



Teacher and Leader Effectiveness and Standards and Assessment Community of Practice

Race to the Top

*State Strategies to Improve Instructional Leadership
Practices, Systems and Structures*

INFORMATIONAL SUMMARY

September 2012



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On July 13, 2012, the Reform Support Network (RSN) held an expert convening on instructional leadership to inform the support activities of the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness and Standards and Assessment Community of Practice (CoP). Participants included RSN staff, key staff from the U.S. Department of Education and several leaders in the field of instructional leadership, including Karla Brooks Baehr, Josh Edelman, Tracy Epp, Ben Fenton, Michael Moore, Jody Spiro, Brad Jupp, Aaron Pinter-Petrillo, Ann Whalen, Tyra Mariani, Tyra Stewart, Pat Barrett, Peggy Zelinko, Elizabeth Shaw, Jenn Vranek, Phil Gonring, Amanda Perkins Walsh, T.J. Horwood and Sarah Johnson.

The goals of the convening were to reach agreement on key leadership behaviors, responsibilities and actions related to teacher evaluation and development systems for this new era of college and career-ready standards for all; prioritize key levers to support instructional leaders as they seek to improve teacher practice; and identify and align resources and supports for States, local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools that seek to improve instructional leadership. While recognizing that there is a broader human-capital continuum related to instructional leadership, the experts advised that RSN should focus its technical assistance supports in the following five areas within the human-capital continuum:

- Preparation programs
- Licensure and relicensure
- Performance management, including:
 - Principal evaluation
 - Roles and career pathways

The group suggested that these five levers had the most potential to ensure that every school building has a principal with the set of skills necessary to implement new reforms and markedly improve student outcomes. RSN aims to focus its instructional leadership technical assistance activities on the most critical interactions between teachers and building-level instructional leaders (principals, coaches, master teachers) centered on classroom practice, as well as on the systemic supports (with an emphasis on hiring, assignment, evaluation and coaching/development) that enable those interactions.

To inform its support priorities and the upcoming RSN convening focused on instructional leadership, RSN compiled detailed reports on the implementation status of States' efforts to improve instructional leadership systems and structures.¹ This report provides a summary and analysis of what States

¹ Citations are included in the individual, detailed 19 State status reports. The American Institute for Research and Education First reviewed the following sources: the U.S. Department of Education Race to the Top Year 1 Program Assessment, the U.S. Department of Education-approved amendments to State plans, U.S. Department of Education annual and progress reports, SEA websites, Race to the Top proposals, Race to the Top scopes of work and Elementary and Secondary Education Act flexibility request applications. We also met informally with the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness leads in each State. We had discussions with 17 out of the 19 States (we were unable to connect with AZ and PA). The other 17 States reviewed and

reported regarding the status of instructional leader evaluation implementation in each of the following priority policy levers:

- I. [Instructional leader effectiveness strategies, components and timelines](#)
- II. [Principal preparation](#)
- III. [Licensure and relicensure](#)
- IV. [Performance management](#)
- V. [Principal evaluation](#)
- VI. [Roles and career pathways](#)

approved their respective State summary reports, and the data in this report is based on the data collected and the State discussions.

MAJOR FINDINGS

Major Components and Timelines

- Instructional leadership policies are primarily focused on principals and assistant principals, though some States are considering expanding evaluations to instructional coaches and model teachers.
- Most States report being challenged by the pace of implementation, the complexity of implementing multiple, complex elements at once (for example, teacher and principal evaluation and implementation of the college- and career-ready standards), and giving each equitable time and consideration.
- The majority of States (AZ, CO, FL, GA, HI, IL, KY, MA, MD, NJ, OH, PA and RI) are moving to full scale State implementation in 2013–2014 and 2014–2015. New York and Tennessee are moving to full-scale implementation in 2012–2013, and only Maryland is planning for full implementation by 2015–2016. Washington, DC, Delaware and Louisiana state that they are currently undergoing full implementation.

Principal Preparation, Licensure and Relicensure

- State leaders report using licensure/certification as policy levers that are within the States' regulatory authority, and, as such, both are critical levers at the States' disposal to change barriers to entry and to improve the quality of candidates entering programs, reframe the curricula used to train future principals to better reflect the demands of new educator effectiveness systems and the CCRS, create new rigorous routes to certification, and hold preparation programs accountable for the quality and effectiveness of their principal graduates.
- Most States are making principal preparation more rigorous and aligned to new evaluation systems. The more aggressive States are completely revamping their preparation systems by instituting new policies that require all preparation programs to reapply for program certification and putting in place new requirements around curriculum- and performance-based assessments for graduates.
- Several States also have made important changes to principal relicensure policies, making it possible to revoke the licenses of principals who are not effective. Colorado, Delaware, Louisiana and Rhode Island require that both new and licensed principals meet new criteria and demonstrate effectiveness to secure and maintain their license.

Performance Management

- Several States are developing or improving the capacity of their longitudinal data systems that link student, teacher and district performance data. Some are creating report cards and new measures, as well as monitoring performance metrics on implementation of the Race to the Top metrics.
- State ability to monitor quality implementation of instructional leader evaluations and provide support to LEAs can be challenging and depends on whether the State specified a single approach or permitted multiple approaches for districts to develop their own evaluation models. In States such as Rhode Island, where there is more consistency across LEA models, the State reported better control over the quality and consistency of the training it provided and its ability to provide one-on-one support to schools or LEAs.

Principal Evaluation

- Eleven States are explicitly aligning their principal and teacher evaluation criteria to their efforts surrounding the CCRS and their teacher evaluation systems. For instance, many have incorporated the adoption of instructional shifts for the CCRS in their principal and teacher evaluations. Others have integrated the adoption of the CCRS in trainings for principals on new teacher evaluations to better integrate the two elements.
- Some States report that providing training for districts on the new evaluation structure has proven challenging depending on the size of the State and the degrees of freedom that LEAs have in adopting the State model. Smaller States, such as Delaware, Hawaii and Rhode Island, can more easily reach all principals. In larger States, State education agency (SEA) staff is thinking proactively about how to leverage their existing training organizations. For instance, 11 States are redesigning the purpose and structure of their regional training offices to provide districts with training and support.²

Roles and Career Pathways

- Career advancement for an instructional leader is typically a local practice, guided by local policies, including collective-bargaining agreements. Despite these circumstances, some States are implementing incentives that would encourage LEAs to create career ladders and new pathways to leadership. The majority of States (CO, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, IL, KY, LA, MA, NY, OH, RI and TN) are providing incentives and models to help districts develop local models of performance-based career ladders and compensation structures.

² Due to varying levels of detail in State discussions, we were unable to consistently determine which States were developing temporary versus permanent capacity. This is an important concept that deserves future study.

I. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER EFFECTIVENESS STRATEGIES, COMPONENTS AND TIMELINES

Instructional leadership is a top driver to improve teaching practice and therefore student achievement. It encompasses *people* (principals; school-based teacher leaders and instructional coaches; and central office staff, such as curriculum, professional development, human capital and principal supervisors), *systems* (for example, the systemic approach in Illinois' 2010 Principal Preparation legislation) and *structures* (for example, the structures put in place to improve educational leader preparation in Louisiana).

When RSN describes State capacity, we describe a context bigger than the SEA itself. Rather, we refer to the capacity of the entire State—SEAs, LEAs, institutions of higher education (IHEs), and community, union, professional and advocacy organizations—which comprise a much more abundant and flexible resource, especially when they work together to create alignment and synergy across a decentralized and too often siloed system. We describe instructional leadership at the school, district or State level similarly.

If we think of the instructional leader as the principal or administrators at a school, it is a highly limited resource. Understood this way, we are tempted to think of a heroic leader, who in rare cases exists, but it is impossible to replicate this at scale. RSN describes instructional leadership as the work of setting direction, motivating and supporting staff towards goals, assessing progress, and driving continuous, collaborative organizational improvement that results in strong classroom practice and student achievement. Instructional leadership is a critical factor in improving teacher practice and student learning. Instructional leaders can be principals, assistant principals, teacher leaders, coaches, and central office staff that supervise and support school leaders and teachers. In order to establish strong building-level instructional leadership, States need to develop comprehensive systems that fundamentally rethink how leaders will be identified, trained, managed and evaluated. This requires a well-planned strategy aligned with the State's student achievement goals and a definition of leadership.

Principals at the Center

In our information gathering, several State leaders noted the need to broaden the role of the principal and to better leverage all of the instructional leadership at their school sites. However, our information gathering found that most States are focusing their efforts primarily on principals and assistant principals. All 19 States are focusing their efforts to improve the support and management of principals and assistant principals, given their central role in teacher evaluation and overall instructional improvement. The majority of States are focusing their strategies solely on principals and assistant principals, although States such as Florida, Louisiana, Maryland, North Carolina, Rhode Island and Tennessee plan to include teacher leaders, instructional coaches and other instructional lead personnel in their evaluation systems.

- **Louisiana** expanded its definition of “administrator” to include academic deans, coaches, master teachers and anyone responsible for providing instructional support for teachers. The State will include all of these positions in their instructional leader strategy.
- **North Carolina** has developed an optional evaluation instrument for other instructional leaders at the district level.
- **Colorado** is including teacher leaders and master teachers in their overall teacher effectiveness strategy. Both can serve as evaluators, coaches and mentors to help support teachers.

Key Levers to Improve Instructional Leadership

As stated above, in our information gathering we focused on five key policy areas to improve instructional leadership: evaluation, preparation programs, licensure and relicensure, performance management, and roles and career pathways. All 19 States are considering changes in policy or regulations to at least one of these policy areas, though States vary in terms of how aggressively they are making changes in all of the areas. Fifteen States (AZ, CO, DC, FL, GA, HI, KY, LA, MA, MD, NC, NJ, NY, OH, and PA) are working to establish more professional development opportunities for current leaders and using evaluations to inform human capital decisions.

Eight States (AZ, FL, HI, LA, MD, NJ, NC and NY) are building out their processes for identifying and training new leaders. These States are looking at elements throughout each stage of leader development, including strengthening their pipelines for school leaders, improving district processes for identifying and recruiting effective teachers as principals, and developing more rigorous curriculum for training instructional leaders. We expand on these reforms in later sections.

Implementation Timelines

The majority of States (AZ, CO, FL, GA, HI, IL, KY, MA, MD, NJ, OH, PA and RI) are moving to full-scale State implementation in 2013–2014 and 2014–2015. The Department can help States working with RSN to share best practices and lessons learned with each other as well as with other States not receiving RSN support, and only Maryland is planning for full implementation by 2015–2016. Washington, DC, Delaware and Louisiana state that they are currently undergoing full implementation.

II. PRINCIPAL PREPARATION

All 19 States have some work underway to reform principal preparation. State leaders report that both preparation and licensure/certification are policy levers that are within the States' regulatory authority. As such, State leaders see both policy areas as critical to raise the standards to entry; reframe the curricula used to train future principals to better reflect the demands of new educator effectiveness systems and the CCRS; create new, rigorous, residency-based routes to certification; and hold preparation programs accountable for the quality and effectiveness of their principal graduates. **Colorado**, for example, has partnered with The New Teacher Project to commission a report that puts forth a set of recommendations to redesign all of its policies surrounding licensure, certification and preparation of principals, and to align those policies with the CCRS.

All 19 States have regulatory authority to review and recommend authorization for principal preparation programs. Several States are leveraging this authority to put in place new rigorous standards for preparation programs.

- As part of the Race to the Top competition, **Illinois** began a full review of all principal preparation programs in the State. Approved programs must focus on instructional leadership and develop partnerships with local school districts. Furthermore, the State has also begun developing a performance-based assessment for principal candidates, including two five-hour sessions to ensure principals meet the new standards.
- **Florida** now uses a competency model for certification in educational leadership. It is developing a pilot program with Broward County and Florida Atlantic University that will provide school leadership candidates a seamless preparation experience that integrates their preparation and certification.
- **Hawaii** has full regulatory authority over leader preparation programs, and the SEA leads almost all of the work on principal development and training. It has created two new leadership pipelines through which SEA leaders are proactively identifying highly effective teacher leaders and providing them with leadership training. One of those new pipelines, the Professional Education Development and Research Institute, allows local superintendents to identify effective teacher leaders and place them into a leadership academy.
- **Delaware** introduced new regulations governing licensure and certification for principal preparation programs. These efforts were led by the Delaware Department of Education in conjunction with the Professional Standards Board. As part of their Race to the Top efforts, Delaware is investing \$1 million in the Leadership Project, which will create an alternative route for principals modeled after the New York City Leadership Academy. The new regulations would require a specific set of competencies and design requirements based on best practices for all new programs, and allow the State to hold preparation programs accountable for the quality of their principal graduates.

Partnering with Boards of Higher Education and Other Institutions Involved in Preparation

Several States (including CO, DE, GA, IL, KY, LA, NC, OH, and TN) are partnering with their higher education boards to improve principal preparation. Areas of collaboration include passing new regulations for certification of preparation programs, developing steering committees to inform teacher and leader evaluation development, and reporting on the effectiveness of preservice institutions.

- **Illinois** has developed a strong partnership with the Board of Higher Education to establish a system in which public universities in the State no longer develop preparation programs on their own, but rather in partnership with the State of Illinois and local districts.
- In **Louisiana**, the Board of Regents, Board of Elementary and Secondary Education and Louisiana Department of Education have worked collaboratively to change principal preparation policies and practices by requiring all universities to redesign their education leadership preparation programs. National experts were used to evaluate the quality of the programs. All pre-redesign programs were sunset and only post-redesign programs that met State expectations were jointly approved by the Board of Regents and Board of Elementary and Secondary Education for implementation. Through a grant from The Wallace Foundation that ends on December 31, 2012, the Louisiana Department of Education and Louisiana Board of Regents also have collaborated to implement new programs and procedures.
- In **Georgia**, the University System of Georgia (UGA) leads the efforts to improve teacher and principal preparation programs. The State meets quarterly with UGA key leadership and recently drafted teacher and leader effectiveness measures which would apply to the preparation programs. These would be piloted in 2013–2014 and roll out 2014–2015 statewide and would be used to determine program approval and State funding. In addition to partnering with their higher education boards on program approval and reporting, many States are partnering with IHEs to increase the level of coordination between preparation programs and districts to provide more seamless and practice-based preparation programs.
- **New York** has established an agreement with public higher education systems that will help the State coordinate its reforms around the CCRS and teacher evaluation with leader preparation. This will involve standardizing preparation materials and enable regular communication between the State and preparation programs.
- **Georgia** recently established an Innovation Fund designed to help participating Race to the Top districts to partner with institutions of higher education and nonprofit organizations. Allowable use of funds includes programs that will increase teacher and leader effectiveness by encouraging K-12 schools with preparation programs to work together to “bridge the gap between preservice and in-service.”

- **North Carolina** communicates regularly with the Deans Council, where the deans of education in North Carolina convene every month. The State has similar meetings with private schools of education and community colleges to set a more consistent agenda for preparation throughout the State. The State has intentionally developed close collaboration with IHEs and their Higher Education Board, and reports that this collaboration has resulted in improved practice.

Adapting Preparation Programs to Meet the Demands of New Educator Effectiveness Systems and College- and Career-Ready Standards

Most States report a shift to require preparation programs to specifically include training on new principal and teacher evaluation expectations (CO, LA, NY, OH and PA) and implementing college- and career-ready standards (CO, DC, DE, FL, HI, IL, LA, MD, NY, OH, PA and RI).³ Seven States (FL, HI, LA, MD, OH, PA, and RI) actively collaborate with preparation programs to align these programs to the new evaluation and to improve the quality of implementation. For instance, college campuses in **Louisiana** now have teams of eight members solely responsible for preparing for the implementation of college- and career-ready standards and the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers assessments. These teams initially were intended for preparing teacher candidates but will now also inform principal preparation.

Tracking Candidate Data to Improve Preparation Programs

The majority of States are developing report cards and creating feedback loops that use data from teacher and principal evaluation systems to drive improvement in preparation programs (CO, DC, DE, FL, GA, KY, LA, MA, MD, NC, NJ, NY, OH, RI and TN). Five of these States (DE, FL, GA, MA and OH) are tying State funding for preparation programs to the ongoing data on their candidate's performance. The State of **Florida** is implementing an electronic data collection, analysis and reporting tool to enable preparation programs to track and monitor candidate and completer data.

Aligning Alternative Route Programs to New Initiatives

Several States reported the need to improve and expand the array of alternative route programs as a lever to increase the pipeline of high-quality principal candidates. Nine of the States we spoke with report they have developed alternative pathways for principal certification to ease the process and attract higher-quality candidates (CO, GA, HI, KY, LA, MA, NY, RI and TN). In these cases, alternative programs are subject to the same requirements surrounding new reforms as traditional certification programs.

³ Some States refer to improving curricula but do not mention CCRS or teacher evaluation specifically.

- **Tennessee** is putting out grants to LEAs explicitly to develop new alternative certification programs for principals, which will need to adhere to the strict criteria the State already has in place for such programs.
- **Delaware** law allows alternative certification for principals and assistant principals, and the State is actively supporting the efforts of Delaware’s nonprofit and business community, which are working to bring national leaders in alternative certification for teachers and principals to the State. Innovative Schools, a Delaware nonprofit, is currently working to establish a partnership with the New York City Leadership Academy, which expects to bring ten leaders to Delaware per year to work in high-need schools.
- **Maryland** regulation allows LEAs and partnerships with LEAs and other organizations to design and operate alternative route programs. As part of their Race to the Top efforts, Maryland will continue a partnership with New Leaders for New Schools (NLNS) to work with five counties on the Eastern Shore, which are poorer and have leadership succession issues. NLNS has been working with these five counties and a university on their data analysis and problem solving to build a better pipeline for those school systems. Additionally, the State intends to create an Officers to Principals preparation program to train 15 exceptional leaders from the military to be principals.

III. LICENSURE AND RELICENSURE

As previously noted, State leaders believe that changes to principal licensure and relicensure policies and regulations are an important policy lever available to States. The majority of States (CO, DC, DE, IL, FL, GA, LA, MA, NC, NY, OH, RI and TN) have the authority to approve all licensure programs and issue licenses. Twelve States (AZ, CO, DE, FL, GA, IL, LA, MA, NJ, NY, RI and TN) have developed new, more-rigorous principal licensure requirements that incorporate evidence from principal performance and evaluation into licensure decisions.

- **Tennessee** has raised the barriers for becoming a principal. They now require that candidates demonstrate two years of effectiveness in their evaluation in order to advance or receive their leadership certification. Currently, principal licenses have a five-year renewal process and require a certain number of professional development hours. Tennessee is proposing to compress the window to two years and link the required development hours to the competencies in the principal rubric and tie it more closely to the principal and teacher evaluation results.
- **Massachusetts** is working with an independent group to develop a principal assessment to determine licensure based on the new principal standards. The performance-based assessment will provide a new framework for IHEs to improve the rigor of all principal preparation programs.
- **North Carolina** has launched three Regional Leadership Academies to provide an alternative route for principal certification. The academies provide initial licenses along with ongoing education for leaders.

Several States have been able to also make important changes to principal relicensure policies, making it possible to revoke the licenses of principals who are not effective. The four States below are requiring that both new and licensed principals meet criteria and demonstrate effectiveness to secure and maintain their license or certification.

- As part of its work with The New Teacher Project (TNTP), **Colorado** is considering two new types of licensure options for principals, requiring that both existing and newly licensed principals demonstrate effectiveness in order to obtain/retain their licenses. Administrators will need to receive three consecutive ratings of effective or higher to receive nonprobationary status. They will be able to move out of probationary status only if they receive two consecutive ineffective ratings.
- **Delaware** is requiring that all current principals take and pass new DPAS II content modules. Any principals who do not pass the new modules will lose their principal certification⁴.

⁴ In DE, licensure and certification are separate.

- **Louisiana** has developed a review process for both new and existing principals. To retain their leadership licensure, principals will need to demonstrate three years of effective evaluation ratings over a five-year span.
- **Rhode Island** is tying principal license renewal to their evaluations. If new principals are found to be ineffective for five consecutive years, the State will rescind their principal and teaching licenses.

IV. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

States are developing and using performance management systems that allow districts and States to collect performance data for teachers, principals and districts to accurately determine their levels of performance, make determinations about where to provide additional assistance and improve performance at all levels over time.

Improving State Data Collection and Longitudinal Data Systems

States recognize the importance of developing strong performance management systems that can accurately collect data and provide information to help them improve the performance of individual principals, as well as the overall instructional leadership systems and structures over time. States listed three primary goals regarding the data they collect:

1. Conduct research on the performance of leaders to identify best practices
2. Create feedback loops that provide support for struggling leaders based on quantitative and qualitative data
3. Create reports for schools and districts that catalogue strengths and weaknesses and improve collaboration across the State

A majority of States reported developing or improving the capacity of their longitudinal data systems that link student, teacher and district performance data (CO, DC, FL, GA, HI, IL, KY, LA, MA, MD, NC, NJ, NY, OH, RI and TN), which will improve their overall ability to improve the performance of the system over time, including the support and management of instructional leaders. State leaders reported that given the fast pace of the work and the challenges involved in building effective systems, it has been difficult to explicitly focus on the data needs of instructional leaders or use the data to specifically improve principal evaluation over time. Eight States (DE, GA, LA, MA, NC, NY, RI and TN) reported that they are creating report cards and new measures, as well as monitoring performance metrics on implementation of the Race to the Top metrics, which will include information on principal evaluation and effectiveness.

- **Colorado** is developing a comprehensive data system that will collect teacher- and school-level data with the goal of creating feedback loops that inform practice for all licensed educators and leaders. The State is currently developing effective practices for disseminating performance data to inform practice and is looking to partner with other States to share best practices.
- **Georgia** has developed an electronic platform it hopes will help ensure quality principal and teacher evaluation implementation at the district level. SEA staff will have access to school level reports, allowing them to monitor the percentage of teachers at each effectiveness rating and to look at patterns of over- or underscoring, and then deploy up to 20 field staff to provide support to principals that are struggling. Additionally, the State is contracting with an external evaluator to conduct surveys, focus groups and phone interviews with those engaged in the work, which will generate additional data on stakeholders' perception of implementation.

- **Louisiana** has created the Human Capital Information System, which allows State, district and school leaders to track student, teacher and principal data online, and creates a conversation between educators and evaluators. The system also aggregates data at the district level to better inform State decisions at multiple levels of leadership.

Learning from Leading Districts

Many States are working closely with districts to develop complementary district-level systems and approaches to performance management, which they can later expand throughout their States. These include data systems, data protocols and coaching structures that help measure and improve the performance of instructional leaders.

- **North Carolina** has developed a collaborative relationship among the State and its districts. State leaders meet quarterly with all of the LEA superintendents and instructional leaders to review data, work with research directors and have regional discussions regarding local performance and best practices. The State also is using online tools to improve district communication and share resources. State officials report that there is an expectation that SEA staff will conduct site visits to learn and understand what high-performing LEAs are doing to improve instructional leadership.
- **Florida** is providing grants to programs for training principals, school board members and other district leaders focusing on Common Core training and superintendent evaluation models. They also have created a position at the State level in charge of observing and evaluating local teacher and administrator evaluation systems. In 2012–2013, Florida plans to conduct a meaningful analysis of such programs.
- **Kentucky** built the Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System (CIITS), which is described as a “one-stop shop” technology support system for Kentucky educators that helps customize learning experiences for students, professional growth for educators and coordinated district/school-level planning and monitoring for student success. The Educator Development Suite (EDS), the component of the CIITS system specifically dedicated to teacher and leader effectiveness, will organize the teacher and leader effectiveness component to capture and analyze data for educator ratings and produce reports and dashboards. Data systems and use has been a key driver in Kentucky reforms. Working closely with the U.S. Education Delivery Institute, Kentucky has developed new ways of collecting and analyzing metrics.
- **Massachusetts** is using some of their Race to the Top funds to provide incentives to districts interested in piloting system improvement and performance monitoring strategies. Currently, several Massachusetts districts are employing new technology, such as iPads and My Learning Plan, to track progress within schools and creating learning plans for principals and teachers.

- **Tennessee** has eight regional centers focused on identifying and working with struggling schools and those that have the greatest misalignment between teacher evaluation scores and value-added achievement data. Each center has a director, data specialist and a math coach. Currently, the centers are putting an emphasis on improving instructional leadership surrounding teacher evaluation.

Using Data on Instructional Leadership Implementation to Drive Improvement Over Time

As noted above, States are still determining the best way to use data to help instructional leaders improve their performance over time.

- **Illinois** plans to use data to inform the work of a new research collaborative, the Illinois Collaborative for Education Policy Research. The collaborative will review data regarding teacher effectiveness, low-performing groups of students, school restructuring and P-20 alignment of curricula to determine improvements in relevant professional development and State policy.
- **Maryland** plans to have monthly meetings with LEA and school-based stakeholders working on teacher and principal evaluations to discuss what they are learning, which they will use to complement the State data to inform the future iterations of the State and local models.

Challenges to Moving Forward

Although some States have existing data systems that are very sophisticated, others are still tracking evaluation data with pencil and paper. Many States are still in the planning stages of building data systems, with some still deciding which measures to track. More research is needed on which types of data are the most useful for informing State and local practice as well as the necessary level of data. States are also working to make new data systems comfortable and easy-to-use for teachers and principals, which has proven to be complicated. And despite the many efforts States are taking to improve performance management for instructional leaders, States often lack the capacity or the authority to monitor and support local practices.

V. PRINCIPAL EVALUATION

Instructional leader experts who helped shape our information gathering agenda suggested that one of the most critical strategies for improving instructional leadership is having in place an evaluation system that can properly assess the performance of leaders and provide them with actionable feedback. The information collected found that this is new territory for many States, many of which have established teacher evaluation plans but have done less work on evaluations for school leaders.

Aligning with the College- and Career- Ready Standards and Teacher Evaluation Systems

Eleven States (AZ, CO, FL, GA, HI, KY, LA, MD, NJ, OH and TN) are explicitly aligning their principal and teacher evaluation criteria to their efforts to implement college- and career-ready standards. For instance, many have incorporated the adoption of instructional shifts for the college- and career-ready standards into the competencies measured in their principal and teacher observation and evaluation rubrics. Others are changing principal training to include both the instructional shifts in the college- and career-ready standards and how to observe the shifts during evaluation and observation of teachers.

- **Tennessee** has created a guide that unifies their teacher evaluation rubric with the college- and career-ready standards' instructional shifts, and is currently in the process of developing a similar guide for principals.
- **Louisiana** is explicitly linking teacher and principal evaluation to the implementation of college- and career-ready standards. As it was developing teacher evaluations, it selected five of Charlotte Danielson's instructional elements most critical to the college- and career-ready standards (such as questioning and assessment in instruction), and prioritized those in its professional development and observations. As the State teams developed its leader rubric, they prioritized those same five elements. Additionally, the Louisiana Department of Education has created a team to support the alignment of teacher and principal evaluations with the college- and career-ready standards. The team will provide guidance documents, professional development and tools to support implementation at the local level.

Support and Guidance for Local Educational Agencies

States range in the flexibility they allow LEAs in developing their evaluation systems. Seventeen States (AZ, CO, DC, DE, FL, GA, IL, KY, LA, MA, MD, NJ, NC, OH, PA, RI, and TN) have opted to develop a State model that LEAs can adopt, but they also allow LEAs to develop their own models that must meet the State's criteria. However, there is wide variation in the degrees of freedom States allow districts to depart from the State model.

- In **North Carolina**, for example, LEAs are expected to use the statewide system and only have discretion to choose their own measures for tracking student growth.

- Similarly, **Delaware** gives districts very little flexibility in adapting its State model, only providing waivers if districts can prove that their system is as rigorous, incorporates multiple measures of student growth, is a product of collective bargaining and contains processes for approving evaluators to ensure quality control.
- On the other end of the spectrum, **New York** allows districts to develop their own models within guidelines established by the State, rather than provide a State model. These district models are then reviewed and approved by the State.
- **Kentucky** is also approaching principal evaluations largely as a district-led initiative. While the State has created a framework for evaluation standards, it is collaborating directly with districts to create a collective State system that districts can choose to adopt.

States report that the amount of resources and time needed to vet and validate measures and evaluation instruments are providing an additional incentive for smaller districts to adopt the State models.

State leaders also reported that providing training for districts on the new evaluation structure has proven challenging depending on the size of the State and the degrees of freedom that LEAs have in adopting the State model. Smaller States, such as Delaware, Hawaii and Rhode Island reported it was less difficult to reach all principals and schools across their respective States. In larger States, SEAs are thinking proactively about how to leverage their existing training organizations. For instance, 13 States (AZ, CO, DE, FL, GA, HI, KY, MA, NC, NJ, NY, RI and TN) are attempting to leverage their regional delivery/training structures to provide districts with in-person training modules and meetings.

- **Arizona** is making use of its local Regional Education Laboratory and Regional Education Centers to provide districts with technical assistance, including a series of Arizona educator evaluation summits, and monitor the quality of implementation.
- **Louisiana** is planning to expand its use of reform teams to support implementation of the new evaluation system through in-person trainings and technical assistance, online courses and professional learning communities. It is also using its District Support Network teams to help assess central office and school-level management capacities for implementation.
- **Massachusetts** will use its network of District and School Assistance Centers (DSACs) to conduct hands-on training for educators and answer questions about the new evaluation framework in a timely manner. Through the regional DSAC networks, LEAs will have the opportunity to share best practices and work collaboratively on their development and implementation.
- **North Carolina** made principal evaluation an early priority, developing and rolling out an evaluation program over the past five years. It focused on training all superintendents and principals on the new evaluation framework, using retired superintendents and a full-time

training manager for principals and teachers. In doing so, it has developed a full set of training materials that comprehensively address each standard within the framework and are being used with principals across the State.

Engaging Principals and District Leaders in the Development of State Evaluation

States vary in their efforts to engage principals and local leaders in the development of the State model. At least five States (CO, GA, HI, MA and NC) mentioned collaborating directly with districts to develop principal evaluation plans.

- **Colorado** collaborated directly with districts to develop their principal evaluation model. It piloted the new teacher and principal evaluation systems in 27 districts across the State. Each district has a local council that includes principals and teachers and provides input into the evaluation system. Each council is collecting feedback from local teachers, principals and district leaders to make changes to the State model as needed, and prior to statewide implementation in 2014–2015.
- **Georgia** will work closely with each participating district’s LEA Critical Feedback group (comprised of superintendents, principals and teachers) to finalize evaluation instruments, determine weights assigned to effectiveness components or assist in the addition of any new performance measure into the evaluation system.

Weights and Measures in Principal Evaluations

All 19 States are planning to use multiple measures for principal evaluations.⁵ While all States had historically used measures that included evidence of professional standards and different aspects of leadership, the States report that they continue to use those measures, but are using more rigorous evidence to evaluate principal performance in those areas.

All States reported using student performance data (either student achievement or school-wide growth measures) as part of their evaluations. While some States are allowing LEAs to determine the weights for each measure, the majority of States (AZ, CO, FL, HI, IL, LA, MD, NJ, OH, PA and DC) have identified the weight each measure will have in determining principal ratings. Seven States (AZ, CO, DC, FL, HI, LA, OH and TN) reported that student performance data will account for as much as 50 percent of a principal’s rating.

⁵ The data reflected in this section is based on State responses to the question: *What skills or dispositions are prioritized by the new evaluation system?* As with other items, data collection was based on State Race to the Top applications and other documents, in addition to State responses during informal conversations. States varied in the detail of their responses.

All States also indicated they are evaluating principal practice using leadership standards. Several State leaders are using the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards as their leadership standards, or to inform their State developed standards.

In addition to student growth and performance standards, several States are including measures related to principal ability to effectively manage and retain their most effective staff. **Pennsylvania**, for instance, is including a measure weighted at 15 percent comparing how principals' evaluations of teachers correlate with teachers' value-added scores. **New Jersey** is including a measure for the percentage of effective teachers the principal retained. A few States are also looking at evidence from student and/or employee feedback. For example, **Illinois** and **Louisiana** are using 360 principal surveys that include student and employee feedback.

Timelines for Implementation

The majority of States (AZ, CO, FL, GA, HI, IL, KY, MA, MD, NJ, OH, PA and RI) are moving to full-scale State implementation in 2013–2014 and 2014–2015.

School Year	Statewide Implementation of Principal Evaluation
2011–2012	DC, DE, TN
2012–2013	LA, NC, NY
2013–2014	CO, FL, HI, MA, MD, OH, RI
2014–2015	AZ, GA, IL, KY, NJ, PA

Using Evaluation Data to Help Principals Become Better Instructional Leaders

States recognize the importance using principal and teacher evaluation data to identify areas for growth and to deliver better professional supports for both principals and teachers. Several States (IL, MA, NY, RI and TN) are developing online platforms that link student and teacher evaluation data to help the State identify areas of need and provide professional development and assistance directly to districts and principals.

- **New York** will use principal evaluation data to identify principals rated as "developing" or "ineffective" and create detailed improvement plans with specific goals for professional development and improvement. The State has also begun to build a professional development video library on EngageNY.org that will provide guidance and examples for each level of the leader and teacher evaluation rubric.
- **Rhode Island** worked with the New Teacher Center to develop modules for principals on key subjects, such as providing teacher feedback and having tough conversations.

- **Tennessee** has planned a Leadership Action Tank to provide examples of best practices in leadership from highly-rated principals. Using Tennessee Value Added Assessment System (TVAAS) data and other factors, the group will capture practices by school leaders that have been demonstrated to improve student achievement.

Challenges and Opportunities for Learning in Developing and Implementing Principal Evaluations

Almost all of the States noted the lack of best practices, evidence and research on principal evaluation, particularly regarding key-leader competencies, practices for principal observations and how to gather evidence for effectiveness beyond student performance. Some States are trying to translate their teacher evaluation elements to principals but are finding that the two often do not transfer easily. The fast pace of implementation poses a challenge for States and their desire to give the many elements of principal evaluation sufficient time and resources for development.

States noted numerous obstacles and challenges moving forward in their implementation of principal evaluations, including:

- Developing a consensus around principal evaluation criteria and competencies.
- Having limited SEA and regional staff capacity to provide implementation training, support and monitoring of leadership evaluation implementation across districts.
- Providing principals with the necessary resources and time to understand and adapt to the new expectations required of their role, along with the new dimensions measured in principal evaluation, including the demands of new teacher evaluation and implementation of the college- and career-ready standards. For example, several State leaders noted that principals have expressed the need for additional support in exploring how to institute models of distributed leadership to find the time necessary to effectively conduct teacher evaluations.

VI. ROLES AND CAREER PATHWAYS

As States undertake new reforms and initiatives, the roles and responsibilities of instructional leaders are shifting. States are adapting their pathways to leadership to attract leaders with different skills and abilities who can help meet the new challenges. One challenge, however, is that career advancement for an instructional leader is typically a local practice and guided by local policies, including collective bargaining agreements. Despite these circumstances, some States are trying to implement incentives that would encourage LEAs to create career ladders and new pathways to leadership.

- **Maryland** is currently focusing on improving the pipeline of principals for rural, low-income districts, which often struggle finding instructional leaders. As part of their Race to the Top efforts, the State has developed a partnership with local universities to develop stronger leadership pipelines for those districts.
- **Ohio** passed legislation which created license categories for a Senior Professional Educator License and a Lead Professional Educator License, which require teachers to possess at least nine years of successful teaching experience and additional distinction, such as a Master Teacher Designation, a National Board Certification, and/or a Highly Effective/Distinguished Level of Performance rating using the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession. They also created a teacher career ladder that provides advancement opportunities and leadership roles for teachers who are highly effective based upon student growth. Leadership roles include a Lead Teacher, who supports new teachers throughout the State's Teacher Residency Program.
- **Georgia** has drafted guidelines for establishing three different levels of teacher leaders. The State is still working on specific details for each level, but the ultimate goal is to create a career ladder for teachers who want to take on leadership responsibilities but do not want to leave the classroom. Georgia will begin piloting the program in 2013. The State has also begun working with low-achieving schools to broaden the responsibilities of school secretaries to create School Administration Managers, allowing principals to focus solely on managing instruction.
- **Tennessee** has created a Teacher Leader Endorsement for effective teachers. The endorsement would serve the dual purpose of being a beginning administration license for teachers and elevating them to the position of teacher leader.
- **New York** is actively promoting LEA adoption of teacher career ladders, where higher-performing teachers compete for and take on teacher leadership roles. Rather than creating a statewide career ladder, New York is funding LEA model practices for performance-based career ladders that lead to additional duties, such as mentoring and curricular coaching. Additionally, New York is providing resources to support districts as they develop bargaining agreements by providing guidance and best-practice documents, including a common format for plans that has a set of allowable choices and measures.