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Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework

Introduction

The Division for Leadership Development at the Maryland State Department of Education was created by Dr. Nancy S. Grasmick, State Superintendent of Schools, in the summer of 2000. The mission of the Division for Leadership Development is to build the instructional leadership capacity of present and potential school leaders in the content and skills needed to increase student achievement. During the past four years, the division has been responsible for providing professional growth opportunities for principals around the state, serving as the voice for principals in policy discussions, and advocating for principals in their roles as instructional leaders. As the work of this division has evolved, it has become apparent that the next step in leadership development requires the creation of a framework for instructional leadership that will drive principal preparation programs in higher education, professional development, and policy initiatives. Beginning in the summer of 2004, this draft of the Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework, created by the Division for Leadership Development, was shared with a wide variety of stakeholders in order to gain feedback, support, and commitment.

The Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework describes outcomes expected of Maryland principals as they provide instructional leadership for their schools. For each outcome identified, there are evidences in practice that delineate the minimum of what we expect principals to know and be able to do if the respective leadership outcome is to be realized.
The framework is not intended to include all of the various responsibilities of a quality principal. For instance, it does not speak to management responsibilities, legal issues, integrity, and ethical decision-making that are so very important to the principalship. These critical skill sets for leaders are part of the ongoing leadership development work planned and implemented by local system staff who design these learning opportunities around administrative processes and procedures endemic to the particular system.

The Framework focuses, instead, on the content knowledge needed for school principals to be the leader of teaching-learning in the school. It represents the most commonly accepted instructional leadership responsibilities according to respected practitioners, researchers, and theorists in the field of instructional leadership and continuous improvement. It also provides a foundation for the alignment of professional development opportunities offered at the state and local levels as well as coursework offered at institutions of higher education.

**Philosophical Basis**

The philosophical basis for the Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework is found in three seminal Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) documents and the research that serves as the foundation for those documents. The first is *Every Child Achieving: A Plan for Meeting the Needs of the Individual Learner* (adopted by the Maryland State Board of Education in 1999). This extremely important report was a response to the expressed concern of members of the Maryland State Board of Education that the State needed to have a plan in place to intervene on behalf of students not performing to expectations. One component of *Every
Child Achieving addressed the responsibility of principals and the skills they need to lead that effort.

The second document is the Maryland Task Force Report on the Principalship (adopted by the Maryland State Board of Education in 2000). This report was in response to a statewide concern regarding the lack of a sufficient number of quality candidates for the principalship, particularly in light of significant numbers of current administrators eligible for retirement. It spoke directly about the need to redefine the role of the principal as instructional leader.

The final seminal document is Achievement Matters Most: A Report of the Visionary Panel for Better Schools (adopted by the Maryland State Board of Education in 2002). This report, commissioned by Maryland State Superintendent Nancy S. Grasmick, addressed the need to look ahead to the next ten years of school reform in Maryland. It, too, emphasized the need for principals to be instructional leaders in their schools.

**Purposes**

The Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework will:

- Drive the instructional leadership curriculum of the Division for Leadership Development, MSDE;
- Guide instructional leadership professional development for veteran, new, and potential school leaders;
- Serve as a catalyst for the alignment of professional development for Executive Officers (those who supervise and evaluate principals as defined in Code of Maryland Regulations [COMAR] 13A.01.04.02B);
• Provide a self-assessment/reflective practice tool for principals and potential school leaders;

• Promote dialogue in districts around matters of instructional leadership;

• Be referenced in policy through the Code of Maryland Regulations;

• Influence future policy decisions about the principalship;

• Be incorporated into a part of the program approval process used by institutions of higher education to guide their principal preparation programs; and

• Serve as the Maryland-specific evidence in practice for the instructional leadership component of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards.

Foundation Documents

The foundation documents for the Framework are relevant and noteworthy national reports, research in the field, input from various stakeholders, as well as the best thinking of the Division for Leadership Development, MSDE. These documents include:

1. Maryland Instructional Leadership Development Program, Division for Leadership Development (DLD) – This brochure describes the vision and purpose for the work of the DLD. It also describes what effective instructional leaders should know and be able to do. It includes a description of an array of delivery systems for principal training and advocacy. This brochure represents the thinking of MSDE staff and stakeholder groups based on research and literature in the field.
2. Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) – This 2003 working paper details the outcomes of a meta-analysis of 30 years of research on the relationship between principal leadership practices and student achievement. It describes twenty-one leadership responsibilities that are significantly associated with student achievement.

3. Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) – In 2004, this organization produced a variety of research-based materials on leadership, including a series of modules designed to engage leaders in solving real school problems. The fourteen-module curriculum is intended to help guide the redesign of state academies and higher education preparation programs to assist principals and school teams with instructional leadership issues.

4. National Staff Development Council (NSDC), *Moving NSDC’s Staff Development Standards into Practice: Innovation Configurations* – This document presents the twelve revised NSDC standards for staff development along with innovation configuration maps that identify and describe the phases of implementation of the standards.

Communities; Personalization and the School Environment; and Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment.

6. National Middle School Association (NMSA), *This We Believe: Successful Schools for Young Adolescents* – This 2003 position paper embodies the educational ideas that comprise the middle school concept, as well as the conditions that make effective middle level schools. It includes six components that successful middle schools should provide for middle level learners. The Call to Action in this document provides specific charges to principals and the behaviors they must exhibit in order to create effective middle schools.

7. National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), *Leading Learning Communities, Standards for What Principals Should Know and Be Able to Do* – This 2002 NAESP document describes what NAESP believes is the new thinking about school leadership that is required for improving schools. The six standards were derived from a year-long collaborative process with principals.

8. Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) – This Consortium was established in 1994, under the guidance of the Council of Chief State School Officers, and is composed of 32 education agencies and 13 education administrative associations that established an education policy framework for school leadership. The intent of this document is to raise the bar for
school leaders who enter and continue in the profession and to reshape concepts of educational leadership.

9. National Policy Board for Educational Administration, Education Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC), *Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership* – Revised in 2002, the ELCC standards represent a combination of the ISLLC standards and the former ELCC guidelines. The rationale for combining these documents was that many institutions of higher education felt that addressing both sets of guidelines in their principal preparation programs was too burdensome. Underlying these standards is the notion that the central responsibility of leadership is to improve teaching and learning.

**The Research/Document Matrix**

The matrix is a visual representation of the cross match between the foundation documents and the Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework. In reviewing the matrix, the reader is advised to look first at the instructional leadership outcomes in the left column. These are outcomes that appear repeatedly in the foundation documents. They are not intended to be in priority order. The subsequent columns each represent a particular document. If a “Yes” appears in a box in one of the columns, then that outcome was found in that particular document. It should be pointed out that the language of the outcomes was not always exactly the same since it came from different authors. That fact required the exercise of professional judgment by readers based on the language that did appear and supporting descriptions of that language.
## Research/Document* Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Leadership Outcomes</th>
<th>DLD</th>
<th>McREL</th>
<th>SREB</th>
<th>NSDC</th>
<th>BR II</th>
<th>NMSA</th>
<th>NAESP</th>
<th>ISLLC</th>
<th>ELCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Facilitate the Development of a School Vision</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Align All Aspects of a School Culture to Student and Adult Learning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Monitor the Alignment of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improve Instructional Practices Through the Purposeful Observation and Evaluation of Teachers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ensure the Regular Integration of Appropriate Assessments into Daily Classroom Instruction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Use Technology and Multiple Sources of Data to Improve Classroom Instruction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Provide Staff with Focused, Sustained, Research-based Professional Development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Engage All Community Stakeholders in a Shared Responsibility for Student and School Success</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Legends for documents are on previous pages.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Leadership Outcome</th>
<th>Evidence in Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Facilitate the Development of a School Vision | The principal is able to demonstrate that there is/are:  
1.1 A written school vision that encompasses values, challenges, and opportunities for the academic, social, and emotional development of each student  
1.2 A process for ensuring that all staff and other stakeholders are able to articulate the vision  
1.3 Procedures in place for the periodic, collaborative review of the vision by stakeholders  
1.4 Resources aligned to support the vision |
| 2. Align All Aspects of a School Culture to Student and Adult Learning | The principal is able to demonstrate that there is/are:  
2.1 Mutual respect, teamwork, and trust in dealings with students, staff, and parents  
2.2 High expectations for all students and teachers in a culture of continuous improvement  
2.3 An effective school leadership team  
2.4 Effective professional learning communities aligned with the school improvement plan, focused on results, and characterized by collective responsibility for instructional planning and student learning  
2.5 Opportunities for leadership and collaborative decision making distributed among stakeholders, especially teachers |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Leadership Outcome</th>
<th>Evidence in Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.  Monitor the Alignment of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment</td>
<td>The principal is able to demonstrate that there is/are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 Ongoing conversations with teachers as to how state content standards, voluntary state curriculum and/or local curriculum, and research-based instructional strategies are integrated into daily classroom instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Teacher assignments that are rigorous, purposeful, and engaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Student work that is appropriately challenging and demonstrates new learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 Assessments that regularly measure student mastery of the content standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.  Improve Instructional Practices Through the Purposeful Observation and Evaluation of Teachers</td>
<td>The principal is able to demonstrate that there is/are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1 A process to determine what students are reading, writing, producing, and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Use of student data and data collected during the observation process to make recommendations for improvement in classroom instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Formal feedback during observation conferences as well as ongoing informal visits, meetings, and conversations with teachers regarding classroom instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 Regular and effective evaluation of teacher performance based on continuous student progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5 Identification and development of potential school leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Leadership Outcome</td>
<td>Evidence in Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ensure the Regular Integration of Appropriate Assessments into Daily Classroom Instruction</td>
<td>The principal is able to demonstrate that there is/are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1 Multiple and varied assessments that are collaboratively developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Formative assessments that are a regular part of the ongoing evaluation of student performance and that serve as the basis for adjustments to instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 Summative assessments that are aligned in format and content with state assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4 Appropriate interventions for individual students based on results of assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Use Technology and Multiple Sources of Data to Improve Classroom Instruction</td>
<td>The principal is able to demonstrate that there is/are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1 Effective use of appropriate instructional technology by students, staff, and administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2 Regular use of the MSDE websites (Maryland Report Card and School Improvement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3 Review of disaggregated data by subgroups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.4 Ongoing root cause analysis of student performance that drives instructional decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.5 Regular collaboration among teachers on analyzing student work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Leadership Outcome</td>
<td>Evidence in Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7. Provide Staff with Focused, Sustained, Research-based Professional Development | The principal is able to demonstrate that there is/are:  
7.1 Results-oriented professional development that is aligned with identified curricular, instructional, and assessment needs and is connected to school improvement goals  
7.2 Opportunities for teachers to engage in collaborative planning and critical reflection during the regular school day (job-embedded)  
7.3 Differentiated professional development according to career stages, needs of staff, and student performance  
7.4 Personal involvement in professional development activities  
7.5 Professional development aligned with the Maryland Teacher Professional Development Standards |
| 8. Engage All Community Stakeholders in a Shared Responsibility for Student and School Success | The principal is able to demonstrate that there is/are:  
8.1 Parents and caregivers welcomed in the school, encouraged to participate, and given information and materials to help their children learn  
8.2 Parents and caregivers who are active members of the school improvement process  
8.3 Community stakeholders and school partners who readily participate in school life |
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