Educational Leadership Program Standards

ELCC Building-Level Standards

For Advanced Programs at the Master, Specialist, or Doctoral Level that Prepare Assistant Principals, Principals, Teacher Leaders, Curriculum Directors, And/Or other programs that prepare educational leaders for a school building environment

July 2010
NATIONAL POLICY BOARD FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
ELCC Standard 1. A building-level education leader promotes the success of every student by collaboratively facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a shared school vision of learning through the collection and use of data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, create and implement plans to achieve school goals, and promote organizational learning; promote continuous and sustainable improvement; and monitor and evaluate progress and revise plans that is supported by all stakeholders.

Element a. **Collaboratively develop and implement a shared vision and mission:**
Candidates have knowledge about the nature of collaborative school visioning and the impact of vision and mission on student achievement and various methods for involving stakeholders in the visioning process and consensus building and theories and relevant knowledge of vision and mission including understanding of learning in a pluralistic society, the diversity of learners and learners’ needs, schools as interactive social and cultural systems, and social and organizational change.. Candidates are able to design, articulate, and support a collaborative process for developing and implementing a vision and mission for a school and formulate plans and initiatives to implement the vision and mission statements and communicate the vision and mission to the appropriate constituencies.

**Commentary and Research Support:**
The importance of shared school vision, mission, and goals for student success is well documented in the effective schools literature (Clark, Lotto, & Astuto, 1984; Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Purkey & Smith, 1983; Rosenholtz, 1985; Rutter et al., 1979), and subsequently in the school improvement literature (Chrispeels, 1992; Fullan & Miles, 1992; Kurland, Peretz, & Hertz-Lazarowitz, 2010; Lambert, 1998; Leithwood, Begley, & Cousins, 1994; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999; Murphy Elliott, Goldring, & Porter, 2007; Powell, Higgins, Aram, & Freed, 2009; Short & Greer, 1997; Silins, Mulford, & Zarins, 2002; Tillman, 2004). When vision, mission, and goals are widely shared, student achievement usually increases (Chrispeels, 1992; Harris, 2002; Printy & Marks, 2006; Rutter et al., 1979).

Vision and mission statements vary. Some include a social as well as an academic focus (Chrispeels, 1992; Lightfoot, 1986; Short & Greer, 1997; Silins, et al., 2002); some refer to student learning as well as or instead of test achievement scores (Firestone & González, 2007; Harris, 2002; Marks & Printy, 2003;). Trust extended to students (Printy & Marks, 2006; Rutter et al., 1979; Short & Greer, 1997; Silins & Mulford, 2004; Silins et al., 2002) and to teachers (Harris, 2002; Short & Greer, 1997; Silins et al., 2002; Tschannen-Moran, 2009) is reported as important in moving toward ideals captured in vision and mission statements. Use of various techniques for involving stakeholders in the visioning process is explored in the research (Chrispeels, 1992; Chance, Copeland, Farris, & Allen, 1994; Short & Greer, 1997). Developing a shared vision and mission requires consensus building strategies with teachers in particular, but also with other school based personnel and external stakeholders (Chance et al., 1994; Marks & Printy, 2003; McPike, 1987; Purkey & Smith, 1983; Short & Greer, 1997; Silins & Mulford, 2004; Silins et al., 2002).
Sustaining commitment to the vision and mission is enhanced when principals and others communicate them often and sometimes strategically (Short & Greer, 1997) to the appropriate constituencies (Silins & Mulford, 2004; Silins et al., 2002).

Schools are attended by students whose families come from a variety of Western and non-Western cultures. Culture is one of many types of diversity. Diversity also includes socioeconomic status, race/ethnicity, language differences, and various learning styles. Responding positively to diversity and proactively to students’ learning needs enables schools to improve student learning and achievement (Casner-Lotto, 1988; Clark et al., 1984; Delpit, 1995; Gerstl-Pepin, 2006; Kohl, 2007; Rutter et al., 1979; Stedman, 1985; Tillman, 2004). Embracing diversity subsumes understanding schools as interactive social and cultural systems and necessitates cultural competence for school leaders (Aspiazu, Bauer, & Spillett, 1998; Bustamante, Nelson, & Onwuegbuzie, 2009; Institute for Educational Leadership, 2005). Several studies note that establishing a school culture that applauds diversity entails creating a caring community (Harris, 2002; Gerstl-Pepin, 2006; Lightfoot, 1986; Murphy, 2005; Silins & Mulford, 2004; Tschannen-Moran, 2009).

Element b. **Collect and use data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, create and implement plans to achieve goals, and promote organizational learning:** Candidates have knowledge of the purposes and processes for collecting, analyzing and using appropriate data to drive decision making that impacts student learning; the design and utilization of assessment data for learning; have knowledge of organizational effectiveness and learning; strategic, tactical, and operational program planning, implementation, and evaluation, school improvement planning processes, and variables that affect student achievement. Candidates are able to develop and utilize data-based research strategies and strategic planning processes that inform the development and support of a vision and mission that promotes learning and involve stakeholders in collecting and utilizing data to assess the effectiveness of the building to generate building improvement targets that promote learning; create strategic, tactical and operational goals and collaboratively develop implementation plans to achieve those goals and develop school improvement plans that align with district improvement plans and reflect these six concepts: vision, instruction, management, collaboration, ethics, and political structure.

**Commentary and Research Support:**

Data-driven decision making has become a staple in education and educational leadership (Bowers, 2009; Knapp, Copland, & Swinnerton, 2007; Luo, 2008; Moss & Piety, 2007). The importance of collecting and using relevant data on which to base decisions that impact student learning has been documented in the effective schools and school improvement research (Chrispeels, 1992; Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Kurland et al., 2010; Purkey & Smith, 1983). Data useful for decision making with respect to identifying goals, assessing organizational effectiveness, creating and implementing plans to achieve goals, and promoting organizational learning should come from multiple sources, including standardized tests results (Firestone & Gonzáles, 2007; Moss & Piety, 2007), grades from classroom assessments (Bowers,
School improvement is dependent on organizational learning and necessarily involves collaborative, sustained effort (Cardano, 2002). To reap results, this effort must be informed by data (Kurland et al., 2010; Silins et al., 2002). Organizational learning depends on a culture of trust in which problems can be discussed openly and effective solutions shared with and accepted by others (Taylor, 2009). A natural feedback loop is created by organizational learning practices as problems are identified, data are collected, solutions are implemented and evaluated through action research, and the results disseminated (Taylor, 2009).

Element c. **Promote continuous and sustainable improvement:** Candidates have knowledge about the role of professional learning in continuous and sustainable improvement; continuous and sustained improvement models and processes; change processes, including continuous and sustainable improvement and discontinuous transformational change at the building-level; and strategic management of human capital and its impact on continuous and sustainable improvement. Candidates are able to identify strategies and practices to build organizational capacity to support continuous and sustainable school improvement; identify capacity building strategies for developing school leadership capacity; create a plan to implement change processes to support continuous and sustainable improvement and ensure transformational change at the building-level; and design a comprehensive building-level professional development program.

**Commentary and Research Support:**

The 20th century history of school reform is checkered. Most reforms failed to bring about substantial change and most withered, notwithstanding a brief period of initial success, often because professional development needed for implementation success was lacking (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1990). The nature of professional development changed in the last part of the last century. Research on both adult learning (Knowles, 1984; Mezirow, 1991) and the effectiveness of staff development contributed to the development of standards that are now available to guide providers in use of effective practices (see National Staff Development Council, [www.nsdc.org](http://www.nsdc.org)). As a result, professional development has become a vital element of school improvement and sustained change (Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Lambert, 1998).

A comprehensive, coherently scaffolded program of professional development that offers quality learning experiences is a building block of successful improvement efforts (Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, & Orr, 2007; Fullan & Pomfret, 1977, in Levine & Stark, 1981; Harris, 2002; Purkey & Smith, 1983). Professional
development takes many forms, including the collaborative work of professional learning communities within schools (Hall & Hord, 2006), networking with communities external to the school (Spillane & Thompson, 1997), and similar structures, each of which focuses on improving pedagogy and thereby student learning. These heretofore non-traditional forms of professional development have gained stature, again, due in part to effective school research (Casner-Lotto, 1988; Clark et al., 1984; Little, 1982; Levine & Stark, 1981; Maeroff, 1988; Miller, 1988; Purkey & Smith, 1983; Sickler, 1988; Wimpelberg et al., 1989; Witte & Walsh, 1990).

Effective schools research explicitly described building teachers’ capacity in the context of improved instruction and implicitly described building teachers’ leadership capacity. As teacher leadership became a topic of research interest in the 1990s, more researchers (Harris, 2002; Muijs & Harris, 2006; Lambert, 1998, 2003; Printy & Marks, 2006; Silins & Mulford, 2004) examined it as a variable contributing to school improvement and organizational learning. Building teacher leadership capacity is foundational to sustained improvement. Noted in the improvement literature (Lambert, 1998; McLaughlin & March, 1990) is the vulnerability of seemingly successful change efforts to the loss of a few key personnel, especially a supportive principal. Where improvement efforts have become institutionalized and teachers’ leadership capacity has been built, reforms are more likely to survive the loss of key individuals (Davidson & Taylor, 1999; Lambert, 1998).

As noted, professional development is essential to successful school change. Models of change processes abound (see Kidron & Darwin, 2007, for a review), many substantiated by research. While the model selected should be consistent with the vision and mission established for the school, successful change is less dependent on which model is used than it is on the commitment of the principal and teachers to change and the provision of professional development related to the model (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1990). Sustaining the school vision, mission, and improvement efforts is dependent on people as the critical resource (Murphy et al., 2007). School leaders who manage human capital well contribute substantially to the success of improvement efforts (Clark et al., 1984; Stedman, 1985).

Element d. **Monitor and evaluate progress and revise plans:** Candidates have knowledge of effective strategies for monitoring the implementation and revision of plans to achieve school improvement goals and program evaluation models. Candidates are able to develop plans to monitor program development and implementation to achieve school goals and construct evaluation processes to assess the effectiveness of school plans and programs.

**Commentary and Research Support:**

Much is presented above about using data to monitor and evaluate school improvement and its implementation. Multiple sources and types of data allow for a more comprehensive understanding of the effects, strengths, and weaknesses of improvement plans. Periodic formative evaluations are needed to monitor and revise
improvement plans to maintain congruence with the vision and mission (Levine & Stark, 1981). To be useful, a culture of trust should be established and the evaluative data used collaboratively and supportively rather than punitively (Fullan, Miles, & Taylor, 1981, in Levine & Stark, 1981).

**ELCC Standard 2.** A building-level education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning built on collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students; creating, monitoring, and evaluating a comprehensive rigorous and coherent curricular and instructional program; developing and supervising the instructional and leadership capacity of staff to maximize time spent on quality instruction; and promoting the use of the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning.

**Commentary and Research Support:**
Much of the research in this area that connects instructional leadership practices and school improvement and student outcomes has been synthesized in a series of meta-analyses (Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Heck & Hallinger, 2005; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008; Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). The results yield common results—that a combination of leadership practices that focus on student learning through improving the work of teachers and the school generally are positively associated with improved student outcomes and related school conditions. Recent large scale survey and case study research, funded by The Wallace Foundation, has yielded similar outcomes (Knapp, Copland, Plecki, & Portin, 2006; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Portin et al., 2009; Wahlstrom & Seashore-Louis, 2008). Often the effective leadership practices are characterized as instructional leadership, transformational leadership or leading learning, although often assessing similar leadership behaviors.

**Element a. Advocate, nurture, and sustain a culture of collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students:** Candidates have knowledge of the elements of school culture and ways it can be influenced to ensure student success and human development theories, proven learning and motivational theories and knowledge of how diversity influences the learning process. Candidates are able to work collaboratively with others to accomplish school improvement goals; incorporate cultural competence in development of programs, curriculum, and instruction; monitor school programs and activities to ensure integrated learning opportunities aligned with standards, and consistent with the vision; recognize, celebrate, and incorporate diversity in programs, curriculum, and instructional practices; facilitate the use of appropriate content-based, customized learning materials and learning strategies in the instruction of students; create and analyze individualized improvement plans, use data to design learning plans, design and/or implement changes in learning environments; develop school-wide comprehensive programs that meet the unique learning needs and interests of diverse student populations and school personnel; and promote equity, fairness, and respect among students, parents, and faculty.
Commentary and Research Support:
Candidates have knowledge of the elements of school culture and ways it can be influenced to ensure student success and human development theories, proven learning and motivational theories and knowledge of how diversity influences the learning process (Darling-Hammond, Meyerson, La Pointe, & Orr, 2009; Leithwood, Jantzi, Coffin, & Wilson, 1996). Candidates are able to work collaboratively with others to accomplish school improvement goals; incorporate cultural competence in development of programs, curriculum, and instruction; monitor school programs and activities to ensure integrated learning opportunities aligned with standards, and consistent with the vision; recognize, celebrate, and incorporate diversity in programs, curriculum, and instructional practices; facilitate the use of appropriate content-based, customized learning materials and learning strategies in the instruction of students; create and analyze individualized improvement plans, use data to design learning plans, design and/or implement changes in learning environments; develop school-wide comprehensive programs that meet the diverse learning needs and interests of students and school personnel; and promote equity, fairness, and respect among students and faculty.

This element stresses the role of school leaders in developing an effective school culture. This dimension of leadership has been widely research over the past 30 years, through case study and survey research, particularly to capture the leader actions that contribute most to a culture that positively influences student learning, ranging from the early effective schools research (Edmonds, 1979) to the most recent large scale, multi-school research study (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Wahlstrom & Seashore-Louis, 2008). Much of the research focuses either specifically on culture influencing actions of on these actions among other effective leadership practices. Setting high expectations (Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999; Leithwood et al., 2004; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005) and creating a culture of collaboration and trust among staff and the larger community (Hoy, Sweetland, & Smith, 2002; Hoy, Tarter, & Bliss, 1990; Podsokoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990; Silins, Mulford, & Zarins, 2002; Sweetland & Hoy, 2000; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998). Various terms have been used to signify school or organizational culture, including fostering organizational health (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993) to creating a culture of care (Hayes, Christie, Mills, & Lingard, 2004).

Throughout various reviews of research and large scale multivariate analyses, the results remain largely the same, that leaders strongly influence student learning through the culture they create and sustain that sets high expectations and enables teachers and students to learn and work productively. A few studies have tried to differentiate leader practices by comparing similarly challenged schools that have different student outcomes (Brown, Anfara, & Roney, 2004; Watts et al., 2006). These results similarly underscore the leaders’ influence on building a supportive culture around high expectations.

Element b. Create, monitor, and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular/instructional program: Candidates have knowledge of the development of
quality curriculum including principles/theories of learning, appropriate instructional techniques, monitoring and evaluating instruction, using data and technology to improve instruction, and allocating resources; multiple methods of evaluation, accountability systems, data collection, and analysis of data; and program evaluation. Candidates are able to design comprehensive curriculum development plans; analyze instructional lessons; collaborate with faculty to plan, implement, and evaluate a coordinated and articulated curriculum; use technology to design, monitor and/or evaluate instructional programs; use standards-based accountability data to improve the quality of teaching and learning; provide feedback using data, assessments, and evaluation methods to improve practice and student achievement; design evaluation systems, make plans based on assessment data, and provide feedback based on evidence; design, develop, and utilize school assessments for instruction and reporting; interpret information and communicate progress toward vision and goals for educators, the school community, and other stakeholders; use disaggregated data to improve instructional programs; use effective technology and performance management systems where appropriate to improve classroom instruction; and use technology to monitor, analyze, and evaluate assessment results for accountability reporting and to guide continuous school improvement.

Commentary and Research Support:
Candidates have knowledge of the development of quality curriculum including principles/theories of learning, appropriate instructional techniques, monitoring and evaluating instruction, using data and technology to improve instruction, and allocate resources (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Torrence, 2002; Waters et al., 2003; Weber, 2006); multiple methods of evaluation, accountability systems, data collection, and analysis of data; and program evaluation (Smith, 1999; Waters et al., 2003). Candidates are able to design comprehensive curriculum development plans; analyze instructional lessons; collaborate with faculty to plan, implement, and evaluate a coordinated and articulated curriculum (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Robinson et al., 2008); use technology to design, monitor and/or evaluate instructional programs (Waters et al., 2003; Weber, 2006); use standards-based accountability data to improve the quality of teaching and learning; provide feedback using data, assessments, and evaluation methods to improve practice and student achievement (Torrence, 2002); design evaluation systems, make plans based on assessment data, and provide feedback based on data; design, develop, and utilize school assessments for instruction and reporting; interpret information and communicate progress toward vision and goals for educators, the school community, and other stakeholders; use disaggregated data to improve instructional programs (Waters et al., 2003); use effective technology and performance management systems where appropriate to improve classroom instruction; and use technology to monitor, analyze, and evaluate assessment results for accountability reporting and to guide continuous school improvement (Robinson et al., 2008; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2004; Waters et al., 2003).

This element combines two primary knowledge and skill areas—knowledge of curriculum and instruction and capacity to work with teachers to improve these, and capacity to use data to evaluate to inform how to improve these. Many of the measures of leadership practices combine these under a more general rubric of focus on instruction or instructional leadership (Leithwood et al., 2004; Robinson et al.,
For example, in an effort to unpack effective leadership practices, Robinson and others (2008) undertook a meta-analysis of leadership dimensions across 27 studies and found a moderate impact (80 indicators across nine studies) from leadership practices of planning, coordinating and evaluating teaching and the curriculum on student achievement. Waters and others (2003) identified the correlations in their meta-analyses, finding modest association with measures on knowledge of, participation in and practice of monitoring and evaluation curriculum, instruction and assessment.

Element c. Develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of staff to maximize time spent on quality instruction: Candidates have knowledge of supervision strategies that ensure teachers are demonstrating research based professional practices; individual professional development plans and continuous progress; principles of quality professional development; effective instructional techniques; evaluation of professional development; and school systems that promote efficient practices in the management of people, processes, and resources. Candidates are able to provide feedback to improve teaching and learning; work collaboratively at the building-level to improve practice for teaching and learning; monitor individual professional development and continuous improvement; participate in activities that apply principles of effective instruction to improve instructional practices and curricular materials; design building-level professional growth plans that reflect national professional development standards; use a variety of approaches to improve staff performance; and provide and monitor the use of differentiated strategies, materials, and technologies to maximize instructional time.

Commentary and Research Support:
Candidates have knowledge of supervision strategies that ensure teachers are demonstrating research based professional practices; individual professional development plans and continuous progress; principles of quality professional development; effective instructional techniques; evaluation of professional development; and school systems that promote efficient practices in the management of people, processes, and resources (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). Candidates are able to provide feedback to improve teaching and learning (Wildy & Dimmock, 1993); work collaboratively at the building-level to improve practice for teaching and learning (Goddard, Goddard, & Tschannen-Moran, 2007); monitor individual professional development and continuous improvement; participate in activities that apply principles of effective instruction to improve instructional practices and curricular materials; design building-level professional growth plans that reflect national professional development standards; use a variety of approaches to improve staff performance (Youngs, 2007; Youngs & King, 2002); and provide and monitor the use of differentiated strategies, materials, and technologies to maximize instructional time (Leithwood et al., 2004; Marzano et al., 2005).

This element combines both the development of individual capacity as well as collective organizational capacity to improve instruction. While the element frames this in terms of time on instruction, the sub-elements focus more broadly on effective instructional practices and staff performance, much of which has been shown to have moderate to strong mediate effects on student learning (Hallinger & Heck, 1996;
Element d. **Promote the use of the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning:** Candidates have knowledge about technology as pedagogical and administrative tools. Candidates are able to support initiatives that utilize technologies for improved teaching and student achievement and use technology for school improvement.

*Commentary and Research Support:*
Candidates have knowledge about technology as pedagogical and administrative tools (Reale-Foley, 2003; Weber, 2006). Candidates are able to support initiatives that utilize technologies for improved teaching and student achievement and use technology for school improvement (Anderson & Dexter, 2005; Flanagan & Jacobson, 2003; Halverson, Grigg, Prichett, & Thomas, 2007; Isabelle & Lapointe, 2003; Weber, 2006).

**ELCC Standard 3.** A building-level education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring the management of the organization, operation, and resources by monitoring and evaluating the management and operational systems; obtaining, allocating, aligning, and efficiently utilizing human, fiscal, and technological resources; promoting and protecting the welfare and safety of students and staff; developing the capacity for distributed leadership; and ensuring teacher and organizational time is focused to support quality instruction and student learning.

Element a. **Monitor and evaluate the management and operational systems:** Candidates have knowledge about how to assess and manage organizational, operational, and legal resources of the school; manage the marketing and public relations functions of the school; and strategically align the operations, mission, vision, and goals of the school within the district’s strategic framework. Candidates are able to analyze the school’s processes and operations to identify and prioritize daily and long-term challenges for the school; write policies and procedures for the school; and implement and manage long range planning for the school.

*Commentary and Research Support:*
Much of the early research in the field of educational administration (1960’s-1970’s) focused on management functions and operational systems of schools and other educational organizations. Since the 1980’s, however, much more of the literature has focused on instructional leadership functions and leadership for school improvement. Most recently, this leadership (versus management) focus has narrowed to more specifically focus on leadership behaviors and functions associated with improved student outcomes, most notably student learning. However, in spite of this transition in educational administration scholarship, effective management of schools is still considered a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for effective schooling, as established in the 1980’s effective schools research (Purkey & Smith, 1983).
Further, recent empirical studies, meta-analyses of empirical studies, and reviews of leadership literature suggest that both effective management and effective leadership are associated with improved school conditions and subsequent school outcomes (Leithwood & Riehl, 2005; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Murphy, Elliott, Goldring, & Porter, 2007; Portin, Alejano, Knapp, & Marzolf, 2006).

Element b. **Obtain, allocate, align, and efficiently utilize human, fiscal, and technological resources:** Candidates have knowledge about methods and procedures for managing the school’s resources, including the strategic management of human capital, managing school operations, managing school facilities; aligning resources to school priorities; and forecasting resource requirements for the school. Candidates are able to identify and appropriate funds for the school using a variety of tools and processes, including collaborating with stakeholders; develop multi-year fiscal plans and annual budgets for the school; audit the school’s budget and financial status; develop facility and space utilization plans for the school; project short-term, mid-term, and long-term resource needs of the school; and use technology to manage school operations.

**Commentary and Research Support:**
There is a considerable body of empirical literature devoted to issues of resource administration in schools or other educational organizations. However, these empirical studies are often highly specialized to focus on specific human resource issues, including educator work redesign (e.g., Conley, Fauske, & Pounder, 2004; Crow & Pounder, 2000; Gerber, Finn, Achilles, & Boyd-Zaharias, 2001; Pounder, 1998; Pounder, 1999), educator recruitment-selection (Pounder, 1989; Pounder, Galvin, & Shepard, 2003; Pounder & Merrill, 2001; Pounder, King, & Hausman, 2005), educator induction-mentoring-professional development (Crow & Matthews, 1998), educator appraisal-supervision-evaluation (Stronge, & Tucker, 2003; Tucker & Stronge, 2005), and educator compensation (Odden & Kelley, 2002; Pounder, 1988). Similarly, issues of fiscal resource administration are often focused on equity (Card & Payne, 2002; Wenglinsky, 1998), adequacy (Baker & Green, 2008; Grubb, 2007), or productivity issues (Greenwald, Hedges & Laine, 1996; Monk, 1992). Technological resource research often focuses on better technology utilization, including stronger preparation and development of educators to utilize technology to improve student learning (Collins & Halverson, 2009; Halverson & Collins, 2006; McLeod, 2008). As a result of this diverse array of resource issues, it is difficult to identify literature reviews or meta-analyses that succinctly summarize findings on educational resource administration in general. Literature cited above is but a small sample of literature on resource administration in schools.

Element c. **Promote and protect the welfare and safety of students and staff:** Candidates have knowledge about strategies for providing school personnel, students, and visitors with a safe and secure building environment, including how to plan for a substance, weapon, and violence-free school. Candidates are able to create plans for a safe and secure building environment that encompasses crisis planning and management.
Commentary and Research Support:
Much of the support for standard 3c is grounded in the law and case law precedent rather than from empirical research. However, the effective schools research of the 1980’s emphasized the creation of an orderly school environment as one of the critical components of effective schools --- a necessary, but not sufficient condition for student learning (Purkey & Smith, 1983). Similarly, research by Browne-Ferrigno et al (2006) found that successful schools have a culture of leadership that supports a safe, orderly environment.

Element d. **Develop the capacity for distributed leadership:** Candidates have knowledge about the meaning of distributed leadership and how to create and sustain it. Candidates are able to identify leadership capabilities of staff at various levels of the school, model collaboration skills; and authentically involve faculty and staff in decision-making processes.

Commentary and Research Support:
Candidates have knowledge about the meaning of distributed leadership and how to create and sustain it (Day & Leithwood, 2007; Firestone & Martinez, 2009; Gronn, 2002; Harris, 2009; Leithwood, Mascall, & Strauss, 2009; Spillane, 2006; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2001). Evidence on effective principals demonstrates the importance of understanding and practicing leadership as a network of relationships rather than “control over processes or outcomes” (Leithwood et al., 2009, p. 7). Research demonstrates that the principal’s practice of distributed leadership can take various forms depending on school characteristics, specific leadership activities, the school’s stage of development, resources and the leader’s personal preferences (Leithwood et al., 2007; Portin, 2003; Spillane et al., 2000). Although research findings are mixed in terms of the effects of distributed leadership on student learning, evidence exists to support the claim that principals’ use of distributed leadership contributes to school change, student achievement, and organizational learning (Day et al., 2007; Leithwood et al., 2009; Louis & Marks, 1998; Stoll & Louis, 2007; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008; York-Barr & Duke, 2004).

Candidates are able to identify leadership capabilities of staff at various levels of the school, including teacher leaders and assistant principals (Copland, 2003; Firestone & Martinez, 2009; Gronn, 2002; Leithwood, Mascall, & Strauss, 2009). In addition, effective principals model collaboration skills and are able to authentically involve faculty and staff in decision-making processes (Copland, 2003; Silins, 2003; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). Research on principal leadership demonstrates an indirect, but significant, effect on student learning via the principal’s support of teacher collaboration and communication (Supovitz, Sirinides, & Henry, 2010).

Element e. **Ensure teacher and organizational time is focused to support quality instruction and student learning:** Candidates have knowledge about how to manage personal managerial and leadership responsibilities; manage time and priorities; and
create and manage school schedules. Candidates are able to use power and political skills in ethical ways; serve as a role model for effective management and leadership; write school policies that protect instructional time and schedules; and develop a master schedule for the school.

Commentary and Research Support:

Until recently most of the research on principals’ use of time has consisted of ethnographic studies of a few individuals or self-report studies. A recent study of principal time-use (Horng, Klasik, & Loeb, 2010), using methods that blend the strengths of both, found that for most principals almost half of their time was spent in administration or organization management and only 13% on instructional responsibilities. This study also found that increased time spent on organization management (hiring and managing staff and managing budgets) was related to positive school outcomes, including student test performance, as well as teacher and parent satisfaction.

These findings suggest that the time spent on organizational management tasks relate to instructional leadership. Managing and protecting time, setting priorities through the ethical use of power and political skills, and creating schedules contribute to school order, which is necessary for successful teaching and learning (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Supovitz, 2002) Research has demonstrated that the principal’s ability to use time effectively and to provide time as a resource for teachers is critical to quality instruction and student learning (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Leithwood & Riehl, 2005; Morrissey, 2000; Spillane & Louis, 2002). Effective principals are also able to use power and political skills in ethical ways both inside the school and with external constituents (Crow & Weindling, 2010; Owens, 2006).

ELCC Standard 4. A building-level education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources through the collection and analysis of data and information pertinent to the educational environment; understanding, appreciation, and use of the community’s diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources; building and sustaining positive relationships with families and caregivers; and productive relationships with community partners.

Element a. Collect and analyze data and information pertinent to the educational environment: Candidates have knowledge about the collection and analysis of data and information pertinent to the school educational environment. Candidates are able to use the appropriate strategies to collect, analyze and interpret data and information pertinent to the school environment and communicate information about the school to the community.

Commentary and Research Support:
Candidates have knowledge about the collection and analysis of data and information pertinent to the school educational environment (Bustamante, Nelson, & Onwuegbuzie, 2009; Epstein, 2005; Halverson, 2010; Knapp, Swinnerton, Copland, & Monpas-Huber, 2006; Wayman & Stringfield, 2006). The central role of data in the assessment and improvement of learning for students has been well-documented in the research on effective schools and in subsequent studies on school improvement and school reform (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Lezotte & Jacoby, 1992). While the emphasis has been on its use within schools to create formative feedback systems for improving instruction and student engagement (Halverson, 2010), data also have been used to facilitate the understandings that underpin relationships with families and communities. These purposes include identifying goals for partnerships with families and gauging constructs such as cultural competence (Bustamante, Nelson, & Onwuegbuzie, 2009; Landsman, 2006; Epstein & Salinas, 2006; Epstein & Sheldon, 2002; Sanders & Epstein, 2000). Descriptive literature (Epstein et al., 2002; Landsman, 2006) offers strategies for collection of information through regular phone calls to parents, neighborhood bus tours, and home visits. Research on the ways in which data can be used to enhance the educational environment for constituencies within schools and the communities they serve is limited but more targeted studies, for example, on the impact of parent involvement on reading skills (Adler & Fisher, 2001; Edwards, 2003; Fiala & Sheridan, 2003), offer guidance on more targeted ways to engage parents in specific ways to enhance schooling.

Candidates are able to use the appropriate strategies to collect, analyze and interpret data and information pertinent to the school environment and communicate information about the school to the community (Halverson, 2010; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Knapp, Swinnerton, Copland, & Monpas-Huber, 2006; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Lezotte & Jacoby, 1992; Wayman & Stringfield, 2006). Substantial research supports the importance of data-driven decision making in all aspects of school leadership. How information is used to inform the development of partnerships with families and communities is best captured by the strategies used by the National Network of Partnership Schools which was established in 1996 and has been guided by the work of researchers at Johns Hopkins (Epstein, 2005; Epstein & Sanders, 2006; Sanders & Epstein, 2000; Sheldon, 2005).

Element b. **Promote understanding, appreciation, and use of the community’s diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources:** Candidates have knowledge of cultural competence and diverse cultural, social and intellectual community resources. Candidates are able to identify and use diverse community resources to improve school programs and meet the needs of all students.

**Commentary and Research Support:**
Candidates must possess cultural competence and have a basic knowledge of the communities they serve to understand, appreciate and use the community’s diverse cultural, social and intellectual community resources (Aspiazu, Bauer, & Spillett, 1998; Bustamante, Nelson, & Onwuegbuzie, 2009; Flanagan, Cumsille, Gill, &
Given the growing diversity of students, their families and communities, cultural competence across a broad spectrum of constituents is viewed as critical to building a welcoming environment for learning in schools and at home. Limited research suggests that programs can enhance culturally competent practice and that the climate and culture within a school is related to school wide cultural competence. Increased understanding and appreciation of cultural differences, as well as commonalities, serve as the foundation for “cultural relationships” which are necessary for reciprocity and collaboration within schools and with community entities (Bustamante, Nelson, & Onwuegbuzie, 2009; Evans, 2007; Gaitan, 2004; Harry, 1992; Nzinga-Johnson, Baker, & Aupperless, 2009; Tucker & Herman, 2002).

The importance of candidates being able to identify and match diverse community resources to meet the needs of all students has been highlighted by a number of studies which look at outreach with specific student populations (Blue-Banning, Summers, Frankland, Nelson, & Beegle, 2004; Gaitan, 2004; Epstein & Sanders, 2006; Christenson, 2004; Leistyna, 2002; Tucker & Herman, 2002; Zirkel, 2008).

Element c. **Build and sustain positive relationships with families and caregivers:** Candidates have knowledge of the needs of students, parents or caregivers; the organizational culture that promotes open communication with families and caregivers; and the strategies for effective oral and written communication and collaboration with families and caregivers. Candidates are able to assess the needs of students, parents or caregivers; articulate a vision of school leadership characterized by respect for children and their families; apply oral and written communication and collaboration strategies to develop school relationships with families and caregivers; and involve families and caregivers in decision making about their children's education.

**Commentary and Research Support:**
Candidates have knowledge of the needs of students, parents or caregivers (Catsambis, 2002; Christenson, 2004; Fuerstein, 2000; Harris & Chapman, 2002; Hoover-Dempsy et al., 2005; Landsman, 2006; Louis & Miles, 1990; Patrikakou, & Weissberg, 2000; Reid, Reid, & Peterson, 2005; Ryan & Martin, 2000). To build trusting relationships with parents and key community members, school leaders must first understand the challenges and pressing issues in the lives of their students and their communities. Based on this knowledge, responsive outreach efforts can be undertaken that build relationships of consequence for caretakers (Anderson, Christenson, & Sinclair, 2004; Barnyak, & McNelly, 2009; Blue-Banning, Summers, Frankland, Nelson, & Beegle, 2004; Coalition for Community Schools, & Institute for Educational Leadership, 2003; Epstein & Sanders, 2006; Harris & Chapman, 2002; Harry, 1992). The research describes a wide range of strategies that bring parents into the school for meaningful engagement and dialogue or create events in the community such as potluck dinners and sporting events that create a sense of connectedness (e.g., Colombo, 2004). Efforts to engage family members in the learning environment for children and youth has been found to be related to stronger cognitive and emotional outcomes in many research studies, some of which offer
compelling longitudinal evidence of impact (Catsambis, 2002; Fan & Chen, 2001; Epstein, 2002; Fantuzzo, McWayne, Perry, & Childs, 2004; Jeynes, 2005; Mathematica Policy Research, 2001; Reynolds, 1999; Reynolds, Temple, Robertson, & Mann, 2002; Xu, Kushner Benson, Mudrey-Camino, & Steiner, 2010).

To be effective in building positive relationships with families and caregivers, the candidate understands how to build the organizational culture that promotes open communication with families and caregivers (Levin & Fullan, 2008; Miretzky, 2004). Research indicates that cultural competence is both an individual and organizational skill and must be developed at the building level to influence how students and families respond to engagement efforts (Benson, & Martin, 2003; Bustamante, Nelson, & Onwuegbuzie, 2009; Epstein & Sanders, 2006; Griffith, 2001; Pena, 2000; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003; Steinberg, 1992).

Research has identified factors which help schools develop meaningful partnerships with schools which include strategies for effective oral and written communication and collaboration with families and caregivers (Berger, 2003; Cairney, 2000; Gordon & Louis, 2009; Lawson, 2003; McIntyre, Kyle, Miller, & Moore, 2002; Miretsky, 2004; Pena, 2000; Porterfield & Carnes, 2008; Smrekar & Cohen-Vogal, 2001). These partnerships are related to higher levels of family involvement in student learning at home and school (Durlak et al., 2007; Epstein, 2005; Sheldon, 2005; Sheldon & Van Voorhis, 2004; Taylor, 2004).

Candidates are able to assess the needs of students, parents or caregivers; articulate a vision of school leadership characterized by respect for children and their families; apply oral and written communication and collaboration strategies to develop school relationships with families and caregivers; and involve families and caregivers in decision making about their children's education (Epstein, 2005; Gordon & Louis, 2009; Jacobson, Brooks, Giles, Johnson, & Ylimaki, 2007; Miretsky, 2004). The research on the National Network of Partnership Schools provides the best evidence of how these elements work together to ensure better learning outcomes for students (Epstein, 2005; Epstein & Sanders, 2006; Sanders & Epstein, 2000; Sheldon, 2005).

Element d. **Build and sustain productive relationships with community partners:** Candidates have knowledge of the needs of school community partners; the school organizational culture that promotes open communication with community partners; and school strategies for effective oral and written communication and collaboration to develop and sustain productive relations with community partners. Candidates are able to assess the needs of school community partners; articulate a vision of school leadership characterized by respect for community partners; and apply oral and written communication and collaboration strategies to develop school relationships with community partners.

**Commentary and Research Support:**
Candidates have knowledge of the needs of school community partners; the school organizational culture that promotes open communication with community partners;
and school strategies for effective oral and written communication and collaboration
to develop and sustain productive relations with community partners (Cairney, 2000;
Dryfoos & Maguire, 2002; Hiatt-Michael, 2006; Institute for Educational Leadership;
2002; Leistyna, 2002; Levin & Fullan, 2008; Miretzky, 2004; Price, 2008; Sanders,
2001; Sanders, 2009; Sanders & Harvey, 2002; Sheldon, 2005; Sheldon, Epstein, &
Galindo, 2010; Sommerville & McDonald, 2002; Warren, Hong, Rubin, & Uy, 2009).
As educators recognize the broader set of variables which influence student success in
schools, there is a greater interest in collaborating with community partners to serve a
wide range of medical, emotional, and social needs of students, sometimes within
full-service community schools (Dryfoos & Maguire, 2002; Institute for Educational
Leadership; 2002; Trivette & Thompson-Drew, 2003). In addition, after-school
programs are opportunities for collaboration with community resources (Cairney,
2000; Leistyna, 2002; Price, 2008).

Candidates are able to assess the needs of school community partners; articulate a
vision of school leadership characterized by respect for community partners; and
apply oral and written communication and collaboration strategies to develop school
relationships with community partners (Dryfoos & Maguire, 2002; Institute for
Educational Leadership; 2002; Levin & Fullan, 2008; Warren, Hong, Rubin, & Uy,
2009).

ELCC Standard 5. A building-level education leader promotes the success of every
student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner to ensure a system
of accountability for every student’s academic and social success and model
principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior;
safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity; consider and evaluate the
potential moral and legal consequences of decision-making; and promote social
justice to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

Element a. Ensure a system of accountability for every student’s academic and
social success: Candidates have knowledge of federal, state, and local legal/policy
guidance to create operational definitions of accountability, equity, and social justice.
Candidates are able to plan, implement, and evaluate policies, procedures, and practices
within the school that support students’ academic and social successes.

Commentary and Research Support:
Candidates have knowledge of federal, state, and local legal/policy guidance to create
operational definitions of accountability, equity, and social justice (Leithwood,
Steinbach & Jantzi, 2002; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003). The importance of a leader’s
knowledge of policy is also connected to their ability to facilitate teachers’
understanding of policy and its connection to equity and social justice (Marks &
Nance, 2007; Reitzug, 1994; Prawat, 1991; Burch, Theoharris & Raucher, 2010) as
well as their ability to effectively implement the policy (Burch & Spillane, 2003;
Spillane, 2004). Candidates are able to plan, implement, and evaluate policies,
procedures, and practices within the school that support students’ academic and social
successes (Burch, Theoharris & Raucher, 2010; Bustamante, Nelson, &
Onwuegbuzie, 2009; Halverson, 2010; Knapp, Swinnerton, Copland, & Monpas-Huber, 2006; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Lord & Maher, 1993; Portin, Schneider, DeArmond & Gundlach, 2003; Reitzug, 1994; Theoharris, 2001; Wayman & Stringfield, 2006; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003). The importance of a leader’s ability to use multiple sources of data in the assessment of student learning and the planning, implementation and evaluation of school programs and policies has been well-documented in the research on effective schools and in subsequent studies on school improvement and school reform (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Lezotte & Jacoby, 1992; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2001).

Element b. **Model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior:** Candidates have knowledge of the legal and professional organizations’ information to understand the basic tenets of ethical behavior, the relationship between ethical behavior, building culture and student achievement and the effect of ethical behavior on one’s own leadership. Candidates are able to formulate a school-level leadership platform grounded in ethical standards and practices and analyze decisions in terms of established ethical standards.

**Commentary and Research Support:**
Candidates have knowledge of the legal and professional organizations’ information to understand the basic tenets of ethical behavior, the relationship between ethical behavior, building culture and student achievement and the effect of ethical behavior on one’s own leadership (Beckner, 2004; Begley, 2006; Brennan & Brennan, 1988; Bustamante, Nelson, & Onwuegbuzie, 2009; McGough, 2003; Webster, 1994). Although, the research literature does not specifically refer to information provided by professional organizations, it does emphasize the importance of understanding and having a set of ethical principals (Becker, 2004; Begley, 2006; Brennan & Brennan, 1988) Candidates are able to formulate a school-level leadership platform grounded in ethical standards and practices and analyze decisions in terms of established ethical standards (Browne-Ferrigno, 2003; Bush, 2008; Huefner, 1994; Stöcklin, 2010; Walker & Shuangye, 2007; Wegenke, 2000). The empirical basis for developing a leadership platform grounded in ethical standards is underdeveloped. Moreover, the majority of studies that specifically stress the importance of having a leadership platform are from outside of the United States (e.g., Bush, 2008; Huefner, 1994; Stöcklin, 2010; Walker & Shuangye, 2007). However, research that emphasizes the importance of formulating a vision or plan for the school that is grounded in a leader’s ethical principals is more common in the US and is linked to literature on building school capacity and leading change (Beck, 1994; Beckner, 2004; Begley, 2006; Browne-Ferrigno, 2003).

Element c. **Safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity:** Candidates have knowledge of democratic values, equity, and diversity. Candidates are able to develop, implement, and evaluate a professional development plan for a school that clearly addresses democratic values, equity, and diversity.
Commentary and Research Support:
Candidates have knowledge of democratic values, equity, and diversity (Hess, 1993; Gross & Shapiro, 2004; Papa & Fortune, 2002; Rollow & Bryk, 1993; Theoharris, 2001; Rusch, 1998; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003). Moreover, school leaders play a pivotal role in shaping meaning, fostering understanding and promoting the values of democracy, equity and diversity in their organizations through communication, symbols, structures and routines (Cooper, 1996; Meyer, 1984; Strike, 1993). Candidates are able to develop, implement, and evaluate a professional development plan for a school that clearly addresses democratic values, equity, and diversity (Burch, Theoharris & Raucher, 2010; Theoharris, 2001; Webster, 1994). Although, much of the research on the leaders role vis-à-vis professional development (e.g., Leithwood, 1994; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Murphy & Louis, 1994) casts it as supportive, the leader is considered critical in the development of professional learning communities that support teacher growth (Fine, 1994; Louis, Marks & Kruse, 1996; Louis, Kruse, and Associates, 1995; Talbert, 1996). Furthermore, research indicates that leaders who model democratic values and equity can develop such values and educational practice that serve the needs of diverse students among their staff members (Corson, 1995a, 1995b; Perry & Fraser, 1993; Rusch, 1998).

Element d. Consider and evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision-making: Candidates have knowledge about current ethical and moral issues facing education, government, and business and their consequences. Candidates are able to formulate sound solutions to educational dilemmas across a range of content areas in educational leadership.

Commentary and Research Support:
Candidates have knowledge about current ethical and moral issues facing education, government, and business and their consequences (Beck, 1994; Brennan & Brennan, 1988; Evers, 1985; Englert, 1993; Grundy, 1993; Lakomski, 1987; Militello, Schimmel & Eberwein, 2009; Nevin, 1979; Smith & Blase, 1991). Of the various moral and legal issues used as the focus of research in this area, special education was most common (e.g., Brennan & Brennan, 1988; Harry, 1992; Nevin, 1979; Rebore, 1979; Van Horn, Burrello & DeClue, 1992). Candidates are able to formulate sound solutions to educational dilemmas across a range of content areas in educational leadership (Duke & Salmonowicz, 2010; Gross & Shapiro, 2004; Kaplan & Owings, 2001; Leithwood & Steinbach, 1992; Militello, Schimmel & Eberwein, 2009; Portin, Schneider, DeArmond & Gundlach, 2003; Rebore, 1979; Roche, 1994). While the majority of research on decision-making emphasizes the importance of leaders using multiple data sources (e.g., Leithwood & Steinbeck, 1992), a large body of research also emphasizes the importance of considering the potential consequences of different strategies and actions. Within this literature, it is argued that principals understand the ethics and fairness of issues involved and the costly consequences for falling short even as they support raising academic standards (Duke & Salmonowicz, 2010; Gross & Shapiro, 2004; Kaplan & Owings, 2001; Leithwood & Steinbach, 1992; Militello, Schimmel & Eberwein, 2009; Portin, Schneider, DeArmond & Gundlach, 2003; Roche, 1994).
Element e. Promote social justice and ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling: Candidates have knowledge about the relationship between social justice, school culture, and student achievement. Candidates are able to develop and evaluate school policies, programs, and practices that ensure social justice, equity, confidentiality, acceptance, and respect between and among students and faculty that support student achievement.

Commentary and Research Support:
Candidates have knowledge about the relationship between social justice, school culture, and student achievement (Aspiazu, Bauer, & Spillett, 1998; Bustamante, Nelson, & Onwuegbuzie, 2009; Flanagan, Cumsille, Gill, & Gallay, 2007; Franke, Isken, & Parra, 2003; Gaitan, 2004; Harry, 1992; Papa & Fortune, 2002; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003; Theoharris, 2001; Tucker & Herman, 2002; Zirkel, 2008). Given the growing diversity of students, their families and communities, the ability to understand the relationship between social justice, school culture, and student achievement and to practice inclusive leadership is cited as critical (Baptiste, 1999; Deering, 1996; Katz, 1999; Miron, 1997; Reed, 1978; Shakeshaft, 1993; Sather, 1999; Walker, 1999; Winfield et al., 1993). Increased understanding and appreciation of cultural differences, as well as commonalities, serve as the foundation for reciprocity and collaboration (Bustamante, Nelson, & Onwuegbuzie, 2009; Evans, 2007; Gaitan, 2004; Harry, 1992; Nzinga-Johnson, Baker, & Aupperless, 2009; Tucker & Herman, 2002). Candidates are able to develop and evaluate school policies, programs, and practices that ensure social justice, equity, confidentiality, acceptance, and respect between and among students and faculty that support student achievement (Burch, Theorharris & Raucher, 2010; Nevin, 1979; Papa & Fortune, 2002; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003). Research demonstrates that principals play essential roles in creating organizational and policy conditions that influence how teachers teach and are supported when adopting new practices (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Burch & Spillane, 2003; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Lezotte & Jacoby, 1992) as well as in providing teacher learning opportunities, the use of physical and human resources, and the design of instructional systems in improving instruction for underserved populations (Stainback, Stainback, & Forest, 1989; Theoharris, 2001; Van Horn, Burrello, & DeClue, 1992). The literature also emphasizes the importance of leaders promoting such an ability among their teaching staff (Reitzug, 1994).

ELCC Standard 6. A building-level education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context through advocating for children, families, and caregivers; acting to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning; and assessing, analyzing, and anticipating emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt leadership strategies.

Commentary and Research Support:
The 2010 formulation of Standard 6, is grounded in scholarship that called attention to the need for education leaders at both district and school levels to know about and respond to the social, political and economic contexts of schooling (see Murphy, 2005), and has also been informed by evidence from more recent empirical and analytic scholarship, along with accounts of best practices, reports, and that has taken into account critical commentary. The analysis of these sources has led to the identification of three important domains of knowledge and associated skills of leadership that must be developed by school and district leaders if they are to effectively address the socio-economic and political challenges of leading 21st century schools: a) advocacy for children, families and caregivers to improve social opportunities, b) influencing local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning and c) assessing, analyzing, and anticipating emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt leadership strategies. All three domains reflect a new focus on the importance of proactive leadership of schools and districts. This proactive turn in both school and district leadership is informed by analytic scholarship distinguishing the uniquely important nature of educational leadership critical to educational change and reform, requiring proactive leadership skills, and commitment to exercising influence and engaging in advocacy. There are now growing bodies of empirical research and commentaries on best practices associated with proactive leadership of schools and districts, in particular the scholarship calling for a new thrust towards advocacy as a central orientation and skill in educational leadership.

Element a. **Advocate for children, families, and caregivers:** Candidates have knowledge of policies, laws and regulations enacted by state, local and federal authorities that affect schools, especially those targeted to improve educational and social opportunities. Candidates are able to advocate based on an analysis of the complex causes of poverty and other disadvantages and their effects on families, communities, children and learning.

**Commentary and Research Support:**
That principals must have knowledge of policies, laws and regulations enacted by state, local and federal authorities has been a foundational principle in defining the responsibilities of the role (Cooper, Fusarelli & Randall, 2004; Cunningham & Corderio, 2009; Fowler, 2000; Hanson, 2003; Heck, 2004; Hoy & Miskel, 2004; Hoyle, English & Steffy, 1998; Leithwood, 1999; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2007; Murphy, 1990; Murphy, Elliott, Goldring & Porter, 2007; Murphy, Martin & Murth, 1997; Razik & Swanson, 2001). In recent years scholars of policy have argued that “the logic of standards-based reform has become, a fundamental part of the architecture of policy and governance in American education” in ways that “represent a fundamental shift in the relationship between policy and institutional practice” (Elmore, 2000, p. 4)). The importance of this shift has become most clearly evident in findings of studies that have examined principals’ experiences in implementing state responses to the federal government’s No Child Left Behind Act (Powell, Higgins, Aram, & Freed, 2009, McQuillan, & Salomon-Fernandez, 2008).
Since passage of the legislation state departments of education across the U.S. have been busy creating or modifying school accountability systems to meet NCLB guidelines. Given the NCLB provisions and the growing number of schools not meeting AYP, the number of state interventions in low-performing schools increased, and researchers have found that principals of those schools have had to develop detailed understanding of the state policies, while also struggling to address frustration and the erosion of trust among teachers (McQuillan, & Salomon-Fernandez, 2008). In this context researchers have found the most important influence on principals’ of rural schools educational vision for the future and the need for professional development has been meeting AYP and raising test scores (Powell, Higgins, Aram, & Freed, 2009). These studies suggest that principals must have detailed knowledge of how accountability policies and regulations can guide efforts to improve educational opportunities for students.

There is also empirical evidence that principals are critically important in efforts at education reform that seek to improve the social opportunities of students, particularly in contexts where issues of student marginalization demand proactive leadership (Murphy & Datnow, 2003; Brown, 2004; Frattura & Capper, 2007; Brooks, Jean-Marie, Normore, & Hodgins, 2007; Larson & Murtadha, 2002; Marshall & Oliva, 2006; McKenzie et al., 2008; Theoharis, 2007). In a series of articles reporting on a study of principals of schools where students traditionally marginalized are thriving, Theoharis (2007, 2008a, 2008b, 2009, 2010) found that the daily practices of advocacy for children were informed by their analyses of the complex causes of marginalization. Like other researchers (Lyman & Villani, 2002; Riester, Pursch & Skrla, 2002; Scheurich, 1998; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003; Skrla, Scheurich, Garcia, & Nolly, 2004), Theoharis (2010) found that principals’ advocacy practices were informed by analyses’ of student demographic and accountability data and by awareness of complex causes of marginalization and concern for equity. These and other researchers found that principals enacted their advocacy for marginalized families by purposefully reaching out to involve families and to create partnerships with community agencies (Theoharis, 2010; Scheurich, 1998). Similarly research revealed the importance of proactive support for students and their families by principals in the success of implementing High School College Collaborative programs that provide traditionally underserved high school students with opportunities to receive college credit (White-Smith & White, 2009). Other researchers report that principals who practice an expanded approach to advocacy take into account the differences in the schooling experiences of marginalized students (Ares, 2007), and create opportunities for discussions of those differences (Shields, 2004; Sheilds, Larocque & Oberg, 2002). Research also suggests that engaging in advocacy to address issues of equity and marginalization requires that principals challenge traditional managerial oriented views of the role and the various resistances and barriers to equity-oriented reforms (Brown, 2004; Bogotch, 2002; Dantley, 2002; Dantley & Tillman, 2006; Larson & Murtadha, 2002; Marshall & Ward, 2004, Rapp, 2002; Theoharis, 2008a).
Element b. **Act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning:** Candidates have knowledge of the larger political, social, economic, legal and cultural context and have knowledge of how to use power and political skills to influence local, state and federal decisions. Candidates are able to advocate for school policies and programs that promote equitable learning opportunities and success for all students and communicate policies, laws, regulations and procedures to appropriate school stakeholders.

**Commentary and Research Support:**

Current commentaries on the context of schooling confirm that administrators must assume different mindsets if public schools are to remain viable and functional. Scholars, and researchers point out that every week federal and state courts hand down decisions that have the potential to affect schools and school districts (Cooper, Fusarelli & Randall, 2004; Cunningham & Corderio, 2009; Smith, 2009; Fowler, 2000; Lunenburg & Orienstein, 2007; Seyfarth, 2008). School leaders should have an understanding of the federal constitution and the Bills of Rights as well as their state constitutions and statutes. They should understand the legal rights of teachers and students should be aware of current legal issues and their potential impact on schools (Cambron-McCable, McCarthy, Thomas, 2004; Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2005; Stefkovich, 2006). Changing populations resulting in heterogeneous communities, the diversity of community values, and the finite resources available to meet the infinite desires of a demanding constituency have created the necessity for political acumen on the part of local educational leaders (Owen, 2006). Empirical studies confirm that activist principals use knowledge of social, political and economic context inform their political clarity, political capacity, political collaboration, and an ethic of risk (Hoffman, 2009). Practice-informed case studies developed to support school leadership preparation confirm the importance of such knowledge (Gause, 2008), while also recognizing that “in this paradoxical, unstable, and ethically polarized era” such case studies must help principals develop capacities for ethical leadership (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2005).

There is broad support in scholarship and research that principals play a critical role in creating schools that are responsive to the growing heterogeneity of students, more inclusive and responsive to the diverse needs of all students. Most broadly there is a growing body of research and scholarship providing evidence that culturally responsive educational leadership positively influences academic achievement and students’ engagement with the school environment (Banks & McGee-Banks, 2004; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002; Johnson, 2003, 2006; Juettner, 2003; Klingner et al., 2005; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Richl, 2000; Skrla, Scheurich, Garcia, & Nolly, 2006a, 2006b). More specifically, research has shown that principals supporting inclusion of students with disabilities share a commitment to the principles of diversity, social justice, and equity (Brooks, Adams, Morita-Mullaney, 2010; Mayrowetz & Weinstein, 1999; Reitzug, 2002; Richl, 2000; Salisbury & McGregor, 2002; Salisbury, 2006). Research suggests that principals’ commitments to these principles influence orientations to advocacy to promote equitable learning opportunities and success for students with disabilities requiring action beyond
compliance with Less Restrictive Environment (LEA) provisions of the 1997 Amendments to IDEA (Salisbury, 2006). Researchers report similar commitments are important influences on principals’ support for effective supports for English Language Learners (K. Brooks et al., 2010). Research suggests that in all cases active educational leaders must develop skills in public policy advocacy, networking, organizing, community development, and scholarship (Hoffman, 2009).

Element c. **Assess, analyze, and anticipate emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt leadership strategies:** Candidates have knowledge about anticipating future issues and trends that can affect schools and contemporary and emerging leadership theories (e.g., entrepreneurial approaches). Candidates are able to identify emerging trends and issues likely to impact the school and adapt leadership strategies and practice to address emerging issues.

**Commentary and Research Support:**
There is widespread recognition that school building leaders must be prepared to anticipate future trends that can affect schools (Hodgkinson, 2003). Some trends are predictable and can be addressed using modes of strategic planning (Smith, 2009). For example, some researchers suggest that as part of their approach to strategic human resources planning, principals must engage in external scanning, considering, for example, national demographic trends, populations projections, ethnic diversity, issues associated with provisions for special education, responding to violence, and school choice (Smith, 2009). Other researchers point out that anticipating future issues arising from the complexities associated with what many view as an unstable era of war, terrorism, natural disasters and other conditions of turbulence raises ethical dilemmas that require principals to have knowledge of ethical concepts associated with principles of justice, critique, care and the profession (Shapiro & Gross, 2008).

Although scholars have long recognized that principals must know about leadership theories (Nystrand, 1981), it is only recently that knowledge of three contemporary theoretical perspectives (transactional, transformational, and distributed) have been perceived as essential (Marsh, 2000). They agree that principals should understand the strengths and limitations of transactional approaches (English, 2003, Shields, 2005) and transformational models (Freidman, 2004; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006, Leithwood & Sun, 2009), and the challenges of distributive approaches (Gronn, 2000; Harris, 2004, 2007; McBeath, 2005; Murphy, Smylie, Mayorowetz & Louis, 2009; Printy & Marks, 2004; Scribner, Sawyer, Watson & Myers, 2007; Spillane, 2006). Many scholars now argue that in order to address complex environments school building leaders must have knowledge of emerging leadership theories. For example, a mounting body of research suggests that culturally responsive educational leadership positively influences academic achievement and students’ engagement with the school environment (Banks & McGee-Banks, 2004; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002; Johnson, 2003, 2006; Juettner, 2003; Klingner et al., 2005; Ladson-
Recent scholarship on educational change supports the critical importance for principals to have knowledge of how to anticipate trends (Fullan, 2002). Based on his extensive study of change leadership, Fullan (2002) concludes “Only principals who are equipped to handle a complex, rapidly changing environment can implement the reforms that lead to sustained improvement in student achievement” (p.16). Other researchers have found that in the current landscape of change, requires leaders to be flexible, skilled and "versed in a variety of approaches to address unique problems inherent in the multiple contexts in which school leadership finds itself' (Friedman, 2004, p. 206). In this context, there is widespread understanding informed by practice that principals must learn “how to conscientiously and accurately keep a finger on the pulse of the community to discern the changing tides of favor and disfavor, the covert criticisms, and the coalescing groups with a single agenda” (Owen, 2007). Analysts conclude that it is clear that 21st century realities of global interdependence and diverse institutions require that schools effectively and appropriately respond to diverse groups in the school and school community and prepare all young people for positive interactions with people who are culturally different (Banks, 2008; Mawhinney, 2008, 2009, 2010).

**ELCC Standard 7. A building-level education leader promotes the success of every student through a substantial and sustained educational leadership internship that has field experiences and clinical practice within a school setting monitored by a qualified on-site mentor.**

*Commentary and Research Support:*

The theory and research on the importance of an internship and the nature of highly effective internships dates back to the early work on experiential learning (Dewey, 1986) and its promotion as a highly effective means of adult learning (Kolb, 1984; Mezirow, 1991). Internships are widely used in professional education generally (LaPlant, 1988). More current work in the field stresses the full-time, job-embedded internship as the ideal (Barnett, Copland, & Shoho, 2009).

Much of the research on internships has focused on what typically occurs (Barnett et al., 2009; Copeland, 2004; McKerrow, 1998). This is mixed with case study research on innovative models (Cordeiro & Sloan, 1996; Ellis, 2002; Jones, 1999; Mercado, 2002; Milstein & Kruger, 1997) and conceptualizations of more robust approaches (Frye, Bottoms, & O'Neill, 2005; Milstein, Bobroff, & Restine, 1991; Straut & Calabrese, 1999). Limited research has compared the effects of conventional and exemplary preparation, but the results suggest that principals either report (Franklin, 2006; Mercado, 2002) or demonstrate (Orr & Orphanos, 2010 (forthcoming)) better leadership practices when they have had longer, more full time internships.
Many of the internship elements and sub-elements in Standard 7 parallel the research findings from Danforth Foundation funded innovations in leadership preparation in the early 1990s. Comparative case study analyses yielded strong conclusions about the nature of high quality internships (Milstein & Kruger, 1997). They concluded that the critical components of field experience that have the greatest value and potential impact are:

- Sufficient time on task (frequency and regularity of work across school year and day; exposure to and engagement in relevant and realistic range of site responsibilities; support of effective mentor practitioners);
- Relationship with mentors who have demonstrated skills and have been trained as mentors: focus on appropriate modeling and reflection;
- Multiple and alternative internship experiences to support diverse clinical training (e.g., medical rotation model);
- Reflective seminars to support interns' analysis and integration of learning;
- Field supervision - typically not given much consideration/focus within larger internship process; and
- Program coordination by educators who can link district and university programs, model professional development and learning.

Element a. **Substantial Experience:** The program provides significant field experiences and clinical practice opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the content knowledge and pedagogy and develop professional skills identified in the Educational Leadership Building-Level Program Standards through authentic school-based leadership experiences. Candidates demonstrate the ability to accept genuine responsibility for leading, facilitating, and making decisions typical of those made by educational leaders within a school. Intern experiences provide candidates with authentic building-level responsibilities that increase over time in amount and complexity and involve direct interaction with staff, students, parents, and school community leaders. Candidates are provided with opportunities to work with appropriate community organizations such as social service groups and local businesses. Clinical experiences occur in a variety of school leadership settings that allow candidates to demonstrate a wide range of relevant knowledge and skills.

**Commentary and Research Support:**
Research on the quality internships shows that principals prepared in innovative preparation programs (n=213) were statistically significantly more likely than those prepared in conventional programs (n=446) to have an internship (89% vs. 72%), and to report that their internship gave them responsibilities for leading, facilitating and making decisions typical of an educational leader (Darling-Hammond, Meyerson, La Pointe, & Orr, 2009). Further analysis of a subgroup of these principals showed that the degree of internship quality, based on three measures—having had responsibilities for leading, facilitating and making decisions typical of an educational leader; being able to develop an educational leader’s perspective on school improvement; and having an excellent that was an learning experience for becoming a principal—accounted for the extent to which principals’ learned about leadership, which in turn
influenced their use of effective leadership practices and school improvement (Orr & Orphanos, 2010 (forthcoming)).

While not directly addressed in the standard elements, but implied in the stress on complexity and authenticity, is the field’s emphasis on the role of the internship in socializing the candidate to the principalship (Browne-Ferrigno & Muth, 2004) and transforming their perspectives (Osterman.K. & Fishbein, 2001).

Element b. **Sustained Experience:** Candidates are provided a six-month, full-time (9-12 hours per week) internship experience. This experience need not be consecutive and may include experiences of different lengths. An extended capstone experience is provided to candidates to maximize their opportunities to practice and refine their building-level knowledge and skills. This experience may include two noncontiguous internships of three months each, a four-month internship and two months of field experiences, or another equivalent combination.

**Commentary and Research Support:**
Based on reviews of research on internships, educational experts have argued that ideally, it is full-time and job embedded (Barnett et al., 2009; Carr, Chenoweth, & Ruhl, 2003). Research on the quality internships shows that principals prepared in innovative preparation programs (n=213) were statistically significantly more likely than those prepared in conventional programs (n=446) were more likely to have longer internships (50% longer on average), averaging a full year (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). Other research on program practices shows that programs vary widely in the length of candidates’ internship experiences and in whether they are released from teaching (some or all the time) for their internship work (Orr, 2010, forthcoming). A comparison of 17 programs in 13 institutions shows that 90% of the candidates had internships (ranging from 56-100%), 37% had full or partial release time for their internship work (ranging from 16-100%), and rated the quality of their internship as good on average (4.0 on 5-point scale), ranging from mixed to highly effective.

Element c. **Qualified On-site Mentor:** An on-site school mentor who has demonstrated successful experience as an educational leader within a school is selected collaboratively by the intern candidate and institution. High-quality training of on-site mentors is provided by the supervising institution in order that the on-site mentor may provide the intern candidate with ongoing supervision, guidance, and evaluation. Candidates take the internship for credit according to the policies of the program.

**Commentary and Research Support:**
Research on the quality internships shows that principals prepared in innovative preparation programs (n=213) were statistically significantly more likely than those prepared in conventional programs (n=446) to report that in their internship they were closely supervised and assisted by knowledgeable school leaders and were regularly evaluated by program faculty (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). Other research shows
the importance of high quality mentoring on participant outcomes in both corporate and educational settings (Sosik et al., 2005).

There is limited work on mentor training for school leader internships but a common emphasis on the role of mentors and the importance of training for quality field experience (Wallace Foundation, 2007). There is modest evidence of the importance and influence of selecting and preparing mentors on internship experience and graduate outcomes (Cordeiro & Sloan, 1996; Ellis, 2002; Geismer, Morris, & Lieberman, 2000), and on the supervisory relationship between on-site mentors and supervising faculty for quality internship experiences (Busch, 2003).

There is no research on the benefits of earning course credit for internship experiences, but many experts advocate for universities to manage these more rigorously, facilitate greater connections between coursework and field work, and provide better quality oversight (Barnett et al., 2009; Milstein et al., 1991; Milstein & Kruger, 1997).

**ELCC Standard 8.** A building-level education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding principles for the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning; understanding principles for advocating, nurturing and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth; understanding best practices regarding management of a school organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment; understanding strategies for collaboration with faculty and community members, understanding of diverse community interests and needs, and best practice for mobilizing community resources; understanding dispositions of integrity, fairness, and ethical practice; and understanding how to respond to and influence the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context within a school and district.

**Commentary and Research Support:**
An important foundation for the knowledge base for that is the focus of Standard 8 for school building leadership is the evidence from the empirical, scholarly, craft and expert studies, literature reviews, reports and commentaries that informed the formation 2008 Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium’s (ISLLC) Educational Leadership Policy Standards. This research base has highlighted the importance of knowledge of each of the domains of the ELCC standards (www.ccsso.org/ISLLC2008Research). The development of the 2008 Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium’s (ISLLC) Educational Leadership Policy Standards, updating the 1996 ISLCC Standards was informed by a body of empirical research and scholarship documenting the fact that “dramatic changes that have put educational leadership at the forefront of education policy research and debate” (ISLLC Education Leadership and Policy Standards, 2008, p. 3). The panel of scholars and experts in educational administration created by the National Policy Board on Educational Administration to support the development of the 2008 ISLCC
standards identified a research base comprised of “empirical research reports, policy analyses, leadership texts, and other resources considered ‘craft knowledge’ and ‘sources of authority in the field” (p. 7). The majority of this research did not exist when the original standards were published as ISLCC 1996, nor did the international interest in standards-based leadership preparation as the current OECD international activity Improving School Leadership affirms (Huber, 2004).

Two important research reports confirmed the importance of the 2008 ISLLC standard revision efforts. A 2006 report for the Wallace Foundation entitled Leadership for learning: Making connections among state, district and school policies and practices confirmed that among the standards are the core system elements that determine the quality of school leadership. A similar conclusion was reached in the 2007 report by Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, Orr and Cohen which provided empirical evidence confirming the importance of the standard revision efforts. Darling-Hammond et al. found that among the features shared by exemplary pre and in service development programs for principals was “a comprehensive and coherent curriculum aligned to state and professional standards, in particular the NCATE/Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLCC) standards, which emphasize instructional leadership.” (cited in (ISLLC Education Leadership and Policy Standards, 2008, p. 10). The ISLCC 2008 developers also found persuasive support for the importance of standard revision efforts in the Wallace Foundation report, Leadership for Learning, which concluded that “standards that spell out clear expectations about what leaders need to know and to do to improve instruction and learning and that form the basis for holding them accountable for results” are critically important to the development of strong leadership (p. 10). Other reviews and analyses provided similar research support for the importance of education leadership standards (Hoyle, 2005a; ). An international review of the literature on standards, leadership theory and research found that a key challenge in leader preparation is linking standards to practice (Ingvarson, Anderson, Gronn, & Jackson, 2006). Efforts to address this challenge are documented in descriptions of practices that clarify leadership standards (West Ed., 2003).

Some reviews considered in developing the ISLL 2008 standards explicitly set out to explore commonalities among standards for education leaders. For example Hoyle, English and Steffy (1998) found commonalities among standards created by the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), the NASSP, National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA), the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). An important contribution was a crosswalk completed in 2005 for the Education Commission of the States (ECS) of the different leadership standards developed by five different groups National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) and the Education Leaders Constituent Council (ELCC), The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) and the Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL). The crosswalk found that all the standards
generally fit within several categories of what a highly qualified leader would excel at. The categories included, developing and articulating a vision, strategic decisionmaking and implementation, creating a culture of learning, using data effectively, understanding curriculum and instruction, engaging all members of the staff, understanding effective management, providing high-quality professional growth opportunities to staff, communicating effectively and honestly with staff, students and community members (Anthes, 2005).

An important foundation of research base informing the development of the 2008 ISLLC standards was the Wallace Foundation 2007, report: A Bridge to School Reform. The report identified research showing there is a crucial connection between school leadership and the success and achievement of every student. Other reviews of research confirmed the importance this connection (Murphy, Elliott, Goldring & Porter, 2007; Waters, Marzano, McNulty, 2003; Marzano, Waters & McNulty). Identification by ISLCC 2008 developers of key domains of knowledge required of leaders seeking to impact student learning and achievement was also informed by an extensive review of research conducted in 2004 by Leithwood, Seashore Louis, Anderson and Wahlstrom who reported that there was evidence of direct and indirect leadership effects on student learning, and that one way this occurred was when educational leaders’ set directions by focusing faculty attention on goals and infusing relevant organizational culture with a sense of purpose. The Leithwood et al. review of research also led to the ISLCC developers to conclude that there was ‘substantial support that effective education leaders can enhance teachers’ performance by providing targeted support, modeling best practice, and offering intellectual stimulation’ (ISLLC Education Leadership and Policy Standards, 2008, p. 9). Analysis of these reviews led ISLCC 2008 developers to formulate grounding assumption that education leaders must have deep knowledge of how their work influences the success of every student, an important shift from the focus of the ISLLC 1996 standards on promoting the success of all students, to emphasizing each and all students.

The commentaries in this document have identified more recent evidence from empirical, scholarly, craft and expert studies and literature reviews of the knowledge base for each of the ELCC Standards for School Building Leadership.

**Evidence presented in support Standard 1 confirms that a building-level education leader must have knowledge of how to promote the success of every student by understanding principles for the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning.** This includes knowledge of the importance of shared school vision, mission, and goals for student success that is documented in the effective schools literature (Clark, Lotto, & Astuto, 1984; Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Purkey & Smith, 1983; Rosenholtz, 1985; Rutter et al., 1979), and subsequently in the school improvement literature (Chrispeels, 1992; Fullan & Miles, 1992; Kurland, Peretz, & Hertz-Lazarowitz, 2010; Lambert, 1998; Leithwood, Begley, & Cousins, 1994; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999; Murphy Elliott,
Goldring, & Porter, 2007; Powell, Higgins, Aram, & Freed, 2009; Short & Greer, 1997; Silins, Mulford, & Zarins, 2002; Tillman, 2004). It includes knowledge that when vision, mission, and goals are widely shared, student achievement usually increases (Chrispeels, 1992; Harris, 2002; Printy & Marks, 2006; Rutter et al., 1979). The importance of the knowledge presented in evidence supporting Standard 1 was recognized in the reviews of scholarship informing the development of the ISLLC 2008 standards that highlighted the importance of knowledge “facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders” (Murphy, 1990). Formation of the ISLLC 2008 Policy Standards was also based on consideration of the importance of knowledge of the theoretical foundations for leadership practice (for example, Blanchard et al., 2007; Ulrich, Zenger & Smallwood, 1999). Some reviews of scholarship highlighted the importance of knowledge of how to collaboratively develop and implement a shared vision and mission (Clark, Lotto & Astuto, 1984). The importance of knowledge about how to use data in decision making was highlighted in reports informing the formation of the ISLLC 2008 Standards (Creighton, 2007; Knapp, Copland, Plecki, Portin, 2006; Van Houten, 2003). Other reports considered confirmed the importance of knowledge of creating and implementing plans to achieve goals (Clark, Lotto & Astuto, 1984).

Evidence presented in support of Standard 2 confirms that a building-level education leader must have knowledge of principles for advocating, nurturing and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. This includes knowledge of the elements of school culture and ways it can be influenced to ensure student success and human development theories, proven learning and motivational theories and knowledge of how diversity influences the learning process (Darling-Hammond, Meyerson, La Pointe, & Orr, 2009; Leithwood, Jantzi, Coffin, & Wilson, 1996), and knowledge of the effective leadership practices including those characterized as instructional leadership, transformational leadership or leading learning, and knowledge of models of change processes (Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Heck & Hallinger, 2005; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008; Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). The importance of the knowledge presented in evidence supporting Standard 2 was recognized in the empirical evidence, craft knowledge and theoretical writings that supported the development of ISLLC’s Standard 2 (ISLLC, 2008, p. 18) “promoting the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth” (Murphy, 1990). Classic theories of motivation (Bandura, 1986; Herzberg & Mauser, 1959, Maslow, 1954; McClelland, 1961; Vroom, 1964; Weiner, 1986), social control (Glasser, 1986), and goals (Ames, 1992) are foundational sources of knowledge for education leaders seeking to nurture a culture of trust and to motivate faculty and students. Theories of human development (Armstrong, 2007), and evidence found in case studies of how improvements in teaching and learning can be achieved (Schmoker, 2006) confirm that both are essential to effective school leadership. A review of literature by Murphy, Elliott, Goldring and Porter (2006) on learning centered leadership
concluded that instructionally-focused leadership paired with leadership processes are required for high performing schools. Earlier reviews found strong evidence that knowledge of leadership approaches to developing school culture and climate is critically important (Anderson, 1982). Evidence of the importance of applied knowledge of how to create a culture of trust, learning and high expectations was found in scholarship on the impact that leaders have on building learning communities (Boyd & Hord, 1994). Knowledge of the nature and practices of distributive leadership was identified as essential in a number of scholarly works consulted (Bennett, Wise, Woods & Harvey, 2003). Other reviews highlighted the importance of knowledge of curriculum planning (Cotton & Savard, 1980; ), and knowledge of how to develop motivating student learning environments (Cotton & Savard, 1980; Murphy & Alexander, 2006). Infusing technology into leadership practices has become a recognized domain of practical knowledge essential to effective instructional leadership (Brooks-Young, 2002, 2004).

**Evidence presented in support of Standard 3 confirms that a building-level education leader must have knowledge of best practices regarding management of a school organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.** This includes knowledge of effective management and effective leadership that are associated with improved school conditions and subsequent school outcomes (Leithwood & Riehl, 2005; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Murphy, Elliott, Goldring, & Porter, 2007; Portin, Alejano, Knapp, & Marzolf, 2006), and knowledge of human resource issues, including educator work redesign (e.g. Conley, Fauske, & Pounder, 2004; Crow & Pounder, 2000; Gerber, Finn, Achilles, & Boyd-Zaharias, 2001; Pounder, 1998; Pounder, 1999), educator recruitment-selection (Pounder, 1989; Pounder, Galvin, & Shepard, 2003; Pounder & Merrill, 2001; Pounder, King, & Hausman, 2005), educator induction-mentoring-professional development (Crow & Matthews, 1998), educator appraisal-supervision-evaluation (Stronge, & Tucker, 2003; Tucker & Stronge, 2005), and educator compensation (Odden & Kelley, 2002; Pounder, 1988). The importance of the knowledge presented in evidence supporting Standard 3 was recognized in research informing the formation of the ISLLC 2008 which also found knowledge of the nature of distributed leadership to be essential (Goleman, Boyatzis & Mckee, 2002).

**Evidence presented in support of Standard 4 confirms that a building-level education leader must have knowledge of strategies for collaboration with faculty and community members, understanding of diverse community interests and needs, and best practice for mobilizing community resources.** This includes knowledge about the collection and analysis of data and information pertinent to the school educational environment (Bustamante, Nelson, & Onwuegbuzie, 2009; Epstein, 2005; Halverson, 2010; Knapp, Swinnerton, Copland, & Monpas-Huber, 2006; Wayman & Stringfield, 2006), and knowledge of the needs of students, parents or caregivers (Catsambis, 2002; Christenson, 2004; Fuerstein, 2000; Harris & Chapman, 2002; Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005; Landsman, 2006; Louis & Miles,
Evidence presented in support of Standard 5 confirms that a building-level education leader must have knowledge of how to act with integrity, fairness, and engage in ethical practice. This includes knowledge of democratic values, equity, and diversity (Hess, 1993; Gross & Shapiro, 2004; Papa & Fortune, 2002; Rollow & Bryk, 1993; Theoharris, 2001; Rusch, 1998; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003), knowledge about current ethical and moral issues facing education, government, and business and their consequences (Beck, 1994; Brennan & Brennan, 1988; Evers, 1985; Englert, 1993; Grundy, 1993; Lakomski, 1987; Militello, Schimmel & Eberwein, 2009; Nevin, 1979; Smith & Blase, 1991), and knowledge about the relationship between social justice, school culture, and student achievement (Aspiazu, Bauer, & Spillett, 1998; Bustamante, Nelson, & Onwuegbuzie, 2009; Flanagan, Cumsille, Gill, & Gallay, 2007; Franke, Isken, & Parra, 2003; Gaitan, 2004; Harry, 1992; Papa & Fortune, 2002; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003; Theoharris, 2001; Tucker & Herman, 2002; Zirkel, 2008). The importance of the knowledge presented in evidence supporting Standard 5 was recognized in research on practices that promote social justice identified as important in the 2008 ISLLC Policy Standards. Support for the importance of this knowledge was informed by scholarship on practices of inclusive leadership (Ryan, 2006), and leadership for diversity (Tillman, 2004). Observations by education experts affirm the central role that knowledge of reflective practices is for education leaders if they are to model principles of self-awareness and ethical behavior (Sparks, 2005). A number of theoretical and practice focused commentaries have noted the critical need for education leaders to have knowledge of the moral and legal consequences of decision-making (Papalwis, 2004; Mawhinney, 2005).

Evidence presented in support of Standard 6 confirms that a building-level education leader must have knowledge of how to respond to and influence the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context within a school and district. This includes knowledge of policies, laws and regulations enacted by state, local and federal authorities (Cooper, Fusarelli & Randall, 2004; Cunningham & Corderio, 2009; Fowler, 2000; Hanson, 2003; Heck, 2004; Hoy & Miskel, 2004; Hoyle, English & Steffy, 1998; Leithwood, 1999; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2007; Murphy, 1990;
Murphy, Elliott, Goldring & Porter, 2007; Murphy, Martin & Murth, 1997; Razik & Swanson, 2001), knowledge of how to improve the social opportunities of students, particularly in contexts where issues of student marginalization demand proactive leadership (Murphy & Datnow, 2003; Brown, 2004; Frattura & Capper, 2007; Brooks, Jean-Marie, Normore, & Hodgins, 2007; Larson & Murtadha, 2002; Marshall & Oliva, 2006; McKenzie et al., 2008; Theoharis, 2007), and knowledge of how culturally responsive educational leadership can positively influence academic achievement and students’ engagement (Banks & McGee-Banks, 2004; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002; Johnson, 2003, 2006; Juettner, 2003; Klingner et al., 2005; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Riehl, 2000; Skrla, Scheurich, Garcia, & Nolly, 2006a, 2006b). The widespread recognition in the practice and policy community that education leaders must be prepared to understand, respond to, and influence the political, social, economic, legal and cultural context of education provided an important impetus for the formation of this domain of the ISLLC standards (see for example, Hoyle’s (2007) description of leadership practices in visioning). An important focus on mindful practices influenced the formation of the ISLLC 2008 standards, reflected in craft and practice scholarship on knowledge of “habits of the mind” which are “characteristics of what intelligent people do when they are confronted with problems, the resolutions to which are not immediately apparent” (Costa & Kallick, 2008).
Alignment of ELCC Program Standards with NCATE Standard Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCATE Standard Principles</th>
<th>ELCC Program Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRINCIPLE 1. CONTENT KNOWLEDGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>ELCC Standard 8.</strong> A building-level education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding principles for the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning; understanding principles for advocating, nurturing and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth; understanding best practices regarding management of a school organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment; understanding strategies for collaboration with faculty and community members, understanding of diverse community interests and needs, and best practice for mobilizing community resources; understanding dispositions of integrity, fairness, and ethical practice; and understanding how to respond to and influence the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context within a school and district.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **PRINCIPLE 2. CONTENT PEDAGOGY** | **ELCC Standard 1.** A building-level education leader promotes the success of every student by collaboratively facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a shared school vision of learning through the collection and use of data to identify school goals, assess organizational effectiveness, create and implement plans to achieve school goals, and promote organizational learning; promote continuous and sustainable improvement; and monitor and evaluate progress and revise plans that is supported by all stakeholders.  
**ELCC Standard 2.** A building-level education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning built on collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students; creating, monitoring, and evaluating a comprehensive rigorous and coherent curricular and instructional program; developing and supervising the instructional and leadership capacity of staff to maximize time spent on quality instruction; and promoting the use of the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning. |
### PRINCIPLE 3. LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

#### ELCC Standard 3.
A building-level education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring the management of the organization, operation, and resources by monitoring and evaluating the management and operational systems; obtaining, allocating, aligning, and efficiently utilizing human, fiscal, and technological resources; promoting and protecting the welfare and safety of students and staff; developing the capacity for distributed leadership; and ensuring teacher and organizational time is focused to support quality instruction and student learning.

#### ELCC Standard 5.
A building-level education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner to ensure a system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success and model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior; safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity; consider and evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision-making; and promote social justice to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

### PRINCIPLE 4. PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

#### ELCC Standard 4.
A building-level education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources through the collection and analysis of data and information pertinent to the educational environment; understanding, appreciation, and use of the community’s diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources; building and sustaining positive relationships with families and caregivers; and productive relationships with community partners.

#### ELCC Standard 6.
A building-level education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context through advocating for children, families, and caregivers; acting to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning; and assessing, analyzing, and anticipating emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt leadership strategies.

#### ELCC Standard 7.
A building-level education leader promotes the success of every student through a substantial and sustained educational leadership internship that has field experiences and clinical practice within a school setting monitored by a qualified on-site school mentor.
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