Maryland Task Force on the Principalship

Recommendations for redefining the role of the principal;
recruiting, retaining, and rewarding principals;
and improving their preparation and development

Adopted by the Maryland State Board of Education
August 30, 2000

Maryland State Board of Education

Membership: Maryland Task Force on the Principalship

Michael Hickey, *Co-Chair* ....Superintendent of Schools, Howard County

Donald Barron, *Co-Chair* .... Principal, Montgomery Village Middle School

Helen Becker ....Principal, Boonsboro High School

Wendy Boardman .... Teacher, Severna Park High School

Tom Bowman...Principal, Thomas Johnson Elementary School

Dane Colemen..President, Maryland Association of Boards of Education

Liz Crosby.. First Vice President, Maryland Parent Teacher Association

Gerald DeGrange ....Principal, Yellow Springs Elementary School

Debbie Glinowiecki .... Assistant Principal, Pinewood Elementary School

Rochelle Ingram...................................Director, Graduate Division of Education, Johns Hopkins University

Theodore Kight ....Principal, Allegany High School

Nicole Kim.. Student, River Hill High School

Kent Kreamer...Assistant Principal, Westminster High School

Hanne Mawhinney .... Associate Professor of Education Policy, University of Maryland

Christopher Nunzio ....Principal, Beaver Run Elementary School

Jacqueline Pipkin.. Special Education Specialist, Baltimore County Public Schools

Roger L. Plunkett ....Principal, Wilde Lake High School

Dorothea Pressey ....Professor, Morgan State University

Cynthia J. Rodgers .... Principal, Princeton Elementary School

David D. Rudolph... Principal, North East Middle School

Franklin Tull .... Principal, William Paca/Old Post Road Elementary School

Wayne Walbrecher ....Vice President, Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland

James V. Foran, *Staff Liaison to Task Force*................. Director of Secondary School Development, MSDE

Nan Mulqueen, *Staff Writer to Task Force* ....School and Community Outreach Office, MSDE

Executive Summary

In 1998, the Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP) surveyed and inter-viewed 21 superintendents and 121 aspiring, assistant, and current principals on the shortage of prospective secondary administrators. MASSP presented its qualitative study—which yielded participants' perspectives not only on the severity of the shortage but on the reasons for it—to the State Board of Education in December 1999. That same month, State Superintendent of Schools Nancy S. Grasmick convened the Maryland Task Force on the Principalship to issue specific recommendations for increasing the quantity and quality of Maryland's school administrators.

The task force divided into three subcommittees to more efficiently address what members agreed were the major issues facing the principalship today: the changing role of the principal and structure of the principalship; professional preparation and development provided prospective and current administrators; and the compensation/incentives accorded principals and accountability demanded of them.

Role of the Principal

Noting that extraneous responsibilities impede principals' ability to fulfill their primary role as instructional leader/facilitator, the task force recommends that the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) and all 24 local school systems "clear the plate" of those functions that do not contribute in a substantive way to this role.

The task force further recommends that this be accomplished by giving principals sufficient staff and support and the power to use staffing creatively to build an effective leadership team; recommending triennially to state and local officials which tasks, responsibilities, duties, and regulations can be removed from the principalship; and awarding grants for current and proposed efforts focused on redefining the principalship.

Professional Development

The task force recommends that, in conjunction with the Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning K–16, local school systems and/or school system consortia develop comprehensive, job-embedded programs for the identification and professional development of principal candidates and of current principals.

To facilitate their development, MSDE should clearly articulate standards and develop a frame-work for identifying and training principal candidates, while local school systems and/or consortia should provide for the ongoing professional development of current principals. To connect theory and practice, institutions of higher education (IHEs) should align their school administration programs with state standards and frameworks, and MSDE should base program approval upon such alignment. Additionally, to facilitate principals' professional growth and development, MSDE should help develop and maintain an electronic clearinghouse on promising practices.

Compensation, Incentive, and Accountability

The task force recommends that local school systems adjust principal salary and compensation packages to better reflect the responsibilities of the principalship. MSDE and its stakeholders should develop a model principal compensation package (addressing salary, standard benefits, perquisites, incentives, and accountability) as a comparative standard for evaluating principals' salaries across Maryland and post on its web site statewide data on salaries, benefits, and

incentives.

MSDE should also convene a workgroup of human resource and benefits administration experts to develop incentives that will attract, retain, and reward high-performing principals. And, to ensure adequate security for principals who take on difficult challenges—while linking performance and accountability—MSDE and its partners should examine the feasibility of instituting specific-term contracts and/or appointments for principals governing service and performance incentives. ∎

Table of Contents

Introduction

In 1998, the Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP) began a 15-month study to answer two questions: 1) Does Maryland have a shortage of qualified prospective secondary administrators? 2) If so, what do we do about it? In December 1999, the group presented its findings *(see Appendix A)*.

Is There a Shortage?

Yes. All 21 superintendents who responded to MASSP's survey and each of the 121 principals, assistant principals, and aspiring principals who participated in its focus groups said that a shortage does exist. Many respondents pointed to the fact that their districts recruit out-of-system, leading them to question both the quality and quantity of in-system candidates.

> If a principal is the single most important person in a school—and there is widespread agreement on this—then states, local districts, and higher education need to look at how principals are selected, prepared, and rewarded.
> —Southern Regional Education Board, 1986

One focus group participant cited the relaxation of certification requirements. "Not too long ago, [our system] required that all candidates be fully certificated as a principal," the participant said. "A few years ago, that restriction was lowered so that somebody coming into an assistant principalship didn't need to be fully certificated. Any time you see a relaxation in requirements, it indicates a dearth of candidates in some area" (Barron, Becker & Pipkin, 1999).

In fact, the shortage will only worsen in coming years. An informal Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) survey conducted last year indicates that more than two-thirds of Maryland's middle and high school principals are eligible to retire within five years.

What Do We Do About It?

Because changing the principalship is clearly a K–16 issue—a position shared by the Southern Regional Education Board (above)—MASSP recommended appointing a statewide group, representing all key constituencies, K–16, to examine the principal's role, recruitment, retention, salary, and professional development. Specifically, MASSP asked that the task force answer the following questions:

- o What should the role of the school principal be?
- o What administrative and support positions does each school need to help the principal fulfill that role?
- o How long should a principal's tenure be to allow for positive changes in student learning?
- o What kinds of on-going professional development will best serve sitting principals and assistant principals?
- o How much should principals and assistant principals earn?
- o What kinds of mentoring program will attract new administrators?
- o How do we change current preparation programs to better serve future administrators? (Barron, Becker & Pipkin, 1999).

> I have real fear of where we're going to get the next generation of building-level administrators—fear and concern. There aren't a lot of candidates out there.
> —Robert L. Urzillo, superintendent, Phoenixville, PA, (in Olson, 2000b)

The very same month that MASSP released its report, State Superintendent of Schools Nancy S. Grasmick appointed the Maryland Task Force on the Principalship. Expanding the scope of study from *secondary* administrators to *all* administrators, Dr. Grasmick charged the task force with helping the state redefine the role of the principal and structure of the principalship; recruit and retain more principals; and improve their preparation and development. "It's time we recognized that the principal

who provides good *instructional* leadership—not merely *administrative* leadership—makes the biggest difference in his or her school," said Dr. Grasmick. "What we need, then, is not only more principals, but more principals willing and able to meet new demands."

The National Shortage

In 1997, concerned about increasing numbers of retirement-eligible principals and anecdotal evidence indicating fewer applicants for principal openings, the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) asked the Educational Research Service (ERS) to survey superintendents nationwide about their ability to fill principal vacancies.

Principal Availability, by Location Type

Chart showing % of districts responding by location type (All Respondents, Urban, Suburban, Rural), categorized as Surplus, Right Number, and Shortage. X-axis: 0% to 100% (% of districts responding).

Principal Availability, by School Type

Chart showing % of districts responding by school type (All Respondents, Elementary, Jr. High/Middle, High), categorized as Surplus, Right Number, and Shortage. X-axis: 0% to 100% (% of districts responding).

Principals' Plans to Remain in Field

Source: Educational Research Service, *Is There a Shortage of Candidates for Openings in Qualified the Principalship: An Exploratory Study*, 1998

The results, published in 1998, confirmed the associations' suspicions regarding a looming principal shortage—in all regions and at all levels. Forecasting out 5-10 years, an even bleaker picture emerges. Just as the key to the nation's teacher shortage lies in the number of teachers eligible to retire, the principal shortage owes its urgency, in large part, to this category of attrition. Locally and nationally, educational associations estimate that about half of all current principals will be eligible to retire in the next five years. Sixty-six percent of all New

> The normal laws of supply and demand have been suspended. Apparently, more people are earning administrative certificates, but fewer are actually applying for available positions.
> —Richard P. McAdams, Asst. Professor of Educational Leadership, Lehigh University, 1998

York principals are eligible to retire today, and officials expect that 50 percent will in the next five years. Since 1994, about half of all Boston principals have retired or resigned (Daley, 1999). In general, fewer principals plan to remain principals until retirement and more are undecided about their future plans.

But retirement eligibility is really only half the problem. Equally troubling is the fact that there aren't a lot of educators willing or able to replace this aging principal corps. The critical problem appears to stem less from the number of possible *candidates* for the principalship than the number of *applicants*. For instance, between 1991 and 1995, Pennsylvania certified more than twice as many potential administrators as it did between 1966 and 1970—3,991 vs. 1,817.

While the number of the state's male candidates has remained relatively constant over the last 25 years, the number of women increased 78 percent and now make up 51 percent of its certified administrators. Nonetheless, Pennsylvania superintendents say the applicant pool is only half of what it was 10 or 15 years ago (McAdams, 1998).

Pennsylvania's experience finds validation across New England. In 1988, the New England School Development Council found that, in terms of certificated residents per state, "the supply of ... principals, in general, appears more than adequate to meet current and future demand.

However, many New England districts have experienced a reduced pool of quality applicants for administrative openings. The situation in New England seems to reflect findings from throughout the United States" (New England School Development Council, 1988).

The Reasons

Maryland mirrors the nation not only in the magnitude of its principal deficit but in the reasons for it. MASSP focus group participants frequently attributed the principal shortage to insufficient compensation. "The money differential isn't worth it," said one. "A teacher at the top or close to the top who is coaching ... can make more on a per diem basis" than an assistant principal.

Rarely, however, was money cited in the absence of what became its corollary—job stress. "Money doesn't become an issue unless you're unhappy," said one principal. Said another, "There's more stress than satisfaction. You have to ask yourself, 'Is it worth it, and for how long?'" (Barron, Becker & Pipkin, 1999).

Principals nationwide apparently feel the same. Asked what discourages applicants for the principalship, respondents to the ERS survey picked three clear winners: inadequate compensation, job stress, and too much time required.

> *Virtually all of the principals ... that Evans [1996] encountered acknowledge that their professional lives have grown more complicated and less satisfying, leading many to question not just whether it can be done, but also whether it is worth the cost.*
> —Michael Fullan, 1997

In 1994 and 1999, respectively, Louisiana and Montana surveyed educators who held administrative certification but weren't working as administrators. In both states, just half of those surveyed intended to apply for administrative positions. Those who didn't intend to apply cited as their reasons low salary, high stress, long working hours, increasing job complexity, inconsistency with desired lifestyle, and a lack of resources and support. Meetings and focus groups held in Maine, New Jersey, and North Carolina reinforced these findings (ERS/NAESP/NASSP, 2000).

> *When I was a teacher, I thought that there was the possibility of having good and wonderful schools by creating communities of teachers, regardless of who the principal was. I have not seen that happen. Good schools have good principals.*
> —Paul Schwarz, former USDE principal-in-residence, 1999

When executive directors and presidents of state principal associations were polled on factors they thought discouraged good candidates from applying for the principalship, respondents cited the customary factors—stress, time, salary, inadequate parental support, and a job scope that is not appreciated by the public. However, they touched on an equally persuasive point: principals are held accountable for results but often are not in control of all the factors that affect these results.

Elementary school principals responding to a 1998 NAESP survey felt the same. More than one-quarter of the respondents indicated that "the authority given to me by the school board and central administration [is] *not* in balance with the degree to which I am held responsible if things go wrong." Said one participant, "if the principal is to be held accountable for what occurs at the site, then he or she must have the authority, clout, or support to make things happen." Apparently, respondents did not feel that this was frequently the case (ERS/NAESP/NASSP, 2000).

What Discourages Applicants for the Principalship?

Source: Educational Research Service, *Is There a Shortage of Qualified Candidates for Openings in the Principalship: An Exploratory Study*, 1998

The Importance of the Principal

A principal shortage alone would be cause for alarm. But couple the shortage with established and emerging evidence that "the [principal] ... is absolutely critical to educational change and improvement" and the implications for public school quality are clear (U.S. Department of Education, 1999). By 1996, more than 40 statistical studies had been conducted across the U.S. to determine the effect of principal behavior on school performance. More than half of those studies found that principals made a significant difference in student achievement. Some went so far as to say that active principal leadership was the *best* indicator of higher student achievement (Harkreader & Weathersby, 1998).

At the University of Toronto—where some of the largest studies of school change have been conducted—researchers found that very few elements account for more variability in student achievement than school leadership (Leithwood, 1994).

It's a position Arthur Andersen has no trouble backing. Following a state takeover of the Jersey City and Paterson public school systems, the consulting firm was hired to file a report on the two districts for the state's legislature. Visiting 13 elementary schools—six identified as high-performing and seven, low-performing—firm representatives reported that the schools meeting state thresholds on various tests were not necessarily the ones with the fewest poor children or the least student mobility. "Based on our site evaluations," the researchers concluded, "this is attributable to the actions of the building principal" (Arthur Andersen, 1997).

> Research has documented what common sense has long dictated: that school leaders do determine whether or not schools are successful.
> —Gordon Cawelti, former executive director, ASCD, 1987

Recommendations

The Maryland Task Force on the Principalship divided into three subcommittees to more efficiently address what members agreed were the major issues facing the principalship today: the changing role of the principal and structure of the principalship; professional preparation and development provided prospective and current administrators; and compensation/incentives accorded principals and accountability demanded of them.

Our overall assessment is that the school principal has the greatest single impact on student performance. As a result, we believe that increased attention and funding needs to be directed towards programs that attract, evaluate, train, and retain the best principals.
—Arthur Andersen, 1997

The Role of the Principal

MSDE and all 24 local school systems will "clear the plate" of extraneous responsibilities assigned principals to ensure they have sufficient time to fulfill their primary role as instructional leader/facilitator.

Strategies

1. With education stakeholders, an MSDE workgroup will develop administrative staffing and support standards. Local school systems will give principals sufficient staff/support and the power to use staffing creatively to build a leadership team that best serves the school community.

2. MSDE will establish a workgroup charged with recommending triennially to the State Superintendent of Schools which state-level tasks, responsibilities, duties, and regulations can be removed from the principalship. The committee will also establish a model that local school systems can use to remove local tasks.

3. MSDE will support the redefinition of the role of the principal as instructional leader by awarding grants to at least five local school systems for current and proposed efforts focused on redefining the principalship. The results will be shared as part of principals' professional development.

Professional Development

In conjunction with the Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning K–16, local school systems and/or school system consortia will develop comprehensive, job-embedded programs for the identification and professional development of principal candidates and of current principals.

Strategies

1. MSDE will clearly articulate standards and develop a prototype framework to serve as the focus of identification and in-depth professional development of principal candidates.

2. Local school systems and/or school system consortia will develop comprehensive, job-embedded programs for the ongoing professional development of current principals.

3. Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs)—in collaboration with MSDE, the Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning K–16, and local school systems and/or school system consortia—will align their school administration programs with state standards and

the prototype frameworks to connect theory with practice. MSDE program approval of IHE programs will be contingent upon such alignment.

4. MSDE will facilitate the development and maintenance of an electronic clearinghouse for exemplary approaches and/or promising practices for principals' continuing growth and professional development.

Compensation, Incentives, and Accountability

Local school systems will adjust principal salary and compensation packages to better reflect the responsibilities, accountability, and stressors of the principalship.

Strategies

1. MSDE; the Maryland State Teachers' Association (MSTA); the Baltimore Teachers' Union (BTU); the Public School Superintendents' Association of Maryland (PSSAM); the Maryland Association of Boards of Education (MABE); MAESP; MASSP; the Maryland Business Roundtable for Education (MBRT); the Maryland Parent Teacher Association (PTA); and the Maryland Negotiations Service (MNS) will develop a model principal compensation package as a comparative standard for evaluating principals' salaries across Maryland. This standard will address salary, standard benefits, perquisites, incentives, and accountability.

2. Working with PSSAM and MNS, MSDE will establish web-based data on administrative salaries, benefits, and incentives statewide.

3. MSDE will convene a small workgroup of human resource and benefits administration experts from MSTA, BTU, PSSAM, MAESP, MASSP, and MBRT to develop specific incentives that will attract, retain, and reward high-performing principals.

4. To ensure adequate security for principals who take on difficult challenges and to link performance and accountability, MSDE, MSTA, BTU, MABE, MAESP, MASSP, and MNS will examine the feasibility of instituting specific-term contracts and/or appointments for principals governing service and performance incentives, coupled with appropriate accountability measures.

While initially submitted by separate subcommittees, the preceding recommendations were subsequently endorsed by all task force members. The remainder of this report will examine the basis for, and implications of, these recommendations. ∎

The Role of the Principal

Recommendation
MSDE and all 24 local school systems will "clear the plate" of extraneous responsibilities assigned principals to ensure they have sufficient time to fulfill their primary role as instructional leader/facilitator.

Strategies
1. With education stakeholders, an MSDE workgroup will develop administrative staffing and support standards. Local school systems will give principals sufficient staff/support and the power to use staffing creatively to build a leadership team that best serves the school community.

2. MSDE will establish a workgroup charged with recommending triennially to the State Superintendent of Schools which state-level tasks, responsibilities, duties, and regulations can be removed from the principalship. The committee will also establish a model that LEAs can use to remove local tasks.

3. MSDE will support the redefinition of the role of the principal as instructional leader by awarding grants to at least five local school systems for current and proposed efforts focused on redefining the principalship. The results will be shared as part of principals' professional development.

> *Across the country, there's not a hotter seat in all of education than the one in the principal's office.*
> —Bess Keller, 1998

Nowhere is the pressure to reform the nation's public schools more palpable than in the principal's office. "Principals must provide the leadership for changes expected by the public and public officials," says the SREB. "They will be responsible for establishing the climate and setting or reinforcing high expectations for teachers and for students" (1986). Increasingly, it is the principal who is recognized as the linchpin of school improvement and the gatekeeper of change.

Voluminous effective schools research conducted through 1984 is predicated upon the supposition that when specific elements are present in a school to an appreciable degree, student achievement will exceed expectations. When these same elements are absent, student achievement will fall short of them. One of these critical elements, borne out by each study, is a "building-wide, unified effort that depends on the exercise of leadership—most often identified as the principal" (ERS/NAESP/NASSP, 2000).

The Principal as Instructional Leader
The context of the principal's job has changed dramatically over the last 20 years. In their discussion of effective elementary schools, Hallinger and Murphy articulate the shift in what is considered the principal's primary responsibility. Effective principals, they say, have strong task orientation *with the focus on development of curriculum and instruction, rather than on management issues* [emphasis added] (1986).

This "new" focus is reiterated in the work of Bess Keller, who found that the best principals:
- recognize teaching and learning as the main business of the school;
- communicate the school's mission clearly and consistently to staff members, parents, and students;
- foster standards for teaching and learning that are high and attainable;

- provide clear goals and monitor the progress of students toward meeting them;
- promote an atmosphere of trust and sharing;
- build a good staff and make professional development a top concern; and
- do not tolerate bad teachers (1998).

However, the primacy of instructional leadership, substantiated well in theory, is not always borne out in practice. Principals see themselves on the firing line, and many report that the job now involves more work, more pressure and frustration, greater demands, and more responsibilities than when they assumed the position. In the midst of this chaos, they say, it's not always easy to maintain a focus on what matters. While one principal supported the notion of deemphasizing the principal as manager and reestablishing him/her as the educational leader, once inside the school, he said, it's business as usual. "We're still functioning on three levels: every day management; putting out fires; and a whole array of interpersonal ... things. There is little time to really do what you went to school for—what you thought the job was about" (Mertz, 1999).

> Too often, carrying out necessary management and support tasks leads to distortion of the goals of the job of the principal. The management tasks become the main goal, and instructional improvement is worked in wherever there is time.
> —Thelbert Drake & William Roe, 1994

What the Standards Say

In the prodigious research conducted on the nature of the principal's role, four key leadership domains emerge: organizational, political, instructional, and strategic. These domains have been translated into performance-based standards for licensure assessment. Twenty-four member states (Maryland among them) and more than a dozen educational associations spent two years developing the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards for School Leaders (*see Appendix B*). The six standards, adopted in 1996, are reinforced by 182 indicators governing required principal knowledge, disposition, and performance.

The standards* reflect the centrality of student learning; acknowledge the changing role of the school leader; recognize the collaborative nature of school leadership; are ambitious, improving the quality of the profession; inform performance-based systems of principal assessment and evaluation; are integrated and coherent; and are predicated on access, opportunity, and empowerment for all staff.

But while the standards were informed by those elements of leadership that produce high-performing schools and better student outcomes, they are so comprehensive that they underscore the concern expressed by many principals and researchers: that the principal's role is too overwhelming in score and complexity.

A Pared-Down Vision of School Leadership

Articulating standards and indicators of effectiveness provides a basis for clarifying the principal's role and for developing appropriate incentives and supports for ongoing professional development. But at the same time, standards proliferation can undermine these processes.

Therefore, the Task Force has created a concise vision statement to bring even more focus to the critical dimensions of school leadership.

_____

*ISLLC Standards: 1) Facilitate a shared vision. 2) Sustain a school culture conducive to student and staff learning. 3) Manage the organization for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. 4) Collaborate with families and community members. 5) Act with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner. 6) Influence the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

A New Vision for the Principalship

The principal is the instructional leader of the school, and this role must take priority over all other responsibilities. He/she must facilitate a school vision which includes challenging and suitable opportunities for the academic, social, and emotional development of each student. It is the principal's responsibility to ensure the school's program is consistent with and accountable to faculty and community priorities and aligned with the expectations of MSDE and his/her local board of education.

The Leadership Team

If the principal is to devote the necessary time and thoughtful energy to the critical tasks outlined in this vision, he/she must have a leadership team able to share in the many instructional and managerial functions involved in running a school.

1. **With education stakeholders, an MSDE workgroup will develop administrative staffing and support standards. Local school systems will give principals sufficient staff/support and the power to use staffing creatively to build a leadership team that best serves the school community.**

We need administrative support at the building level ... so the job expectations can be more realistic.
—ERS/NAESP/NASSP, 2000

The effective 21st century school team will function in a leadership capacity for daily and long-term planning. The principal will serve as its leader and as a mentor for team members who wish to prepare for the principalship. One possible team configuration is outlined below.

Team Member	Responsibilities
Director of Instruction/ Academic Dean	With the principal, supervises curriculum implementation and the evaluation of teachers.
Assistant Principal	Ensures the safety and security of all students; handles attendance and discipline concerns for no more than 250-300 students; supervises counselors.
Activities Director	Manages the school calendar; supervises co-curricular programs, including activities and athletics; recommends the selection of athletic coaches and activity sponsors.
Business Manager	Manages the school's accounts; supervises the school plant and cafeteria.

Delegation ... is an orientation and skill that only a minority of middle managers have mastered. It amounts to ... not [doing] anything that someone else in the building can do, because principals need to spend their time on what others in the building are not in a position to do.

—Michael Fullan, 1997

O'Neil likens the new millennium's school and its leadership implications to the contemporary corporation. Fundamental challenges, he says, require fundamental changes—cultural changes that, in turn, require collective learning. Involving people at many levels devising, together, significant and enduring solutions, the managerial arrangement reflects the principal as "facilitator-

leader." Rather than being the school's key decision-maker or "thinker," principals ... "facilitate the activities of myriad groups and subgroups all engaged in decision-making on several fronts" (Odden, 1995).

Corderio says the best of today's principals are generalists who, through collaboration, distribute and coordinate leadership opportunities that focus on curriculum, instruction, and assessment (1994). Describing transformational change, Murphy's ideal organizational diagram has principals leading from the center (of a network of human relationships) rather than the top (of an organizational pyramid); enabling and supporting teacher success; managing a constellation of change efforts; and extending the school community (1994).

Undeniably, this "school community" includes parents. Improving schools requires the active participation of adults both within and beyond the school. To internalize in others the school improvement imperative and develop in them a commitment to the tenets of reform, principals must be competent in engaging parental involvement and establishing community partnerships.

> *Dependency [is having] one's actions predominantly shaped, however unintentionally, by events and/or by actions ... of others. Dependency is created through the constant bombardment of new tasks and continual interruptions on the job which keep principals occupied or at least off balance. Overload fosters dependency.*
> —Michael Fullan, 1997

> *The principal's job is to ensure that essential things get done, not to do them all himself or herself. There are few things that absolutely must be done, cannot be delayed, or cannot be delegated.*
> —Michael Fullan, 1997

The principal's role as instructional leader has thus evolved from command-and-control bureaucrat to facilitator—a role that works best in the decentralized restructuring school. In this role, the principal enables teachers, parents, and community members to assume leadership and decision-making roles to promote improved curriculum, instruction, and assessment (Speck, 1999). By serving as a role model, and establishing an atmosphere in which all members of the school's organization work to improve processes and outcomes, the principal encourages a self-correcting school (Goldring & Rallis, 1993).

Ivonne Durant, principal of a Texas elementary school, acknowledges her role as a leader of leaders. "I'm not the only leader in this building. We are a building full of leaders. When I got here, there were a lot of bright, energetic people who were all going in different directions. They really weren't focused on a common mission. My job was to harness that energy and to focus it on common goals and objectives" (Richardson, 1999).

2. **MSDE will establish a workgroup charged with recommending triennially to the State Superintendent of Schools which state-level tasks, responsibilities, duties, and regulations can be removed from the principalship. The committee will also establish a model that LEAs can use to remove local tasks.**

Principals responding to an NAESP survey indicated that they spend, on average, 54 hours a week on school-related activities. Compared with concerns such as student behavior, security issues, and teacher performance, fragmentation of time was for these principals the top-ranked issue—selected by nearly three-quarters of the respondents. The time commitment only worsens with secondary principals. In 1991, twice as many middle school principals (30 percent) reported spending 60–69 hours a week on their jobs as did in 1981. Three times as many (6 percent) reported spending 70 or more hours a week on the job. (ERS/NAESP/NASSP, 2000).

More time on the job, however, doesn't necessarily mean more time devoted to instructional leadership. High school principals reported spending "relatively less time on program development

and planning, and relatively more time on student behavior and working with the district office" (Pellicer, 1988). A job shadowing exercise conducted in 12 urban middle schools revealed a critical problem for principals: most of them had too little time to spend on instructional and leadership matters because they spent "an inordinate time keeping order and dealing with administrative trivia" (Lewis, 1993).

> *We are way beyond time management. There is simply no more time to manage. There is no such thing as a 10-hour day or a 12-hour day anymore. If it takes 15 hours, then that's what it takes and that's what you have to do to get the job done.*
> —Focus group participant (in Barron, Becker & Pipkin, 1999)

In fact, top-ranked frustrations among nearly 200 North Carolina principals included "managing time demands and paperwork, [and] dealing with ... bureaucracy and constantly changing regulations" (Lyons, 1999). And "frequent interruptions that interfere with completing other tasks" ranked high on two different inventories of job stressors administered to principals in another school district (Favaro, 1996).

Overwhelmingly, principals indicate a sense of multiple, often conflicting priorities. Time is fragmented, they say, and focusing on important issues is difficult when so many administrative tasks must be completed first. In this frenetic atmosphere, not everything is done well, and leadership is habitually shortchanged. Just as delegating essential responsibilities is important, so is removing extraneous ones entirely.

Howard County first tackled time fragmentation in 1995. While its "Clearing the Plate" initiative was successful, county superintendent Michael Hickey says that, to effect real change, the efforts must be ongoing. The plates that were cleared, he notes, "have since been refilled [by] the state, the school system, and even principals themselves" (Hickey, 2000).

Who	Howard County Public Schools
What	"Clearing the Plate"
When	1995
How	Eliminate and/or compromise staff duties and responsibilities determined to be discretionary, unnecessary, nonproductive, and/or of a low priority.
Result	17 responsibilities removed or mitigated, many directly affecting administrators; implementation timetable set for each
For Example	o Discontinue school-level reports on signal incidents and human relations violations. o Evaluate secretaries and custodians every two years, rather than every year. o Designate a special education chairperson to attend all ARD/CARD meetings. o Hire additional building/athletics security to relieve administrators.

   3. **MSDE will support the redefinition of the role of the principal as instructional leader by awarding grants to at least five local school systems for current and proposed efforts focused on redefining the principalship. The results will be shared as part of principals' professional development.**

Sprinkled throughout the U.S. are district- and statewide initiatives focused on developing prospective school leaders. (These "grow-your-own" programs, however, can be as cursory as one-day workshops or week-long summer sessions.) Existing, as well—though to a lesser degree—are induction programs geared toward new principals. However, virtually none of these

programs "deal[s] with significant issues such as the amount of time many principals spend on the job, concerns that not enough time is available to devote to instructional leadership, and the feeling ... that what is expected of them is unrealistic. These are issues that must be addressed if we are to have well-qualified principals in all of our schools" (ERS/NAESP/NASSP, 2000). ∎

Professional Development

Recommendation

In conjunction with the Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning K–16, local school systems and/or school system consortia will develop comprehensive, job-embedded programs for the identification and professional development of principal candidates and of current principals.

Strategies

1. MSDE will clearly articulate standards and develop a prototype framework to serve as the focus of identification and in-depth professional development of principal candidates.

2. Local school systems and/or school system consortia will develop comprehensive, job-embedded programs for the ongoing professional development of current principals.

3. IHEs—in collaboration with MSDE, the Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning K–16, and local school systems and/or school system consortia—will align their school administration programs with state standards and the prototype frameworks to connect theory with practice. MSDE program approval of IHE programs will be contingent upon such alignment.

4. MSDE will facilitate the development and maintenance of an electronic clearinghouse for exemplary approaches and/or promising practices for principals' continuing growth and professional development.

> The need for high-quality professional development is greater now than ever. Principals who have been poorly prepared in out-dated preparation programs and poorly inducted in programs that do little more than review district policies simply cannot lead breakneck reform in the way states now require them to.
> —National Association of State Boards of Education, 1999

One of the most important policy considerations for ensuring high-quality candidates for the principalship is building preparation programs that provide candidates with the knowledge, skills, and disposition they need to meet state standards. In Maryland, responsibility for building these programs falls primarily to the Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning K–16.

> Improved training and selection practices will produce school leaders who are ready to handle today's challenges, but continued restructuring will likely make tomorrow's challenges quite different. Schools that fail to support professional development may find their leadership becoming increasingly irrelevant.
> —Larry Lashway, 1999

However, it remains that most school administrators, locally and nationally, have been trained in programs that are now both irrelevant and grossly inadequate for the current responsibilities of the principal-ship. "In general, they are criticized for being non-competitive, lacking in rigor, fragmented, and failing to provide the knowledge and skills that principals need to succeed" (National Association of State Boards of Education, 1999).

Effective programs, on the other hand ...
- are competitive;
- develop philosophical and intellectual perspectives on the school system;
- bridge the gap between theory and practice;
- implement innovative course schedules;
- develop principals who go where they are needed;
- forge partnerships with school districts; and
- insist upon rigorous internships (NASBE, 1999).

1. **MSDE will clearly articulate standards and develop a prototype framework to serve as the focus of identification and in-depth professional development of principal candidates.**
   o Local school systems and/or school system consortia will develop their own identification and professional development frameworks for principal candidates, which include internships that are long-term, full-time, comprehensive, and part of school system staffing. Appropriately trained and compensated local school system/consortia staff and/or IHE staff will serve as intern supervisors, and the internships will be eligible for IHE intern practicum credit.
   o Professional development programs will be consistent with the NSDC standards and will be linked to student achievement and improved classroom practices.
   o MSDE-approved IHE principal preparation programs will reflect these standards and support local frameworks for professional development.
   o Local school systems and/or school system consortia will submit professional development program proposals to MSDE for approval and supplemental funding.

Quite frankly, I think we've been disappointed with the traditional teacher and leadership training programs. They have not been able to move from the theoretical to the practical issues that principals face in a manner that's been, in our minds, as effective as they need to be.
—Vincent L. Ferrandino, executive director, NAESP (in Olson, 2000a)

As part of its licensure process, Maryland requires that principal candidates pass the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA), a six-hour constructed-response test based on the ISLLC's Standards for School Leaders. To provide appropriate guidance for local school systems, MSDE should clearly articulate these standards and develop a prototype framework to serve as the focus of in-depth professional development of principal candidates. Local school systems or school system consortia should then create their own frameworks using the state prototypes as a guide.

Most prospective educational leaders are self-selected because there are virtually no leader recruitment programs—nor even research about it.
—Joseph Murphy, 1992

Do you have a formal induction/mentoring program for new principals?

	% of superintendents reponding "yes"
All Respondents	~46
Urban	~55
Suburban	~48
Rural	~45

Do you have an aspiring principals' program to recruit/prepare candidates?

	% of superintendents reponding "yes"
All Respondents	~27
Urban	~45
Suburban	~38
Rural	~22

Source: Educational Research Service, *Is There a Shortage of Qualified Candidates for Openings in the Principalship: An Exploratory Study*, 1998

To assure the appropriateness of local professional development programs, MSDE has a twofold responsibility. Recognizing both the scarcity of local resources and the enormity of the problem, MSDE should provide supplemental funding to local school systems to help establish and implement these plans, contingent upon LSS submission and MSDE approval of a professional development program proposal.

Clearly, the current system of simply promoting a teacher to assistant principal and, subsequently, to principal—without substantial training—is insufficient for developing an effective principal corps. And simply throwing such candidates into the position to get on-the-job training is totally unacceptable.

While school leaders consistently say that mentoring by effective, experienced principals was the most important support they received as rookies, just under half of the superintendents interviewed by ERS indicate that their districts have a formal induction or mentoring program for new hires. Just one-quarter have a program in place to recruit and prepare candidates (1998).

In addition to "good on-the-job training under a fine mentoring principal," respondents found practicums or internships designed to provide real-world theory application (while still supported by university faculty or practicing administrators) an effective induction tool (ERS/NAESP/NASSP, 2000).

2. **Local school systems and/or school system consortia will develop comprehensive, job-embedded programs for the ongoing professional development of current principals.**
   o MSDE will clearly articulate standards and develop a prototype framework to serve as the focus of in-depth professional development of current principals.
   o Local school systems and school system consortia will provide a comprehensive mentorship program for first- and second-year principals. Mentors will be experienced principals with no other assignments and will receive appropriate compensation and training.
   o Professional development programs will be consistent with NSDC standards and will be linked to student achievement and improved classroom practices.
   o Local school systems and/or school system consortia will submit mentorship program proposals to MSDE for approval and funding.
   o MSDE will plan, fund, and implement comprehensive professional development for current principals using the former Maryland Professional Development Academy as a model.
   o MSDE will coordinate inter-system networking for cooperative problem solving and sharing best practices.
   o Local school system and/or school system consortia will coordinate intra-system networking for cooperative problem solving and sharing best practices.
   o MSDE will supplement funding for principals' participation in state and national conferences.

If most preparation programs have done an inadequate job of preparing candidates for the principalship, most professional development opportunities have also done little to compensate for knowledge and performance gaps once principals are on the job (NASBE, 1999). Although much of the literature concerns administrator preparation, it is important to recognize that ongoing, high-quality professional development is necessary even for seasoned principals (ERS/NAESP/NASSP, 2000). Indeed, it is unconscionable to think that, once placed, principals require no further development. "Even among well-prepared and high-performing principals, expertise doesn't last forever" (NASBE, 1999).

State Policy Options: Building a Foundation for Quality Through Principal Preparation and Professional Development

o Include in the state's system of standards clear expectations for preparation and professional development outcomes.
o Use accreditation to ensure that preparation programs meet high standards.
o Allow diverse routes for principal preparation as long as they adhere to the same high standards as traditional preparation programs.
o Ensure that all new principals have access to high-quality induction that includes mentorship.
o Base principals' professional development on the results of individual formative and summative evaluation that is based on state standards and clearly defines the targeted educational needs of individual principals.
o Evaluate systems of preparation and professional development to ensure they help principals meet state standards.

Source: National Association of State Boards of Education,
Principals of Change, 1999

Preparation and transition problems are, of course, exacerbated among first- and second-year principals, who will most certainly encounter situations never studied in their preparation programs. They need mentors who are experienced principals with no other assignments, and who receive appropriate compensation and training (ERS/NAESP/NASSP, 2000). Likewise, veteran principals still require continuous renewal if they are to remain current in their ideology and conversant with best practices.

In general, effective professional development is:
o standards-based and systemic;
o flexible—able to respond quickly to principals' new and evolving needs; able to use new technologies to improve efficiency and cut costs;
o focused on effective practice or application, which is, in turn, based on rigorous theory;
o evaluated according to outcomes;
o held accountable for bringing principals to high standards;
o sufficiently flexible to address the individual learning needs of the principal; and
o focused on three interrelated goals: principals' personal improvement, meeting school goals, and fostering principals' career growth.

> A profession is never mastered. Professionals grow older and face different life circumstances. Clients change. New research and technology appear. Social and political priorities are reordered.
> —Daniel Duke, 1993

The Maryland Professional Development Academy was a widely respected delivery model that closed in 1990 due to lack of financial support. This academy or one similar to it in scope and intensity should be reestablished to serve principals' ongoing professional development needs. Such a model would also facilitate a statewide network allowing for cooperative problem solving and the sharing of best practices. MSDE should help fund principals' participation in state and national conferences, as well, to expand the breadth of best practices available for modeling in-state.

While leadership academies are certainly a step in the right direction—especially when they include intensive and targeted assistance—policymakers should look "beyond leadership academies and *ad hoc* professional development opportunities to an overall system of professional development that can provide targeted training and assistance to principals throughout their careers" (NASBE, 1999).

> **3. IHEs—in collaboration with MSDE, the Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning K–16, and local school systems and/or school system consortia—will align their school administration programs with state standards and the prototype frameworks to connect theory with practice. MSDE program approval of IHE programs will be contingent upon such alignment.**

Because no local school system *could* or *should* provide all its own training, IHE administrator preparation programs must be aligned with state standards and local school system plans and frameworks. Colleges and universities already have the research base necessary to assure the delivery of information that is timely and reflects best practices. Their programs, however, would benefit from more job-embedded preparation opportunities for current and prospective principals and more concrete linkages between theory and practice. Ongoing dialogue and cooperation between local school systems and IHEs are critical to ensuring this alignment.

> **4. MSDE will facilitate the development and maintenance of an electronic clearinghouse for exemplary approaches and/or promising practices for principals' continuing growth and professional development.**

If university programs don't change over the next several years, I think we're going to look at all types of alternatives to prepare principals. I think the private sector is going to get very much into the game.
—Gerald N. Tirozzi, executive director, NASSP (in Olson, 2000a)

Depending upon their size, local school systems may not have the time and personnel to stay on top of emerging best practices and other information necessary for principals' continued growth and development (MSDE, 1999). It is important that MSDE establish an electronic clearinghouse from which local school systems could secure such information. The clearinghouse should reflect collaboration with external professional organizations and their state affiliates—the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD); NAESP; NASSP; the American Association of School Administrators (AASA); and the Council of Educational, Administrative, and Supervisory Organizations of Maryland (CEASOM). ∎

Although trial and error is an inevitable part of learning a new job, the all-too-common laissez-faire approach to the transition from preparation to practice among principals makes [that] transition ... much more nerve-wracking than it need be.
—NASBE, 1999

Compensation, Incentives, and Accountability

Recommendation

Local school systems will adjust principal salary and compensation packages to better reflect the responsibilities, accountability, and stressors of the principalship.

Strategies

1. MSDE, MSTA, BTU, PSSAM, MABE, MAESP, MASSP, MBRT, the Maryland PTA, and MNS will develop a model principal compensation package as a comparative standard for evaluating principals' salaries across Maryland. This standard will address salary, standard benefits, perquisites, incentives, and accounta-bility.

2. Working with PSSAM and the MNS, MSDE will establish web-based data on administrative salaries, benefits, and incentives statewide.

3. MSDE will convene a small workgroup of human resource and benefits administration experts from MSTA, BTU, PSSAM, MAESP, MASSP, and MBRT to develop specific incentives that will attract, retain, and reward high-performing principals.

> *Assuming a person's first administrative position will increase his or her income by $10,000 ... and [recognizing] that many teachers hold supplemental contracts for coaching or other extra-curricular activities ... promotion to an administrative position ... might actually have a negative impact on family finances.*
>
> *—Richard P. McAdams, asst. professor of educational leadership, Lehigh University, 1998*

4. To ensure adequate security for principals who take on difficult challenges and to link performance and accountability, MSDE, MSTA, BTU, MABE, MAESP, MASSP, and MNS will examine the feasibility of instituting specific-term contracts and/or appointments for principals governing service and performance incentives, coupled with appropriate accountability measures.

While "insufficient pay compared to responsibilities" consistently tops superintendents', principals', and certificated (but not practicing) administrators' list of job disincentives, thoughtfully addressing (much less adjusting) principals' compensation remains a complicated process. Its complexity—exacerbated by constraints imposed by the public sector—lies in several interacting factors.

Collective Bargaining

All Maryland principals are members of a collective bargaining unit. In 12 of the state's 24 LEAs, this unit is the same unit that negotiates teacher salaries. This requirement substantially constrains the compensation process, and, in some respects, is antithetical to the role of leadership—certainly in the private sector—and, to a large degree, in the public sector as well.

Closed System

Related to collective bargaining, salaries in school systems operate within a closed system—breeding implications up and down the salary scales. In a closed system, principals' salaries cannot be considered in isolation from those of teachers and other personnel whom they supervise and whose roles are considered critically important to school effectiveness. Neither can they ignore salaries of those who supervise them, namely LEA and area superintendents. There is a commonly held perception among principals that they "get what's left over after the teachers' contract is settled," and in the collective bargaining context, this notion is essentially true.

Baseline Determination

Are all principalships the same? Are some more difficult than others? These are more than philosophical questions, for they determine the degree to which we can establish a baseline salary for the profession. Traditionally, the first question elicits an unqualified "yes"—a tacit acknowledgment and reinforcement of "professional unity." (A principal is a principal is a principal.)

On a practical level, however, it is rather apparent that many factors affect the scope and difficulty of a principal's responsibilities. If all principalships are essentially the same, we could presume that principal shortages would be comparable across grade levels and localities. That, however, is not the case. High schools consistently have more principal vacancies than elementary schools—

> If education is important, let's invest in it with salaries that are commensurate with the level of responsibility.
> —Focus group participant (in Barron, Becker & Pipkin, 1999)

55 percent vs. 47 percent in 1998—and rural schools historically experience graver shortages than suburban ones—52 percent vs. 45 percent in 1998 (ERS/NAESP/NASSP, 2000). In the private sector, hard-to-fill positions would warrant comparatively higher compensation. In education, they generally do not.

Motivators vs. Hygienes

Finally, there is Herzberg's classical dichotomy between job elements that motivate and those that do not, which he termed "hygienes" (Herzberg, year). Salary is a hygiene factor. Obviously, employees expect money to be exchanged for services and in sufficient quantities. If both criteria aren't satisfied, applicants will not take the positions offered and employees will not remain in them. However, local and national studies confirm that, for most principals, *salary alone does not motivate performance*.

1. **MSDE, MSTA, BTU, PSSAM, MABE, MAESP, MASSP, MBRT, the Maryland PTA, and MNS will develop a model principal compensation package as a comparative standard for evaluating principals' salaries across Maryland. This standard will address salary, standard benefits, perquisites, incentives, and accountability.**

2. **Working with PSSAM and the MNS, MSDE will establish web-based data on administrative salaries, benefits, and incentives statewide.**

Because principals operate in the public sector, and are governed by its rules, these three key compensation categories will be circumscribed to varying degrees.

Compensation Packages

Baseline Salary

For purposes of this report, the baseline salary is the negotiated salary (*see chart on page 31 for salary ranges by local school system*).

> We can talk about money issues, but I don't think anyone at this table is here just because of the money.
> —Focus group participant (in Barron, Becker & Pipkin, 1999)

Standard Benefits

Standard benefits—such as health and hospital insurance, term life insurance, sick leave, vacation time, and pension packages—remain fairly comparable among Maryland's 24 LEAs.

> What principals want most is more money, according to [a] nationwide survey.
> —Linda Perlstein, 2000

Perquisites

With the exception of travel reimbursement and conference stipends, perquisites are used rather sporadically in Maryland's LEAs. Some more common perks are pagers, cell phones, laptops, fax machines, credit cards (for business expenses), and home hook-up to the Internet. While perks and their ancillary costs (e.g., additional phone lines) are standard in the private sector, they are decidedly not in education—at least not at the principal's level.

Incentives

Incentives are designed to serve one of two purposes: attract and retain qualified people, or encourage high performance. While incentives are widely used in the business arena, they are quite rarely used in education, due largely to their implications for collective bargaining. Nevertheless, incentives can be used to reward outstanding or improved performance, motivate candidates to accept particularly challenging or even undesirable job assignments, or encourage them to focus on specific priorities that may change from one year to the next. *As long as the (prospective) recipient has the ability and resources to influence the outcome—and the desired results are measurable*—incentives are a valid and valuable compensation component.

The foregoing statement is the essence of true accountability, which the public/political sector not only *expects* of leadership, but *demands* of it. However, these demands must be accompanied by access to and control over the resources required to perform the role successfully. Accountability without this control of resources is an arrangement doomed to failure. The equation must be a balanced one: strong outcome measures on the one hand, and power over the tools that breed success on the other.

> 3. **MSDE will convene a small workgroup of human resource and benefits administration experts from MSTA, BTU, PSSAM, MAESP, MASSP, and MBRT to develop specific incentives that will attract, retain, and reward high-performing principals.**

Maryland's decade-old school-reform agenda is predicated upon measuring school performance and holding principal accountable for results. However, the downside of recognition (e.g., sanctions, takeover) currently outweighs the up (monetary and professional rewards). If accountability is our primary goal, then incentives are appropriate C even when principals believe they haven't sufficient power or resources to put their performance on the line. For better or worse, accountability has drawn that line for us. It exacts sanctions for failure and, for equity's sake, should demand rewards for success.

NASBE (1999) strongly recommends incentives to encourage high performance. Indicators that serve as measures for such incentives include student performance; achievement of agreed upon goals; and school improvement trends, such as staff turnover, attendance rates, climate, and customer satisfaction.

Incentives centered on attracting and retaining high-quality principal candidates include:
- signing bonuses
- sabbaticals
- waivers to regulations regarding earnings caps for retired individuals reemployed as classroom teachers (allowed under Senate Bill 15, passed in 1999)
- longevity bonuses
- annuities
- enhanced medical coverage post-retirement
- increased access to top-level leadership
- direct reporting capability (e.g., principal to superintendent)

4. To ensure adequate security for principals who take on difficult challenges and to link performance and accountability, MSDE, MSTA, BTU, MABE, MAESP, MASSP, and MNS will examine the feasibility of instituting specific-term contracts and/or appointments for principals governing service and performance incentives, coupled with appropriate accountability measures.

Subject to standard clauses governing egregious behavior, contracts should provide principals with sufficient security to follow strategic plans without fear of penalty following declining student performance—a phenomenon that frequently accompanies change. Barring a clear indication of negligent behavior, principals should have the time to allow plans to come to fruition and thus provide a more reliable basis for evaluation—both of the outcomes and of their performance. ■

Local School System	Principals' Salaries (12 months) 1999–2000 School Year	
	Minimum	Maximum
Allegany	$42,684	$76,495
Anne Arundel	55,788	88,333
Baltimore City	66,226	86,392
Baltimore County	73,037	82,500
Calvert	75,000	91,000
Caroline	64,584	74,492
Carroll	48,692	86,788
Cecil	53,389	76,940
Charles	57,907	94,242
Dorchester	57,716	73,917
Frederick	46,940	83,189
Garrett	39,820	70,856
Harford	45,393	77,187
Howard	60,931	87,805
Kent	58,085	79,280
Montgomery	73,345	105,014
Prince George's	62,623	90,723
Queen Anne's	60,218	77,876
St. Mary's	49,173	84,439
Somerset	37,289	65,380

Principals as dynamic change agents seem to be still in the minority despite at least 20 years of effort.
—Michael Fullan, 1997

Talbot	55,409	73,706
Washington	56,047	82,258
Wicomico	55,940	75,080
Worcester	49,482	83,670

Source: Cecil County Public Schools, 1999

Conclusion

In the literature on effective leadership, one quality shared by the best principals emerges rather quickly, though its descriptors might differ. An effective principal "provides clear goals and monitors the progress of students toward meeting them" (Keller, 1998). An effective principal is "intimately familiar with the school curriculum" (Stringfield & Herman, 1997). An effective principal is conversant in curriculum design and alignment and the development of content-driven assessment instruments (National Staff Development Council, 1995).

The effective principal sustains a focused vision for the school; insists that both students and educators meet high standards; obtains or provides targeted staff development; recruits high-quality staff; and, as necessary, strongly encourages the departure of staff unwilling to adapt to a shared, targeted, and more active instructional program (National Staff Development Council, 1995).

Additionally, when effective principals move up and out of their schools, as they often do, the school districts' willingness and ability to select like-minded individuals for those principalships is a powerful predictor of the reform effort's staying power (Stringfield & Herman, 1997).

The Problems

Despite the overwhelming evidence showing that active instructional leadership influences student performance positively, still more evidence suggests that many principals fall short of the instructional ideal. NAESP surveyed K–8 principals last year and found that they gave low priority to staff development. Staff supervision and contact, on the other hand, they rated their highest priority. Simply put, much of what the leadership literature shows makes an effective principal is not what principals are trained for (Keller, 1998)—nor what they are given time for.

Time is certainly an issue to California principals, surveyed two years ago by EdSource, a nonprofit research organization. Respondents said they wish they could spend almost twice as much time as they currently do on instruction and curriculum. Only about a quarter of their time goes to teaching and school improvement, they said (Keller, 1998).

Insufficient preparation is foremost on the minds of Muse and Thomas, who contend that "regardless of the year appointed, [principals] have been trained and certified as administrators through programs largely irrelevant to, and grossly inadequate for, the work responsibilities found in the school principalship ..." (1991).

Maryland administrators are also concerned about the lack of training prior to and after taking on a principalship. In an MASSP survey administered last year to 250 principals and assistant principals, respondents speculated that this oversight could contribute to the state's dearth of qualified, *interested* administrator candidates.

Consult any survey of principals undertaken locally or nationally, and you'll find that poor pay, long work hours, high stress, and insufficient authority contribute significantly to this dearth as well.

The Rewards

However, it is important to note that just as readily as principals express the frustrations inherent in their jobs do they share the satisfactions. Seeing students learn and succeed in school, working with students, and helping teachers grow in their work topped North Carolina principals' list of professional joys.

Almost two-fifths of principals responding to a 1998 NAESP study described their morale as "excellent"; more than half said that it was "good but could be better"; and less than 1 percent characterized personal morale as "very bad." More than half the principals responding said they would become a principal again if they had it to do all over; one-third said they "probably would;" and just 15.5 percent said they probably or certainly would *not*. Middle school principals talked enthusiastically of the opportunity to help students and others using their creative leadership abilities and of developing a close rapport with students and teachers. (ERS/NAESP/NASSP, 2000).

The Solution

These are not the sentiments of principals looking to jump ship. Many, perhaps, will decide not to—if MSDE and local school systems act decisively on the recommendations put forth by the Maryland Task Force on the Principal-ship. In fact, they might just stick around long enough to persuade the many potential candidates out there that the principal's office really *is* the place to be.

This report is intended to generate discussion about the state's shortage of qualified principals and principal candidates—an issue with serious implications for the future of school reform in Maryland. Of course, discussion, alone, does very little. Therefore, the report outlines concrete strategies to mitigate the priority, professional development, and compensation issues that seriously threaten the quantity of school leaders and the quality of school leadership today.

1. **MSDE and all 24 local school systems will "clear the plate" of extraneous responsibilities assigned principals to ensure they have sufficient time to fulfill their primary role as instructional leader/facilitator.**

2. **In conjunction with the Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning K-16, local school systems and/or school system consortia will develop comprehensive, job-embedded programs for the identification and professional development of principal candidates and of current principals.**

3. **Local school systems will adjust principal salary and compensation packages to better reflect the responsibilities, accountability, and stressors of the principalship.**

We are encouraged by the state's swift and sweeping response to the imminent teacher shortage and hope that the state's response to its crippling *administrator* shortage—using these and comparable recruitment and retention strategies—will be equally swift and decisive. We hope, too,

that insisting on professional preparation and induction programs that more accurately reflect the new role of the principal will better serve those educators who do decide to pursue administrative positions.

In a presentation last year to the American Association of School Personnel Administrators, Richard Flanary and Peter Reed suggested that the primary task before us is to "first determin[e] what good principals look like" and then determine what experiences would help candidates and new principals acquire these skills and attributes (Flanary & Reed, 1999). This report is Maryland's first step toward doing just that. ∎

Glossary of Acronyms

AASA   American Association of School Administrators

ASCD   Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

BTU   Baltimore Teachers' Union

CEASOM   Council of Educational, Administrative, and Supervisory Organizations of Maryland

ERS   Educational Research Service

IHE   Institution of Higher Education

ISLLC   Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium

LSS   Local School System

MABE   Maryland Association of Boards of Education

MAESP   Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals

MASSP   Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals

MBRT   Maryland Business Roundtable for Education

MNS   Maryland Negotiations Service

MSDE   Maryland State Department of Education

MSTA   Maryland State Teachers Association

NAESP   National Association of Elementary School Principals

NASBE   National Association of State Boards of Education

NASSP   National Association of Secondary School Principals

NSDC   National Staff Development Council

PSSAM   Public School Superintendents' Association of Maryland

PTA   Parent Teacher Association

SLLA   School Leaders Licensure Assessment

SREB   Southern Regional Education Board

USDE   United States Department of Education

Appendix A: Report on the State of the Secondary Principalship

Appendix B: ISLLC Standards

Appendix C: Seven Dimensions of Effective School Leadership

In drafting its recommendations, the Maryland Task Force on the Principalship (Role of the Principal Subcommittee) reviewed the Chicago Standards for Developing School Leaders developed by the Chicago Principals and Administrators Association. Modifying the standards for use in Maryland, the Subcommittee identified seven dimensions of effective school leadership and the indicators of effective action in each.

Seven Dimension of Effective School Leadership
1. School Leadership
2. Parent Involvement and Community Partnerships
3. Student-Centered Learning Climates
4. Professional Development and School-Based Resource Management
5. Instructional Leadership/Improving Teaching and Learning
6. School Management and Daily Operations
7. Interpersonal Effectiveness

School Leadership
Leadership actions taken by principals often catalyze the school improvement efforts of teachers, staff, parents, and community members. In order for these actions to become automatic for principals, they must develop competence in three specific areas: building high performing teams, coordinating the work of others, and developing school improvement plans to fully implement the vision.

Indicators of Effective Leadership:
- Builds high-performing teams
- Pluralizes leadership across the staff, parents, and community
- Empowers teachers to develop collective faculty action
- Engages teachers, staff, parents, and community in decision making
- Implements an inclusive school improvement planning process
- Employs resources to serve school improvement priorities
- Crafts a personal vision and builds a collective vision
- Maintains moral ground as a leader

Parent Involvement and Community Partnerships
Improving schools requires the active participation of the adults both within and beyond the school. To internalize in others the school improvement imperative and develop in them a commitment to reform principles, principals must be competent in engaging parental involvement and establishing community partnerships.

Indicators of Effective Leadership:
- Develops an array of methods to improve communication
- Supports parents in their desire to help their children learn
- Recruits and trains parent and community volunteers
- Involves parents and community members through programs designed to facilitate and enhance school improvement efforts
- Coordinates the resources of the immediate community in the interest of students

o Establishes partnerships with businesses and other organizations
o Builds relationships with other institutions of higher learning

Student-Centered Learning Climates

As key culture builders, principals are critical to creating a student-centered climate that influences all school-based decisions and interactions. Principals will do this by nurturing student development, enforcing discipline, and setting high academic expectations.

Indicators of Effective Leadership:
o Works with the team to establish standards for a safe, respectful, and disciplined climate
o Implements policies and standards consistently and equitably
o Devises programs to combat tardiness and absenteeism
o Helps teachers set challenging goals for students and themselves
o Monitors instruction to ensure high expectations
o Uses and recognizes student work
o Builds a schedule that meets the needs of all learners
o Coordinates school and community resources to meet student needs
o Promotes instructional practices that foster the potential of each student

Professional Development and School-Based Human Resource Management

Because student learning is highly dependent upon teacher learning, principal competence in professional development and human resource management are critical to improving academic achievement.

Indicators of Effective Leadership:
o Conducts needs assessments to determine direction for professional development
o Coordinates content-driven professional development programs
o Aligns professional development activities with school improvement plan goals
o Develops a professional community to support teacher collaboration
o Identifies resource providers for professional development
o Understands change management models
o Involves others in recruiting and interviewing new teachers and staff
o Hires new teachers and staff following appropriate on-site procedures
o Develops a team through hiring decisions and staff development
o Builds a department or faculty through strategic hiring decisions
o Inducts new staff through orientation programs

Instructional Leadership/Improving Teaching and Learning

Improving teaching and learning requires assertive instructional leadership from the principal. Principals must be competent in three key areas: supervision of student achievement and assessment, implementation of curriculum, and monitoring of instructional improvement.

Indicators of Effective Leadership:
o Interprets data on students, staff, and the community to enhance student achievement
o Uses school and student data for instructional planning
o Develops and maintains a school-wide assessment system to monitor instruction and student achievement
o Aligns assessment with curriculum and instruction

- Aligns curriculum with Maryland Learning Outcomes
- Establishes and implements an intellectually challenging curriculum to meet the individual learning needs of all students
- Coordinates curricular priorities with school improvement plan goals
- Uses curricular resources — including programs, instructional materials, and technology — to support school, district, and state learning outcomes
- Promotes a range of instructional strategies to engage students in meaningful learning activities
- Uses action-research to evaluate continuously instruction and student learning
- Fosters the growth of learning communities
- Facilitates the use of technology to support instruction

School Management and Daily Operations

Unless principals are competent managers—operationally and fiscally—they will never be able to initiate the cultural changes many schools need to improve student learning.

Indicators of Effective Leadership:
- Opens and closes the school year
- Develops schedules and assigns staff
- Establishes policies and procedures consistent with board of education rules
- Works with unions associated with schools
- Supervises personnel and resources for facilities management
- Uses technology for administrative applications
- Understands and uses budget documents
- Manages budget operations (internal accounts, purchasing, payroll)
- Implements board policies, procedures, and legal requirements
- Uses rules, regulations, and procedures for budgets and audits
- Uses technology to manage local budgets
- Maintains personal accountability—monitoring, reporting, signing

Interpersonal Effectiveness

Competence in the previous six dimensions will be of little value unless principals can lead, manage, and facilitate individual and organizational learning and change. Interpersonal effectiveness provides the energy for initiating dramatic improvement, the lubricant that keeps the parts moving smoothly, and the ballast that maintains stability and focus during the change process.

Indicators of Effective Leadership:
- Influences others to adopt values and accept ownership for goals
- Motivates individuals to set higher expectations
- Empowers individuals and groups to improve performance
- Expresses ideas clearly both verbally and in writing
- Adjusts communication style to meet different audience needs
- Uses non-verbal cues and gestures to reinforce communication
- Interacts effectively with diverse groups and individuals
- Perceives the needs, values, and concerns of others
- Helps others accept and understand the richness of diversity
- Resolves individual and organizational conflicts
- Builds consensus around key organizational initiatives
- Uses different decision-making models to develop solutions

Appendix D: Supporting Research

Encouraging Learning is the Primary Task of Leadership
Encouraging learning is the primary task of leadership, and perhaps the only way a leader can genuinely influence or inspire others. (p. 65)

> Senge, P., Kliener, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R. B., Smith, B.J. (1994). The fifth
> discipline fieldbook: Strategies and tools for building a learning
> organization. New York: Doubleday.

Our fundamental challenges in education are no different than those in business. They involve fundamental cultural changes, and that will require collective learning. They involve people at many levels thinking together about significant and enduring solutions we might create, and helping those solutions come about (p. 21).

> O'Neil, J. (1995). On schools as learning organizations: A conversation with Peter
> Senge. Educational Leadership 52(7), 20-23.

The New Facilitative-Collaborative Role of the Principal
The role of the principal has evolved from that of manager, to instructional leader, to the current role of facilitator-leader.

> Speck, M. (1999). The principalship: Building a learning community. Upper
> Saddle River: Prentice-Hall.

Rather than being the key decision-maker and 'thinker" in the school, principals in restructuring schools facilitate the activities of myriad groups and subgroups all engaged in decision-making on several fronts (p. 190).

> Odden, A. (1995). Educational leadership for America's schools. New York:
> McGraw Hill.

Principal as Coordinator of Leadership Opportunities
The principal's role in today's school learning community is that of a generalist who, through collaboration, distributes and coordinates leadership opportunities that focus on curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

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

Principals of Restructuring Schools
Principals lead from the center (of a network of human relationships) rather than the top (of an organizational pyramid); enable and support teacher success; manage a constellation of change efforts; and extend the school community.

> Murphy, J. (1994). Transformational change and the evolving role of the principal:
> Early empirical evidence. In J. Murphy & K Seashore Louis (Eds.)
> Reshaping the principalship: Insights from the transformational change
> efforts. (pp. 20- 54) Newbury Park: Corwin Press.

Principal's Role as Facilitative Leaders
The principal's role as instructional leader has thus evolved from a command-and-control bureaucracy

to a facilitative (behind-the-scenes) role that works best in the decentralized restructuring school. In this role, the principal enables teachers, parents, and the rest of the community to assume leadership and decision-making roles to promote improved curriculum, instruction, and assessment for all students (p. 133).

Speck, M. (1999). The principalship: Building a learning community. Upper
Saddle River: Prentice-Hall.

Principal as Head Learner

The principal need no longer be the "headmaster" pretending to know all. His/her more crucial role is head learner, engaging in the most important enterprise of the schoolhouse—experiencing, displaying, modeling, and celebrating what it is expected that teachers and pupils themselves will do.

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

Principal as Role Model of a Dynamic School

The principal serves as a role model, establishing an atmosphere in which all members of the school's organization work to improve processes and outcomes. In this way, the principal encourages a self-correcting school (p. 140).

Goldring E., & Rallis, S. (1993). Principals of dynamic schools: Taking charge of
change. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Principal as Moral Leader of a Community of Learners

Vision informs our work. We need leaders who understand how children and adults learn and keep on learning, and who understand how to build communities of learners (p. 1).

Sergiovanni, T. (1992) Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school
improvement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schools must be run effectively and efficiently if they are to survive. Policies must be in place. Budgets must be set. Teachers must be assigned. Classes must be scheduled. Reports must be completed. Standardized tests must be given. Supplies must be purchased. The school must be kept clean. Students must be protected from violence. Classrooms must be orderly. These are essential tasks that guarantee the survival of the school as an organization. But for the school to transform itself into an institution, a learning community must emerge. Institutionalization is the moral imperative that principals face. No matter how relentlessly administrators pursue their managerial imperative, reliability in action, firmness in conviction, and just disposition are the consequences of the moral imperative. Without tending to the moral imperative there can be no organizational character, and without character a school can be neither good nor effective (pp. 329– 330).

Sergiovanni, T. (1991). The principalship: A reflective practice perspective. 3rd
Ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Appendix E: Implementation Steps and Timeline

The Maryland Task Force on the Principalship has made several recommendations to the Maryland State Board of Education. In the interest of establishing priorities and reasonable expectations for the phasing in of these recommendations, we suggest adhering to the following implementation plan and timeline.

Implementation Plan

1. **Task Force Recommendation:** That MSDE release a Request for Proposal (RFP) to allow local jurisdictions to develop initiatives focused on defining the principal as the school's instructional leader. The recommendation challenges LEAs to acknowledge that this role takes priority over all other responsibilities.

   Implementation Recommendation: The Task Force recommends that MSDE fund a maximum of five such initiatives using GOALS 2000 money and allocate $5,000 for each funded proposal. This RFP should be released no later than September 1, 2000, with a proposal submission deadline of October 15, 2000. *(Recommendation 1, Strategy III)*

2. **Task Force Recommendation:** That MSDE establish a workgroup to: study and propose administrative staffing and support standards; make recommendations regarding which state level tasks, responsibilities, duties, and regulations falling to principals can be eliminated or reassigned; develop a "clearing the plate" model that local school systems can follow; and establish a process for the triennial review of the state-level "clearing the plate" initiative.

   Implementation Recommendation: The Task Force recommends that a current principal chair this workgroup and that it consist of no more than 10 participants. Appropriate MSDE representatives should be called on, as needed.

   The chair of this workgroup should be chosen, the workgroup established, and the meeting dates selected by September 2000. Workgroup recommendations should be issued to the State Superintendent by December 2000.

   Recommendations approved by the State Superintendent should be distributed to local super-intendents by January 2001 and returned with comment by February 2001. A final report for the State Board of Education should be presented at the Board's February 2001 meeting, and this report, once approved by the Board, should be submitted to LEAs, who will be encouraged to engage in a similar endeavor. *(Recommendation 1, Strategies I and II)*

3. **Task Force Recommendation:** That MSDE establish a second workgroup to study salary, benefits, perquisites, incentives, and accountability, as well as methods for providing the necessary security for principals who assume difficult challenges.

   Implementation Recommendation: The Task Force recommends that a current superintendent (nominated by PSSAM) chair this workgroup, and that the group not exceed 10 members. In addition to the chair, a representative should be sought from each of the following organizations:
   - the Maryland State Teachers' Association (MSTA),
   - the Baltimore Teachers' Union (BTU),
   - the Maryland Association of Boards of Education (MABE),

- o   the Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals (MAESP),
- o   the Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP),
- o   the Maryland Business Roundtable for Education (MBRT),
- o   the Maryland Negotiations Service (MNS), and
- o   the Maryland Congress of Parents and Teachers.

If additional participants are needed, those positions should be filled by current or recently retired principals.

The chair of this workgroup should be chosen, the workgroup established, and the meeting dates selected no later than September 15, 2000. The workgroup's recommendations should be made to the State Superintendent no later than December 15, 2000. Recommendations approved by the State Superintendent should be distributed to local superintendents by January 1, 2001, and returned with comment no later than February 1, 2001. A final report for the Maryland State Board of Education should be presented at the Board's February 2001 meeting.

The workgroup's final report, once approved by the Board, should be submitted to local jurisdictions for their review and subsequent action at the local level. *(Recommendation 3, Strategies I, III, and IV)*

4.   **Task Force Recommendation:** That MSDE and LEAs enhance the professional development provided aspiring, new, and veteran principals.

Implementation Recommendation: The Task Force recommends that the professional development provided aspiring and new principals be dealt with separately from that provided veteran principals.

Over the past few years, MSDE has collaborated with the University of Maryland, College Park, and others to plan and administer the Principals' Institute. The Task Force recommends that the Principals' Institute continue in its current form and its focus remain on the professional development of veteran principals. MSDE should continue to collaborate with the University of Maryland and others in this effort.

Because of the tremendous professional development needs among new and aspiring principals, the Task Force recommends that the Principals' Academies, in operation until 1990, be revived. MSDE should establish a third workgroup—consisting of principals, MSDE staff, higher education representatives, and businesspeople—to plan these academies. Planning should begin immediately so that the first such academy may open in Summer 2001. *(Recommendation 2, Strategy II)*

5.   **Task Force Recommendation:** That local school systems and school system consortia provide comprehensive mentorship programs for first- and second-year principals.

Implementation Recommendation: The Task Force recommends that, once it is confirmed that the Department will receive requested mentorship funds in its FY02 budget, MSDE release an RFP to LEAs to establish such mentoring programs. *(Recommendation 2, Strategy II)*

6. **Task Force Recommendation:** That MSDE create a prototype framework to identify principal candidates and to establish internships that are long-term, full-time, comprehensive, and part of school system staffing.

   Implementation Recommendation: The Task Force recommends that a small workgroup be convened in January 2001 to begin reviewing comparable efforts currently in place in LEAs across the state. Based on a review of these efforts, MSDE should prepare a prototype framework for distribution to LEAs by August 2001. *(Recommendation 2, Strategies I and II)*

7. **Task Force Recommendation:** That MSDE develop an electronic clearinghouse for posting exemplary professional development approaches for principals; sharing information on administrative salaries, benefits, and incentives; and providing a problem-solving network for administrators.

   Implementation Recommendation: The Task Force recommends that a small workgroup, chaired by the newly appointed Director of Strategic Delivery Systems, begin work on this project in January 2001. The existing MSDE school improvement web site should serve as the source for this clearinghouse. Workgroup recommendations should be posted on the web site by August 1, 2001. *(Recommendation 2, Strategy IV and Recommendation 3, Strategy II)*

8. **Task Force Recommendation:** That MSDE submit a funding package to the Maryland legislature to support all of the above initiatives. (Some of the recommendations found in this report already have potential funding mechanisms, while others will require additional funding sources.)

   Implementation Recommendation: Based on various workgroup outcomes and the funding required to implement the recommendations, the Task Force recommends that appropriate MSDE divisions submit with their FY02 budget requests sufficient funding to satisfy the adopted recommendations. These should include, but not be limited to, money to fully implement the following:
   - mentorship programs for new principals,
   - Principal Academies for new and aspiring principals,
   - Principals' Institute for veteran principals,
   - conference attendance for principals,
   - web site development, and
   - internships for principal candidates (for future budget consideration).
     (Recommendation 2, Strategies I, II, and IV)

9. **Task Force Recommendation:** That professional development programs for principals be consistent with National Staff Development Council (NSDC) and Interstate School Leaders and Licensure (ISLLC) standards; that IHE principal preparation programs reflect those standards; and that MSDE approval of IHE programs be based on them.

   Implementation Recommendation: The Task Force recommends that MSDE's Division of Certification and Accreditation immediately submit a copy of this report to all IHEs and inform them of the new program approval requirements resulting from it. *(Recommendation 2, Strategies I and III)*

Timeline

September 2000
- o MSDE releases RFP for "Role of Principal as Instructional Leader" grant
- o MSDE selects chairs of, and invites organizations to nominate membership for, three workgroups:
- o administrative staffing and support standards and "clearing the plate" effort
- o principal salary, benefits, incentives, accountability, and security
- o design of principals' academies for new and aspiring principals
- o Workgroups develop meeting schedules
- o MSDE notifies IHEs of new program approval requirements resulting from Task Force report (compliance with NSDC and ISSLC standards)

October 15, 2000
- o LEAs submit proposals for "Role of the Principal as Instructional Leader" grants

November 1, 2000
- o MSDE notifies "Role of the Principal" grant recipients

December 2000
- o Workgroups 1 and 2 submit report to State Superintendent

January 2001
- o Workgroups 1 and 2 distribute recommendations to LEAs for comment
- o Workgroup 3 submits report to State Superintendent
- o MSDE selects workgroup to develop prototype framework for identifying principal candidates and for developing internships
- o MSDE selects workgroup to develop/expand web site

February 2001
- o LEAs return comments on reports from Workgroups 1 and 2

February 27/28, 2001
- o Workgroups 1, 2, and 3 present reports to State Board of Education

March 2001
- o MSDE asks LEAs to nominate participants for Principals' Academies

July 1, 2001
- o LEAs receiving "Role of the Principal" grants submit final reports to MSDE

July 2001
- o Principals' Academies begin
- o Principals' Institute begins
- o MSDE releases RFP to establish mentoring programs for new principals

August 2001
- o Workgroup developing frameworks for principal candidates and their professional development distributes report to LEAs
- o MSDE updates its school improvement web site based on workgroup recommendations
- o MSDE prepares legislative package for:
  - ▪ mentoring programs for new principals
  - ▪ Principal Academies for new and aspiring principals
  - ▪ Principals' Institute for veteran principals
  - ▪ conference attendance for principals
  - ▪ web site development
  - ▪ internships for principal candidates (for future budget consideration)

Ongoing
- o MSDE continues collaboration with University of Maryland, College Park, on Principals' Institute
- o MSDE engages in triennial review of "clearing the plate" initiative