Meeting Notes from February 20th Superintendent Advisory Group Meeting

Review Competencies

Attendees broke up into five groups to review and revise the competencies. The revised competencies are attached.

Partnerships

Attendees reviewed the language drafted around partnerships. The text was revised in the following way:

b) The responsibility and roles of each partner in the design, implementation and administration of the program shall be set forth in a written agreement signed by each partner. The written agreement shall address at least the following:

1) the process and responsibilities of each partner for the selection and assessment of candidates;

2) the establishment of the internship and any field experiences, and the specific roles of each partner in providing those experiences, as applicable;

3) the development and implementation of a training program for mentors and faculty supervisors that supports candidates’ progress during their internships in observing, participating, and demonstrating leadership to meet the 13 critical success factors and 36 associated competencies outlined in “The Principal Internship: How Can We Get It Right?” (Southern Regional Education Board, 2005; http://publications.sreb.org/2005/05V02_Principal_Internship.pdf). No later amendments to or edition of this document are incorporated by this Part;

4) names and locations of non-partnering school districts and nonpublic schools where the internship and any field experiences may occur; and

5) the process to evaluate the program, including the partnership, and the role of each partner in making improvements based on the results of the evaluation.

In addition to these revisions, the attendees discussed the following:

- Partners may not have the manpower to help select candidates, and there are certain concerns about lawsuits if the selection criteria go beyond objective measures.
- Partners may have a role in assessing candidates competencies e.g., before candidate begins the internships.
- Partners would have the knowledge of whether or not a district can offer the experiences the candidates need to grow their knowledge and skills.
- Internships are not conducted in the preparation program but at the district level. Therefore, districts need to have input.
- It was agreed that the partnership should serve three purposes: guiding and informing internships, designing/providing training for all people involved in the internships, and preparation program evaluation and providing feedback for continually improving the program.
• Should the rules require a minimum standard to ensure consistency across programs?
  o If so, the standards should be baseline and not too prescriptive and allow for the needs of the region in which the program resides.
  o Vicki Phillips stated that when principal preparation programs come before the Review Board, they are often asked to answer questions about the systems in place to ensure continuous improvement of the program.
• A subcommittee of the advisory group could set up the language for the baseline partnership standards that guide partnerships.

**Definition of Administrative Experience as an Eligibility Requirement**

During this discussion, two major issues came out about how we would define “Administrative Experience,” or rather “WHO” has the experiences that we would define as appropriate experience to be eligible for the superintendency.

• Teacher Leaders: would they have the leadership experience to qualify them for the superintendent endorsement?
  o Some said that the Teacher Leader position is too young to know yet what that leadership experience will look like and if should qualify teacher leaders for the superintendency.
  o Some said no, the Teacher Leader endorsement was created for the purpose of giving teachers who did not want to take a leadership role that was beyond the classroom (e.g., the principalship). The Teacher Leader endorsement was created to articulate to the principalship (e.g., into principal preparation programs).
  o Some said yes, the Teacher Leader endorsement should allow those teachers to enroll in superintendent preparation programs.
• School Psychologists and other school support staff: would this group of staff have the administrative experience to allow them to be eligible for the superintendency?
  o The rules for the principal endorsement does not allow these staff eligibility for the principalship based on the notion that their experiences do not qualify for the teaching experience requirement. There has been much debate and tension around this issue.
  o Some said that the roles and responsibilities for school support staff (e.g., school psychologists) have changed which has led them to have instructional delivery responsibilities, coaching and modeling teachers on intervention and teaching strategies, etc. This change in their job responsibilities should enable them to be eligible for both the superintendency and the principalship.
  o Some said that the school support staff, for example a school psychologist could be eligible for the superintendency if they hold the position of special education director. This position could be their gateway to the superintendency. But, otherwise, if the school support staffperson has not held that position, then they are not eligible for the superintendency.
  o Another said that the interest should lie in the leadership experiences that the person has accomplished rather than the type of certificate the person holds.
  o Here were the career pathways laid out for teacher leaders and school psychologists:
    - Teacher Leader → Principal → Superintendent
    - School Psychologist → Special Education Director → Superintendent
  o A subcommittee was charged with defining “Administrative Experience” for the group.

**Define Qualifications of an On-Site Mentor**
There was consensus that first-year superintendents should not be tasked with mentoring or supervising an intern unless there are unforeseeable circumstances that cannot prevent it.

There was also consensus that the on-site mentor should be a person who holds the Superintendent Endorsement, but that mentor can ask other central office staff to work with the intern if there are other leadership experiences the candidate needs that the other central office person can better offer the intern. The On-Site Mentor (i.e., superintendent) retains the authority over the candidates internship and signs off on all experiences and assessments of candidate’s performance.

The language around internships should make it explicit that candidates/interns CANNOT evaluate school or district staff.
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