Quality Measures™ Principal Preparation Program Self-Study Process

A research based resource for use in developing, assessing, and improving principal preparation programs
INTRODUCTION

Developed by EDC to guide and support the collaborative self-study of principal preparation programs by state educational agencies, school districts, and their training providers, this edition of Quality Measures™ rubrics and evidence based protocols reflects the evolution of indicators beginning with the seminal research of Linda Darling-Hammond et al. on exemplary preparation program practices in 2007.

Since that time, these tools have gone through a series of important revisions to keep pace with an ever-changing landscape of increased accountability for preparation programs’ linkages to principal performance. They reflect current research and professional leader standards, and feedback collected from a host of users from across the country, over the past decade. In addition, review teams may now use the QM virtual platform to access selected program domains and electronically submit program ratings and exemplary evidence (level 3 or 4).

Quality Measures™ indicators and rubrics are designed for use by SEAs, school districts, preparation program providers, and policy makers as a central component of a focused program self-study and continuous improvement process. The tools are intentionally focused on program candidate admissions, course content, pedagogy-andragogy, supervised clinical practice, performance assessment, and graduate performance outcomes.

These indicators and rubric criteria are used to build a shared understanding of program quality and to guide team discussions and consideration of evidence that would support a program rating of Level 4–All, Level 3–Most, Level 2–Some, or Level 1–Few/None. Ratings are then used to guide the design and implementation of strategic interventions as part of an ongoing continuous improvement process.

QM Theory of Change

**Research Based Indicators and Rubric Criteria**

**INPUTS**

1. Selecting the "Right" Candidate(s)
2. Standards-Based Course Content
3. Active Learning Experiences
4. Clinical Practice in Real Schools
5. Performance-Based Assessments
6. Graduate Performance Outcomes

**OUTCOMES**

- Highly Effective Principals
- Highly Effective Teachers
- High Performing Students

**OUTPUTS**

- Professional Standards for Educational Leaders
  
  **Standard 1.** Mission, Vision, and Core Values
  - Effect each student's learning of the content, and nurture their growth, abilities, and core values, maintaining academic success and wellbeing.
  
  **Standard 2.** Ethics and Professional Norms
  - Effective educational leaders are ethically aligned and are guided by professional norms to promote each student's academic success and wellbeing.
  
  **Standard 3.** Equity and Cultural Responsiveness
  - Effective educational leaders promote equity, cultural responsiveness, and social-emotional learning for all students to promote each student's academic success and wellbeing.
  
  **Standard 4.** Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
  - Effective educational leaders design meaningful and rigorous curricula that promote each student's academic success and wellbeing.
  
  **Standard 5.** Community of Care and Support for Students
  - Effective educational leaders create an inclusive, caring, and supportive school community that promotes each student's academic success and wellbeing.
  
  **Standard 6.** Professional Capacity of School Personnel
  - Effective educational leaders develop the professional capacity and practice of school personnel to promote each student's academic success and wellbeing.
  
  **Standard 7.** Professional Community for Teachers and Staff
  - Effective educational leaders foster a professional community of teachers and other staff to promote each student's academic success and wellbeing.
  
  **Standard 8.** Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community
  - Effective educational leaders engage families and the community in a meaningful and effective way to promote each student's academic success and wellbeing.
  
  **Standard 9.** Operations and Management
  - Effective educational leaders manage school operations and resources to promote each student's academic success and wellbeing.
  
  **Standard 10.** School Improvement
  - Effective educational leaders address educational issues and problems to promote each student's academic success and wellbeing.
QM Program Domains and Indicators at a Glance

**Research Based Indicators and Rubric Criteria**

**Candidate Admissions**
1. Marketing Strategy
2. Recruitment Practices
3. Admission Standards
4. Applicant Screening
5. Predictor Assessments
6. Candidate Selection

**Course Content**
1. Standards
2. Learning Goals
3. Course Design
4. Course Evaluation
5. Course Coherence

**Pedagogy-Andragogy**
1. Active Learning Strategies
2. Experiential Learning Activities
3. Reflective Practices
4. Formative Feedback
5. Performance Benchmarking
6. Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

**Clinical Practice**
1. Clinical Design
2. Clinical Quality
3. Clinical Coaching
4. Clinical Supervision
5. Clinical Placements
6. Clinical Evaluation

**Performance Assessment**
1. Assessment Purpose
2. Candidate Performance Targets
3. Assessment Quality
4. Assessment Methods
5. Communication of Assessment Results
6. Assessment Impact

**Graduate Outcomes**
1. Exit Competencies
2. State Certification
3. School District Eligibility
4. School District Hiring
5. Job Placement and Retention
6. Job Performance
Figure 1 provides an overview of the steps involved in the QM self-study process. The nine-step collaborative inquiry process is used to guide self-study teams through the inquiry and intervention cycles and is optimally facilitated by the self-study team leader, with ongoing facilitation and technical support from EDC, through each step of the process. A bank of resources and tools are available to self-study teams, including a catalogue of exemplar artifacts submitted as supporting evidence by programs that have completed this process.
# QM Process Steps and Time Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PURPOSE</strong></td>
<td>Introduce QM domains, indicators, and rating criteria and prepare the self-study team for the evidence review meeting</td>
<td>Determine which evidence best supports preliminary program ratings</td>
<td>Engage in conversations about the degree to which evidence assembled match the criteria. Adjust preliminary ratings as needed</td>
<td>Upload final program ratings and level 3-4 evidence to EDC for analysis and report writing</td>
<td>Identify similarities, differences, and patterns across a cohort for targeted intervention and planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QM PROCESS STEPS</strong></td>
<td>Attend orientation webinar and complete preliminary ratings</td>
<td>Gather supporting evidence</td>
<td>Share preliminary findings and evidence with colleagues and invite clarifying questions, constructive feedback, and discussion</td>
<td>Upload to EDC using online portal</td>
<td>Review aggregate program data with collaborative inquiry cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPROXIMATE TIME COMMITMENT</strong></td>
<td>3-4 hours</td>
<td>About 2 hours per domain</td>
<td>About 1-2 hours per domain</td>
<td>1 hour to complete online submission</td>
<td>4-6 hours (as part of report of findings meeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARTICIPANTS</strong></td>
<td>Program self-study team</td>
<td>Program self-study team</td>
<td>Program self-study team</td>
<td>Program self-study team and invited cohort stakeholders</td>
<td>Program self-study team and invited cohort stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACILITATED BY</strong></td>
<td>EDC</td>
<td>Self-study team leader with support from EDC facilitator</td>
<td>Self-study team leader with support from EDC facilitator</td>
<td>Self-study team leader with support from EDC facilitator</td>
<td>EDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>METHOD</strong></td>
<td>Face-to-face meeting or virtual webinar</td>
<td>Self-study team decision</td>
<td>Face-to-face meeting (location determined by the self-study team)</td>
<td>Electronic submission to EDC through QM portal</td>
<td>Face-to-face meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The fifth step in the QM process is to provide individual programs their written report of findings. In the case where more than one program is part of a collaborative inquiry cohort, a second report is prepared by EDC that aggregates the data from each program in the cohort and removes program identifiers.
The Wisdom of SEA/School District/Training Provider Partnerships

Research on exemplary school leader preparation programs suggests that programs are more effective when school districts and training providers work together to address common problems of practice associated with preparing principals to effectively lead schools (Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, Orr, & Cohen, 2007).

We are seeing the reciprocal benefits of SEA, school district, and training provider collaboration. Partnerships are becoming more widespread and proving to be valuable in influencing programmatic changes in practice.

While the impact of these partnerships is not fully understood, there is significant early evidence to suggest that SEAs and school districts are able to influence changes in area principal training program practices on a number of fronts including: course content and pedagogy, candidate recruitment and selection, internship placements and practices, and clinical supervision.

Similarly, training providers report that they are gaining valuable insights from school districts about the performance expectations for today’s school principals; particularly those aspiring to lead chronically low performing schools. These insights are helping to shape the reconceptualization of school leadership and the redesign of principal preparation and training. The diagram below illustrates the partnership alliances established between one Maryland school district and four of its local training providers.

Prince George’s County Public Schools Partnership Alliances
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