REDESIGNING PRINCIPAL PREPARATION

A WORK IN PROGRESS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI ST. LOUIS (UMSL)

By Matthew Kelemen and Benjamin Fenton, New Leaders

New Leaders

UMSL | Education
Innovative Education. Engaged Educators.

REDESIGNING PRINCIPAL PREPARATION
A WORK IN PROGRESS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI ST. LOUIS (UMSL)

By Matthew Kelemen and Benjamin Fenton, New Leaders

In the fall of 2015, the University of Missouri St. Louis (UMSL) College of Education welcomed a small cohort of teachers to spend two years preparing to be principals of high-need schools. In many ways, their preparation will be similar to how UMSL has historically prepared school leaders; they will take courses within the University's approved Master in Educational Administration program, fulfilling all of the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's requirements to apply for certification as a school administrator.

But the experience of these aspiring leaders will diverge from traditional principal preparation in several important ways. They were selected based on demonstrated teaching expertise and a demonstrated commitment to improving outcomes for students. Their coursework will be more intensely based on learning the practices of effective school administrators. In their second year, they will leave their current jobs and undertake a full-time, paid "residency" in a school, where they will practice their leadership under the guidance of a sitting principal and with support from UMSL faculty. The assessment of their learning will be tied into those residency experiences. And their experience will be the new normal at UMSL, with cohorts added each year and the current program phased out as students graduate.

This shift in practice for UMSL is happening because a number of leaders in and around the university—notably the Dean of the College of Education, but also faculty members, community partners, civic leaders, and superintendents of area districts—believe that UMSL and other universities in the St. Louis metropolitan area are not producing enough principal candidates with the necessary mindset and skill set to effectively lead schools, especially the most challenging schools. "Principal preparation was stuck in the past," said one former superintendent. "Principal preparation was mostly theoretical and the theory wasn't relevant to the needs of candidates. They took courses, crossed their fingers and hoped to get a job."

These same leaders know that having effective principals is central to the challenge of improving schools in the region and increasing opportunities for the most disadvantaged students. "We came to realize that it's all about leadership," explained a civic leader. "You can pretty up a school and you can invest in scholarships and invest in other things, but if you don't have the right leadership in the classroom and at the school level, reform will not happen. You'll have spots here and there, but reform for all kids cannot happen." Improving principal preparation can, they say, be one of the pillars for improving opportunity for students in the St. Louis region.

Despite this impetus for change, the shift in approach at UMSL carries some risk for the College. It requires faculty members to embrace a collaborative approach to course design and implementation when they are accustomed to a high level of autonomy. It requires faculty to completely re-think the content of courses and the assessment of leadership competencies. It requires strong relationships with school districts, since the model includes full-time placement in schools. It requires a commitment to selectivity, which cuts against an ethos of open access to the university as a community institution. And it challenges the College to compete in a market with strong incentives for candidates to seek out low-cost, convenient options for their preparation. As one experienced school district human resource director said, "Good people go in those programs, but they want to get finished as inexpensively as possible and as quickly as possible. I think the standard has to increase across the board because if you have those low points across the region, people tend to gravitate to that. If everybody's standard is raised, then that's just what candidates will have to do to get a Master in Administration."

UMSL's shift in approach to principal preparation comes at a time when universities across the country are grappling with the same issues. While there are important pockets of innovation and a growing sense of urgency among policy makers and institutions themselves, too many programs have not responded to the need to drastically upgrade the quality of principal preparation. Those that do want to improve and innovate likely face the same internal challenges and market pressures confronting UMSL.

This case study is intended to help other colleges of education and their partners to consider both the opportunities of embracing key improvements in principal preparation—rigorous selection and aligned assessment; updated content based on current understandings of effective leadership practices; greater opportunities to practice leadership in a school context during preparation; and closer partnerships with hiring school districts—and challenges associated with changing program structures and content.

To do that, the case study has four parts:

(1) Background on UMSL
This section provides additional context on UMSL and the community it serves.

(2) UMSL's Process of Improvement
This section describes the process that UMSL has undertaken to discuss and decide on changes to its approach to principal preparation.

(3) UMSL's New Approach to Principal Preparation
This section outlines the key substantive features of the College's new approach to principal preparation.

(4) Discussion
This section offers several areas of inquiry that other programs should pursue in following UMSL's lead.

METHODOLOGY FOR THE CASE STUDY

To develop this case study, the authors used two primary sources:

(1) Documents developed by the team that designed UMSL's new approach to principal preparation. Documents include new program standards for principal preparation, a scope and sequence, drafts of course outlines, and planning documents developed by the work group and by the group's facilitators.

(2) Structured interviews with sixteen people knowledgeable about the process for developing the new approach. Interview respondents included University administrators, College of Education faculty, civic leaders engaged in education improvement work, superintendents and other senior school district leaders, and community partners. The interviews were semi-structured, based on a protocol developed by the authors to elicit information about the context for the work at UMSL, the College's purpose in changing its approach to principal preparation, the process of change, and the key components of the new program.

The authors examined the documents and interview transcripts to identify common themes relevant to the design and implementation of new approaches to principal preparation. Once these themes were turned into a manuscript, the authors consulted with interview respondents to confirm the accuracy of quotations and ideas attributed to them.

Note about the authors and the purpose of the case study: The principal authors work at New Leaders, a national non-profit organization whose mission is to ensure high academic achievement for all children, especially students in poverty and students of color, by developing transformational school leaders and advancing the policies and practices that allow great leaders to succeed. New Leaders operates principal preparation programs in cities throughout the United States. In 2013 and 2014, New Leaders staff held multiple conversations with civic and educational leaders about launching the New Leaders programs in the St. Louis metropolitan area. In the course of those conversations, New Leaders was approached by UMSL College of Education Dean Carole Basile about assisting the College to re-design its principal preparation program. As a result, UMSL contracted with New Leaders to facilitate the design team responsible for developing the new approach. New Leaders' responsibilities included facilitating the work of the design team, sharing content from the New Leaders approach, and sharing, under license, specific tools for assessing candidates. As such, the authors of this case study were deeply involved in the design process described in the case study and continue to support the ongoing design and implementation.

We recognize that this level of involvement presents opportunities for bias, both in our writing and in how interview respondents may have chosen to share information. We would address concerns about such bias by pointing readers to our website (www.newleaders.org), which describes details of our programs, our research findings, and our policy positions on a range of issues related to school and school system leadership. In addition, we would emphasize that this case study is not intended as an evaluation of UMSL. Rather, it is intended as a starting point for discussions by leaders and faculty members in university-based principal preparation programs and their partners. We hope that UMSL's experience can assist program leaders as they assess their own programs and consider ways to improve them.

The University of Missouri St. Louis is the largest public research university in metropolitan St. Louis, serving nearly 18,000 undergraduate and graduate students. The significant majority of students (83%) hail from the St. Louis region. 60% of students are women and 32% are classified as minority students.

Located 10 miles northwest of downtown St. Louis, UMSL draws students from across the St. Louis metropolitan area, which includes over thirty school districts. None of the districts are particularly large: St. Louis Public Schools, the largest district in the region, serves 25,000 students, while the suburban districts of Rockwood and Ft. Zumwalt serve approximately 22,000 and 19,000, respectively. In the immediate area of UMSL are a number of smaller districts, including some that have struggled with poor performance and financial instability: Normandy and Riverview Gardens school districts are in state receivership, a status that has allowed their students to transfer to other districts.

The UMSL College of Education serves 1,400 students (with 1 in 7 enrolled full-time) taught by 54 full-time faculty. The College has a standard suite of programs from early childhood education to adult education and from undergraduate studies to doctoral programs. For aspiring school leaders, the College has offered a Master in Educational Administration degree with focus areas in elementary education, secondary education, community education. This degree enables students to obtain their Initial Certification in Elementary or Secondary School Administration from the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE). "Initial certification enables graduates to attain a variety of leadership positions in Missouri School Districts including assistant principals, principals, career center directors, school activity directors, school directors, and a variety of other administrative/supervisory positions."[1]

For the most part, UMSL's program is quite typical of university-based programs across the country. Classroom teachers and others apply to UMSL when it suits their professional needs to attain a Master in Education. If they meet a basic academic threshold—a minimum grade point average of 2.75 for undergraduate coursework (and 3.0 for relevant graduate coursework)—they are admitted. They take a series of required and elective courses, moving at a pace that fits their schedules as working professionals. Along the way, they accrue hours to meet a requirement for an "internship," usually taking on administrative tasks in their own school. Upon graduation, if they aspire to be school administrators, they sit for the state's licensure exam and then go on the job market.

A few things distinguish UMSL's approach to leadership. For one, the College has a program in leadership for character education that is well-regarded locally. Though not focused on preparation, the credit-bearing program provides sitting principals with a background in character education and democratic education and support to develop character education plans for their schools. The team of faculty members and partners who came together to re-design the program had an early brainstorming session and identified these additional strengths: A diverse faculty that includes experienced practitioners, a curriculum that melds theory and practice, with an emphasis on social justice, high-quality technology support for both students and faculty, and a high pass rate on the principal and superintendent exams.

Nevertheless, interview respondents pointed to several concerns with the way UMSL prepares principals. Overall, the program was described as "mediocre," "too theoretical," and lacking rigor. As one faculty member said, "We need greater depth to the course work, more rigor to the coursework. Sometimes I'm chagrined by the requirements of some of the professors for a course. In my judgment, they're not stringent enough, they don't challenge the students enough." Despite the College's social justice orientation, principal preparation is not adequately focused on preparing leaders for struggling schools in the communities immediately surrounding UMSL. Further, the experience of UMSL students varies widely based on who they have as instructors, according to faculty members. "Sometimes when faculty teach the same course but teach it differently, they may emphasize different things. As you prepare principals to lead instruction and lead teachers, you want to be sure that

---

[1] UMSL COE website (https://coe.umsl.edu/mycoe/index.cfm?event=p2_pe:). To meet DESE's requirements for a permanent degree, the College also offers an Education Specialist (EdS) degree, which allows students to apply some credits from their Master in Educational Administration degree and prepares them for "leadership positions in schools, school district central offices, community agencies and government."

there's a lot of consistency in the program."

In addition to these concerns about the quality of preparation, UMSL and other local universities admit many candidates who do not actually aspire to be principals. As one superintendent noted:

> Salary schedules are set up in St. Louis—and I'm sure this is pretty typical across the country—such that to maximize the amount of money you are going to get in your career, you need to have an advanced degree and multiple years of experience. The more formal education you have and the more years you have, the higher your salary is going to be. So there are a lot of people that, when they start off working on that Master's degree and have to work on a concentrated area, just pick administration "because." It might be something they want to do in the future or it might not be where they want to go. It is hit and miss who is in those programs to be administrators. Sometimes it's not always candidates who have that aptitude to be an administrator, they are just trying to move over on the salary schedule.

Many respondents were concerned that, because of this, UMSL and other local universities have strong incentives to keep programs easy to access and easy to complete.

Despite this sub-par equilibrium, concerns about the quality of teacher and school leader preparation in the St. Louis area began to mount. The state of Missouri was ramping up new requirements for educator preparation and was changing how educators were to be evaluated. Furthermore, several school districts had lost their accreditation, allowing students to transfer to accredited districts and putting into stark relief the disparity in educational opportunities for youth in the St. Louis area.

Against this backdrop, the University hired Carole Basile as the Dean of the College of Education four years ago. Basile brought an unusual resume to the position, including both a background in higher education administration and a dozen years of experience in business and industry in the areas of sales, management, marketing, and corporate training and development. The University asked Basile to focus on educator preparation in part because it was a significant topic in the education reform community in St. Louis and in part because it is central to the College of Education's mission. As Glen Cope, the University Provost, said:

> We have a lot of schools that are not doing as well as possible and I think that principal preparation is part of that challenge. We have several school districts that have schools that are unaccredited by the state, which means their test scores show that they're not achieving what they're supposed to be achieving. From my perspective, some of that has to go back to the principal—what teachers they hire, what support they give to the students and to the faculty. We have a definite need in the St. Louis area to improve the quality of our schools. As a result of that, we have to improve the quality of principal preparation and their understanding of what to do to help things get better… Carole has been talking about taking a different approach to preparing teachers and administrators for schools since she got here. That's partly why we hired her. We wanted a different approach. We wanted to look at what is the cutting edge of how to prepare teachers and principals.

Basile herself saw the wisdom in prioritizing changes to educator preparation. "When you are a dean of a college of education, those are the two big things that you are always thinking about. They tend to be the most visible of what we do, and making sure we get those right was really critically important." She began with an aggressive effort to change UMSL's approach to teacher preparation. The new model centers on an enhanced teacher practicum experience—called "Studio Schools"—in which teacher candidates take on authentic teaching experiences and have rigorous assessments (including videos) of their practice. Twelve districts and several charter schools have signed on as partners to the Studio Schools model, which also requires increased participation from "clinical teachers" to mentor and coach teacher candidates.

The revision to UMSL's approach to teacher preparation set the stage for changes to principal preparation in two important ways. First was the increase in emphasis on practice, as noted above. Second was Basile's promotion of the idea of "collective wisdom" as a basis for changing or improving existing programs. This involves drawing on the experience of practitioners, scholars and education innovators as a basis for solving problems of practice and developing new knowledge.[2] This approach to change is visible in the actual design of the teacher preparation program and in ongoing innovations in the College;[3] it also informed the process for improving principal preparation.

---

2 See http://coe.umsl.edu/w2/About%20Us/ for more information about the Collective Wisdom model.

3 See http://coeexchange.com/responsivedesign-powers-innovation-in-teaching/ for details.

UMSL'S PROCESS OF IMPROVEMENT

To spearhead the improvement of principal preparation, Basile called on Art McCoy, a local education consultant and former superintendent of the 12,000-student Ferguson-Florissant School District. As an alumnus of a local school district and UMSL, McCoy had a long history with the University and the community. In January of 2014, McCoy began by assembling a team of faculty members and stakeholders to participate in re-designing the program. Community partners included senior staff members from two of the larger school districts in the region, leaders of small, education-focused non-profit organizations, two school leaders with ties to UMSL, and education advocates. Faculty members included the chair and several senior members of the Education Leadership Department, one senior faculty member with primary leadership for the College's character education program, and an adjunct faculty member knowledgeable about recent changes in teacher education. McCoy described the selection of team members as a highly intentional effort to raise the level of urgency and bring new ideas to the table: "We wanted to include some transformative, non-traditional thinkers from the start to break up the status quo in the Master's program."

Simultaneous to McCoy's efforts to assemble a design team, Basile asked New Leaders to assist in the design work. New Leaders lent both meeting facilitation support and concrete tools and program documents for review and adaptation by the design team. The New Leaders consulting team consisted of Benjamin Fenton and Matthew Kelemen, the authors of this case study.[4]

From February of 2014 to June of 2015, the design team met seven times (in person, except as noted), with the following areas of focus:

Meeting date	Focus areas
February 2014	**Clarifying the goals for redesign** – The team agreed that the central goal for their work was to "build a school leader preparation program that graduates leaders who are prepared to dramatically improve the schools they lead." **Establishing key ideas for innovating on the program design** – The team agreed on these key ideas: (1) Select candidates based on evidence of important personal leadership characteristics and qualities (specifically confidence, creativity, resiliency, courage, belief in students, and commitment); (2) Focus more on competency (the accomplishment of critical skills) than on content; (3) Meet people where they are – tailor learning experiences to needs; and (4) Provide mentoring during the program and follow-up support after program completion. **Sketching out an initial program structure** – Using a design studio process[5], the team worked in groups to elaborate on this challenge: "Design a school leader preparation program for UMSL that is organized around giving candidates experiences that lead to mastery of competencies central to the effective execution of the principalship." The program design is described in detail in the next section of the case study.
July 2014	**Drafting program standards** – The team reviewed the New Leaders Aspiring Principals program standards, the Missouri state standards and other standards;[6] then, deciding as a group to use the New Leaders standards as a starting point, they drafted a set of working standards for use in continued design of the program. There are four standards: (1) Personal and Professional Leadership; (2) Instructional Leadership; (3) Culture Leadership; and (4) Adult and Team Leadership. Over the course of the design process, the team made further minor edits to the standards and then locked a version for use for the 2015-16 school year, with the expectation of revisiting the standards after initial use. See Appendix A for a copy of the standards.

4   See the methodology section for further information about New Leaders. Also see www.newleaders.org.

5   For more information on design processes, see http://www.designthinkingforeducators.com.

6   Included in the review was an initial working draft of revised standards for the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC). That draft has since been superseded by the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders released by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration in late 2015; see http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2015/ProfessionalStandardsforEducationalLeaders2015forNPBEAFINAL.pdf

August 2014 (webinar)	**Assigning responsibilities for developing course modules** – In advance of the session, New Leaders developed a module planning template (see Appendix B) and a draft list of course modules derived from UMSL's current curriculum and New Leaders' Aspiring Principals curriculum. The term "module" was used to describe a distinct strand of leadership practice that would be taught to candidates, either as a stand-alone course or embedded in a broader course. The team reviewed and agreed on the modules and assigned themselves modules to complete before the next meeting.
September 2014	**Reviewing course modules** – The team provided peer feedback on the course modules and agreed on how the modules fit together into courses, forming the building blocks of a scope and sequence for the program.
November 2014	**Reviewing the residency design** – While individual team members continued working on course design, the design team built out a detailed design of the residency for year two and shared it for feedback with a group of area superintendents.
February 2015 (webinar and in-person)	**Building a scope and sequence** – The team used a webinar followed by an in-person meeting to draft and edit a scope and sequence outlining the sequence of courses and experiences for candidates. See Appendix C for the scope and sequence.
April 2015	**Building understanding of core assessments and applying them to course design** – Having decided to license and use the New Leaders Aspiring Principals admissions materials to both select candidates and to assess their progress during the program, the team received a training from New Leaders staff on the admissions tools. Then, they determined which tools would form the basis of initial screening of candidates and which would be used as capstone assessments for courses in the first year. These substantive decisions are described in more detail in the next section.

This sequence of meetings was intended to build support for the core objectives before moving into detailed planning. Facilitators pushed for consensus on each major product and used completed products as a basis for the next phase of work. For example, by drafting, editing, and locking a set of program standards, the team had an anchor to use in designing courses and building a scope and sequence.

Participants expressed appreciation for this approach to external facilitation, both in terms of moving the process forward and in terms of allowing for authentic dialogue: "It was helpful to have outside facilitators. It helps you be more introspective and to not carry biases forward," said one faculty member. Having New Leaders, a national organization knowledgeable about the content of principal preparation, serving in a facilitation role allowed for innovative ideas to be introduced naturally, they said.

As noted in several places in the table, both New Leaders and design team members used time between the meetings to advance the substantive design of the program. Often, this involved New Leaders constructing templates (e.g., Appendix B), providing completed examples of the templates, or creating "strawman" designs for review and consideration by the team. Design team members described these work aids as helpful in advancing the work that they had to undertake on their own. "It helped immeasurably to track what we were doing. It gave me a foundation to put what I believed would be helpful. We filled them out, discussed them with one another, and decided what needed to be added and what was duplicative. That was the foundation."

Participants also lauded the variety of voices involved in the process, as suggested by this community partner:

> *You have a room that encompasses traditional public school educators, educators and administrators from charter schools and private schools, higher education researchers, experienced practitioners and a cross section of community folks, those like me who play an advocacy role, others who are engaged in the business community or social services, all of whom are trying to look at how best can we create a model to develop a leadership pool to adequately provide high quality education for our children. From the very beginning, there was an agreement around the table that, although we might disagree about particular approaches, the bottom line was always the best interest of the children. That moved us forward in terms of how do we develop that talent pool, what should that talent pool be exposed to, and how do you focus on the end result, which is developing a highly competent, highly effective building leader who's going to move the curriculum and assessments in a way that the entire building staff is focused on fully developing every child in the building to the highest level of their ability.*

They thought that the inclusion of so many different voices allowed for a more authentic conversation that valued UMSL's work to date but also focused much more on the needs of the community.

Despite all of these positives, there were significant concerns raised about the process. Participants felt rushed to develop the content. "It would have been helpful to have more meetings or a longer process," according to a faculty member. "We were left to do the work and, without the nudging and pushing, some of it didn't get done. There wasn't always time enough to get the work done along with our current work. We were juggling." As a result, the program is launching with some aspects still under development, a "building the plane as you fly it" situation that makes some team members uncomfortable.

Related to this, the program has many new elements – new admissions criteria, new coursework, and new practical experiences – that are being implemented fully without the benefit of some initial piloting. A faculty member related, "One of the things we had talked about was to do a beta test in the spring, to take one of the course modules and test it out. Is the module rigorous enough, or too rigorous? Is there scaffolding that we need put in place? Doing that would help to validate the work we are doing." None of that testing occurred before the program was launched.

Finally, according to respondents, some voices were missing from the conversation, including superintendents, graduate students preparing to be principals, and faculty from the teaching and learning division whose work should be aligned with leadership preparation. Further, as the work moved from initial design to more detailed curriculum and residency planning, the participation of non-faculty members tailed off.

Some of these problems can be attributed to the unusual amount of personnel change that the College experienced over the course of the eighteen months of the design process. Some of the change was expected, including the addition of two new faculty members – Vanessa Garry and James Shuls – who were hired with the expectation that they would teach in the new program. As Dean Basile said, "That was sort of an interesting dynamic itself, to hire people and say, 'Alright, you are coming to work in this new program. Don't come work for me unless you are ready to go.'" Indeed, several participants noted that expected faculty transitions created a unique opportunity to shift to a more innovative approach to principal preparation.

But there were unexpected transitions as well. Art McCoy left the state mid-project to assume another role. Corinne Harmon, an adjunct faculty member who had served as a Special School District superintendent before entering academia, stepped in for a time. But she, too, left the St. Louis area during the program to assume another faculty position. Meanwhile, the Education Leadership chair was diagnosed with a significant medical condition and had to take temporary leave. Since the Interim Chair, Matthew Davis, had no prior experience with principal preparation, Dean Basile also brought in Patty Corum, a former human resources director, to resolve several critical implementation issues, in particular how to partner with school districts to support a robust in-school residency experience (which is described in more detail later).

These transitions had two deleterious effects. First and foremost, the planning process was slowed down, resulting in a rush in the spring of 2015 to complete some critical tasks related to district partnerships, marketing to students, and internal approval of the program. Second, once McCoy left, the connections to community partners weakened somewhat, resulting in lower participation from non-faculty members in the design process. Each of these will be challenges as the program moves from design to implementation.

UMSL'S NEW APPROACH TO PRINCIPAL PREPARATION

UMSL'S design team embraced six innovations in its new approach.

1. The program is grounded in program standards that are specific to UMSL. UMSL's program was and is aligned to Missouri's state standards for school leaders.[7] But, it became clear to the design team that those standards lacked the specificity needed to guide decisions about program design. So, the new program will be based on a set of standards tailored to UMSL's vision of effective school leadership, while still aligned to the Missouri standards. As outlined in Appendix A, the four high-level standards are elaborated in 20 concepts (i.e., high level themes useful for organizing specific course content and experiences) and 41 specific competencies. The competencies are action-oriented statements that form the expectations for program graduates.

2. Candidates are selected based on demonstrated teaching expertise, a demonstrated commitment to improving outcomes for students, and a dedicated interest in serving as a principal or other school leader. UMSL had previously admitted students based on a minimum grade point average of 2.75 for undergraduate coursework (and 3.0 for relevant graduate coursework); no further screens were used. As a signal of the increased rigor of the program, the new admissions process includes three new screens:

   A. Belief and Student Results Assessment – Candidates are asked six questions designed to gauge their beliefs in students' abilities to succeed in school and beyond school. In addition, candidates are asked to share measureable results from their teaching experience and reflect on those results. Candidates submit their responses to the College, which uses a scoring rubric to determine whether a given candidate meets a minimum threshold for standards 1.1 and 3.1.

   B. Instruction Assessment – Candidates watch a video of classroom instruction and are asked to rate the teacher's practice and provide substantive feedback. Candidates submit their responses to the College, which uses a scoring rubric to determine whether a candidate meets a minimum threshold for standard 2.3.

   C. Interview – Candidates are interviewed by a panel of faculty members and community partners involved in the design of the program. The interview covers a broad spectrum of competencies from the program standards (e.g., experience looking at and analyzing data and making decisions, experience leading groups, and diagnosing situations), each of which is scored by the panel.[8]

Respondents view these additional selection screens as "much more rigorous" than the requirements for entering other area programs. Said one superintendent:

> *A lot of times I feel like universities need to stay in business, right? So they will take warm bodies if they are willing to pay. I feel like what the UMSL program is attempting to do is really screen in who is getting in to begin with, and maybe not screen out after they have already paid and started and are half-way through or count on a school district to screen them out.*

3. Coursework is sequenced, has a strong focus on the practice of school leadership, and is being designed in conjunction with a unified set of assessments. UMSL previously allowed students to take courses in whatever sequence and pace fit their personal schedules. In the new approach, students proceed as a cohort through a scope and sequence (see Appendix C). The coursework aligns to the program standards and focuses on key aspects of principal practice: leadership development, vision and mission, equity and cultural competence, supervision of instruction, school culture, curriculum planning, data driven instruction and team leadership, diagnostic and strategic planning, management of organizational systems, and school law. This approach to coursework is designed to scaffold students' learning and prepare them for the application of new skills in the context of an in-school residency.

---

7   The standards can be found here: https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/LeaderStandards.pdf. A more detailed continuum of performance can be found here: https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/LeaderStandardsContinuum.pdf.

8   Since the tools are included as part of a confidential admissions process, they are not included as appendices here. For more information about these tools, contact the authors.

This change in coursework represents a substantial shift in culture and practice for the College, as described by both a faculty member and an alumna.

> *In higher education, coursework is completely territorial. People don't want to give up what they're teaching or change what they're teaching because they've been doing it forever.*

> *The update in the coursework has got to happen. That might be one of the biggest challenges. If the people who have been teaching at universities for thirty years are the ones to teach a new and practical way to do something, I think it is going to be tough. I love my professors, but it's hard for some of them to shift into twenty-first century learning and get away from the way they have always done it. And you know what? That did work for them. I am not knocking what they did. But there is such a different way to learn now.*

UMSL's response to this challenge is to hire new faculty committed to a practice-based approach to coursework, to bring on experienced and successful administrators as adjuncts to teach specific courses, and to build a new culture among new and existing faculty through a collaborative design process.

As the courses are being designed, faculty members are embedding new, common assessments that require candidates to demonstrate new knowledge in practice (see #5 below for more details). This close connection between coursework and practice-based assessments is also a departure for UMSL.

4. Students have authentic leadership experiences during their preparation. Missouri law requires candidates for the principalship to undertake an internship, but it is of limited value. "The internship isn't really an effective model for preparing leaders. The state requires 300 hours of shadowing principals and doing some administrative duties, which, in reality, turns into helping the principal with the schedule or leading a committee or two usually after school or before school, during a teacher's planning time, or during summer school. So it doesn't really adequately prepare a candidate for what administration is really all about."

The new approach meets and substantially supersedes the state requirement. In year one, students will undertake six structured school visits to deepen their understanding of the content of their courses (i.e., fall visits will relate to content from Leadership for Equity and Supervision of Instruction, while spring visits will relate to content from Data Driven Instruction & Team Leadership and School Culture).

In the second year, students will leave their current jobs (usually as teachers) and assume a full-time residency. UMSL has formed formal relationships with a small number of districts that have agreed to bring on an UMSL resident next year as an Administrative Intern, which is an existing job category that many districts use for leaders in training. In this context, students will:

- be assigned two goal areas (one focused on academics and one on school culture), with responsibility for setting targets and strategies and monitoring and supporting implementation;

- be responsible for supporting a grade-level team or department, including observing teacher practice and leading team meetings focused on student level data in ELA and/or math;

- have primary responsibility for the development of at least two teachers, including direct observation of and feedback on their practice; and

- have an opportunity to serve in the principal role for one week (with appropriate support).

Other duties may include the full range of administrative responsibilities (e.g., master scheduling, hiring and staffing, budgeting, student support, and discipline).

The residency is the most visible shift in UMSL's approach and many participants viewed it as a sea change in how principals are prepared, as this human resources director describes:

> *You typically need to put in X number of hours subbing for a principal, doing some duty, doing some schedules. It's just blips of experiences and it's not truly embedded development within an organization. As a result, graduates of preparation programs really don't know what being a school administrator is like. They only get a snapshot. That is typical across the board, except what UMSL is trying to do… The residency is going to embed them in the school where they make those key connections. It's the connections and being facilitators of problem-solving that will help them become leaders. That's what we do every day. We facilitate conversations to solve problems in our schools.*

It is also the change that will be most challenging to implement because it requires a different kind of partnership with school districts. Districts will need to contribute financial resources – in the form of administrative intern positions – so that residents can earn a salary as they leave their current positions and take on the full-time demands of the residency. UMSL originally designed the program to include a half-time residency in the second year. However, feedback from districts that this would be too complicated to implement led Basile to change the program to a full-time residency, which will ultimately require further design around the timing and structure of coursework in the second year.

Unlike most residency-based programs in existence across the country, UMSL is designing the program to be regional in nature. So, candidates coming from one district might be placed in another district for their residency. This raises particular logistical challenges, as outlined by a human resources director.

> *If you take a teacher out of their classroom for a year and put them in another school district, there is going to be a pay differential, insurance is going to be different, and St. Louis and Kansas City have a different retirement system from other districts. How can we do this and make it work so that it would sit well with superintendents?*

Another human resources director adds that it puts pressure on UMSL to convince districts to contribute to improving leadership for the region, not just for their own district.

> *One of the biggest issues is letting their teachers go for a year knowing that they might not come back. If a star teacher does an internship in another district, that district may like them and they may like the school district and they may get a job there next year and they don't come back to me. Superintendents have to live with that and that's been the hesitation of some districts. One school district in particular said that their board would not let teachers go to another district with the possibility of staying. That's one of the hard conversations. Do you tell teachers, "we'll let you go, but you have to come back and serve for another year or two?" The other piece is accepting interns from other districts into their district. A lot of districts have interns within their own districts. It's a way to bring people along who are interested in administration. Some districts have agreements with teacher unions to do it, so you have to work through that. "If you let someone from another school district come and do this, are we putting them in front of our own?"*

Some participants noted that developing and forging relationships with districts will require new skills, and perhaps new staff, at UMSL. In the transition from design to implementation, the College has contracted with Patty Corum, an experienced human resources director, to provide some of this expertise, but Dean Basile has not decided on any permanent positions to manage the program.

5. Students experience rigorous assessment of their learning against the standards. UMSL previously limited assessment of student learning to exams and assignments within individual courses, an altogether typical approach. "In traditional programs, you go to classes and turn in assignments," said a faculty member. "When you go do your internship, you just go do stuff. Someone might talk to you or they might not."

In the new approach, UMSL is making two changes related to assessment. First, the College licensed the use of several tools designed and used by New Leaders to assess the readiness of candidates to enter a residency. These include several activities and protocols for interviews:

Activities	
Adult Leadership Activity	Requires students to read a scenario focused on the work of an instructional team and provide guidance and recommendations to the team
Exemplary Teaching Activity	Requires students to articulate their understanding of effective teaching
Data-Driven Instruction Activity	Requires students to examine data from classroom and interim assessments, identify patterns, and make recommendations to the teacher based on their analysis
Case Study Activity	Requires students to examine a school scenario and develop goals and an action plan in response to it
Self-Assessment Activity	Requires student to identify their own strengths and areas of growth in connection to the program standards
Protocols	
Instruction Interview	Helps faculty examine a student's understanding and expertise with key aspects of instructional leadership (e.g., understanding and using data, building a culture focused on instruction, understanding and leading the implementation of curriculum)
Adult Leadership and Data-Driven Instruction Interview	Helps faculty examine a student's understanding and expertise with key aspects of leading teams focused on instructional improvement
Role Play Interview	Helps faculty lead students through multiple, inter-related role plays to assess their ability to adapt to challenging situations that school leaders regularly face
Project Management Interview	Helps faculty examine a student's understanding and expertise with key aspects of planning and implementation of action plans
Reflection Interview	Helps faculty examine a student's ability to reflect on their own practice as a leader

UMSL faculty members were trained on the use of these assessments, agreed that they offered a way to increase rigor ("The assessments are really good, are tied to research, and scaffolded to monitor progress," a faculty member noted), matched them to courses in the scope and sequence, and are integrating them into their courses.[9]

Second, students will have authentic leadership assessments tied to their residency experiences. The residency-based assessments include:

Action plan design and execution	For one academic goal area and one school culture goal area, students will diagnose their school's needs based on observations and data review, develop goals and an action plan, and implement the plan. Their assessments will include presentations of their diagnosis, their plan, and their progress over the course of the year.
Teacher observation and feedback	Three times during the year, students will submit for review a 15-minute video of their practice providing actionable feedback to a teacher based on observation of classroom practice.
Team leadership and data-driven instruction	Students will share and be assessed on several aspects of their work to lead a team with instructional responsibilities, including: presenting a team charter, submitting a 15-minute video of their practice leading a team meeting focused on data-driven instruction, sharing a professional development plan for the team, and presenting the team's accomplishments and ongoing challenges.

These assessments build on their coursework and culminate in a summative judgment of the student's readiness to be a school leader. They will also help candidates build evidence of meeting new state-level expectations for competency-based assessments of aspiring principals.

---

9   As of this writing, the process of integrating these assessments is still underway. This includes making significant decisions about how to roll these assessments into summative judgments about candidates, both as a way of deciding on a candidate's readiness for the residency and as a way of signaling a candidate's readiness to assume the principalship.

---

6. Students are mentored by both faculty and sitting principals. During the residency, mentorship and coaching will be the joint responsibility of sitting principals and UMSL faculty. Students will draft a learning plan and receive feedback and sign-off from a faculty advisor. Components of the learning plan include leadership competencies (2-3 competencies on which the student expects to improve during the residency), learning targets (measureable targets for each competency area selected), leadership actions (a small set of actions the student will implement multiple times), and opportunities for learning. Each student, their sitting principal, and a faculty advisor will meet monthly to review progress against the learning plan.

Respondents – including a faculty member and an alumna quoted below – point to this approach to mentorship, paired with having authentic leadership experiences, as critical to the design.

> *We determined that we need to meet as a team on a regular basis and talk about student performance and progress, so that we understand what our students are struggling with and how to support them. That was an important commitment for all of us, even if we are not teaching one of the modules until later in the year.*

> *When you get thrown into the principal's seat that first day, and you haven't had the opportunity to shadow a principal, to be mentored by a principal, to do the job of a principal, it is absolutely frightening. You are thinking, "Oh my gosh, I am in charge of this place and I am not ready." Even if you have been an assistant principal in the same building, to step into that leader role is tough, so I just think that those last two pillars of full-time residency and the mentorship will be huge in actual preparation.*

DISCUSSION

UMSL's program will undoubtedly evolve as it moves from design to implementation. Even as it does, the College's experience designing this new program offers some important considerations for other programs exploring innovations in principal preparation. Because of the emerging nature of the UMSL program, we offer these as areas of inquiry and discussion, rather than hard and fast lessons.

Creating the time and space for authentic dialogue and design

UMSL's new approach to principal preparation requires different ways of operating for just about everyone involved: faculty have to collaborate in new ways and restructure how and what they teach; students need to turn a part-time add-on into a full-time job; and districts need to have skin in the game. That level of change speaks to the need for a robust, engaging process that allows for new thinking to be surfaced, discussed, and debated in the context of current practices.

Some elements of UMSL's planning helped create powerful engagement. First is the idea of "collective wisdom." Not only did Basile bring faculty, practitioners and community members together to design the program, she also explicitly connected this effort to a broader philosophy about valuing the expertise and contributions of everyone involved. Second is the use of "design thinking." All of the major aspects of the new approach – the creation of new standards, the decision to make admission more rigorous, the introduction of a residency far more extensive than minimum requirements for a principal license in Missouri – resulted from design chal- lenges posed to and worked out by the group. Third is the use of external facilitators with experience designing and implementing principal preparation programs. Rather than having to work from scratch, UMSL program designers had templates and content exemplars to use as a basis for their own designs. And they had an external push. As one civic leader said, "most universities are not going to be able to do this on their own. They need a partner. It's a night and day change and that's hard for people. Particularly for universities because there is so much tradition and so much inertia."

Yet, UMSL and its partners missed some opportunities to use these strengths in the process to maximum effect. Faculty not in the core design group had little involvement from the outset, resulting in some challenging conversations as the program went through an approval process within the university. While Basile reached out to superintendents and got their input along the way, none were ever part of the design process; perhaps as a result, only a few signed on as early partners. Basile and others wanted to pilot part of the new approach by introducing new practice-based courses in the spring of 2015, but none of the courses was ready in time for such a pilot. And finally, while the process benefitted from the involvement of some UMSL graduates as design team members, it did not include conversations with current students (other than informal efforts by individual faculty members to reach out for input). All of these represent real areas of improvement for UMSL going forward.

UMSL took a year and a half to move from initial planning to welcoming a new cohort of students. Such speed in the design process capitalized on civic urgency to change outcomes for disadvantaged students. At the same time, it left little room for error. With unexpected changes in leadership, and with faculty designing a new program on top of their existing responsibilities, some things did not get done in time and some essential conversations with the broader faculty community did not occur. The result was a process that felt rushed and a product that is going live while it is still being developed.

Fortunately, with a very small first cohort (six students), continued external support from New Leaders, and a team of faculty and close partners who are meeting monthly, UMSL still has the opportunity to expand engage- ment and deepen the learning. For others considering innovations in principal preparation, UMSL's experiences suggests that: (1) college leaders should be vocal about the need for "collective wisdom" and create structures for engaging multiple voices throughout the process of design; (2) faculty need dedicated time to do the detailed work of program design; and (3) external partners can bring both the facilitation needed to support good conversation and substantive ideas and resources to assist with design.

Creating a viable and sustainable program

"If all of the other schools of education are cranking out anyone who shows up, how can UMSL stay relevant and have the kind of participation they need?" Given the current structure of principal preparation in St. Louis and elsewhere, this query from a civic leader is perhaps the central question for any program considering new innovations. In a world where the bar to become a certified school administrator is relatively low, in a world where many teachers are incentivized by district salary schedules to seek out the easiest Master's degree they can find, and in a world where degree programs in Educational Administrator generate revenue for colleges and universities, it is no wonder that low quality programs abound. Making a program more rigorous runs the very serious risk of encouraging degree-seekers to simply go elsewhere.

Numerous people involved in the UMSL redesign process fretted over this. Some faculty members worried about losing their jobs if enrollment dropped too much. Human resources directors predicted that many candidates would go to other universities without a broader commitment to raising standards for program quality. Complicating matters, district leaders expressed that it would be a challenge to prioritize sending candidates to UMSL because they count on the resources that come with partnerships with multiple local universities on a host of issues and do not want to jeopardize those relationships; and they expressed concerns about committing to hosting interns in their own districts because of significant budget pressures they face.

But, importantly, Carole Basile and UMSL Provost Glen Cope were more sanguine about trading quality for quantity. Cope noted that, as a public university serving the community, there is always a tension between access and selectivity, especially given limited resources.

> We ultimately are going to come down on the side of selectivity. We want the best people to be teachers and principals and if that means we have to be a bit more selective on the front end and really be clear about what our expectations are, that's what we have to do. We have to be preparing people to be the best. In some cases, we have to take a hit for a few years and then get back up in the long term. If we don't get the numbers back up in the long term, then we probably have to add other programs to make the budget work. Money has been cut so much by the state that we have to pay attention to our enrollment. But we don't want to do that at the expense of quality.

Basile, having discussed the program with a number of superintendents and having considered the operational logistics, concluded that the program would remain small. "I don't think the program is ever going to be huge. At most I think you're going to have fifteen in a cohort. That feels like a good number and to place fifteen students in residencies is doable."

Even at this size, UMSL will still need to navigate issues related to being more selective. Participants (including the faculty member quoted below) worried that the new program structure would limit entry to candidates specifically chosen by their superintendents, closing out opportunities for individuals wanting to advance their careers without explicit sponsorship.

> My concern is about the have and have-nots. If superintendents are paying for the residency and they know you're in the program, release time is fine. When you have to pay for the program yourself and you have to get release time, that's a problem. I'm worried about the fairness.

Some were concerned that this could have a negative impact on the diversity of the aspiring leader pool at UMSL, which has traditionally attracted a larger share of minority candidates than other programs in the region.

Further, UMSL will need to build new capabilities in-house, including a different approach to student advising and support and a stronger focus on marketing, as one civic leader noted.

> We have not marketed it. You cannot put something new out there – you know, you can bring a horse to water but you can't make them drink. In this case, you have to bring the water to the horse because they don't know they're thirsty. Show them how it's different and engage them and market to them and make them feel part of this. That takes money. A lot of traditional universities just put it out and people sign up for it, but if you're really into recruiting the best people, you have to go out and select them.

Such capabilities may not be common in university settings, but may end up being central to sustaining a program such as this one.

As UMSL continues to navigate their way toward a sustainable program serving a diverse population of aspiring leaders, their experience invites other universities to consider how to ensure long-term viability while pursuing new innovations.

Tinkering and innovating at the same time

UMSL's new approach is at once quite radical and quite traditional. Radical in the sense that very few university-based programs have embraced the core practices that UMSL plans on implementing (i.e., the higher entry bar, the practice-based curriculum, and the residency); and radical in the sense that the design asks superintendents to invest in improving leadership across the region, not just in their own districts. As one superintendent said:

> We should and ought to be a player in the region. With that, we have to develop an understanding that for us to be vibrant as a school district, our region is vibrant, too. If the region is having struggles, eventually our district will have those struggles. Principals are key to maintaining vibrancy in our schools… The important thing is that, over time, we are not just a sender. We would like to have people who've come to us. That's an important long-term outcome.

But the approach is traditional in the sense that most of the candidates are coming through the regular pipeline (i.e., from the classroom) and in the sense that the new practices are essentially the same ones most principals end up learning once they are on the job, either through structured internships in their districts or by dint of their own efforts to continue learning.

Several community partners expressed a desire to see UMSL depart from tradition in more significant ways, whether by finding non-traditional candidates or exposing candidates to different experiences:

> Are we all along the line picking the diversity we need — not just racial diversity, but intellectual diversity, gender diversity, experience diversity? I don't necessarily think you should have to come from a school to be a school leader. That's another problem in our systems, that somebody might transition to education from other careers where they were successful managers and leaders. I'm not saying you shouldn't have some experience in schools, but how to get that experience pretty fast when your strength is in leading teams and motivating people.

> I would build in a function where part of the residency had people working with, looking at, and being part of leadership teams outside of schools. I think education is terribly isolated. We should know, as school leaders, what the hospitals do for professional development. We look inwardly too much. That is something that I pushed at UMSL, trying to get some of the observations to be outside of their current district and outside of education.

Dean Basile herself shares this belief that principal preparation should include leadership experiences outside of schools and wants to see deeper connections between the program and how non-profit leaders are prepared.

Perhaps ideas such as those will eventually become part of UMSL's program or its broader approach to leadership. However, as other programs consider adopting new practices, it is worth examining the degree to which traditional pathways and established schools of thought are constraining the options under consideration.

A FINAL NOTE: IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY

Principal preparation is guided, in many ways, by state policy. States determine the rules for licensure, write the standards for leadership, and establish the regulations governing the structure and content of principal preparation programs. Missouri, for example, does not have alternative routes to certification, making the reform of traditional university-based programs the primary vehicle for improvement in preparation.

This case study is not focused on state policy. Others have written extensively on what states can do to strengthen principal preparation. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the state of Missouri can either put wind behind Carole Basile's sails or create headwinds to slow her progress. If the state were to increase the rigor of internship requirements, that might make full- or part-time residencies more the norm and make it harder for programs of lower quality to persist and draw in candidates. Or if the state were to make a financial investment in innovative programs, that might provide seed money for UMSL to incent district participation more quickly.

The same goes for other states. Large-scale improvement of principal preparation will either come as a result of many university-based programs embracing innovation or by alternative programs in districts, non-profits and charter networks becoming more common. In either case, supportive state policy will play a significant role in determining how quickly that improvement occurs.

SELECTED REFERENCES FOR STATE POLICY RELATED TO PRINCIPAL PREPARATION

Briggs, K. et al. (2013). *Operating in the Dark: What Outdated State Policies and Data Gaps Mean for Effective School Leadership.* Available at www.bushcenter.org.

Ikemoto, G., et al. (2016) *State Evaluation of Principal Preparation Programs*. UCEA and New Leaders.

Manna, P. (forthcoming). *Developing Excellent School Principals to Advance Teaching and Learning: Considerations for State Policy.*

New Leaders. (2013). *Change Agents: How States Can Develop Effective School Leaders.* Available at www.newleaders.org.

Rowland, C. (2015) *Improving Educational Outcomes: How State Policy Can Support School Principals as Instructional Leaders*. Available at www.nga.org.

APPENDIX A

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI ST. LOUIS (UMSL) PRINCIPAL PREPARATION PROGRAM
PROGRAM STANDARDS – VERSION FOR USE IN 2015-16 ACADEMIC YEAR

UMSL's Standards for the Principal Preparation Program define what graduates need to know and be able to do by the end of their preparation to lead schools in preparing students to be successful in college, careers, and citizenship.

There are four standards:

1. Personal and Professional Leadership

2. Instructional Leadership

3. Culture Leadership

4. Adult and Team Leadership

CONSISTENT VOCABULARY

Standards: High-level statements of what graduates need to know and be able to do to lead schools in preparing students to be successful in college, careers, and citizenship

Concepts: High-level themes embedded within each standard

Competencies: More specific statements within each concept regarding what graduates need to know and be able to do to lead schools in preparing students to be successful in college, careers, and citizenship

STANDARD 1: PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP

Highly effective graduates demonstrate personal and professional behaviors focused on collaboration, vision/mission/values, reflective practice, effective communication, and strategic thinking to improve student achievement.

Graduates will know and be able to:

1.1 Reflective Practice and Continuous Self-Improvement

> 1.1a: Demonstrate personal resolve and maintain core confidence and belief in self, students, and staff, even in the face of adversity

> 1.1b: Continuously reflect on own performance, seek feedback, and actively pursue opportunities to improve personal and ethical leadership

> 1.1c: Model professionalism for others, maintaining consistency between one's own words and actions

1.2 Communication and Interpersonal Relationships

> 1.2a: Model appropriate communication strategies with others; interactions transmit the message of the school's vision and mission

> 1.2b: Build strong and trusting relationships with school stakeholders

1.3 Vision and Mission

> 1.3a: Collaboratively create, refine, and articulate a compelling vision, mission, and set of values for student success and ensure that students, staff, and parents share a vision for college, careers, and citizenship

> 1.3b: Pursue democratic values by establishing systems that allow for authentic participation in the creation and implementation of the mission and vision

1.4 Leading Change

> 1.4a: Understand the change process and the challenges involved in implementing change

> 1.4b: Effectively manage change to support the vision and mission, both by helping school community members to change and grow, and by mediating the impact of broader systems on the school's culture and operation

> 1.4c: Recognize and appropriately address adaptive challenges by tackling teacher practices, biases and/or mindsets not aligned to the vision and mission

STANDARD 2: INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

Highly effective graduates drive gains in student achievement and development by aligning curriculum and assessments to standards-based planning, remaining focused on high expectations for all students, using data to drive instruction and interventions, and ensuring quality instruction within the building.

Graduates **know and** will **be able to**:

2.1 Pedagogy/Instructional Strategies

> 2.1a: Develop classroom-based non-negotiables for instruction focused on planning and instructional strategies to increase student achievement

> 2.1b: Develop processes and structures to ensure the creation, implementation, and evaluation of consistent and quality classroom routines, differentiated instructional strategies, and individualized learning experiences supporting the belief that all students can achieve at high levels academically

2.2 Data-Driven Instruction

> 2.2a: Use multiple forms of student-level data to design and implement academic interventions for students, including the implementation of a targeted pyramid of intervention

> 2.2b: Lead the DDI cycle, focused on teachers adjusting instructional practice to meet the needs of all students

> 2.2c: Use multiple forms of student-level data to design and implement supports for students' social and emotional development

2.3 Observation and Supervision of Teacher Practice

> 2.3a: Observe and engage in coaching, mentoring, and feedback with staff on the effectiveness and appropriateness of their practice

> 2.3b: Improve teacher practice by developing professional learning communities in which staff build each other's capacity and hold each other accountable

2.4 Standards-Based Planning

> 2.4a: Successfully lead an instructional team in developing and implementing lesson plans and unit plans aligned with college and career-ready standards

2.5 Curriculum/Assessments/Scope and Sequence

> 2.5a: Translate college and career-ready standards into a clear scope and sequence

> 2.5b: Facilitate proper alignment of standards, assessments, and curriculum

> 2.5c: Communicate expectations about standards, assessments, and curriculum with families

STANDARD 3: CULTURE LEADERSHIP

Highly effective graduates create an equitable and efficacious culture where all students and staff are valued and held to high expectations.

Graduates **know and** will **be able to:**

3.1 Urgency and Efficacy

    3.1a: Inspire staff, students and community to champion a vision and mission for student success and development for all

    3.1b: Set ambitious and achievable goals for the whole school, for every classroom, and for all students

    3.1c: Create and maintain sense of urgency and commitment to ensuring a high level of student success

    3.1d: Develop and leverage a sense of efficacy that influences teacher beliefs and students' belief in themselves

3.2 Equity and Cultural Competence

    3.2a: Engage in discovery with self and staff, through inquiry and discussion, to surface social and racial biases in order to establish culturally-responsive practices that ensure equitable student outcomes

    3.2b: Identify and interrupt inequitable systems and structures and replace them with systems and structures that support more inclusive and efficacious school environments for adults and children

3.3 Systems, Routines, Behaviors, and Code of Conduct

    3.3a: Translate the vision and mission into an identity and set of behavioral expectations for adults focused on teamwork, collaboration, and a sense of ownership amongst all stakeholders

    3.3b: Develop and align norms, behavioral expectations for students (including the implementation of a code of conduct), and rituals with the school's vision and mission

    3.3c: Ensure equitable, consistent, and quality classroom practices that reinforce the behavioral expectations

3.4 Family and Community Engagement

    3.4a: Proactively, purposefully, and systematically engage families (including through regular communications structures) in the academic and social success of children for college, careers, and citizenship

STANDARD 4: ADULT AND TEAM LEADERSHIP

Highly effective graduates utilize the strategic planning process to organize adults and continuously track progress towards accomplishing goals.

Graduates **know and** will **be able to:**

4.1 Diagnostic and Strategic Planning

    4.1a: Analyze and diagnose issues (both technical, complex and adaptive) and identify challenges in order to determine what is needed to achieve goals

    4.1b: Implement data collection systems to monitor and track progress against goals

    4.1c: Facilitate collaborative development of strategic plans in service of goals and objectives

4.2 Performance Management

    4.2a: Define clear and detailed performance expectations for adults and teams

    4.2b: Strategically monitor coach and hold adults and teams accountable for meeting performance expectations

4.3 Leadership Development

    4.3a: Use multiple strategies (e.g., creating stretch roles, modeling leadership) to build leadership capacity of teachers, staff and school leaders

    4.3b: Utilize effective team-building strategies and other structures in order to develop and lead high-performing teams

4.4 Professional Development

    4.4a: Design, develop, deliver and support high-quality professional development in alignment with vision, mission, values, data and goals

4.5 Management of Organizational Systems

    4.5a Manage the school's organizational structure, time, personnel, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment

    4.5b Manage regulatory requirements in a way that does not impede pursuit of the school's vision and mission

APPENDIX B

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI ST. LOUIS (UMSL) PRINCIPAL PREPARATION PROGRAM MODULE PLANNING TEMPLATE

The UMSL principal preparation planning work group wants to ensure that learning modules (be they individual seminars or semester-long courses) for principal candidates are of the highest quality. Quality is defined by:

- alignment to program standards
- inclusive of assessment of participants before, during and after the module
- inclusive of strategies for differentiation of instruction to meet the varying needs of participants
- coherence with other modules
- opportunities for application and guided practice with the learning activities

Please complete this Module Planning Template (MPT). The information will be used to create a comprehensive scope and sequence for principal candidates.

Module Name	Focus areas
Length of time for the module	Year 1: Year 2:
Inquiry Questions	In this module, candidates will explore/examine…
Expected Outcomes	By the end of the module, candidates will…
Alignment	The module will measure the following skills, knowledge, and dispositions in the UMSL Principal Preparation Program Standards
Assessment	The relevant program standards will be assessed by… Year 1: Year 2:
Activities	Candidates will undertake the following leadership activities:
Content and Materials	Key content and materials for this module are…

APPENDIX C
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI ST. LOUIS (UMSL) PRINCIPAL PREPARATION PROGRAM
SCOPE AND SEQUENCE

COURSE/ACTIVITY	OUTCOMES	COMPETENCIES	ASSIGNMENTS	CREDITS
Year 1 – Fall				
6701 - Leadership for Equity (XL[10]: 6201)	Establish personal leadership development goals Increase commitment to equitable outcomes for students	1.1, 1.2, 1.3a (team level), 1.4c, 3.1 3.1c, 3.2a (esp. focused on self)	A1. Complete initial leadership reflection and self-assessment A2. Build on A1, completing a written personal reflection	3
6702 - Supervision of Instruction I (X:L 6401)	Build skills in identifying rigorous instructional practice and providing feedback to teachers	2.1 a-b, 2.3 a-b	B1. Classroom observation and feedback as peer, with focus on rigor of instruction	3
School Visits	Learn effective leadership practices connected to Leadership for Equity and Supervision of Instruction I from three school visits	3.1, others TBD from list above		n/a
Year 1 – Winter Intersession				
6703: Vision and Mission I	Build skills in developing and communicating a vision and mission for student success	1.2, 1.3a (school level), 1.3b, 1.4 a-c, 3.1	TBD	3
Year 1 –Spring				
6704: Data-Driven Instruction & Team Leadership I	Build skills in leading adults through a cycle of data analysis and use	2.2 a-c 3.1b	C. Organize team, identify data and analyze, name problem of practice (could be case study and/or "real" data), create and monitor plans to address	3
6705: School Culture I	Learn strategies for effectively supporting student social and emotional learning, increasing student voice, and engaging families	3.4, others TBD	D. Implement a classroom-based family engagement strategy aligned to SIP, collect data, present results	3
School Visits	Learn effective leadership practices connected to DDI & Team Leadership and School Culture from three school visits	3.1, others TBD from list above	TBD	n/a

XL=Crosslist

New Leaders WWW.NEWLEADERS.ORG

COURSE/ACTIVITY	OUTCOMES	COMPETENCIES	ASSIGNMENTS	CREDITS
Year 1 –Summer				
6706: Diagnostic and Strategic Planning (XL: 6203)	Apply skills in developing, communicating, and implementing a vision and mission for student success Learn and apply skills in diagnosing school conditions and data and developing action plans to address problems	1.2, 1.3a (school level), 1.3b, 1.4 a-c, 3.1 2.2a, 2.2b (building level), 4.1	TBD	3
6707: Supervision of Instruction II (XL: 6411/6415)	Acquire certification to conduct teacher observations; build skills in having difficult conversations about practice Evaluate the quality of curricular strategies based on research	2.3, 4.2 2.4, 2.5	B2. Difficult conversations role play ** Complete certification as trained teacher evaluator E. Evaluate a proposed curriculum or strategy based on research	3
Year 2 – Fall				
6708: School Culture II: Equity and Cultural Competence (XL: 6503)	Learn and apply strategies for effectively supporting student social and emotional learning, increasing student voice, and engaging families Learn and apply systems and structures for creating equitable opportunities for students	3.4, others TBD 3.2 (b in particular)		3
6709: School Law and Regulation (XL: 6205)	Understand legal issues and compliance requirements common to all school leaders (including special education compliance)	4.5b	TBD	3
6710: Residency I	Practice leadership actions across a range of competency areas		A1. Conduct diagnosis of school's practices A2. Establish goal and action plan for one academic focus area and report on progress B1. Complete first cycle of data analysis and use for a grade level team or department C1. Complete first cycle of teacher observation and feedback, including identifying and communicating growth areas C2. Complete second cycle of teacher observation and feedback, including identifying and communicating growth areas C3. Facilitate/videotape leadership of PLC session	3

COURSE/ACTIVITY	OUTCOMES	COMPETENCIES	ASSIGNMENTS	CREDITS
Year 2 – Winter/Spring				
6711: Data-Driven Instruction and Team Leadership II	Build skills in leading adults through a cycle of data analysis and use, including supporting the professional learning of teachers	2.1, 4.4		3
6712: Management of Organizational Systems (XL: 6203/6204)	Learn and apply strategies for effective management of school operations, including budgeting, staffing and safety	4.5a		3
Residency II *Note: Not a separate course for credit in this semester*	Practice leadership actions across a range of competency areas		A5.Report on progress against two goal areas (academic and culture) B3. Complete third cycle of data analysis and use for a grade level team or department C4. Complete third cycle of teacher observation and feedback, including developing individual personal/ professional growth plans for the following year C5. Develop full PD plan for school addressing whole faculty, teacher team, and individual needs	n/a

Note on other course changes:

- 6301 will no longer be a requirement

- 6707 (education measurement, not the new 6707 described above) will no longer be a requirement