

Governor's Principals' Task Force Report

Presented to the Governor's P-20 Leadership Council of Maryland

May 2009

The Honorable Martin O'Malley, Chair

Membership: Principals' Task Force

Ms. Mary Cary.....Assistant State Superintendent, Division for Leadership Development, MSDE
Dr. Elizabeth M. MorganSuperintendent, Washington County Public Schools

Ms. Mita Badshah.....Principal, Ballenger Creek Elementary School
Ms. Diane S. Bragdon.....Principal, Wiley H. Bates Middle School
Ms. Anissa K. Brown-Dennis.....Principal, Deep Creek Middle School
Ms. Betty Ann Clark.....Specialist, Baltimore City Public Schools
Mr. Lawrence H. Cohen.....Member, Howard County Board of Education
Ms. Jan Hastings Conway.....Retired Principal, Wicomico County
Mr. Gerald R. DeGrange.....Principal, Brunswick Elementary School
Dr. Judy Ringgold Docca.....Member, Montgomery County Board of Education
*Ms. Debbie S. Drown.....Executive Director, Maryland Association of Elementary
School Principals*
Dr. Albert P. DuPont.....Principal, College Gardens Elementary School
Ms. Colleen Eisenbeiser.....Director, Anne Arundel Community College
Ms. Maha Fadli.....Principal, Kenmoor Middle School
*Dr. James V. Foran.....Executive Director of High School and Postsecondary
Initiatives, Division for Leadership Development, MSDE*
Ms. Hope R. Harrington.....2008 Member, P-20 Council
Dr. Ted Haynie.....Director of School Performance, Calvert County Public Schools
Mr. Lorenzo L. Hughes.....Principal, Wicomico High School
Mr. R. Owen Johnson, Jr.....Member, Prince George's County Board of Education
Mr. Christopher W. Lloyd.....Teacher, Montgomery County Public Schools
Mr. Patrick S. McCusker.....Principal, Dulaney High School
Ms. Janet Pauls.....Principal, Church Hill Elementary School
*Dr. George W. Reid.....Assistant Secretary for Planning and Academic Affairs,
Maryland Higher Education Commission*
Mr. James E. Richmond.....Superintendent, Charles County Public Schools
*Mr. Eugene L. Streagle, Jr.....Executive Director, Maryland Association of Secondary
School Principals*
*Dr. Ronald S. Thomas.....Associate Director, Center for Leadership in
Education, Towson University*
Mr. Wayne Douglas Thibeault.....Principal, Patterson Mill High School
*Ms. Karen Webber-Ndour.....Principal, National Academy
Foundation High School*

Staff:

Mr. Thomas DeHart.....Staff Specialist, Division for Leadership Development, MSDE
*Ms. Shulamit Finkelstein.....Executive Assistant for Strategic Planning, Board &
Community Relations, Washington County Public Schools*
Mr. Joseph Freed.....Staff Specialist, Division for Leadership Development, MSDE
Ms. Jeanne Hammond.....Staff Specialist, Division for Leadership Development, MSDE

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	
Background	3
Charge to Task Force	3
The Principalship	3
Description of Task Force Process	5
Financial Implications	7
Action Plans	7
Short Term Recommendations	
Recommendation # 1: Financial Incentives	8
Recommendation # 2: Building Manager	9
Recommendation # 3: Contracts	9
Recommendation # 4: Administrative Teams	10
Recommendation # 5: Professional Growth	11
Recommendation # 6: Principals' Academy	11
Recommendation # 7: Mentoring	12
Recommendation # 8: Aspiring Principals	13
Long Term Recommendations	
Recommendation # 9: Administrator III Certification	14
Recommendation # 10: Officers to Principals	14
Appendices	
A. Invitation to Offer Testimony	16
B. Testimony Offered	18
C. Bibliography	19

Executive Summary

The Maryland State Board of Education (MSDE) has declared the principalship a critical shortage area. Research shows that one of the key predictors of student achievement gains is strong leadership in the school. It is common knowledge that excellent principals are “magnets” for excellent teachers. Thus it behooves policymakers to create policies that will ensure that every child in every school has an outstanding principal.

The issue of finding outstanding principals is complex. Certainly, the broad area of compensation is of major importance. Moreover, it is critical for those entering the path to the principalship to know that they will get the kind of support and professional development they need. Principals also need to have a sense of security about their jobs and work in an environment with minimal distractions (*Clearing the Plate*, 2001) so that they can be the kind of instructional leaders that Maryland needs. Compensation and clearing the plate are not new concepts. They both appeared in the report of *Maryland Task Force on the Principalship* (2000). Much remains to be done in that regard.

The Principals’ Task Force offers the following recommendations, all of which are priorities but in no specific priority order, to deal with this burgeoning crisis:

Short Term Recommendations

1. Provide by July 1, 2010, an array of financial incentives for principals that will entice high-quality, aspiring leaders to seek and stay in the principalship.
2. Provide by July 1, 2010, a building manager whose primary responsibility is to handle managerial tasks associated with the operation of the school, thereby allowing the principal the time to be the instructional leader.
3. Provide by July 1, 2010, contracts for all principals that are school specific and that can only be voided for cause as outlined in COMAR or by mutual consent; and

Provide by July 1, 2010, contracts for assistant principals that can only be voided for cause as outlined in COMAR or by mutual consent.

4. Allow principals of schools in any stage of differentiated accountability by July 1, 2010, the flexibility to select their entire administrative teams from the pool of available candidates;

Allow all principals by July 1, 2011, the flexibility to select a minimum of one member of their administrative teams from the pool of available candidates; and

Require school systems to develop a plan by July 1, 2012, that would allow all principals the flexibility to choose their entire administrative teams from the pool of available candidates.

5. Provide by July 1, 2010, a systemic, comprehensive structure for professional growth of principals and assistant principals.
6. Provide by July 1, 2010, an annual statewide Principals' Academy available to all principals based on the *Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework*.
7. Provide by July 1, 2010, a comprehensive mentoring program for newly assigned principals and assistant principals.
8. Provide by July 1, 2010, multiple opportunities for aspiring principals to engage in instructional leadership in order to properly prepare them for the principalship.

Long Term Recommendations

9. Establish by July 1, 2012, Administrator III certification based on the work currently under way with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.
10. Create by July 1, 2011, a pipeline of potential principals by developing an *Officers to Principals* program modeled after the *Troops to Teachers* program.

Introduction

Background

In October 2008, Governor Martin O'Malley's P-20 Leadership Council agreed to convene a task force to develop a comprehensive set of recommendations to address critical questions concerning the recruitment, retention, and development of qualified principals in the state. The Governor appointed Ms. Mary Cary, Assistant Superintendent, Maryland State Department of Education, and Dr. Betty Morgan, Superintendent, Washington County Public Schools, to co-chair the Principals' Task Force. The Task Force members are a broadly representative group of individuals who deliberated on the Governor's charge during the 2008-2009 academic year.

Charge to Task Force

The Principals' Task Force was responsible for the following charge developed by the Governor's P-20 Leadership Council:

School leadership is a key to enhancing student achievement and a key to developing a productive citizenry and a world-class workforce. Nevertheless, the Maryland State Board of Education has identified a critical shortage of principals in the state. To address this shortage, the Principals' Task Force shall develop a plan of recommended actions to provide additional support for current principals and create an infrastructure for the training of future principals and other school leaders.

In developing the plan, the Task Force shall:

- develop a clearer understanding of the current and emerging roles of school principals;
- identify efficient and effective means to provide guidance to school leaders through the *Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework*;
- identify best practices for recruiting, developing, and retaining principals in Maryland;
- identify the characteristics of successful leaders in Maryland schools, especially those who have been successful in challenging circumstances;
- discuss alternative pathways to principal licensure;
- discuss core standards for the evaluation of principals; and
- identify strategies to promote organizational structures that distribute school leadership responsibilities and allow principals to enhance their roles as instructional leaders

The Principalship

Emerging Role of the Principal

The report of the *Maryland Task on the Principalship* (2000) called for a change in how the role of the principal is viewed. Rather than continuing to look at principals as managers of buildings, this report called for them to be viewed as instructional leaders in their schools. The Visionary Panel for Better Schools in *Achievement Matters Most* (2003) stated that "The principal's primary role must be that of instructional leader, and that role must take priority over all other roles and responsibilities." Current performance results, including the recent announcement that

Maryland was named as the # 1 state in the country by *Education Week*, suggest that this change in role has been effective. As Maryland moves toward international benchmarking, it will be even more critical for principals to assume the role of instructional leader to a greater degree than ever before.

Characteristics of Successful School Leaders

Much research has been done over the years on the characteristics of effective school leaders. Maryland has its own experience with a legislatively funded Distinguished Principal program. These principals have been effective in turning around challenging schools, and they all have a common characteristic – instructional leadership.

Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) conducted a meta-analysis of thirty-five years of research on school leadership. This meta-analysis was one of the foundation documents for the *Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework*. From this synthesis of the research, they identified twenty-one characteristics of school leaders that correlate with student academic achievement. Some of these characteristics overlap, but as a whole, they confirm findings from previous studies about the nature of leadership. The twenty-one characteristics are:

1. Affirmation – recognizing and celebrating accomplishments and acknowledging failures
2. Change agent – willingness to challenge the status quo
3. Contingent rewards – rewarding individual accomplishments
4. Communication – establishing lines of communication with students and teachers
5. Culture – fostering shared beliefs
6. Discipline – protecting teachers from influences that detract from their primary jobs
7. Flexibility – adapting leadership styles to situations
8. Focus – establishing clear goals
9. Ideals/Beliefs – operating from a strong belief system
10. Input – involving teachers in decision-making
11. Intellectual stimulation – creating a culture of continuous learning for staff
12. Involvement in curriculum, instruction, and assessment – direct involvement
13. Knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment – understanding the relationship
14. Monitoring/evaluating – ongoing monitoring of school practices
15. Optimizer – inspiring others and leading innovative initiatives
16. Order – establishing standard operating procedures
17. Outreach – advocating for the school to all stakeholders
18. Relationships – demonstrating personal awareness of teacher and staff needs
19. Resources – providing teachers with necessary materials and professional development
20. Situational awareness – awareness of details and undercurrents in school
21. Visibility – regular, quality contact with teachers and students

Core Standards for Evaluation

The evaluation of principals is a local responsibility in Maryland. However, the core standards that should be part of such evaluations can be found in the outcomes and evidences in practice in the *Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework* (2005). These research-based “standards” represent the key instructional concerns to which principals must pay attention. Principals have other managerial responsibilities as well, but the core of their work is focused on improving

instruction and increasing student learning in their schools. Hence, these standards should be part of all principal evaluations across the state.

The standards found in the *Framework* include:

1. Facilitate the development of a school vision
2. Align all aspects of a school culture to student and adult learning
3. Monitor the alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment
4. Improve instructional practices through the purposeful observation and evaluation of teachers
5. Ensure the regular integration of appropriate assessments into daily classroom instruction
6. Use technology and multiple sources of data to improve classroom instruction
7. Provide staff with focused, sustained, research-based professional development
8. Engage all community stakeholders in a shared responsibility for student and school success

Distributed School Leadership

The role of principal is critical to the success of any school. However, it is also important for principals to be aware that in order to maximize the potential of a school, leadership opportunities should be distributed among the staff in a way that helps develop future leaders while ensuring that the entire staff embraces the vision and mission of the school. In fact, the *Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework* establishes the principal's responsibility to demonstrate collaborative decision making as well as the ability to identify and develop potential school leaders.

Principals need to recognize that leadership extends beyond their role; it includes aspiring and potential leaders as well as teacher leaders. Nurturing these key people is a fundamental responsibility of the principal. Using their talents in a constructive manner allows for a schoolwide sharing of responsibility for student performance. It also creates a culture of student and adult learning that permeates the entire building. The successful principal understands that he or she cannot "do it alone." Several of the recommendations in this report discuss the need to develop leaders throughout the school. Effective principals will then find ways to allow these leaders in the school to emerge and practice their leadership with the understanding that a distributed leadership model provides greater opportunity for adults to grow and children to achieve.

Description of Task Force Process

The Task Force had its initial meeting on December 2, 2008, at the Cultural Arts Center in Ellicott City, Maryland. At that meeting the Task Force members reviewed the background for their work and the charge to the Task Force. They also discussed the process for completing the work in a timely manner. The meeting schedule was reviewed, and a research background paper on the state of the principalship was shared with the group. The Task Force also examined information on leadership work currently taking place in Maryland through the efforts of MSDE, local school systems, and institutions of higher education. Next steps were discussed, and members selected preferred committee assignments.

To fulfill the Task Force's charge, it was important to hear from a wide variety of stakeholders. Task Force members helped identify constituencies that would be invited to offer written testimony to be considered by the group in its deliberations. For the sake of organizing the anticipated recommendations, stakeholders were advised to submit their recommendations regarding principal recruitment, development, and retention. As testimony was received, it was posted on the Task Force website for access by all Task Force members, as well as other constituencies.

The second meeting of the Task Force was held on January 21, 2009, at the Johns Hopkins University building in Columbia, Maryland. At this meeting there was a general discussion of the issues. This discussion was followed by the Task Force separating into three committees in order to streamline the work of the group. Each committee further defined the issues and attempted to decide on initial recommendations based on these identified issues. Committee members agreed to meeting dates during the month of February to continue deliberations and prepare for the March meeting of the Task Force.

In order to prepare for these additional meeting dates in February, the committees were asked to review research, resources, and stakeholder input posted on the website. Each committee was charged in February with the responsibility of revising the recommendations they had created based on the issues raised in the January meeting. In addition, each committee composed a draft rationale to accompany and explain the recommendations. Recommendations and rationale were sent out electronically for review by committee members and then to the entire task force. The subsequent revisions formed the basis for the draft to be reviewed at the March meeting.

The third meeting of the Task Force was held on March 12, 2009, at the Anne Arundel County Board of Education. At this meeting Task Force members arrived at general consensus for the language they wanted to see in the final report. Staff revised the recommendations based on the conversations at the March meeting. The chairs reviewed the language of those recommendations. Staff then sent the recommendations back to Task Force members for their review and comment. Comments received were submitted to the Task Force members so key issues could be voted on prior to the April meeting and further discussed at that meeting. Staff also prepared and distributed electronically a final draft report for the Task Force to consider and discuss at its April meeting.

The final meeting of the Task Force was held on April 23, 2009, at the National Academy Foundation High School in Baltimore City. At this meeting the Task Force reached consensus on final recommendations and edits they wanted to see in the final report. Staff was assigned the task of completing these edits in time for submission to the Governor's P-20 Leadership Council meeting on May 5, 2009.

Financial Implications

The executive committee of the P-20 Leadership Council has approved a template for task force reports that requires the Task Force to develop both short-term and long-term recommendations. Additionally, the responsible parties named in the recommendations are expected to determine the fiscal impact of the recommendations. The Task Force urges funding authorities to make certain that adequate funding undergirds any required implementation of these recommendations.

If Maryland schools are to become the best in the world, they will only do so with appropriate resources. Adequate funding must be directed to local school systems and to the Maryland State Department of Education to ensure they have sufficient resources to fund implementation of the recommendations in this report. Many of the recommendations do indeed have financial implications. For example, providing all schools with a building manager or providing mentors for principals will have immediate financial implications. However, providing principals with contracts and allowing principals to select members of their administrative teams in a phased-in manner have no immediate financial implications. These fiscal notes will be submitted by responsible parties as they complete their action plans.

Action Plans

Action plans are to be developed by the designated responsible party(ies) following the recommendation. Action plans should include a complete timeline, strategies designed to implement the recommendations, interim benchmarks, and fiscal note. Action plans should also include a reporting schedule in order to update the P-20 Council on the then current status of the recommendations.

Principals' Task Force Recommendations

Short Term Recommendations

- 1. Provide by July 1, 2010, an array of financial incentives for principals that will entice high-quality, aspiring leaders to seek and stay in the principalship.**

Responsibility: State Legislature; Local School Systems

Rationale: The Task Force believes that providing enhanced financial incentives for principals is a critical aspect of attracting high quality aspiring leaders to assume those positions. In many instances, it is not financially advisable for a teacher to pursue an administrative career because of the current financial disincentive to do so. The compensation that principals receive is not commensurate with the responsibilities and the expectations of the job, especially when compared with compensation in the private sector for leaders with similar responsibilities. Retirement benefits do not serve as an inducement to leave the teaching profession or to stay any longer than necessary in the principalship. The first Task Force on the Principalship (2000) addressed compensation issues. However, these issues persist, and they need to be considered again.

Specifically, the Task Force believes the following incentives could make the principalship much more attractive to potential candidates:

- Salary: Assistant Principals should make a minimum annual salary greater than the equivalent of the highest paid 12 month teacher in that school system. Principals should make a minimum annual salary significantly greater than the highest paid assistant principal in that school system.
- Retirement: Principals should receive a 1.2 multiplier effect for retirement benefits if they serve a minimum of ten years in the principalship.
- Tax Credits: Principals should receive individual tax credits on their state income tax returns.
- Professional Growth: Principals should receive sufficient resources to allow them to maintain membership in appropriate professional organizations and attend state, national, and international conferences critical to staying current in the field.
- Tuition Reimbursement: Principals should be reimbursed for advanced coursework and degrees at the rate of the least expensive institution in the University System of Maryland.
- Differentiated Pay: Principals serving in challenging schools should receive a substantial stipend for their willingness to accept challenging assignments. Although all schools can be said to have challenges, principals should earn differentiated pay based on specific, identified school “challenge factors.” Principals should receive a base salary commensurate with other principals in the local education agency (LEA), but a stipend should be added to the base for challenge factors that include the size of the school; high student poverty as determined by the FARMS rate; high student

mobility; a school under renovation or construction while students are in attendance; and a school in any stage of not meeting AYP. Other factors that make it difficult to attract and retain quality principals should be considered for a stipend that would be added to base pay.

- **Benefits Package:** Principals should receive an enhanced benefits package (e.g., medical, life, and disability insurance; deferred compensation; sabbatical leave) as an enticement to seek and stay in the principalship.

2. Provide by July 1, 2010, a building manager whose primary responsibility is to handle managerial tasks associated with the operation of the school, thereby allowing the principal the time to be the instructional leader.

Responsibility: State Legislature; Local School Systems

Rationale: Historically, the principal has been expected to be both a manager and an instructional leader. For too many years, however, principals have been overwhelmed with the managerial aspects of the job. With the advent of increased accountability and the need to focus on raising student achievement, the principal's primary role has shifted much more to that of instructional leader. At the same time, additional support has not been provided to principals to meet these expanded expectations. The current reality is that the job of the principal has grown beyond an individual's ability to be effective in both areas without significantly sacrificing quality of life issues, a major reason that it is difficult to get people to consider the principalship as a career path. With additional support for building management, the principal will be able to focus on the most critical aspect of the job, that of instructional leader. The building manager's responsibilities would be those of a non-instructional nature as determined by the LEA in order to allow the principal greater focus on improving the instructional program.

The first Task Force on the Principalship (2000) offered this as one of its primary recommendations. However, few school systems have implemented the recommendation. It needs to be addressed if the job of the principal is to be manageable and desirable.

3. Provide by July 1, 2010, contracts for all principals that are school specific and that can only be voided for cause as outlined in COMAR or by mutual consent; and

Provide by July 1, 2010, contracts for assistant principals that can only be voided for cause as outlined in COMAR or by mutual consent.

Responsibility: State Legislature; Local School Systems

Rationale: One disincentive for potential school leaders is lack of job security, which could be alleviated by providing contracts for principals. The Task Force also believes that

contracts would be beneficial not only to the principal, but also to the school system as well, particularly if strong principal professional growth programs are in place. Contracts would offer the incentive of job security to attract good leaders to the principalship, and the school system would be able to retain high quality principals for a substantial period of time in order to be able to maintain stability and effect progress in student achievement. The contracts should contain provisions pertaining to renewal or non-renewal. Additionally, there would need to be provision to allow for possible reassignment of the principal in the event that the school moves into the priority stage of the differentiated accountability* for *No Child Left Behind*.

The rationale for assistant principals is the same as for principals with one exception. The Task Force believes that contracts for assistant principals should not be limited to a specific school. Assistant principals expand their skills by working with different principals and having a variety of other learning experiences prior to assuming the principalship. Being assigned to a specific school for an extended period may not be in the best interest of an assistant principal who is being groomed for the principalship. The assistant principal should have an automatic renewal clause similar to that of the principal.

*“Differentiated accountability” refers to a school in any stage of improvement status for not making Adequate Yearly Progress as structured by the present *No Child Left Behind* law.

- 4. Allow principals of schools in any stage of differentiated accountability by July 1, 2010, the flexibility to select their entire administrative teams from the pool of available candidates;**

Allow all principals by July 1, 2011, the flexibility to select a minimum of one member of their administrative teams from the pool of available candidates; and

Require school systems to develop a plan by July 1, 2012, that would allow all principals the flexibility to choose their entire administrative teams from the pool of available candidates.

Responsibility: Local School Systems

Rationale: Unless there is a compelling reason to do otherwise, principals who are held accountable for student performance in their schools should be given flexibility to select the persons who will be critical to their success from a pool of available candidates identified by the superintendent. The Task Force realizes that allowing principals to select their own administrative teams may cause some initial upheaval in the school system, so a phase-in approach to this action is recommended. It should be noted, however, that the Task Force believes such upheaval will be good for students in the long run because it encourages greater stability and cohesiveness among administrative teams. The Task Force also recognizes the need to assure racial, ethnic, and gender diversity among administrative teams, and guidelines should be established in each local school system to accomplish that goal.

5. Provide by July 1, 2010, a systemic, comprehensive structure for professional growth of principals and assistant principals.

Responsibility: MSDE; Local School Systems

Rationale: The development and recognition of leadership requires a structured plan and process – one that is cumulative and ongoing in nature – to ensure the success of all who choose to undertake the role of a leader. As instructional leaders, principals and assistant principals need to engage in activities that provide them with opportunities to develop a broader perspective related to current issues and to continue their profession growth. Participating in a variety of learning opportunities, consistent with the LEA’s professional development plan, offers principals and assistant principals the chance to learn from leading experts in the education field, network with colleagues facing similar challenges in different environments, and present their own unique ideas and programs. Principals and assistant principals should also be allowed time for leadership training, for visits to other schools, for participation in professional organizations, and for expanding opportunities for electronic means for professional development. The goal of the LEA should be to ensure quality performance of administrators by looking at consistency and alignment with professional development standards and the *Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework*. There also should be a balance between “centralized” staff development, such as is afforded through MSDE’s Division for Leadership Development and through local “grow your own” programs.

6. Provide by July 1, 2010, an annual statewide Principals’ Academy available to all principals based on the *Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework*.

Responsibility: State Legislature; MSDE

Rationale: Because improving student achievement is the primary goal of every school in Maryland, instructional leadership has emerged as the major responsibility of every principal and assistant principal in the state. The Maryland State Department of Education has taken the leadership in developing the *Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework*. Based on extensive research and drawing on several local and national studies, this document describes the outcomes that are expected of Maryland’s principals as they provide instructional leadership for their schools. All principals in the state should complete an in-depth analysis of the *Framework* and identify the specific steps they need to take to exercise the level of instructional leadership that will be necessary for all students in their schools to be successful. The Principals’ Academy will focus on the *Framework* outcomes and will provide the opportunity for all principals to interact in both formal and informal venues with state and national experts in the field of instructional leadership. Attendees will also be able to network with other principals in regional and topic-specific forums to update their knowledge and skills.

As an outgrowth of this Academy, provision should be made for multi-county and/or statewide symposia on varied topics listed in an electronic clearinghouse as development opportunities for principals. The Academy could also lead to the establishment of an Electronic Learning Community designed to support the work of principals throughout the state. Progressive pedagogy, a bibliography of best practices, and a bank of current and relevant resources would support the creation of professional learning communities as a means of collaboration, continuous growth, and collegiality. Principals need a mechanism to share best practices in real time and to find solutions to common problems and issues throughout the state. Time management for principals would also be enhanced through Electronic Learning Communities. This format allows for the various learning styles of principals, as well as meeting scheduling needs. The use of an electronic network would open up the possibility of mentoring, idea-sharing, and problem-solving on a broader scale than ever before. Turnaround time for question and response and/or discussion would be minimal, and the statewide network would provide an excellent opportunity for the continuation of the principal-to-principal networking that is established each summer at the Maryland Principals' Academy.

7. Provide by July 1, 2010, a comprehensive mentoring program for newly assigned principals and assistant principals.

Responsibility: State Legislature; MSDE; Local School Systems

Rationale: A comprehensive mentoring program should exist in all jurisdictions for all newly assigned principals and assistant principals, consistent with the LEA's overall professional development plan for principals. The mentors may come from a variety of sources – current principals, members of the central office staff, or retired principals. There would also be possibilities for online mentoring when a sufficient structure is put in place. The design and structure of such a program would be based on local circumstances and would be consistent with state professional development standards as delineated in COMAR. Standards for mentoring should be developed, and retiree mentors should be required to have a valid state certificate on file.

It should be noted that the Task Force further believes that newly assigned principals throughout the state could benefit from the valuable resources that exist in retired administrators who have both the knowledge of the principalship and the understanding of the local LEA. However, the retired principals currently may not be rehired to mentoring positions without severe limitations imposed by the current pension laws. Part of the overall mentoring strategy should be to revise the Maryland State Retirement System regulations to allow retire/rehire principals to return as mentors to the LEA from which they retired without pension limitations.

8. Provide by July 1, 2010, multiple opportunities for aspiring principals to engage in instructional leadership in order to properly prepare them for the principalship.

Responsibility: State Legislature; MSDE; Local School Systems; Principals

Rationale: Assistant principals need multiple opportunities for instructional leadership, and they need to be nurtured in that regard by the principal, one of whose responsibilities is to identify and support potential candidates for the principalship. Quality leadership succession requires attention to those who will one day assume higher leadership positions. The *Leadership Succession Planning Guide for Maryland Schools* identifies the kinds of instructional and managerial experiences that assistant principals should have. Principals need to ensure that such experiences are part of the job assignment for their assistant principals.

Additionally, where possible, the Task Force believes that carefully selected classroom teachers should be provided similar opportunities by being relieved of teaching responsibilities for a specified period of time in order to experience various leadership positions. Because in some systems in Maryland, the teacher interns retain full teaching responsibilities, their internship activities tend to be limited and fragmented. The Task Force suggests funding of internships, during which teachers with high leadership potential, as identified by their school systems, are relieved of their teaching responsibilities and able to focus full time on learning the essential responsibilities of being an assistant principal. Each district should be encouraged to develop such programs so that teacher interns can devote full time and energy to learn how to become a school leader.

Professional Development Schools* (PDS) in Maryland are showing extraordinary success in the preparation of teachers for Maryland schools. The retention rate of teachers who come through these schools significantly exceeds the comparable rate for teachers who do not receive such training. The Task Force believes that the State should replicate the concept of PDS for potential school leaders by creating Leadership Development Schools. These Leadership Development Schools could be a culminating experience for potential school leaders who engage in a year-long professional development experience to prepare them for an internship. Following the internship experience, the candidate would be deemed ready for an assistant principalship.

* Professional Development School: A Professional Development School is a collaboratively planned and implemented partnership for the academic and clinical preparation of interns and the continuous professional development of both school system and institution of higher education (IHE) faculty. The focus of the PDS partnership is improved student performance through research-based teaching and learning. A PDS may involve a single or multiple schools, school systems and IHEs and may take many forms to reflect specific partnership activities and approaches to improving both teacher education and PreK-12 schools. (www.marylandpublicschools.com)

Long Term Recommendations

9. Establish by July 1, 2012, Administrator III certification based on the work currently under way with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Responsibility: State Legislature; MSDE

Rationale: Certification requirements for principals in Maryland are found in the Code of Maryland Regulations (see COMAR 13A.12.04.05). In order to become an assistant principal in Maryland a candidate must achieve Administrator I status. Those who wish to become principals must achieve Administrator II status. At the present time, the only difference between Administrator I status and Administrator II status is passing a test approved by the Maryland State Board of Education (currently the School Leaders Licensure Assessment). This assessment is in the process of being revised, and the new assessment, once it is completed, will be monitored to ensure that it meets Maryland's recruitment needs in the future. There is an additional section in the regulations (COMAR 13A.12.04.05) that allows for an alternative pathway to the principalship. Recipients of this certificate are called Resident Principals, similar to the Resident Teacher status conferred on teachers who pursue the appropriate alternative route.

In addition, states throughout the country are working to develop, recognize, and retain highly effective principals after they have received the required state certification. To this end, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) is developing Advanced Principal Certification geared to the successful principal who creates a culture that advances student learning and engagement, recruits and retains the best teachers, and improves teacher and school performance. The system is similar to what is already in place for teachers. Principals should be afforded the same opportunity as teachers to successfully complete the certification process set forth by the NBPTS. The State should create a new classification - Administrator III - that would reward principals monetarily for reaching this advanced level of certification.

10. Create by July 1, 2011, a pipeline of potential principals by developing an *Officers to Principals* program modeled after the *Troops to Teachers* program.

Responsibility: Federal Government; State Legislature; MSDE; Institutions of Higher Education

Rationale: There already exists an alternative pathway for professionals from other fields to enter the principalship. The Code of Maryland Regulations (13A.12.04.05) describes the Resident Principal Certificate. This provision allows a local superintendent to recommend a person with appropriate professional experience (e.g., a CEO of a company) to serve as a principal under certain conditions. An *Officers to Principals* program is a specific proposal

that can meet an identified need due to emerging world circumstances and the drawdown of troops from overseas. This program would help address the principal shortage issue by increasing the pool of qualified leaders, and, in so doing, could be a model for the country. Such a program would also benefit the state financially by enticing retired military officers to remain in Maryland. The *Officers to Principals* structure could mirror the national *Troops to Teachers* program that is already in place. Maryland is an ideal state in which to initiate this type of program because of the large number of military bases. Maryland bases include Andrews Air Force Base (P.G. Co.); Meade Army (A.A. Co.); PAX River Air Force (St. Mary's Co.); Aberdeen (Harford Co.); Fort Detrick (Frederick Co.); Walter Reed (Washington D.C.); and National Guard units statewide. With the influx of large numbers of military personnel due to the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC), Maryland is very well positioned for such an initiative.

This program would capitalize an officer's desire, commitment, and lifelong philosophy relative to public service. The officers selected for the program would continue to contribute in a meaningful way, use their leadership skills, and be paid at an appropriate level. Since officers at the level likely targeted for this program retire at an approximate yearly income of \$55,000-\$70,000 including benefits, coupling this retirement benefit with a beginning salary at the assistant principal level would be an attractive incentive. Their training would center on instructional leadership matters and pedagogy related to the principalship to augment the officers' already existing administrative and managerial skills. Their coursework would be accomplished through a partnership with an institution of higher education and would also include seminars facilitated by members of MSDE.

Appendix A: Invitation to Offer Written Testimony



Nancy S. Grasmick
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, MD 21201 410-767-0100 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD

TO: Superintendents, Maryland Local Education Agencies (LEA)
Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland
Maryland State Teachers Association Board of Directors
Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals
Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals
Maryland Association of School Personnel Administrators
PreK-12 Principals Advisory Council
LEA Board of Education Presidents
LEA Human Resources Directors
Maryland Association of Boards of Education
Maryland Parent Teacher Association
Presidents, Two and Four-Year Institutions of Higher Education
Chief Academic Officers, Two and Four-Year Institutions of Higher Education
(to be shared with Deans, etc.)
Deans & Directors of Teacher Education, Two and Four-Year Inst. of Higher Ed.
Maryland Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
Maryland Association of Teacher Educators
Educational Administration Higher Education Coordinators
Achievement Initiative for Maryland's Minority Students Steering Committee
Maryland Independent College and University Association
Maryland Association of Community Colleges
Eastern Shore Educational Consortium
Maryland Business Roundtable for Education
Members, Education Industry Initiative, Governor's Workforce Investment Board
Executive Officers
Principals (to be shared with Assistant Principals)

FROM: Ms. Mary Cary and Dr. Betty Morgan, Co-Chairs
Governor's Principals' Task Force

DATE: November 21, 2008

SUBJECT: Recommendations for the Governor's Principals' Task Force

In the fall of 2008, Governor Martin O'Malley's P20 Leadership Council agreed to convene a task force to develop a comprehensive set of recommendations to address critical questions concerning the recruitment, retention, and development of qualified principals in the state.

marylandpublicschools.org

The Governor has requested that we co-chair the Principals' Task Force. The Task Force members are a broadly representative group of individuals who will work over the next several months to report their final recommendations to the P20 Leadership Council of Maryland.

To fulfill our charge, it is important that the Principals' Task Force hear from the many sectors of the education community. We invite you to present in writing your recommendations for solutions to one or more of the many overlapping facets of the concerns facing us in Maryland as we work to ensure that each school has an outstanding leader. We ask that you submit a written summary of your recommendation(s) and a brief rationale for each (one page per recommendation-rationale). These submissions will enable Task Force members to have your ideas at hand as they shape their final recommendations. Please feel free to share this with other stakeholders as you deem appropriate. We ask that you offer your recommendations within one or more of these general categories:

1. Principal recruitment (for example, alternative certification, mentoring programs, and professional development experiences)
2. Principal retention (for example, tuition reimbursement, bonuses and stipends, and rewards)
3. Principal development (for example, professional development experiences, and mentoring)

We also ask that your recommendations take into consideration how the strategies you offer might be marketed or otherwise communicated (for example, information for the media, for stakeholders at all educational levels, and for the purpose of engaging aspiring leaders or career changers).

Please e-mail your written recommendations **by January 9, 2009**, to Joe Freed, Staff Specialist of High School and Postsecondary Initiatives, at the Maryland State Department of Education, at jfreed@msde.state.md.us.

For more information, please contact one of the Task Force staff members:

1. Tom DeHart Specialist, Succession Initiatives, MD State Dept. of Education (MSDE), tdehart@msde.state.md.us; 410-767-0232
2. Joe Freed, Specialist, High School & Postsecondary Initiatives, MD State Dept. of Education (MSDE), jfreed@msde.state.md.us; 410-767-0725
3. Jeanne Hammond, Specialist, Elementary School Initiatives, MD State Dept. of Education (MSDE), jhammond@msde.state.md.us; 410-767-0761
4. Shulamit Finkelstein, Executive Assistant for Strategic Planning, Board & Community Relations, Washington County Public Schools, Finkeshu@wcboe.k12.md.us

Please share this message with your constituents and other important stakeholders.

cc: Members, Principals' Task Force

Appendix B: Written Testimony Offered

Sydney Cousin, Superintendent, Howard County Public Schools

Barbara Dezmon, Chair, Achievement Initiative for Maryland's Minority Students (AIMMS)
Steering Committee

Dr. Judith Docca, Member, Board of Education, Montgomery County Public Schools

Patricia Dorsey, Principal, Friendship Valley Elementary School, Carroll County Public Schools

John W. Festerman, Principal, Whittier Elementary School, Frederick County Public Schools

Peter Kannam, New Leaders for New Schools

R. Owen Johnson, Member, Prince George's County Board of Education

Walter Mills III, Principal, Middle River Middle School, Baltimore County Public Schools

Diane Mohr, Montgomery County Public Schools

Dr. Peter Murrell, Dean, School of Education, Loyola College

Janet E. Pauls, Principal, Church Hill Elementary School, Queen Anne's County Public Schools

Principals' Advisory Committee, Division for Leadership Development

Provost, Chairs, and Deans, University of Maryland Baltimore County

James Richmond, Superintendent, Charles County Public Schools

Debbie Ritchie, President, Maryland PTA

Cheryl Thim, Principal, Bear Creek Elementary School, Baltimore County Public Schools

Dr. Traki Taylor-Webb, Dean, College of Education, Bowie State University

Rob SantaCroce, Principal, Sparrows Point High School, Baltimore County Public Schools

Sr. Sharon Slear, Dean, School of Education, College of Notre Dame

M. Jacques Smith, Principal, Chesapeake Bay Middle School, Anne Arundel County Public Schools

Henry V. Wagner, Jr., Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, Dorchester County Public School

Appendix C: Bibliography

In addition to the bibliography below, the Task Force wishes to acknowledge that the *Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework (2005)*, the *Leadership Succession Planning Guide for Maryland Schools (2006)*, *Achievement Matters Most: Report of the Visionary Panel (2002)*, and the *Maryland Task Force on the Principalship (2000)* all had a rich list of bibliographic entries that were the foundation of the recommendations in those reports. By using those reports, we feel that we have also incorporated those entries into our work but did not feel it was necessary to include the entire list from each of those reports into our own bibliography.

Achilles, C.M. & Keedy, J.L. (1983/1984). Principal norm setting as a component of effective schools. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision. 1*, 58-68.

Barth, R (1990). *Improving schools from within*. San Francisco,CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bennis, W. (2003). *On becoming a leader*. Cambridge, MA: Basic Books.

Blumberg, A. & Greenfield, W. (1980). *The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bookbinder, R.M. (1992). *The principal: Leadership for the effective and productive school*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Brookover, W. (1979). *School social systems and student achievement: Schools can make a difference*. New York, NY: Praeger.

Brookover, W. (1981). Review of why do some urban schools succeed? The Phi Delta Kappa study of exceptional urban elementary schools. *Harvard Educational Review. 51*, 439-440.

Burr, A. (1993). *Being an effective principal*. Paper presented at the Missouri Leadership Academy, Columbia, MO.

Cawelti, G.(2001). *Six districts, One goal of excellence*. National Staff Development Council. *Certification – Supervisors and Principals*. In *Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) Vol. 13A.12.04.05*.

Connecticut Principals Center. (2004). *The 21st century: A call to action*. The Connecticut Association of Schools.

Corderio, P. (1994). *The principal's role in curricular leadership and program development*. In L.W. Highes (Ed.), *The principal as leader*. (pp. 161-183). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

- Cotton, K. (1995). Effective schooling practices: A research synthesis 1995 update. Retrieved April 1, 2005, Web site: <http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/esp/esp95.html>
- Cotton, K. (2003). Principals and student achievement: What the research says. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Crowson, R.L. & Porter-Gehrie, C. (1981). The urban school principalship: An organizational stability role. *Planning and Changing*, 12(1), 26-53.
- Darling-Hammond L. & Orphanos, S. (2005). *Leadership development in California*. Institute for Research on Education Policy & Practice, Stanford University.
- Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., Myerson, D., & Orr, M. (2007). *Preparing School Leaders for a Changing World: Lessons from Exemplary Leadership Development Programs – Final Report*. Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.
- De Bevoise, W. (1984). Synthesis of research on the principal as instructional leader. *Educational Leadership*, 41(5), 14-20.
- DeVita, M. Christine. (2007). *Education leadership: A bridge to school reform*. New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation.
- DuFour, R. (1991). *The principal as staff developer*. Bloomington, IN: National Education Service.
- Duke, D.L. (1982). What can principals do? Leadership functions and instructional effectiveness. *NAASP Bulletin*, 66(456), 1-12.
- Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 15-24.
- Edmonds, R. (1982). Programs of school improvement: an overview. *Educational Leadership*, 40(3), 4-12.
- Elmore, R. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Washington, DC: Albert Shanker Institute.
- Fiore, D. (1999). *The relationship between principal effectiveness and school culture in elementary schools*. Doctorial dissertation. Terre Haute, IN: Indiana University.
- Fullan, M. (2006). *Quality leadership, quality learning: Proof beyond a reasonable doubt*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto.
- Gersten, R., Carnine, D., & Green, S. (1982). The principal as instructional leader: A second look. *Educational Leadership*, 24(5), 47-50.
- Goldhaber, D. (2007). *Principal compensation: More research needed on a promising reform*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.

- Golding, E. & Rallis, S. (1993). *Principals of dynamic schools: Taking charge of change*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Gray, C., Fry, B., Bottoms, G., O'Neill, K., & Walker, S. (2007). *Schools need good leaders now: State progress in creating a learning-centered school leadership system*. Southern Regional Education Board Report.
- Gullatt, D.E. & Lofton, B.D. (1996). *The principal's role in promoting academic gain*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 403227). Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/>
- Hall, G., Rutherford, W., Hord, S., & Huling, L.L. (1984). Effects of three principal styles on school improvement. *Educational Leadership*, 41(5), 22-29.
- Hargreaves, A. (2003). *Succeeding leaders: A study of principal succession and sustainability*. Ontario, Canada: Ontario Principals' Council.
- Hargreaves, A. & Fink, D. (2003). The seven principles of sustainable leadership. *Educational Leadership*.
- Holland, H. (2008). *Out of the office and into the classroom*. Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy: University of Wisconsin.
- Kouzes, J. & Posner, B. (2002). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Leithwood, K.A. & Montgomery, D.J. (1982). The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement. *Review of Educational Research*, 52(3), 309-339.
- Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders*. Washington, DC: The Education Schools Project.
- Lezotte, L. (1991). *Correlates to effective schools: The first and second generation*. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products.
- Lezotte, L. (1992). "Principal" insights from effective schools. *Education Digest*, 58(3), 14-17.
- Lezotte, L. W. & Bancroft, B.A. (1985). Growing use of the effective schools models for school improvement. *Educational Leadership*, 42(6), 23-28.
- Lovely, S. (2004). *Staffing the principalship*. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Maryland State Board of Education (2008). Minutes from Maryland State Board of Education October meeting.
- Maryland State Department of Education (2002). *Achievement Matters Most: Report of the Visionary Panel*.

- Maryland State Department of Education (2008). *Leadership Learning Series*.
- Maryland State Department of Education (2006). *Leadership Succession Planning Guide for Maryland Schools*.
- Maryland State Department of Education (2005). *Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework*.
- Maryland State Department of Education (2008). *Maryland Leadership Development Program*.
- Maryland State Department of Education (2008). Agenda, Maryland Principals' Academy.
- Maryland State Department of Education, (2003). Overview – Maryland Professional Development Planning Guide. Retrieved March 26, 2009, from Maryland State Department of Education Web site:
www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/divisions/instruction/planning_guide
- Maryland State Department of Education (2000). *Maryland Task Force on the Principalship*.
- Maryland State Department of Education (2001). *Maryland Task Force on the Principalship Clearing the Plate Workgroup Report*.
- Maryland State Department of Education (2001). *Maryland Task Force on the Principalship Compensation Workgroup Report*.
- Maryland State Department of Education, (1997-2008). Maryland Teacher Professional Development Standards. Retrieved March 26, 2009, from School Improvement in Maryland Web site:
http://mdk12.org/instruction/professional_development/teachers_standards.html
- Maryland State Department of Education (2008). *Maryland Teacher Staffing Report 2008-2010*.
- Marzano, R., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Morgan, E.M. (2008). *Background briefing on the status of the public school principalship in the state of Maryland – A white paper*.
- Morgan, E. M. (1987). *Magnet schools: The role of the principal*. Doctorial Dissertation, Washington, DC: American University.
- Morris, U.C., Crowson, R.L., Hurwitz, E., & Porter-Gehrie, C. (1982). The urban principal: Middle manager in the educational bureaucracy. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 64(10), 689-692.
- National Conference of State Legislators. (2008). *Strong leaders strong schools: 2007 state law*.

- National Association of Secondary School Principals. (2001). *Priorities and barriers in high school leadership*. Reston, VA.
- National Staff Development Council. (2000). *Learning to lead, leading to learn: Improving school quality through principal professional development*.
- Odden, A. (1995). *Educational leadership for America's schools*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Ohio Leadership Advisory Council. (2008). *Leadership development framework*. Peterson, K. (1999). *The role of principals in successful schools*. Retrieved March 22, 2004, Web site: http://www.wcer.wise.edu/ccvi/zz-pubs/Reform-Talk/Year_1999/3_99.pdf.
- Portin, B. (2004). The roles that principals play. *Educational Leadership*, 61(7), 14-19.
- Rammer, R. (2007). *Call to action for superintendents: Change the way you hire principals*. Wheaton, IL: Heldruel Publications.
- Resident Principals Certificate*. In *Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR)* Vol. 13A.12.04.05.
- Schlechty, P. (1993). On the frontier of school reform: Trailblazers, pioneers, and settlers. *Journal of Staff Development*, v14n4, 46-51.
- Senge, P. et al. (2000). *Schools that learn*. New York, NY: Doubleday
- Sergiovani, T.J. (1984, 1991, & 1992). Leadership and excellence in schooling. *Educational Leadership*, 41(5), 4-23.
- Speck, M. (1999). *The principalship: Building a learning community*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice-Hall.
- Stein, S. & Curtis, R. (2008). *Preparing principals to lead learning* (academic paper in draft form -- permission given to distribute).
- Strother, D.B. (1983). The many roles of the effective principal. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 65 (5), 291-294.
- Strother, D.B. (Ed.). (1984). *The role of the principal*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappan.
- Sweeny, J. (1982). Research synthesis on effective school leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 39(6), 346-352.
- Wallace Foundation. (2008). *Becoming a leader: Preparing principals for today's schools* New York.
- Waters, T., Marzano, R. & McNulty, B. (2004). Developing the science of educational leadership. *ERS Spectrum*, 22(1), 4-13.
- Wellish, J.B. (1978). School management and the organization in successful schools. *Sociology of Education*, 51(5), 211-226.

- Whitaker, T. (1999). *Dealing with difficult teachers*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Whitaker, T. & Fiore, D. (2001). *Dealing with difficult parents (and with parents in difficult situations)*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Whitaker, T., Whitaker, B., & Lumpa, D. (2000). *Motivating and inspiring teachers: The educational leader*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Whitaker, T. (2003). *What great principals do differently*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Wolcott, H. (2003). *The man in the principal's office*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Young, P.G., Sheets, J.M., & Knight, D. (2005). *Mentoring principals*. Thousand Oaks, Corwin Press.