrators (AASA), Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), and National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP).

## **HISTORY OF DEVELOPMENT OF ELCC STANDARDS**

### **Background on 1995 Guidelines**

In 1988, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) was founded by 10 national associations interested in combining their energy and influence to become more effective in implementing improvements for education. These associations, representing groups concerned about educational leadership and policy, included the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, American Association of School Administrators, Association of School Business Officials, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Council of Chief State School Officers, National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, National School Boards Association, and University Council for Educational Administration.

The purpose of the NPBEA as stated in its Bylaws is to advance the professional standards of educational administration by collective action. In July of 1993, its Board of Directors articulated two new major goals: (1) develop common and higher standards for the state licensure of principals, and (2) develop a common set of guidelines for the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) for advanced programs in educational leadership. The objective of this second goal was to provide consistent criteria for preparing candidates for a broad range of leadership roles.

The NPBEA appointed a Working Group of representatives from AACTE, AASA, ASCD, NAESP, NASSP, NCPEA, and UCEA to develop common NCATE Guidelines for educational leaders. Over the next year, the Working Group met several times, sent the Guidelines out for review by universities, state agencies, and educational associations and then presented a final draft to the NPBEA and the Special Areas Studies Board (SASB) of NCATE.

The NCATE-approved 1995 *Guidelines for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership* were formulated from several publications developed by national associations and regional bodies that described what principals, superintendents, supervisors, and curriculum directors needed to know and be able to do. These documents included: (1) *Professional Standards for the Superintendency*, published by AASA in 1993; (2) *Proficiencies for Principals, K-8*, published by NAESP in 1988 and revised in 1991; (3) *Principals For Our Changing Schools: The Knowledge and Skill Base*, published by NPBEA in 1993; (4) *Proposed NCATE Curriculum Guidelines for the Specialty Area of Educational Leadership*, published by ASCD in 1993; and (5) *Framework for the Continual Professional Development of Administrators*, published by Region 1 of DOE and the Northeast States in 1993. Also incorporated as resources were two assessment structures: (6) *The Administrator Diagnostics Inventory*, released by NAESP in 1985 and (7) *Principals Assessment Center*, developed by NASSP in 1980. Each of these documents is research-based, includes extensive citations, involves multiple authors, and features broad participation by representatives

from higher education and secondary and elementary education.

## **Revision Process**

NCATE requires that Guidelines be revised and resubmitted every five years. Between publication of the Educational Leadership Constituent Council's *Guidelines for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership* in 1995 and the time for their revision, NCATE published its *NCATE 2000* document, which delineates a new direction for accreditation. This new direction calls for a more results focused orientation. Programs will now be assessed on how well graduates are prepared to perform in the workplace rather than on the number of courses offered or on objectives listed in syllabi.

Also during this period, standards developed by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) were disseminated and adopted or adapted by a large number of states for the licensure of school administrators. Though the ELCC Guidelines and the ISLLC standards were similar, some universities believed the challenge of addressing two separate sets of criteria was too burdensome. Consequently, the two sets of criteria were combined in the new standards.

In planning the process for revising the Guidelines, the NPBEA appointed a working group and charged it with three central tasks: (1) integrate the ELCC Guidelines within the ISLLC standards framework; (2) restructure the standards to include doctoral level program reviews; and (3) add the performance assessment component outlined in the NCATE 2000 initiative.

As a first step, the working group staff did a review of the literature pertaining to the preparation of school administrators. The principal publications cited were the *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration* (1999) and the *21<sup>st</sup> Century Challenges for School Administrators* (2001). These two handbooks captured the profession's best thinking in the time period following the drafting of the initial guidelines. Two specific references were cited often by the working group: *Skills for Successful 21<sup>st</sup> Century School Leaders* (1998) and the *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: Standards for School Leaders* (1996). See the bibliography section at the end of this document for more information.

Each NPBEA member association selected an individual to represent them on the working group. Six university professors and two association staff constituted the working group with consultants from NCATE, NPBEA, and the ELCC. A complete list of working group members is available at the end of this document. The committee met many times over the course of a year and a half with extensive communications between meetings. A draft of the revised standards was posted on NCATE's website for comment and circulated in the fall of 2000 and the winter of 2001 to NPBEA association members who mailed them to their constituency members. In addition, feedback was obtained from discussion sessions held at national conferences of the major educational leadership associations. The draft standards were also placed on the websites of all NPBEA member associations and disseminated to university professors through state associations for comment. Feedback was also obtained from ISTE's National Center for Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology. All comments and suggestions received were considered and discussed at a series of meetings in the spring of 2001. Final adjustments were made during the summer of 2001 in preparation for presentation to NCATE's Specialty Areas Studies Board (SASB) in October of 2001.

# PROGRAM OVERVIEW SECTION

## **ASSUMPTIONS UNDERLYING THE STANDARDS**

Several assumptions guided the development of the new standards. These assumptions included the belief that:

1. The central responsibility of leadership is to improve teaching and learning.
2. The purpose of the standards is to improve the performance of school leaders, thereby enhancing the performance of teachers and students in the workplace.
3. The standards apply to the most common positions in educational leadership, including principal, supervisor, curriculum director, and superintendent but specifically exclude business managers. While the emphasis in preparation programs may shift among the standards depending upon specific leadership roles (i.e., potential superintendents may focus more on finance and policy development while potential principals may focus more on instructional programs and student personnel), it is important for all school leaders to be familiar with and able to accomplish the tasks associated with each standard as well as to participate in an extensive internship.
4. The exercise of leadership in its various expressions constitutes the core function of principals, curriculum directors, supervisors, and superintendents. Leadership is active, not passive. It is collaborative and inclusive, not exclusive. While leadership may be viewed as a process, it also requires the exercise of certain expertise and the expression of particular attributes.
5. No overarching theory of leadership has proven adequate, but many of the skills and attributes of effective leadership are understood and can be taught and practiced.
6. Preparation programs should focus primarily on developing school leaders for responsible positions in elementary and secondary schools. This preparation requires the cultivation of professional competence through bridging experiences and clinical practice as well as classroom performance activities.
7. Many preparation programs fall short of developing the knowledge, skills, and attributes required of school leaders in today's workplace. Principals, supervisors, curriculum directors, and superintendents need increasingly to take initiative and manage change. They must build a group vision, develop quality educational programs, provide a positive instructional environment, apply evaluation processes, analyze data and interpret results, and maximize human and physical resources. They also must generate public support, engage various constituencies, and mitigate value conflicts and political pressures. School leaders clearly must be prepared to operate in the community as well as in the academy.

8. Leadership includes an ethical dimension because principals and other leaders are moral agents responsible for the welfare and development of students. Preparation programs should provide opportunities for candidates to formulate and examine an ethical platform upon which to rely when making tough decisions.
9. Preparation programs should be essentially an institutional responsibility, but the design and delivery of these programs should include participants from school districts. In addition, some key learning experiences must take place in operating schools, particularly the application of knowledge and the practice of skills.
10. The standards should be assessed primarily through performance measures. Increasingly, schools are responding successfully to performance-based criteria and educational leadership preparation programs can benefit from similar processes. This approach provides a useful review of contemporary practice and the rationale for that practice.

### **Addressing the Standards**

Universities are encouraged to design curricula in an integrated and/or problem-based mode to promote an understanding of the connectedness of the various knowledge and skill areas in educational leadership. The standards necessarily segment the total knowledge and skill base, but these separations are only for the purpose of providing manageable descriptions of essential content and practice within a comprehensive delivery system. (Here, "system" is defined as an array of components designed to accomplish a program objective.)

The application of knowledge and the development, integration, and practice of professional skills are important components of the campus program and of the internship. Universities, therefore, should plan and conduct beneficial bridging experiences between course content and the workplace that feature clinical intern exercises and/or intern work in field settings. Because life in schools is not compartmentalized as are content areas for the convenience of instruction, teaching for the application of knowledge requires structures that provide transitions from isolated, specialized concepts toward more realistic, interconnected patterns.

Preparation programs should include three dimensions: (1) *Awareness*, defined as acquiring concepts, information, definitions, and procedures; (2) *Understanding*, defined as interpreting knowledge to school environments, integrating concepts with practice, and using knowledge and skills in context; and (3) *Capability*, defined as applying knowledge and skills to specific problems of practice.

Universities also are encouraged to employ appropriate adult learning strategies in educational leadership programs, recognizing the advantages of addressing problems authentic to graduate students and using candidates' reflective experiences.

The standards are stated as candidate proficiencies because program assessment should be based on results criteria. Program goals and objectives should focus on the knowledge, skills, and

attributes required by candidates to lead and manage an educational enterprise centered on teaching and learning. While an array of methodologies and resources may be incorporated, emphasis is best placed on those methods and materials that anticipate the candidate's role and performance in the workplace.

In summary, the campus-based elements of performance-based programs should provide clear connections and bridging experiences seated in an awareness of content, an integration of concepts and practice in the classroom, and the application of candidate knowledge and skills in intern experiences. The internship needs to provide generous opportunities to synthesize and practice the application of knowledge and skills contained in the standards and required by the common or individualized objectives of the program. When coupled with integrating experiences through related clinics or cohort seminars, the outcome should be a powerful synthesis of knowledge and skills useful to candidates who complete the program.

## **INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARING THE PROGRAM REPORT**

### **Who Should Prepare a Program Report?**

All institutions that offer post-baccalaureate programs to prepare superintendents, principals, curriculum directors, or supervisors at the master's, post-master's, specialist or doctorate degree levels should prepare and submit a program report. The "Standards for School Leadership" are intended to review those programs (typically at the master's degree level) that prepare candidates to work at the school leadership level. The "Standards for School District Leadership" are intended to require a broader set of skills and more knowledge than the standards of school leadership and should be used for those programs (typically certificate of advanced study (CAS) and doctoral degree programs) that prepare candidates to assume leadership posts at the district level. Only programs that intend to prepare district administrators (as opposed, for example, to higher education administrators) should submit programs for review. A degree or certificate that intends to prepare candidates for both school and district level leadership should submit evidence in both the "Standards for School Leadership" and the "Standards for School District Leadership" matrices. Institutions with multiple programs should submit one program report that includes all of them. Color coding or using different font type are ways each program can be differentiated in the program report matrix.

### **When Should Program Reports be Submitted?**

Program reports are submitted by institutions for review twice a year; they are due at NCATE on either February 1 or September 15. Reports received after the deadline may not be reviewed until the next review cycle. Institutions planning initial reviews by NCATE must submit program reports to NCATE at least 18 months before the on-site visit. Institutions seeking continuing accreditation must submit their program reports to NCATE approximately 12 months before the visit.

A copy of these new standards is available on the NCATE website under "Program Standards" for the ELCC, and is found on the NPBEA website at [www.npbea.org](http://www.npbea.org).

## **What Should be Included in the Program Report?**

Institutions are encouraged to use these new standards as they prepare their program reports for ELCC review. However, some institutions may elect to submit documentation under the previous guidelines. According to NCATE policies, institutions planning to submit a program report in the year following the adoption of these standards by the SASB may choose whether to submit their program report using the old ELCC guidelines published in 1995, or to submit their report using these new standards.

The NCATE program report for the preparation of educational leaders must include narrative responses to the items listed on the cover sheet. Please use the program matrix to provide evidence of candidate performance and candidate and program assessment measures and evidence of program outcome effectiveness. If you have more than one program, please use the program matrix to list evidence for all programs. You may choose to transfer the matrix to a computer so that sufficient space to respond is available.

Please identify on the program report matrix the type of evidence and the page number in the appendix where supporting evidence (i.e., course, performance activities, assessments, results of assessments, ties to rubrics, etc.) can be found for each standard indicator. Each candidate performance activity must be described sufficiently in the appendix materials to reflect the relationship of the activity to the standard indicators being addressed. The evidence provided in the appendix materials should be cross-referenced back to the standard indicator being addressed in the matrix. This is accomplished by writing in the specific standard indicator number (e.g., 1.1, 3.1) at the specific place in the evidence where alignment is shown to be met. Use the indicators listed under each of the standards as a guide to expectations for teaching and learning in each area.

For program report review purposes, it is important to understand the need for performance assessment evidence. This evidence is defined as assessment results that demonstrate proof that candidates have mastered the standards. Describing only what has been offered to candidates through performance activities in a program is not sufficient.

Reviewers of the program report will check the performance activities, the assessments, and the program outcome measurements to determine whether or not the performance expectations for each standard have been adequately addressed.

Performance evidence and results (ability to apply skills) may be presented as follows:

1. Through descriptions of performance assessment activities in syllabi, or
2. Through presenting evidence of performance assessment in separate sections, or
3. Through methods of choice that clearly demonstrate the application of performance, *and*
4. By providing evidence of successful application in real settings.

Please note, performance and assessment evidence must have sufficient description to show alignment with the standard(s) being addressed and include a cross-reference to the program matrix (e.g., 1.1, 1.3, 2.1)

## **What Are the Characteristics of Performance Assessment?**

Performance assessment can be defined in several ways--as actual demonstrations that show learning has occurred, as results-based assessment, as task performances that reflect real-life situations, as the production of a product or performance that reflects program objectives, and so on. It is most useful when focusing on broad professional tasks rather than on a single subskill.

Performance assessment may include aggregated evaluations or random samplings of candidate and/or professor portfolios, rubrics of projects and investigations, candidate program evaluations, interviews, documented observations of simulations or clinical experiences, peer assessments, job performance of graduates, and so on.

Another characteristic of performance assessment is the use of higher-order thinking skills (e.g., analysis, synthesis, evaluation) by candidates. Integration of performance assessment with the instructional process allows assessors and candidates to interact to strengthen learning.

Performance assessments are:

- ◆ Essential, not arbitrary or contrived to shake out a grade.
- ◆ Enabling, constructed to point the candidate toward more sophisticated use of skills or knowledge.
- ◆ Contextualized complex intellectual challenges, not atomized tasks corresponding to isolated actions.
- ◆ Representative challenges designed to emphasize depth more than breadth.
- ◆ Engaging and educational.
- ◆ Involved with broad tasks or problems that may be somewhat ambiguous.

## **What Faculty Development Should be Provided to Implement These Standards?**

While intending that the program report development process lead to continuous self-improvement, the ELCC believes that each institution must decide for itself the best method for self-improvement. Developing a program report offers institutions an opportunity to learn about learning. The end product, therefore, must document that the faculty responsible for preparing educational leaders engages in self-reflection. This process offers institutions both flexibility and accountability. The "burden of proof" for providing evidence that candidates are achieving the standards rests with the institution.

As part of this process, the institution should answer three fundamental questions: What is it that our graduating candidates should know and be able to do? How are we doing? How can we do a better job?

## **Is Additional Guidance Available for Preparing a Program Report?**

Institutions desiring assistance in preparing a program report are strongly encouraged to contact the ELCC coordinator's office at (703) 875-0755. ELCC statistics show that those institutions that seek answers to their questions prior to preparing their program reports have a higher likelihood of gaining national recognition after only one review.

On-site consultation visits to a department are available for a fee by arrangement with the ELCC coordinator's office. In addition, periodic preparation workshops are offered through NCATE, various state association meetings, ELCC member's annual conferences, and NCPEA. For a list



of upcoming workshops, please contact the ELCC coordinator's office.

A list of institutional programs found to be in compliance with these standards is routinely published by NCATE as part of its *Annual Guide to Accredited Education Programs/Units*. It can also be found on NCATE's ([www.ncate.org](http://www.ncate.org)) and NPBEA's website ([www.npbea.org](http://www.npbea.org)). In addition, a list of the programs that have gained "National Recognition" is regularly promoted on the websites of the following organizations: AASA ([www.aasa.org](http://www.aasa.org)), ASCD ([www.ascd.org](http://www.ascd.org)), NAESP ([www.naesp.org](http://www.naesp.org)), and NASSP ([www.principal.org](http://www.principal.org)). This list is updated twice a year.

Questions about these standards or the submission of program reports can be forwarded to the ELCC coordinator's office at AASA, 1801 N. Moore Street, Arlington, VA 22209-1813.  
E-mail: [hfedede@aasa.org](mailto:hfedede@aasa.org).

## **What Is the Proper Length of the Program Report?**

The program report must be limited to 140 pages and should consist of three sections.

Section 1-- **PROGRAM OVERVIEW:** Items listed on the cover sheet will comprise the overview section. This section should not exceed 25 pages. The overview section should also include a completed "Compliance with Program Criteria" page.

Section 2-- **PROGRAM MATRIX:** The matrix should not exceed 15 pages and should cross-reference supporting evidence in the Appendix.

Section 3-- **APPENDIX:** Supporting documentation in the appendix should not exceed 100 pages. This documentation should include descriptions of candidate performance activities, candidate and program assessment results, documentation of program outcome effectiveness such as survey summaries, a compilation of state licensure data, summaries of internship evaluations, and so on. Items in the appendices should be aligned and cross-referenced to the appropriate standards in the program matrix.

Institutions providing candidate logs or actual candidate projects or papers can consider 10 pages of each to the equivalent of one program report page. Please tab the different sub-sections in the appendix for ease of review.

## **How Many Copies of the Program Report Must be Submitted and to Whom Should They be Sent?**

Three bound or spiral copies of the program report should be sent to the NCATE office at 2010 Massachusetts Avenue, Suite 500, Washington, DC 20036-1023, with the institution's preconditions package. An institution that wishes to submit an electronic program report should contact the ELCC coordinator's office to make a special arrangement. The program report should have tabs for each of the different sections of the report and the contents of the appendix. Please number the pages in consecutive order for the entire document.

## **What Happens After a Program Report is Submitted?**

Program reports are analyzed by a team of ELCC reviewers. Each program report is examined by one professor from a university-based educational leadership department and one practicing educational leader at the school building level and/or district level (depending on the program) who then meet to discuss their findings and write a report. Reviewers are trained to judge the program(s) holistically based on each of the seven standards. Once the team's report is written, it is reviewed by the ELCC and a decision is made whether to grant "National Recognition" to the program(s). If a program is not in substantial compliance with each of the seven standards, or if there is insufficient information to make a decision, the ELCC may decide to "Deny" or "Defer" the program. Once a decision is made, the ELCC report is forwarded to NCATE. After the response from the ELCC has been received, a copy is forwarded by NCATE to the NCATE coordinator at the institution. Institutions with a "Deferred" program action are expected to submit missing documentation for ELCC review.

## **Rejoinder Review Process**

Should a program be "Denied," the institution may be allowed to submit a rejoinder report to correct the weaknesses identified by the ELCC review. Approximately two months will be allowed for the institution to prepare a rejoinder report. A subsequent review by the ELCC will occur in another four to six months. While the preparation of a rejoinder report is optional and is not required by NCATE, the submission of a rejoinder is strongly encouraged. Should an institution decide to complete a rejoinder report, it is expected that the rejoinder and subsequent ELCC review will take place in advance of the scheduled NCATE accreditation visit so that the results will be available to the NCATE Board of Examiners (BOE) team for use in judging the evidence for *NCATE Unit Standard I, Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions*.

## **How Does the Program Review Process Fit into NCATE Accreditation?**

NCATE has program (content) standards in 17 areas. The program standards are developed by the national specialized professional associations, of which the ELCC is one. Consistent with NCATE guidelines, the most important element of the program standards is their performance orientation. Results of program reviews conducted by the various professional organizations for each specialized program (educational leadership, reading education, special education, etc.) of an institution are used by NCATE to decide accreditation status for the institution's educator preparation unit under *Unit Standard I (Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions)*. Under *NCATE Unit Standard II, Assessment System and Unit Evaluation*, the unit must have an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to make decisions about its candidates and to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs. In defending the quality of its programs against NCATE's unit standards, the unit must provide data about its candidates through multiple means of assessment throughout their preparation (*NCATE 2000 Blueprint: A Status Report*).

# COVER SHEET

Preparation of Educational Leaders  
Educational Leadership Constituent Council

**SUBMITTED BY:** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name of Institution)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Address)

**CHIEF COMPILER:** \_\_\_\_\_ **DEAN:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**DEPARTMENT CHAIR:** \_\_\_\_\_ **EMAIL:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**PHONE:** \_\_\_\_\_ **FAX:** \_\_\_\_\_ **DATE:** \_\_\_\_\_

## PROGRAM AREA(S) FOR WHICH YOU SEEK APPROVAL

\_\_\_\_ Building Level Leadership Programs

\_\_\_\_ District Level Leadership Programs

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title of Program/ Degree Awarded

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title of Program/ Degree Awarded

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title of Program/ Degree Awarded

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title of Program/ Degree Awarded

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

1. Explain the knowledge and skill base, philosophy for preparation, and goals and objectives for each program.
2. Describe the program of studies, indicating all required and elective courses for each program. If the department is submitting this report for more than one program, describe how the programs differ from each other and describe any overlap in courses for each intended leadership role.
3. Provide the number of credit hours required for each program and the type of degree or certificate awarded.
4. Explain where each program is located within the institutional unit and its interrelationship with other programs in the department or division, and in the university or program.
5. Describe how the department assesses its educational leadership program(s). Focus on collection, compilation, and analysis of candidate results that demonstrate candidate progress toward mastery of the ELCC standards. Explain how individual results are aggregated for program improvement purposes. Explain how multiple measures are examined over time to assess program effectiveness as demonstrated by candidate proficiency.
6. Describe relevant policies and practices affecting the program(s), including the relationship of the framework for the ELCC standards with the conceptual framework used for unit accreditation.
7. Describe any state requirements for candidates that may impinge on implementation of the program or on performance of the candidates, explaining how the program accommodates differences between ELCC standards and state standards.

## FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS

Please provide information on the following indicators of quality for your faculty. You are welcome to include information on other indicators of your choosing. Please be as specific as possible.

1. Describe recent awards received by individual faculty and/or the program or the department for outstanding professional contributions to the field.
2. Describe the type of support and training the department provides to adjunct faculty members to prepare them to teach their classes.
3. Describe the process by which faculty are evaluated to ensure quality instruction and continuing program improvement.
4. Describe the scholarly productivity of faculty by documenting their current understanding of, teaching about, use of, and contribution to the knowledge base in educational leadership (e.g. publications, citations, external funds secured, editorships of journals, etc.).
5. Describe the work your faculty has done to assist schools, school districts, and state departments of education with educational improvement and reform.

Provide a faculty chart (see sample below) that lists each faculty member by program and includes the following information:

1. Names of faculty and teaching staff in each program.
2. Percentage of time spent teaching within the department (full-time, part-time).
3. Professorial rank and title.
4. Course assignment(s).
5. Highest degree obtained and name of degree-granting university.
6. Status within the department (tenure-track, non-tenure, adjunct, and/or auxiliary).
7. Teaching and advising workload.
8. Average class size.
9. Number of years of previous or current work experience as a school and/or district administrator. (Describe the type of experience)
10. Participation and/or leadership in local, regional, and national professional associations.

### Faculty Chart:

Faculty Name	%Full-Time or Part-Time Teaching or Advising in Dept.	Professorial Rank/ Title	Course(s) Assigned	Highest Degree Obtained and Name of Degree-Granting University	Status within Dept. (tenure-track, non-tenure, adjunct)	Teaching and Advising Workload (#hrs. per week)	Average Class Size (for each course taught)	#Years of Previous or Current Work Experience as a School and/or District Administrator	Professional Membership/ Participation

## CANDIDATE QUALIFICATIONS

Please provide information on the following indicators of quality for your candidates. You are welcome to include information on other indicators of your choosing. Please be as specific as possible.

1. Describe your admissions process and criteria used to evaluate potential candidates for each program. (e.g., entrance test, cut-off scores, interviews, references).
2. Provide the acceptance rate of applicants into each program.
3. Explain your use of admissions criteria that focus on the candidates' leadership records or potential for leadership, and how these criteria lead to admission.

Provide a candidate chart (see sample below) that includes the following information:

1. Number of candidates enrolled by cohort by program for each of the last five years.
2. Average admission score on standardized instruments or other admission assessments for each cohort by program.
3. Average cumulative GPA and/or class rank required for admissions into each program.
4. Number of candidates that have graduated from each cohort for the past five years.
5. Number of graduates that have passed a state licensure exam. (Please specify exam)
6. Number of graduates in the last five years who have worked or are working as school/district administrators.

**Candidate Chart:**

**Program Name:**

#Candidates Enrolled by Cohort	Average Admissions Score for Each Cohort	Average Cumulative GPA or Class Rank Required	#Candidates Graduated	#Graduates Who Passed State Licensure Exam	#Graduates Working in Field
1996					
1997					
1998					
1999					
2000					

## COMPLIANCE WITH PROGRAM CRITERIA

The preparation program must meet the following program criteria. A *brief* summary statement should accompany each program criteria item below, citing evidence of how each item is met by the program(s). For example, evidence for Criterion 7 might be stated as: "Each candidate focuses in each course on the application of knowledge and skills to the particular position for which the degree is sought. Each candidate for the superintendency applies course learnings to the role of a superintendent." *The department chair must attest by signature that the preparation program(s) are in compliance with the items listed below:*

### Program Criteria:

1. Curricula are designed in an integrated or problem-based mode to promote an understanding of the connectedness of the various knowledge and skill areas in educational leadership.
2. Instructional emphasis is placed on those methods and materials that anticipate candidate performance in the workplace.
3. Appropriate adult learning strategies are broadly used.
4. The programs include: (a) the acquisition of concepts and information, (b) the integration of concepts with practice and use of knowledge in context, and (c) the application of knowledge and skills in a workplace environment.
5. Bridging experiences are conducted between course content and the workplace that feature clinical exercises and/or field settings.
6. All candidates are required to have performance experiences in all standards as well as an extensive internship that requires the synthesis and application of appropriate knowledge and skills represented in the standards.
7. Opportunities are provided for candidates to formulate and examine an ethical platform upon which to rely for tough decisions.
8. A quality assurance performance assessment process is in place for candidate preparation, including (a) plans for, and use of, multiple measures to capture various candidate performance proficiencies called for in the standards, (b) plans and/or accomplishments under continuing efforts to assure credibility - accuracy, consistency, fairness, and avoidance of bias – of the assessment and evaluation system, and (c) plans for using, or regular use of, assessment results to evaluate and improve programs and teaching.
9. A program self-evaluation process is in place that focuses on perceived program strengths of and deviations from the ELCC standards.

---

(Department Chair's Printed Name and Signature)

---

(Telephone/Fax Number)

---

(Address)

---

(Email)

# PROGRAM MATRIX SECTION

Please use the following program report matrix to describe and present evidence to substantiate how your program(s) meet standards for school leadership (e.g., principal program) and/or school district leadership (e.g., superintendent program) using both candidate performance evidence, assessment evidence, and program outcome evidence. Institutions should refer to the candidate performance and candidate and program assessment sections for more information. The “Standards for School Leadership” column should be used for those programs (typically at the master’s degree level) preparing candidates to work at the school leadership level. The “Standards for School District Leadership” are intended to require a broader set of skills and more knowledge than the standards of school leadership and should be used for those programs (typically certificate of advanced study (CAS) and doctoral degree programs) preparing candidates to assume leadership posts at the district level. Only programs that intend to prepare district administrators (as opposed, for example, to higher education administrators) should be submitted for review. A degree or certificate that intends to prepare candidates for both school and district level leadership should submit evidence in both the “Standards for School Leadership” column and the “Standards for School District Leadership” columns. The “Indicators of Excellence” column should be used to describe features and attributes at either or both program levels that exceed minimum expectations for a standard. Institutions with multiple programs should submit one program report that includes all programs. Color coding or using different font type are ways each program can be differentiated in the program report matrix.

**Standard 1.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school or district vision of learning supported by the school community.**

Elements	Evidence that Program(s) Meet Standards for School Building Leadership		Evidence that Program(s) Meet Standards for School District Leadership		Program Indicators of Excellence	Measures of Program Outcome Effectiveness
	Candidate Performance Evidence	Assessment of Candidate Proficiency	Candidate Performance Evidence	Assessment of Candidate Proficiency		
<b>STANDARD 1.0</b>						
<b>1.1 Develop a Vision</b>						
<b>1.2 Articulate a Vision</b>						
<b>1.3 Implement a Vision</b>						
<b>1.4 Steward a Vision</b>						
<b>1.5 Promote Community Involvement</b>						



**Standard 2.0:** Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff.

Elements	Evidence that Program(s) Meet Standards for School Building Leadership		Evidence that Program(s) Meet Standards for School District Leadership		Program Indicators of Excellence	Measures of Program Outcome Effectiveness
	Candidate Performance Evidence	Assessment of Candidate Proficiency	Candidate Performance Evidence	Assessment of Candidate Proficiency		
<b>STANDARD 2.0</b>						
<b>2.1 Promote Positive School Culture</b>						
<b>2.2 Provide Effective Instructional Program</b>						
<b>2.3 Apply Best Practice to Student Learning</b>						
<b>2.4 Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans</b>						

**Standard 3.0:** Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Elements	Evidence that Program(s) Meet Standards for School Building Leadership		Evidence that Program(s) Meet Standards for School District Leadership		Program Indicators of Excellence	Measures of Program Outcome Effectiveness
	Candidate Performance Evidence	Assessment of Candidate Proficiency	Candidate Performance Evidence	Assessment of Candidate Proficiency		
<b>STANDARD 3.0</b>						
<b>3.1 Manage the Organization</b>						
<b>3.2 Manage Operations</b>						
<b>3.3 Manage Resources</b>						

**Standard 4.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.**

Elements	Evidence that Program(s) Meet Standards for School Building Leadership		Evidence that Program(s) Meet Standards for School District Leadership		Program Indicators of Excellence	Measures of Program Outcome Effectiveness
	Candidate Performance Evidence	Assessment of Candidate Proficiency	Candidate Performance Evidence	Assessment of Candidate Proficiency		
<b>STANDARD 4.0</b>						
<b>4.1 Collaborate with Families and Other Community Members</b>						
<b>4.2 Respond to Community Interests and Needs</b>						
<b>4.3 Mobilize Community Resources</b>						

**STANDARD 5.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner.**

Elements	Evidence that Program(s) Meet Standards for School Building Leadership		Evidence that Program(s) Meet Standards for School District Leadership		Program Indicators of Excellence	Measures of Program Outcome Effectiveness
	Candidate Performance Evidence	Assessment of Candidate Proficiency	Candidate Performance Evidence	Assessment of Candidate Proficiency		
<b>STANDARD 5.0</b>						
<b>5.1 Acts with Integrity</b>						
<b>5.2 Acts Fairly</b>						
<b>5.3 Acts Ethically</b>						

**Standard 6.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.**

Elements	Evidence that Program(s) Meet Standards for School Building Leadership		Evidence that Program(s) Meet Standards for School District Leadership		Program Indicators of Excellence	Measures of Program Outcome Effectiveness
	Candidate Performance Evidence	Assessment of Candidate Proficiency	Candidate Performance Evidence	Assessment of Candidate Proficiency		
<b>STANDARD 6.0</b>						
<b>6.1 Understand the Larger Context</b>						
<b>6.2 Respond to the Larger Context</b>						
<b>6.3 Influence the Larger Context</b>						

**Standard 7.0: Internship. The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in Standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit.**

Elements	Evidence that Program(s) Meet Standards for School Building Leadership	Evidence that Program(s) Meet Standards for School District Leadership	Program Indicators of Excellence
<b>STANDARD 7.0</b>			
<b>7.1 Substantial</b>			
<b>7.2 Sustained</b>			
<b>7.3 Standards-based</b>			
<b>7.4 Real Settings</b>			
<b>7.5 Planned and Guided Cooperatively</b>			
<b>7.6 Credit</b>			

# APPENDIX SECTION

# Candidate Performance Section

## Introduction

The primary thrust of performance assessment is to ensure that programs are preparing and nurturing educational leaders who can enhance teaching and learning for all children and youth. This is the *raison d'être* for those who lead schools and school districts now and in the future.

Leaders for schools need the strongest knowledge base possible to face the uncertainties of each day. Efforts toward site-based and inclusive schools as well as increased accountability demands require knowledge and skills in collaborative planning and decision-making, curriculum development, instructional strategies, learning and teaching technologies, management, and interpersonal sensitivity.

The ELCC believes that these performance measures will help enable more men and women to move forward as skilled, ethical, and accomplished leaders. The performance measures in this section are based on the knowledge, skills, and standards that have emerged in the discipline as well as professional practice of educational administrators over the past 50 years. Standards developed by NCATE have drawn on the combined efforts of institutional faculty, state departments of education staff, and other education agencies to develop benchmarks that measure the criteria for successful performance in the complicated world of school leadership.

Mastery of every skill related to each standard may not be possible, but school leaders and the professors who prepare them should strive to master each of the seven assessment areas. These standards should be aligned with courses and field experiences in each preparation program seeking national recognition. Though academic preparation programs should not be limited to the performance measures in these standards, the knowledge base undergirding them is the accumulation of research and wisdom about educational leadership as an academic discipline and professional practice.

The first several performance activities will be samples that demonstrate that learning has occurred through several standards. The remaining examples are germane to specific standards, but undoubtedly could be interchanged among all seven ELCC standards.

## Examples of Candidate Performance Activities

These examples are not intended to be used as is, but represent the types of performance activities an institution may develop within their own course activities. Institutions will want to use these examples as ideas for their own development of candidate performances specific to the requirements of each standard indicator (e.g., 2.1, 2.2).

### **Standards 2.0, 3.0, and 4.0:**

Candidates are required to design an innovation to be implemented in a real school that will increase student learning. The proposal begins with an assessment of the needs of the selected site, which results in a clear definition of the innovation to be implemented. The needs assessment must include actual data as well as a review of pertinent literature and research. The

proposal outlines the actions to be implemented and the strategies to be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the innovation both formatively and summatively. The candidate must outline steps to be implemented to ensure institutionalization of the innovation and explain how assessment results will be used to make adjustments to the innovation. The candidate orally shares the design and the results with the class.

**Standards 2.0 and 3.0:**

Candidates are required to prepare and present a plan for staffing, scheduling, and grouping in a school setting, and explain how this plan will impact teaching and learning in the school.

**Standards 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, and 6.0:**

Candidates are required to identify school practices that reflect cultural biases and present recommendations for ways to improve or stop those practices.

Candidates are required to write essays that demonstrate abilities in developing a topic, writing skills, and clarity of issues.

**Standards 1.0, 2.0, and 4.0:**

Candidates are required to analyze and revise a written community or school strategic plan that includes activities to address the diversity and cultural norms of the community.

**Standards 1.0 and 3.0:**

Candidates are required to review a district or school strategic plan to find links between student performance and financial, human, and material resources. The written analysis must explain how these resources connect to teaching and learning.

**Standards 2.0, 3.0, and 4.0:**

Candidates are required to demonstrate consensus-building skills in an actual staff meeting discussion focusing on resource allocations for special needs students.

**Standard 1.0:**

Candidates are required to conduct a visioning workshop in a graduate class, for a central office staff, or with a school staff focusing on ways to promote the success of all students.

Candidates are required to develop a professional philosophy or vision statement reflecting his/her personal dispositions, philosophy, and vision of educational leadership.

Candidates are required to shadow a principal and interview members of a school staff where there is a strong stewardship of a shared vision, then use this knowledge base as well as literature in the field to prepare a paper analyzing how vision is developed, articulated, and implemented.

**Standard 2.0:**

Candidates are required to analyze student performance measures as identified in a school improvement plan, and make specific recommendations for improvements to the plan.

Candidates are required to lead a school or district taskforce that conducts a curriculum audit to demonstrate alignment of curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment.

Candidates are required to design a standards-based personal professional development plan and share evidence of implementation.

**Standard 3.0:**

Candidates are required to be active participants in a simulated disciplinary hearing for an employee.

Candidates are required to collect and analyze data related to a school facility and make recommendations for improvement showing their relationship to the school improvement plan.

Candidates are required to perform a technology inventory in a school or a district, identify the critical shortages, and recommend areas where technology could be used to improve student learning.

**Standard 4.0:**

Candidates are required to construct a school public relations and marketing program, relating each component to the school improvement plan.

Candidates are required to plan and execute a one-day retreat that includes business, civic, religious, medical, and other community agencies and present a plan for integrated community services to benefit all youth in the school or district.

Candidates are required to develop a brief memorandum for the superintendent or board of education that explains a complex state or federal law (e.g., IDEA, ADA, PL 94-142).

**Standard 5.0:**

Candidates are required to lead a discussion around compliance issues for district, school, or professional association codes of ethics.

Candidate are required to make a speech to a local service organization and articulate and demonstrate the importance of education in a democratic society.

Candidates are required to survey constituents regarding their perceptions of his/her modeling the highest standards of conduct, ethical principles, and integrity in decision-making and behaviors.

Candidates are required to present an analysis of how he/she promotes teaching and learning that recognizes learning differences, multicultural awareness, gender sensitivity, and appreciation of ethnic diversity.

**Standard 6.0:**

Candidates are required to analyze and make a report to the school board or graduate class about the state's accountability laws.

Candidates are required to identify the most frequent legal issues facing a school or district, and develop a report identifying the reasons for these issues, including recommendations for solutions to particular situations.

Candidates are required to select a board of education policy, analyze it, and discuss the underpinnings upon which its viability and validity are based.

**Standard 7.0:**

Candidates are required, as part of a weekly observation with a trained mentor, to discuss actual situations and actions taken “on the job.”

Candidates are required to observe and interview central office administrators and create an analysis of the administrative organization of the school district with recommendations for reorganization that align more closely with the system’s goals for improving teaching and learning.

Candidates are required to develop a portfolio from intern experiences gained for the other six standards.

## **Candidate and Program Assessment Section**

### **Principles of Assessment**

Assessment is a critical aspect of program review in the accreditation process. A program’s assessment system must be comprehensive, valid, and based on sound assessment principles. The purpose of assessment is primarily to determine the hallmarks of a quality program and secondarily to provide information on which to judge program and candidate quality for NCATE performance-based accreditation. Two key components drive performance-based accreditation: 1) standards that describe what the candidate should know and be able to do; and 2) assessments to determine what the candidate knows and if she/he is able to apply that knowledge in the practice of leadership (*NCATE 2000 Blueprint: A Status Report*). For program review purposes, the shift to performance evidence by NCATE is defined primarily by assessment results demonstrating that candidates have mastered what is contained in the ELCC standards. Evidence that describes what is offered to candidates during their experiences in a program will not be sufficient to determine whether a program merits National Recognition by a specialized professional association like the ELCC. (*Interim Policies and Procedures for SASB: Approval of Specialized Professional Association Standards, p. 2*).

An assessment system should include criteria for admittance to the program, well-designed performance activities aligned with the standards, evaluations and assessments of candidate proficiency during the program, and evidence of candidate success in leadership activities upon completion of the program. Ideally, assessments should employ a 360-degree model of evaluation in that data should be provided about the program and candidates from diverse sources including the candidates, peers, professors, practitioners, and program or college administrators. A blending of qualitative and quantitative methodologies should be employed



and consideration should be given to reliability and validity of data.

Assessments should be vehicles for both candidate and program evaluation and improvement. An assessment system should be planned, meaningful, and based on the ELCC standards. Performance should be integrated among the standards (whenever possible) and linked to program goals and purposes. A broad range of knowledge and performance should be assessed, including the application of knowledge to the improvement of practice. Knowledge and skills should be assessed through application in as close to real conditions as possible.

Assessments should be continuous, systematic, comprehensive, and rigorous. They should be free from bias, and be consistent, accurate, ethical, and fair. They should treat all candidates and programs with dignity and respect.

It is important that multiple assessment measures be used in making decisions or evaluations. A multiple measures approach to program and candidate assessment may include several formats such as observations, use of work samples, analytic work, reflections, demonstrations, standardized test results, pre- and post-tests, essays, grading rubrics, problem-solving activities, multiple-choice exams, reputational analysis, field assessments of candidate and program performance, self-evaluations, portfolio assessments, action research, candidate projects, simulations, and case studies. (For definitions of important assessment terms, please reference the Glossary section at the end of this document or in the *NCATE 2000 Unit Standards* to be found at the NCATE website at [www.ncate.org](http://www.ncate.org)).

For purposes of establishing the performance of candidates in relation to the seven ELCC standards, preparation programs will need to provide evidence from state licensure examinations, if applicable; at least one of the program assessment methods listed under the “Measures of Program Outcome Effectiveness”; and results from program designed and program specific learning activities and experiences (see examples below).

<b>ELCC Principles of Assessment</b>	<b>NCATE Principles for Performance-Based Assessment Systems in Professional Educational Programs</b>
Assessments should be vehicles for both candidate and program evaluation and improvement. An assessment system should be planned and meaningful, based on standards.	Driven by a conceptual framework and program values that espouse assessment as a vehicle for both individual and program self-evaluation and improvement; assessment is planned and a means to an end.
Performance should be integrated between standards (whenever possible) and linked to program goals and purposes. A broad range of knowledge and performance should be assessed, including the application of knowledge to the improvement of practice.	Includes components that work together in a synergy to address knowledge, skills, and dispositions of candidates across program goals, objectives and curriculum consistent with performance-based standards.
It is important that multiple measures be used in making decisions or evaluations. A multiple measures approach to program and candidate evaluation may include several formats...	Multiple measures are planned and administered on a systematic, ongoing basis, including quantitative and qualitative measures, formative and summative assessment, and positive candidate impact on school students.
...several formats such as observations, use of work samples,	Includes one or more measures created, reviewed, and/or scored

<p>analytic work, reflections, demonstrations, standardized test results, pre and post tests, essays, problem solving abilities, multiple choice exams, reputational analysis, field assessments of candidate and program performance, self evaluations, portfolio assessments, action research, candidate projects, simulations, and case studies.</p> <p>Ideally, assessments should employ a 360 degree model of evaluation in that data should be provided about the program and candidates from diverse sources including the candidates, peers, professors, practitioners, university or college administrators.</p>	<p>by specialty professionals external to the preparation program.</p>
	<p>Clearly delineated. Candidates are made aware of program standards and assessment requirements to which they will be held and are provided with models and examples of performance.</p>
<p>Assessments should be continuous, systematic, comprehensive, and rigorous.</p>	<p>Sufficiently comprehensive and rigorous to make important decisions about the proficiencies of candidates; critical decision-making points delineated.</p>
<p>Assessments should be continuous, systematic, comprehensive, and rigorous.</p>	<p>Includes structure and procedures for sampling, analyzing, summarizing, and reporting aggregated results...gathered on ongoing basis; summaries of results provided to key program stakeholders.</p>
<p>Assessments should be vehicles for both candidate and program evaluation and improvement. An assessment system should be planned and meaningful, based on standards. Performance should be integrated between standards (whenever possible) and linked to program goals and purposes.</p>	<p>Foster the use of results for individual candidate and program improvement. Results regularly reviewed in relation to program goals and objectives.</p>
<p>They should be free from bias, and be consistent, accurate, ethical, and fair.</p>	<p>Has a mechanism for evaluating and improving the assessment itself and its component methods; reliability and validity of system gathered and used to make decisions; valid, fair, and unbiased.</p>

## Program Outcome Effectiveness Section

As important as the criteria for admission to a program are, and as important as the kinds of performance activities and assessments candidates engage in during their program are, the most telling evidence of a program's effectiveness is how well the candidate performs once in a leadership position. Institutions will be required to evaluate their overall program effectiveness relative to each standard using one or more of the following program results in addition to other program-specific assessments; evidence from categories A and B below alone will NOT be sufficient evidence of program effectiveness for the seven ELCC standards.

Note: Institutions are encouraged to review the "Principles of Assessment" for further explanation of the philosophy and framework of performance assessment that is expected. Performance-based measures can take a variety of forms including job placement rates, surveys of employer satisfaction, probationary evaluations, and even graduate assessments of programs.

- A. As a supplement to program-specific assessments, a measure of how well prepared a candidate is to exercise leadership is the ability to pass state licensing exams. All programs seeking accreditation for programs in institutions within states that have such exams will be required to report scores for accreditation. A pass rate that exceeds the state-mandated pass rate or 90% which ever is greater will be considered acceptable.
  
- B. In addition to program-specific assessments and pass rates on licensing examinations, institutions may choose which of the following five measurements they would like to submit as supporting program performance evidence. A narrative explanation should be included with this documentation detailing the institution's program effectiveness plan and how the evidence presented documents program success for all candidates.
  - (1.) Surveys of job placement rates;
  - (2.) Surveys of employer satisfaction as related to the standards;
  - (3.) Summaries of internship evaluations conducted by professionals with whom, or for whom, students worked while an intern;
  - (4.) Summaries of probationary evaluations of graduates by employers;
  - (5.) Program or self-assessments based on the standards by graduates three years after completion of the program.

# GLOSSARY OF SELECTED DEFINITIONS

# GLOSSARY

**Advanced Preparation.** Programs at post-baccalaureate levels for (1) the continuing education of teachers who have previously completed initial preparation or (2) the preparation of other professional school personnel. Advanced preparation programs commonly award graduate credit and include master's, specialist, and doctoral degree programs as well as non-degree licensure programs offered at the graduate level.

**Assessment System.** A comprehensive and integrated set of evaluation measures that provides information for use in monitoring candidate performance and managing and improving unit operations and programs for the preparation of professional educators.

**Benchmark.** A description or example of candidate or institutional performance that serves as a standard of comparison for evaluation or judging quality.

**Candidate Performance Data.** Information derived from assessments of candidate proficiencies, in areas of teaching and effects on student learning, candidate knowledge, and dispositions. Candidate performance data may be derived from a wide variety of sources, such as projects, essays, or tests demonstrating subject content mastery; employer evaluations; state licensure tests; and mentoring year "portfolios" as well as assessments, projects, reflections, clinical observations, and other evidence of pedagogical and professional teaching proficiencies.

**Candidates.** Individuals admitted to, or enrolled in, programs for the initial or advanced preparation of teachers, teachers continuing their professional development, or other professional school personnel. Candidates are distinguished from "students" in P-12 schools.

**Certification.** The process by which a non-governmental agency or association grants professional recognition to an individual who has met certain predetermined qualifications specified by that agency or association. (The National Board for Professional Teacher Standards grants advanced certification.)

**Clinical Practice.** Student teaching or internships that provide candidates with an intensive and extensive culminating activity. Candidates are immersed in the learning community and are provided opportunities to develop and demonstrate competence in the professional roles for which they are preparing.

**Dispositions.** The values, commitments, and professional ethics that influence behaviors toward students, families, colleagues, and communities and affect student learning, motivation, and development as well as the educator's own professional growth. Dispositions are guided by beliefs and attitudes related to values such as caring, fairness, honesty, responsibility, and social justice. For example, they might include a belief that all students can learn, a vision of high and challenging standards, or a commitment to a safe and supportive learning environment.

**Elements of Standards.** The major components of each standard that are described in the rubrics and explanations that accompany the standards. Board of Examiners teams will look for evidence that the unit and its programs address the elements.

**Field Experiences.** A variety of early and ongoing field-based opportunities in which candidates may observe, assist, tutor, instruct, and/or conduct research. Field experiences may occur in off-campus settings such as schools, community centers, or homeless shelters.

**Internship.** Generally, the post-licensure and/or graduate clinical practice under the supervision of clinical faculty; sometimes refers to the pre-service clinical experience.

**Internship Length Equivalency:** The six-month internship experience need not be consecutive, and may include experiences of different lengths. However, all programs must include an extended, capstone experience to maximize the candidate's opportunities to practice and refine their skills and knowledge. This culminating experience may be two noncontiguous internships of three months each, a four month internship and two field practicums of one month each, or another equivalent combination. Full-time experience is defined as the number of hours per week required for attendance by a full-time student receiving federal financial assistance (generally 9-12 hours per week).

**Knowledge Bases.** Empirical research, disciplined inquiry, informed theory, and the wisdom of practice.

**Licensure.** The official recognition by a state governmental agency that an individual has met certain qualifications specified by the state and is, therefore, approved to practice in an occupation as a professional. (Some state agencies call their licenses certificates or credentials.)

**Nationally Recognized Program.** A program that has met the standards of a specialized professional association that is a constituent member of NCATE. An institution's state-approved program also will be considered a nationally recognized program if the state program standards have been approved by the appropriate national association. (Nationally recognized programs are listed on NCATE's website or in the biennial guide of institutions with initial teacher preparation programs.)

**Other Professional School Personnel.** Educators who provide professional services other than teaching in schools. They include, but are not limited to, principals, reading specialists and supervisors, school library media specialists, school psychologists, school superintendents, and instructional technology specialists.

**Performance Assessment.** A comprehensive assessment through which candidates demonstrate their proficiencies in subject, professional, and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions, including their abilities to have positive effects on student learning.

**Performance-based Licensing.** Licensing based on a system of multiple assessments that measure a teacher candidate's knowledge, skills, and dispositions to determine whether he/she can perform effectively as a teacher or in another school specialty.

**Performance-based Program.** A professional preparation program that systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses data for self-improvement and candidate advisement, especially data that demonstrate candidate proficiencies, including positive effects on student learning.

**Performance-based Accreditation System.** A practice in accreditation that makes use of assessment information describing candidate proficiencies or actions of professional education units as evidence for determining whether professional standards are "met" or "not met". It contrasts with accreditation decisions based solely on course offerings, program experiences, and "inputs" as the evidence for judging attainment of professional standards.

**Performance Criteria.** Descriptions or rubrics that specify qualities or levels of candidate proficiency that are used to evaluate candidate performance.

**Performance Data.** Information that describes the qualities and levels of proficiency of candidates, especially in application of their knowledge to classroom teaching and other professional situations. Sometimes the phrase is used to indicate the qualities and levels of institutional practice, for example, in making collaborative arrangements with clinical schools, setting faculty professional development policies, or providing leadership through technical assistance to community schools.

**Portfolio.** An accumulation of evidence about individual proficiencies, especially in relation to explicit standards and rubrics, used in evaluation of competency as a teacher or in another professional school role. Contents might include end-of-course evaluations and tasks used for instructional or clinical experience purposes such as projects, journals, and observations by faculty, videos, comments by cooperating teachers or internship supervisors, and samples of student work.

**Program.** A planned sequence of courses and experiences leading to a degree or recommendation for a state license.

**Program approval.** Process by which a state governmental agency reviews a professional education program to determine if it meets the state's standards for the preparation of school personnel.

**Program report.** The report prepared by faculty responsible for a program (e.g. math education, elementary education, educational leadership) responding to Specialized Professional Association (SPA) standards.

**Rubrics.** Written and shared criteria for judging performance that indicate the qualities by which levels of performance can be differentiated, and that anchor judgments about the degree of success on a candidate assessment.

**SASB.** Specialty Area Studies Board

**Skills.** The ability to use content, professional, and pedagogical knowledge effectively and readily in diverse teaching settings in a manner that ensures that all students are learning.

**SPAs.** Specialized Professional Associations. The national organizations that represent teachers, professional education faculty, and other school personnel who teach a specific subject matter (e.g. mathematics or social studies), teach students at a specific developmental level (i.e., early childhood, elementary, middle level, or secondary), teach students with specific needs (e.g. bilingual education or special education), administer schools (e.g. principals or superintendents), or provide services to students (e.g. school counselors or school psychologists). Many of these associations are constituent members of NCATE and have standards for both students in schools and candidates preparing to work in schools.

**SPA Program Review.** The process by which the specialized professional associations assess the quality of teacher preparation programs offered by an institution. (Institutions are required to submit their programs for review by SPAs as part of the NCATE preconditions process, unless the state's program standards have been approved by NCATE's Specialty Area Studies Board for the review of institutions' teacher education programs.)

**SPA Program Standards.** Standards developed by national professional associations that describe what professionals in the field should know and be able to do.

**SPA State Program Standards Review.** The process by which the specialized professional associations evaluate the degree to which a state's program standards are aligned with the SPA standards. (In states where state program standards are judged to be substantially aligned with SPA standards, the state standards will be approved by NCATE's Specialty Area Studies Board, and NCATE will defer to the state's review of institutions' teacher education programs.)

**SPA Report.** The written findings (or a critique) by a specialized professional association of (1) an institution's programs for the preparation of teachers or other education professionals, or (2) a state's program standards.

**SPA Report Rejoinder.** (1) A unit's written response to a specialized professional association's review of the unit's teacher preparation programs. (2) A state's written response to a specialized professional association's review of the state's program review standards.

**Standards.** Written expectations for meeting a specified level of performance. Standards exist for the content that P-12 students should know at a certain age or grade level.

**State Approval.** Governmental activity requiring specific professional education programs within a state to meet standards of quality so that their graduates will be eligible for state licensure.

**State Professional Standards Board.** State governing body with authority for teacher licensing, licensing of other school personnel, license renewal/revocation, and/or teacher education program approval within a state.

**State Program Approval Standards.** The standards adopted by state agencies responsible for the approval of programs that prepare teachers and other school personnel. In most states, college and university programs must meet state standards in order to admit candidates to those programs.

**State Standards.** The standards adopted by state agencies responsible for the approval of programs that prepare teachers and other school personnel. In most state, college and university programs must meet state standards in order to admit candidates to those programs.

**Students.** Children and youth attending P-12 schools as distinguished from administrator candidates.

**Unit.** The institution, college, school, department, or other administrative body with the responsibility for managing

or coordinating all programs offered for the initial and continuing preparation of teachers and other school personnel, regardless of where these programs are administratively housed. Also known as the “professional education unit”.



# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, J. E., Jr., & Kirst, M. W. (1999). New demands and concepts for educational accountability: striving for results in an era of excellence. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

*The Administrator Diagnostics Inventory*, released by NAESP in 1985.

Barth, R. S. (2001). *Learning By Heart*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Beck, L. G., & Foster, W. (1999). Administration and community: considering challenges, exploring possibilities. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Beck, L.G., & Murphy, J. (1996). *The Four Imperatives of a Successful School*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin/Sage.

Buckner, K. & Bradshaw, L. (2001). Student self-assessment of leadership skills: a useful tool in preparation programs. In T. J. Kowalski & G. Perreault (Eds.), *21<sup>st</sup> Century Challenges For School Administrators*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Chance, P. L., & Lee, K. (2001). Exploring technology, change, and chaos theory: moving educational leadership preparation program into the new millennium. In T. J. Kowalski & G. Perreault (Eds.), *21<sup>st</sup> Century Challenges For School Administrators*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Cibulka, J. G. (1999). Ideological lenses for interpreting political and economic changes affecting schooling. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Driscoll, M. E. & Ketchner, C. T. (1999). The implications of social capital for schools, communities, and cities: educational administration as if a sense of place mattered. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Evertson, C., & Murphy, J. (1992). Beginning with classrooms: Implications for restructuring schools. In H. H. Marshall (Ed.), *Redefining Student Learning*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Firestone, W. A., & Louis, K. S. (1999). Schools as cultures. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

*Framework for the Continual Professional Development of Administrators*  
published by Region 1 of DOE and the Northeast States in 1993.

Fuhrman, S. H. (Ed.) (2001). *From the Capitol to the Classroom: Standards-based Reform in the States*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Fusarelli, L. D., Cooper, B. S., & Carella, V. A. (2001). Leadership and job satisfaction in the school superintendency. In T. J. Kowalski & G. Perreault (Eds.), *21<sup>st</sup> Century Challenges For School Administrators*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985, November). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217-247.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1986, May). The social context of effective schools. *American Journal of Education*, 94 (3), 328-355.

Heck, R.H. & Hallinger, P. (1999). Next generation methods for the study of leadership and school improvement. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Heubert, J. P. (Ed.) (1999). *Law and School Reform: Six Strategies for Promoting Educational Equity*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Hill, P. T., & Guthrie, J. W. (1999). A new research paradigm for understanding (and improving) twenty-first century schooling. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hoyle, J. R., English, F.W., & Steffy, B. E. (1998). *Skills for Successful 21<sup>st</sup> Century School Leaders*. Arlington, VA: AASA.

*Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: Standards for School Leaders* (1996). Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Leithwood, K., Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1993). The expertise of educational leaders. In P. Hallinger, K. Leithwood, & J. Murphy (Eds.), *Cognitive Perspectives on Educational Leadership*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lougheed, J. (2001). Understanding leadership styles of women and men. In T. J. Kowalski & G. Perreault (Eds.), *21<sup>st</sup> Century Challenges For School Administrators*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Louis, K. S., Toole, J., & Hargreaves, A. (1999) Rethinking school improvement. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational*

*Administration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

McCarthy, M. (1999). The evolution of educational leadership preparation programs. . In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

McNamara, J. F., Erlandson, D. A., & McNamara M. (1999). *Measurement & Evaluation: Strategies for School Improvement*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Monk J. E., & Plecki, M. L. (1999). Generating and managing resources for school improvement. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Murphy, J. (1994, December). The changing roles of the superintendency in restructuring districts in Kentucky. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 5(4), 349-375.

Murphy, J. (1989, Fall). Educational reform in the 1980s: Explaining some surprising success. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11, (3), 209-223.

Murphy, J. (1990). The educational reform movement of the 1980s: A comprehensive analysis. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The Reform of American Public Education in the 1980s: Perspectives and Cases*. Berkley, CA: McCutchan.

Murphy, J. (1992). *The Landscape of Leadership Preparation: Reframing the Education of School Administrators*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin/Sage.

Murphy, J. (1999). New consumerism: evolving market dynamics in the institutional dimension of schooling. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Murphy, J. (1990). Principal instructional leadership. In L. S. Lotto & P. W. Thurston (Eds.), *Advances in Educational Administration: Changing Perspectives on the School*. (Volume 1, Part B). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Murphy, J., et al (2001). *The Productive High School*, Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. (1993, May). Restructuring schooling: The equity infrastructure. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 4(2), 111-130.

Murphy, J. (1992). School effectiveness and school restructuring: Contributions to educational improvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 3(2), 90-109.

- Murphy, J. (1994). Transformational change and the evolving roles of the principalship: Early empirical evidence. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Reshaping the Principalship: Insights from Transformational Reform Efforts*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1988, February). The characteristics of instructionally effective school districts. *Journal of Educational Research*, 81(3), 175-181.
- Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1989, March-April). Equity as access to learning: Curricular and instructional treatment differences. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 21(2), 129-149.
- Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1993). Restructuring schooling: Learning from ongoing efforts. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), *Restructuring schooling: Learning from ongoing efforts*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1986, Summer). The superintendent as instructional leader: Findings from effective school districts. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 24(2), 213-236.
- Murphy, J., Hull, T., & Walker, A. (1987, July- August). Academic drift and curricular debris: Analysis of high school course-taking patterns with implications for local policy makers. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 19(4), 341-360.
- Murphy, J., Mesa, R.P., & Hallinger, P. (1984, July). Creating effective school districts: Lessons from practice, research, and national reports. *American Education*, 20(6), 13-14.
- Murphy, J., Weil, M., Hallinger, P., & Mitman, A. (1985, Spring). School effectiveness: A conceptual framework. *The Educational Forum*, 49(3), 361-374.
- Oakes, J., Quartz, K. H., Ryan, S., & Lipton, M. (2000). *Becoming Good American Schools: The Struggle for Civic Virtue in Education Reform*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Ogawa, R. T., Crowson, R. L., & Goldring, E. B. (1999). Enduring dilemmas of school organization. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Principals Assessment Center*, developed by NASSP in 1980.
- Principals For Our Changing Schools: The Knowledge and Skill Base*, published by NPBEA in 1993.
- Priorities and Barriers in High School Leadership: A Survey of Principals*, published by NASSP in 2001.

*Professional Standards for the Superintendency*, published by AASA in 1993.

*Proficiencies for Principals, K-8*, published by NAESP in 1988 and revised in 1991.

*Program Standards for Elementary Teacher Preparation and Professional Standards for Unit Accreditation* (2000). Washington, DC: NCATE.

*Proposed NCATE Curriculum Guidelines for the Specialty Area of Educational Leadership*, published by ASCD in 1993.

Reyes, P., Wagstaff, L. H., & Fusarelli, L. D. (1999). Delta forces: the changing fabric of American society and education. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Ridenour, C. S., First, P. F., Lydon, A., & Partlow, M. C. (2001). Issues of racial, ethnic, and gender diversity in preparing school administrators. In T. J. Kowalski & G. Perreault (Eds.), *21<sup>st</sup> Century Challenges For School Administrators*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Rowan, B. & Miskel, C. G. (1999). Institutional theory and the study of educational organizations. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Shakeshaft, C. (1999). The struggle to create a more gender-inclusive profession. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Slater, R. O., & Boyd, W. L. (1999). Schools as politics. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Smith, S. C., & Piele, P. K. (1997). *School Leadership Handbook for Excellence.*, Third Ed. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Smrekar, C. E. & Mawhinney, H. B. (1999). Integrated services: challenges in linking schools, families, and communities. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Smylie, M. A. & Hart, A. W. (1999). School leadership for teacher learning and change: a human and social capital development perspective. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

*Standards for What Principals Should Know and Be Able To Do*, published by NAESP in 2001.

Sykes, G. (1999). The “New Professionalism” in education: an appraisal. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

# NPBEA Working Group Members



## **NPBEA WORKING GROUP**

### **WORKING GROUP CHAIR**

Scott Thomson

### **AASA**

John R. Hoyle, Professor  
College of Education  
Texas A&M University – College Station

### **AACTE**

David Sperry, Dean  
Graduate School of Education  
University of Utah

### **ASCD**

Agnes R. Crawford, Assistant Executive Director  
Program Development  
Association for Supervision & Curriculum  
Development

### **CCSSO**

Neil Shipman, Director (ret.)  
Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium

### **NAESP**

Frederick N. Brown, Associate Executive Director  
for Professional Development  
National Association of Elementary School  
Principals

### **NASSP**

Diane Ashby, Dean  
College of Education  
Illinois State University

### **NCPEA**

Michael Martin, Interim Associate Vice President  
University of Colorado-Boulder

### **UCEA**

James Cibulka, Associate Dean  
College of Education  
University of Maryland – College Park

### **CONSULTANTS**

Joseph S. Drips, Superintendent  
Southeast Polk Community School District  
Runnells, Iowa  
(ELCC Reviewer)

Odette Redd, Coordinator of School Improvement  
And Personnel Development  
Area 3 / Ottawa Hills High School  
Grand Rapids, Michigan  
(ELCC Reviewer)

Glenn R. Walker, Principal  
Spring Hill High School  
Spring Hill, Kansas  
(ELCC Reviewer)

Emerson J. Elliott, Director  
Program Standards Development Project  
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher  
Education

Linda Avila, Dean  
University Outreach  
Department of Professional Studies  
Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi

### **STAFF**

E. Joseph Schneider, NPBEA Executive Secretary

Honor E. Fede, ELCC Coordinator