

# A Model for Successful District-Based Leadership Development Partnerships

**Barbara A. Storms**

*California State University, East Bay*

**Sarah Gonzales**

*California State University, East Bay (Retired)*

*Abstract: This article outlines the efforts of the California State University, East Bay Department of Educational Leadership to develop, nurture and implement leadership department partnerships with local school districts. This case study reports on how one such partnership developed and the lessons learned from it. Included is a set of partnership features as well as a discussion about promising practices related to program focus, elements, collaborative planning and teaching and long range outcomes.*

## Introduction

Educational leadership programs across California are working to meet the growing need for competent school administrators by forming partnerships with school districts (Basom & Yerkes, 2004; California State University, 2004). And while a commitment to local school districts is not new, the practice of formalizing such partnerships may be. This paper sets out to look at the lessons learned by one California State

### *Successful District-Based Leadership Development Partnerships*

---

University through a series of partnerships with local school districts. Central to both the work of forming these partnerships and to this paper was the question, how can a university build successful partnerships with local districts that are perceived by the district and the university as meeting the needs/goals of both institutions to train school leaders? In addressing that question, a first step taken by this Department of Educational Leadership was an exploration into its own goals followed by a process of identifying how might partnerships with local school districts help the department meet those goals.

The Department of Educational Leadership at California State University East Bay (formerly known as Hayward) had a long history of being forward looking. With Linda Lambert as one of the emeriti faculty, it is not surprising that this Department had explored the concepts of collaborative leadership and shared decision-making in the 1990's (Lambert, et. al., 1995, 2002; Lambert, 1998). Later in that decade the Department developed a mission statement that emphasized "bold, socially responsible leadership" or BSRL, as it came to be referred to by the faculty and students as a mantra for programs. However, since 2000, the Department has been working to define what is meant by BSRL including developing a rubric that defined what such leadership looks like and how its use influences teaching (Szabo, Hoagland, Lambert, Lopez, et al., 2001; Szabo, Gonzales, Hoagland, Hopkins, et al, 2002; Szabo, & Lambert, 2002; Szabo, Storms, Rodriguez & Gonzales, 2003) This rubric was used by the Department to define how that vision of school leadership relates to the work the Department does in its service area, including what constitutes a partnership and why the Department would enter into them.

While this redefining work was occurring, arrangements with local school districts that had been a common course of action continued. We say arrangements because most of these efforts were not formalized. These arrangements took many forms from agreements that allowed districts to identify a particular number of candidates for the programs who would not be subjected to the Department's selection process, to setting up specialized credential programs for particular districts or groups of districts. Often the impetus for such arrangements was personal relationships between Department members and local district officials. Less often the push came from the university solely to raise enrollments. However, during the same period that the Department was redefining what it meant by bold, socially responsible leadership, the Department also took on clarifying the conditions under which it would enter into partnerships. Among the most important of these was that the partnership should address bold, socially responsible leadership by focusing on equity and high achievement for all students.

That focus on equity as outcome-based serendipitously connected with an increased emphasis on accountability in California from the adoption of the Public School Accountability Act (1999) and No Child Left Behind (NCLB) (2001). Given that within the service area of this university many districts were struggling academically, the possibilities for forming partnerships that would focus on equity were numerous as struggling school districts were looking for leaders who would exhibit, bold, socially responsible leadership that would change the world of schooling.

#### Methodology: A Case Study in Developing a District Partnership

In 2001, the CSU Chancellor began discussions with the Stupski Foundation to explore alternative programs to prepare future school leaders based on the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders and focusing on the following areas (Reed, 2001):

1. Supervision and staff development.
2. Using evidence and data to improve instruction.
3. Making decisions and managing change.
4. Allocating resources appropriately.
5. Communicating effectively.

Further, the Chancellor assembled the Presidents of the CSU campuses that offered Educational Leadership Programs to address the challenges of K-12 school administrators in a climate of diminishing resources, overwhelming workloads and increased enrollments of students with diverse learning needs. The Presidents assembled a task force of school administrators and CSU faculty to take a critical look at how the university system prepares educational leaders. In a published report, the CSU Presidents (2004) identified the need for the California State University's system to forcefully advocate for increased support to prepare school leaders. The group also made recommendations for preparing school leaders and recommended that educational leadership programs should:

1. Focus on preparing graduates who will function as effective instructional leaders.
2. Prepare graduates to distribute instructional leadership roles throughout their school.
3. Prepare educational leaders for all levels of service and in sufficient numbers to meet the needs of California.
4. Contain common core elements for key skills for instructional leaders.
5. Be designed to contain learning experiences that balance research, theory, and practice.

### ***Successful District-Based Leadership Development Partnerships***

---

6. Develop a systemic recruitment plan aligned to the knowledge and skills needed for effective educational leaders.
7. Be adapted to meet local needs in leadership, knowledge, skills, recruitment, and support.
8. Draw on multiple partners from within and without the university to build support for the collaborative education.
9. Be designed, taught, and supported by all members of the partnership.
10. Assess, initially and over time, graduates' satisfaction with the effectiveness of their programs.
11. Participate in statewide assessments of the effectiveness of graduates.

As a result, in 2003, an opportunity arose in one of the service area districts to tailor a Preliminary Administrative Service Credential Program to the needs of that district, the West Contra Costa Unified School District (WCCUSD) based in Richmond, California. The WCCUSD is a financially and educationally distressed school district. The school district has been under state control since 1990 and more than half of its schools are under program improvement under the guidelines of NCLB. Unlike most of the previous arrangements that the Department had entered into with districts, including this district in the past, initial discussions focused on the types of leaders, and the behaviors that would demonstrate successful leadership needed by the district, rather than on the logistics of such a program. The district had already done much work on high expectations, coherent curriculum and educational equity as its focus for improving instruction in its schools. District level administrators reviewed the Department of Educational Leadership's BSRL rubric and agreed to a focus on equity for the partnership. In addition, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, the state body that grants teaching and administrative certification, had overhauled its standards for school leaders based on the California Professional Standards for School Leaders (CPSEL's) (Appendix A).

#### Background for the Partnership

##### *Program Design*

CSU East Bay's Department of Educational Leadership organizes its programs in cohorts for its administrative services credential and master's degree programs. The typical design is for a cohort of students (22-25) to stay with a professor throughout the year for the core courses in their credential program. In the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program (at that time), candidates took six courses (including

fieldwork) within the cohort structure and three more courses across cohorts. The required courses were carefully aligned with the CPSEL's and the BSRL rubric (see Appendices A and B). Table 1 shows the alignment of the courses with the CPSELS.

*Partnership History*

CSU, East Bay's Department of Educational Leadership has set up four partnerships with local school districts and two partnerships with organizations over a period of seven years. With each iteration, lessons learned from previous partnerships were used to reframe the design in new and/or continuing partnerships. The Department's previous experience with WCCUSD guided the design of this case study partnership to both to prepare 25 teacher leaders from the district to complete a program for a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential, and to develop a new administrator's evaluation system.

Inquiry Questions

This Department viewed the development of partnerships with districts as an important part of expanding programs and serving students and districts. With a clear mission of "preparing bold, socially responsible leaders who will transform the world of schooling," the Department sought to insure that candidates were clearly focused on

**Table 1**  
Alignment of Required Courses with CPSEL Standards

	<b>EDLD 6000-</b> Intro. To Educational Leadership	<b>EDLD 6300-</b> Administration of Curriculum	<b>EDLD 6400-</b> Instructional Leadership	<b>EDLD 6410-</b> Supervision & Staff Development	<b>EDLD 6550-</b> School Leadership. & Organ. Behavior	<b>EDLD 6600-</b> School Law & Finance	<b>EDLD 6801, 6802, 6803-</b> Fieldwork 3 quarters
<b>Standard 1</b> Developing a Vision	X	X	X	X	X		X
<b>Standard 2</b> Success for all students Culture/Instruction	X	X	X		X		X
<b>Standard 3</b> Success for all students Mgmt of Organ	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Standard 4</b> Engaging broader community					X		X
<b>Standard 5</b> Success for all-Reflective, inquiry practice	X	X		X	X		X
<b>Standard 6</b> -Success for all-cultural/ political competence	X	X	X		X	X	X

### ***Successful District-Based Leadership Development Partnerships***

---

educational equity and leadership. The Department also worked to design and to provide a quality program for students and districts. To that end, these questions guided the development of this partnership:

1. How can a university build a successful partnership with urban districts that is perceived by the district and university as meeting the needs/goals of both institutions to train school leaders?
2. What design features create a strong credential program partnership with urban districts?
3. How do participants evaluate the program?

#### Data Collection

From the inception of this partnership, the Department began to collect data from various sources including course syllabi and materials, on-line student forums, comments from fieldwork supervisors, and students' course evaluations. Over the course of that year, the faculty partnership coordinator had ongoing meetings with district administrators including WCCUSD administrators who were teaching the courses and acting as fieldwork supervisors using the BSRL Rubric and the CPSEL's. Notes from meetings and reports by district administrators served as data sources in this case study. The Department also collected data from end-of-year surveys from students, fieldwork supervisors, instructors, and other district administrators. During the year, reports on partnership activities were shared with the rest of the Department and discussed. Periodic reports were developed and presented both to the district officials and to a university audience including the Dean of the College of Education and the Chancellor's office.

#### District Partnership Features

The partnership between CSU, East Bay and WCCUSD began because the district superintendent saw a need to develop the talents of local teacher leaders to become the leaders and administrators of the future. CSUEB faculty met over a period of several months with the superintendent and other senior district administrators to develop a Preliminary Administrative Credential Program (Tier I) for WCCUSD. The features of this special partnership program included:

- Candidates nominated by district administrators.
- Candidates selected by regional superintendent and CSUEB faculty.

- Introduction course focusing on promise and challenge of urban school leadership.
- Professor selected from exemplary district administrators and CSUEB program graduates.
- Fieldwork supervisors selected by the regional superintendent because they are exemplary principals with a history of successfully transforming schools in the district.
- Program designed to fit district schedule.
- University coordinator to facilitate registration, maintain continuity, and provide support for adjunct professors.
- All courses offered in a location in the district that is highly suited for adult learning.

#### Findings

Data indicate that the WCCUSD/CSUEB partnership had been successful in providing a relevant program for future administrators in the district. Twenty-four of 25 program participants completed the requirements for their Tier I Preliminary Administrative Services credential in June 2004. We also found:

1. An initial course (Pre-program, Spring 2003) helped to focus and orient students to define the role of leadership in transforming urban schools and helped them focus on addressing challenges rather than complaining about the hard work in urban districts;
2. Involving district administrators in nomination and selection of candidates helped to create supportive relationships between instructors, fieldwork supervisors, and candidates and to assume responsibility for candidates success;
3. Top level district leadership and involvement is critical to setting a tone for the value of leadership in school transformation, and to promote continuing support of aspiring administrators;
4. University facilitator's role is crucial to support program instructors (adjunct faculty), many of who were teaching at the university for the first time; to facilitate the university's administrative processes; and to maintain the departments mission and vision for bold, socially responsible leadership; and
5. The university and the district entered into a Memorandum of

### ***Successful District-Based Leadership Development Partnerships***

---

Understanding that defined the partner's roles, resources, and agreements that were useful as these issues were revised as the program unfolded.

Finally, the financial support from the Chancellor's office was invaluable to support this program. WCCUSD is a school district with serious financial challenges and support of a program of this nature would have been almost impossible without the Chancellor's office grant.

Promising Practices:  
Statewide Report on Educational Leadership

The CSUEB/WCCUSD partnership highlights some promising practices that will guide the Department in developing future relationships with districts to prepare school leaders. The future partnerships will be aligned with the recommendations of the recommendations of the Statewide Report on Educational Leadership.

#### *Program Focus on Instructional Leadership*

This partnership focused very clearly on the mission of the Department of Educational Leadership to "...prepare and influence bold, socially responsible leadership to transform the world of schooling." In particular participants in this program completed three courses that focused on educational leadership including "Instructional Leadership," "Supervision and Staff Development," and "Administration of Curriculum." The content of these courses were integrated by the instructors and participants created authentic projects for these courses that they applied to their work at their schools and with district programs. Participants will exit this program with a very clear understanding of the importance of instructional leadership for improving schools and raising student achievement. In particular, they left with a basic set of tools to monitor instruction, supervises curriculum, assess student learning, and interpret student achievement data.

#### *Systemic Core Program Elements*

This partnership was guided by the Department's work in defining "bold, socially responsible leadership (BSRL)" through its work with the BSRL rubric. The rubric defines five key areas for growth and learning including: Teaching and Learning for Equity and High Achievement; Systems Thinking and Strategic Approaches to Developing a Learning Community; Building Organizational Capacity Through Resource Coherence; Ethical, Caring and Reflective Practice; and Engaging and Influencing Forces within The Larger Community (Appendix B). The Department's recruiting and screening processes utilize these five areas that are aligned to the California



Professional Standard for Educational Leaders (CAPSELS) (Szabo, et al., 2001; Szabo, Gonzales, et al., 2002; Szabo, Storms, et al., 2003). By focusing on the intersection of the BSRL Rubric and the CAPSEL's, the Department is able to ensure that candidates completed the program with common elements and key skills for instructional leadership.

In addition, administrators from WCCUSD participated in the selection of the candidates for this partnership program. District administrators also served as instructors, advisors and fieldwork supervisors. With this amount of participation of district administrators in the program, students were supported throughout to succeed and stay with the program. The Department also used the BSRL rubric to help the district develop a new administrators' evaluation system. Both the district and the Department collaboratively designed, implemented, and delivered a program with a balance of research, theory, and practice.

#### *Collaborative Planning and Teaching*

As defined in the District Partnership Features and Findings sections previously presented, this partnership embodied many elements that need to be evident in a successful partnership. The Department faculty met with senior administrators over a period of several months to design the partnership program. Numerous district administrators participated in teaching the courses and providing support to candidates as mentors and fieldwork supervisors. The Department continues to invite district administrators to teach courses and supervise candidates in their fieldwork. A number of administrators from WCCUSD have been invited to serve in the position of "Practitioner in Residence."

#### *Long Range Outcomes*

Participants stated that they were very satisfied with the program and that they found the coursework relevant and useful as they entered their first administrative position. Additionally, through this close relationship, many credential graduates continue in the program to earn a Master's Degree in Educational Leadership.

Senior level administrators in the district also expressed satisfaction with the program for its relevance and its compatibility with district values and goals. Also, numerous graduates of the program have become successful administrators; of the 25 candidates who started, 24 completed and about 50% of the graduates are in administrative or district level positions.

#### Conclusions

Recent educational literature indicates that preparing leaders for urban school districts is complex. Effective leaders need to know more

### ***Successful District-Based Leadership Development Partnerships***

---

than just how to do things in schools, they also need to balance the push for change with protecting the positive aspects of their school culture. They also need to be able to align resources and energy toward meeting their organizational goals (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). By the same token, to be able to form partnerships between universities and school systems requires a clear understanding and practice of leadership. Through this study, we have found that developing a successful partnership requires clear roles and responsibilities between the university and the district that is supported by written agreement outlining clear expectations. In addition, universities must seek the active involvement of senior district administrators in designing, implementing and monitoring the partnership. There is much that senior district administrators can share with university faculty related to the changing and ever challenging aspects of school leadership. Strong collaboration in an egalitarian relationship is essential to an effective partnership. Finally, universities need to build in a system of accountability with the district to ensure that graduates of a partnership to develop educational leaders are successful. This accountability system assesses level of satisfaction in meeting the expectations of the partnership and the success of candidates assuming leadership positions in the district. District and university partnerships can be complex and challenging; however, when carefully planned, districts can improve leadership that enhances student achievement.

#### References

- Basom, M.R. & Yerkes, D.M. (2004). A school-university partnership in administrator preparations: learning and subsequent questions. *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program Development*, 16, 47-60.
- CSU Presidents' Task Force on Education Leadership Programs. (2004). *Report from the Chancellor*. Long Beach: CA, California State University.
- Lambert, L.L. (1998). *How to build leadership capacity in schools*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Lambert, L. L., Walker, D., Zimmerman, D. P., Cooper, J. E., Lambert, M. D., Gardner, M.D., & Ford Slack, P. J. (1995). *The constructivist leader*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lambert, L. L., Walker, D., Zimmerman, D. P., Cooper, J. E., Lambert, M. D., Gardner, M.D., & Szabo, M. (2002). *The constructivist leader (2<sup>nd</sup> ed)*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2001).
- Public Schools Accountability Act of 1999. SB 1X, Chapter 3 of 1999. Education Code section 52050.
- Reed, C. B. (2001). An address to the California County Superintendents of Schools. Retrieved February 25, 2005, from <http://www.calstate.edu/executive/speeches/200/CalCoSuperOfSchools10-15-01.shtml>

- Szabo, M.A., Gonzales, S., Hoagland, G., Hopkins, P., Kass, M., Lopez, J., Rodriguez, G.M., & Storms, B. A. (2002, April). *Teaching bold, socially responsible leadership*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. Retrieved from the California State University East Bay Department of Educational Leadership website, March 31, 2004 from <http://edschool.csuhayward.edu/departments/edld/research.html>
- Szabo, M.A., Hoagland, G., Lambert, L., Lopez, J., Starnes, L., Stern, J., Storms, B. A., & Vieth, B. (2001, April). *Developing bold, socially responsible leadership: Strategies for administrative preparation programs*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA. Retrieved from the California State University East Bay Department of Educational Leadership website, March 31, 2004 from <http://edschool.csuhayward.edu/departments/edld/research.html>
- Szabo, M.A. & Lambert, L. (2002). The preparation of new constructivist leaders. In *The constructivist leader* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed) (pp. 204-238). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Szabo, M. A., Storms, B.A., Rodriguez, G.M., & Gonzales, S.A. (2003) From soloists to ensemble: Shared accountability for leadership preparation. *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program Development*, 15, 73-84.
- Waters, T. Marzano, R.J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. Retrieved January 8, 2005, from <http://www.mcREL.org/>

## Appendix A

### California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders

*Standard 1: facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.*

School administrators engage their communities in the development of a shared vision of student learning. This vision articulates faculty members' understanding of the school as a standards-based education system, and it guides their actions. The vision serves as a central focus as the school community works to develop and implement instructional plans and other activities that give meaning to the vision. Leaders align resources with the priorities of the vision and communicate the vision within and outside the school.

1.1 Develop a Shared Vision

1.2 Plan and Implement Activities around the Vision

1.3 Allocate Resources to Support the Vision

*Standard 2: promoting the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.*

School administrators commit themselves to the concept of schools as rich learning environments for both students and staff. Acknowledging that the core work of the school is the accomplishment of student learning, site leaders focus

## ***Successful District-Based Leadership Development Partnerships***

---

their work around creating a culture that values such work and an instructional program that supports powerful student learning. Continuous teacher learning is a central feature of the school's professional culture.

- 2.1 Develop School Culture and Ensure Equity
- 2.2 Guide the Instructional Program
- 2.3 Guide Professional Growth of Staff
- 2.4 Create and Utilize Accountability Systems

*Standard 3: promoting the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.*

School administrators create and manage school organizations that are structured to support the core work of teaching and learning. They assure that their schools are physically and emotionally safe for all students and adults and they protect the legal rights of all members of the school community. They apply principles of organizational leadership and management to align and integrate the multiple subsystems that comprise the school so that the infrastructure is designed to support student learning to high standards for all students.

- 3.1 Promote a Safe School Environment
- 3.2 Establish an Infrastructure to Support Learning
- 3.3 Manage the School as a System
- 3.4 Assure Legal Integrity

*Standard 4: promoting the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interest and needs, and mobilizing community resources.*

School administrators are leaders who are visible within the community contexts of their sites. They value and are responsive to the families whose children attend their schools. They regard the community as a resource and work to engage the support of individuals, businesses, civic organizations, and other institutions through collaboration and partnering. As they work within their schools to promote success for all students, they provide a critical linking function between the school and the surrounding context that fosters two-way communication and influence.

- 4.1 Incorporate The Perspective Of Families And Community Members
- 4.2 Establish Linkages between the Site and the Larger Context
- 4.3 Engage Support from Agencies outside the School

*Standard 5: promote the success of all students by modeling a personal code of ethics and developing professional leadership capacity.*

School administrators serve as models of professionalism in their sites, communities, and districts. Their work is informed by a set of ethical and moral principles that they espouse and enact. They inspire and encourage others by demonstrating their commitment to lifelong professional learning. They develop, sustain, and apply cutting-edge professional knowledge in making decisions and working with the adults and children at their sites.

- 5.1 Maintain High Standards of Professionalism
- 5.2 Use Pertinent, State-of-the-Art Information to Guide Sound Courses of Action

5.3 Model Reflective Practice and Continuous Growth

5.4 Sustain Professional Commitment and Effort

*Standard 6: promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.*

School administrators are committed to the democratic principles that undergird American public school systems. They actively engage with and shape educational policy to reflect commitment to equity for the diverse communities of learners in their sites, districts, and the state. They engage in ongoing dialogue with a range of stakeholders and policy makers to identify and respond to issues, trends, and potential changes in the operating environments of schools.

6.1 Engage with the Policy Environment to Support School Success

6.2 Communicate with Stakeholders

6.3 Incorporate Input from the Public

Appendix B

Five Mindscapes for Bold Socially Responsible Leadership

*Mindscope 1: Teaching and Learning for Equity & High Achievement*

Desired Impact: Race, class, language, culture, income, gender and sexual identity are no longer good predictors of academic success (or failure). All students are producing high quality work and achieving at high levels.

Essential Questions: What difference are we making and for which students? From whose perspective? What skills and support do I need to take risks and lead for equity?

Key Knowledge and Skill Areas include understanding of and strategies for ensuring: equitable learning outcomes; student/teacher relationships; powerful and equitable teaching; subject matter expertise; best practices and exemplary instruction; inquiry and adjustment of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment; cultural competence.

*Mindscope 2: Systems Thinking & Strategic Approaches to Developing a Learning Community*

Desired Impact: All members of the school community (students, parents, teachers, administrators, district staff, school board, and community members) are pulling together in a constant direction toward achieving a shared vision. The norms, beliefs, structures and skills for inquiry, innovation and continuous improvement are part of the day-to-day culture of the school.

Essential Questions: What are powerful ways to include and energize everyone to share responsibility for equity and better results for all students?

Key Knowledge and Skill Areas include understanding of strategies for ensuring: diversity and inclusion; democratic processes and collaboration; systems thinking; and a culture of inquiry and continuous improvement.

*Mindscope 3: Building Organizational Capacity Through Resource Coherence*

Desired Impact: There is a constancy of effort and progress and a sense of efficacy and accomplishment in the midst of the flurry of daily activity. Values and resources align to support inter-relatedness among decision-making, school

### ***Successful District-Based Leadership Development Partnerships***

---

programs, the school community, improvement efforts, and outcomes for students.

Essential Questions: How are we doing at focusing resources and energy where they will make the most difference to the quality of teaching and learning?

Key Knowledge and Skill Areas include understanding of and strategies for ensuring: organizing and managing effectively; building infrastructure including systems, processes and practices; planning backwards; integrating and using technology.

#### *Mindscape 4: Ethical, Caring & Reflective Practice*

Desired Impact: Honest, open discussion of significant—and sometimes difficult—issues and questions is valued in a supportive, caring learning community. Personal reflection results in focused, ethical behavior and practice. Everyone belongs, feels known and cared about as an individual, and feels s/he has the power and skills to change what needs to be changed and to make a difference here.

Essential Questions: Who belongs and has influence—and who doesn't? How does it feel to work, learn, participate, and live here? From whose perspective?

Key Knowledge and Skill Areas include understanding of and strategies for ensuring: caring and belongingness; aligning values, behavior and action; and critical friendship and reflection.

#### *Mindscape 5: Engaging and Influencing Forces within the Larger Community*

Desired Impact: The school actively engages and influences the context to generate the knowledge, resources and support needed for continuous improvement of teaching and learning. Two-way learning relationships and partnerships support the creating of new knowledge and help the school community proactively meet new challenges.

Essential Questions: How are we engaging outside resources, forces and relationships to help us learn and change what needs to change to get the results we want?

Key Knowledge and Skill Areas include understanding of and strategies for ensuring: balancing organizational integrity and adaptation; inside/outside: mutual influence; inside/outside: building learning relationships.

Mindscales and Essential Questions  
Driving Bold Socially Responsible Leadership

From leadership experience, research, and best practices, our department believes that there are several "Mindscales"—pictures we hold in our heads about how the world works—and corresponding driving questions that guide the thinking, reflection, learning and action of effective leaders. The Mindscales represent one way of describing high quality leadership—Bold Socially Responsible Leadership. Significantly, the Mindscales encompass and align with the new California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders. We will use the five Mindscales for BSRL and their ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS (EQs) as a framework, touchstone and filter as we share problems of practice, explore new knowledge, and provide Critical Friendship to one another.

