

NextEd

TRANSFORMING CONNECTICUT'S EDUCATION SYSTEM

Continuous Improvement Plan from The Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents

The CAPSS Educational Transformation Project

Project Partners

CAPSS gratefully acknowledges our Project Partners for their support of the Educational Transformation Project: The Project Partners are:

DELL

H.A. Vance Foundation

Nellie Mae Education Foundation

The Connecticut State Department of Education

William Caspar Graustein Memorial Fund

The Core Group

A working group of CAPSS members, called The Core Group, developed the recommendations in this report. CAPSS is grateful to the Superintendents, RESC Executive Directors, Assistant Superintendents and University Professors who met over two years to develop the recommendations in this proposal.

Steven Adamowski, Hartford

Gary Chesley, Bethel

Paula Colen, EASTCONN

Michael Cummings, Milford

Bruce Douglas, CREC

Therese Fishman, Stafford

Garth Harries, New Haven

Marie Jordan-Whitney, Hamden

Paul Kadri, Groton

Christine Mahoney, East Granby

Salvatore Menzo, Wallingford

Philip O'Reilly, New Hartford

Colleen Palmer, Monroe

Mark Shibles, UCONN

Frank Sippy, Region #15

Robert Villanova, UCONN

While acknowledging the support of the Project Partners and the work of The Core Group, the content of the report is the sole responsibility of the Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents.

Project Staff

The Educational Transformation Project Staff include:

Joseph Cirusuolo, CAPSS

David Calchera, CAPSS

Morgaen Donaldson, UCONN

Lee Hay, CAPSS

Anysia Mayer, UCONN

Larry Schaefer, CAPSS

REFORM LEADERSHIP

**A Chapter in the
Background Paper for the Report**

**NEXTED:
Transforming Connecticut's Education System**

**Developed By
Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents
(CAPSS)**



November, 2011



Transforming Public Education in Connecticut

The Challenge of Creating a Learner-Centered School System

Purpose

Connecticut's public school superintendents believe that each child should come to school well fed, adequately clothed, and without fear. Every child should be inspired and challenged by a relevant and important curriculum that tackles real world problems. Every child should be taught by highly trained, professional educators in schools equipped with the technology necessary to enhance teaching and learning. Each child should graduate as a young adult, fully prepared to study at a high level, able to compete on the global stage, and committed to being a contributing member of our society.

Yet the current educational system is not working for all Connecticut students. It is not designed to meet the expectation of universal student success. A strong public school system is essential to maintaining our democratic heritage to create a climate of justice for all our citizens and contribute to the economic stability of our state. Our state must operate its schools understanding that the success of all of us is built on the success of each of us.

Tinkering with Connecticut's system of schooling will not help the state recapture its competitive advantage. The Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents calls upon all of our citizens to enter into a spirited and thoughtful dialogue about what is required of a successful school in the 21st Century, what skills will be demanded of our graduates, and what accountability standards must be in place to make this educational transformation a reality.

With this call, it is necessary to revise our own vision of schooling and the social, economic, and political systems that support it. That cannot be done unless Connecticut decision-makers challenge the status quo, setting the cornerstone for a stronger, more equitable, and more vibrant Connecticut. The conversation will not be an easy one. But let us begin.

The Genesis of this Document

This report is the product of research, soul-searching, and debate among Connecticut's public school leaders, and their philanthropic and social service partners. We are grateful to Project Partners and their representatives including the H.A. Vance Foundation, The Nellie Mae Education Foundation, The William Caspar Graustein Memorial Fund, and Dell whose contributions clarified our thinking and strengthened our message. The Educational Transformation Group examined Connecticut's current educational practices, policies, and student results.

Connecticut's educational, political, and social structures present a maze of challenges that cannot be fixed with one single strategy. The current system of public education must evolve in order to meet the dynamic needs of our children. Poverty, ethnicity, neighborhood instability, and individual disability cause inequities that imperil our economic and social fabric as a state.

As we drafted this report, we worked to define our core values, fundamental beliefs, and shared commitments as Connecticut's educational stewards. In our conversations, we shared moments of great pride and equally great despair. We saw notable achievement and insightful decision-making as well as evidence of failure and short-sighted thinking. Throughout our study, the Educational Transformation Group heard from internationally-noted experts. Some provided an ominous glimpse of the future, others advised restructuring of our economic and political supports, still others argued for dissolving most existing educational structures. Many of those ideas earned a place in shaping this report.

We present this vision of an educational transformation to the citizens of Connecticut in the hope that it will provoke statewide conversations about the nature of schooling and what we should expect of our pre-K-16 system. Examining our system of schooling will not be easy. Yet the people of Connecticut will never undertake a more important task.

The Core Principles Supporting the Transformation of our Schools

- Our citizens deserve schools that are second to none.
- No child in Connecticut should be deprived of the opportunity to reach his/her potential due to circumstances of geography, financial inequity, quality of teachers or the school support system.
- Each child's advancement through school should be based upon the mastery of a clearly-defined and sequenced series of skills and a base of knowledge in all disciplines. Each child should have access to instructional technologies, thought-provoking academic activities, and extra-curricular programs that promote the development of a fully functioning adult capable of asking difficult questions and solving sophisticated problems.
- Each child in Connecticut should daily enter a school environment that is designed for and committed to meeting individual academic needs and interests, while also respecting individuality and ensuring personal safety.
- Each educator in Connecticut must be well-educated in a chosen field of study, highly trained in pedagogy, capable of adjusting instruction to meet the needs of every child, and subject to valid accountability standards.
- Those charged with the governance of education K-16, those elected in local communities, our state's legislators, and the executive branch must act with efficiency, harmony, and wisdom to make Connecticut's education second to none. There is no higher responsibility for our state's leaders than to provide a world-class school system.

Connecticut's citizens must challenge the status quo to bring about transformational changes in educational outcomes.

CORE BELIEFS STATEMENT

- The Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS) holds to the following core beliefs.
- Every child is precious. Each child, regardless of any racial, ethnic, economic, physical, mental or cognitive condition, can and must learn to the same high standard
- Each child has sufficient ability to learn to high standards.
- There must be a strong, vibrant, and flexible public education system in order to meet the goal of every child learning to the same high standard.
- The public education system, as it is designed and functioning today, is not designed to achieve the goal of every child learning to high standards.
- Transformative change in public education cannot take place in isolation from the public.
- The family structure is vital to the growth of every child. It must be reinforced and fostered on an equitable and consistent basis.
- The public education system must integrate services to children and raise community expectations both for the education system and for the other systems that offer services to children and their families.
- In order to achieve the result of every child learning to high standards, the system of public education must be transformed.
- Effective leadership is essential for building the capacity for transformative change resulting, in every child learning to high standards.

Education Policy Direction

Policy making for education at federal and state levels are based on bureaucratic assumptions of hierarchy, centralized decision making, standardization, regulation, inspection. These characteristics are designed to limit unit and individual discretion, provide only one point or source of legitimacy, and depress creativity. The chief outcome of bureaucratic assumptions and thinking is stability, not change.

For local school administrators the model has produced ever increasing explicit formal legal and regulative constraints, less decision-making authority and flexibility, greater goal ambiguity and conflict about directions, more intensive external political influences, fewer incentive structures, and greater involvement of external authorities in the leadership of schools. Complicating the situation are the public organization constraints related to the lack of incentives for conserving resources and improving performance.

Virtually all the state and federal solutions of the “educational reform movement” have been bureaucratic: increase centralization, power and direction for the “top”; increase standardization through testing; increase regulations and mandates to limit school district and school discretion. None of this has resulted in any substantial improvement. The US is just as far behind or further behind the foreign competition as before the “reform movement” started. The agenda of expanding centralized controls, raising standards, top down change model, prescriptive policy, and incremental change has failed and will continue to fail.

Two major forces shaping organizations are the centralization of information due to technology and the decentralization of capability to the operational level. A balance of centralization and decentralization is needed to guide activity and encourage initiative and innovation. At government levels this means that activities should be directed more toward defining overall directions, providing capacity-building resources, and analyzing results using meaningful indicators. State Education Departments, for example, should be organized around “problems to be solved”, rather than regulative or narrow programmatic functions. Decentralized to the school district or school level should be responsibilities for the focus and content of the educational program, design of the instructional organization, determining staffing patterns, determination of expenditure priorities, and the development and evaluation of programs and priorities to address problems and priorities. The intent is to avoid separation of decision-making and implementation.

What is needed is the flexibility of operating units to invent, adapt and change to local conditions. If local schools are to be held accountable for outcomes they must have real authority for policymaking and implementing local decisions. Talking about holding schools accountable is useless until schools have the authority structures to be accountable.



REFORM LEADERSHIP

Guiding Principles:

- Effective school and district leadership makes a positive difference in student achievement.
- Leaders must have authority commensurate with responsibility.
- Stability of leadership is a critical factor in ensuring success of educational transformation efforts.
- Investing in leadership development is an effective improvement strategy.
- Teacher leadership is an important component of a school leadership team.

Rationale for Transformation

Leadership transformation is the key to the transformation of schools. In a study of the characteristics of educational leaders who have successfully facilitated the changing of a district or a school, SEDL, a research and development consulting firm, concluded:

Leadership continues to be recognized as a complex enterprise, and as recent studies assert, effective leaders are more than managers. They have vision, develop a shared vision, and value the contributions and efforts of their co-workers in the organization. Transformational leadership holds promise to further an understanding of effective leadership, especially the leadership needed for changing an organization (Mendez-Morse, 1992b, p. 1).



But there is a major organizational problem that must be addressed if school leaders, particularly superintendents, are to lead the transformation of schools. Paul Houston (2011), former Executive Director of the American Association of School Administrators, summed up the problem: “The reality is that, for superintendents to be successful in the future, they will need to completely change their approach to the job. Historically, if superintendents were good at the management issues, they were held to be successful”. (p. 431).

McREL (Mid-continent Research for Research and Learning) expanded on this thinking in its policy brief “Creating Conditions for Leadership Effectiveness: The District’s Role (Miller, 2004). The brief concluded that school leaders are overwhelmed: “The problem related to attracting and retaining qualified administrators are problems related to difficult working conditions, a lack of incentives, and an unmanageable range of responsibilities” (p. 1). Whether at the district or the school level, will administrators have time to become leaders of transformation? At the Wallace Foundation’s National Conference in 2007, Mel Riddle, a principal from Alexandria, Virginia, summed up the problem of asking school leaders to be innovative. “We’re creating systems that do the opposite of what we want them to do. Micromanagement kills innovation. The system is designed to make people march in a straight line” (Colvin, 2007, p.9).

The reality is that, for superintendents to be successful in the future, they will need to completely change their approach to the job.

If we are to truly transform our schools, new priorities must be established for the superintendent. A report from the ECRA Group (2010) avers: “For many years school boards and the school community had defined the superintendency almost exclusively by the leader’s ability to manage fiscal, physical, and personnel resources; recently, though, the emphasis has shifted to *vision...*” (p. 3). SEDL also found that “Information about leaders who have guided or provoked their organizations to change is also beginning to emerge. These leaders began with a vision, developed a shared vision with their co-workers, and valued the organization’s personnel” (Mendez-Morse, 1992a, p. 1).

A major stumbling block to refocusing educational leaders into agents of transformation is the “culture of compliance.” Fred Abbate (2010) from Drexel University synthesized this problem by noting: “A political and regulatory culture that values obedience above all else is continually in danger of becoming increasingly inconsistent with the culture that education leaders need to build” (p. 37). Similarly, Douglas Reeves (2009) has concluded that “Educators are downing under the weight of initiative fatigue – attempting to use the same amount of time, money, and emotional energy to accomplish more and more objectives” (p. 14). The overload of new initiatives requires leaders to be willing and able to complete work on an existing initiative before introducing a new one. New laws, new regulations, and new initiatives leave little time for transformation.

A report of The Institute for Educational Leadership (2001) highlighted yet another major deterrent to transforming educational leadership. “The absence of clear definitions of roles and responsibilities frequently results in micromanagement of administrative matters by school boards or, worse, individual members who may intervene inappropriately in aspects of school operations ranging from curriculum design to student transfers” (p. 5). School boards too often fail to recognize their responsibility as a governance body and not a leadership body.

Further, the nature and role of educational governance is poorly understood or is understood and easily confused with “leadership.” Although much attention has been paid by scholars and educational theorists to leadership at the school and to a degree the district level, less energy has been spent in trying to understand the nature and components of educational governance. Governance holds a unique position in the discussion about improving education leadership, as governance is *not* leadership per se. Rather, governance creates the framework through which high-quality leadership can be exercised throughout the educational system (Plecki, McCleery, & Knapp, 2006, p. 3).

Cathy Lassiter of the Leadership and Learning Center contends that transformation of schooling will require a rethinking of the roles and preparation of all educational leaders.

“As we examine the changes headed for public schools today, leaders at all levels must be prepared to activate new leadership skills and focus on what will matter most in meeting new demands”

(The Leadership and Learning Center, 2011, p. xiii).

What are these new leadership skills? “Leaders of change provide the needed stimulus for change. Calling attention to the possibilities, they take risks and encourage others to initiate change” (Mendez-Morse, 1992a, 2011, p. 11). Similarly, Richard Dufour and Robert Marzano (2011) contend: “Anyone can write a vision statement describing a better future for the organization, but it requires effective leadership to create a shared vision that addresses the hopes and dreams of people within the organization” (p. 201).

Transforming schools to improve student achievement must become the central focus of school leaders, and we can learn much from the corporate world and its transformation as we moved into the new millennium. Leadership in business has changed dramatically, and the most important leadership quality in business may well be equally important for leadership in education. A 2010 study by IBM in which 1,500 corporate and public sector CEO’s were interviewed, found that “creativity is now the most important leadership quality for success in business” (Carr, 2010).



Research has firmly established that the superintendent can have a strong impact on student achievement. A meta-analysis of over 4,500 studies by J. Timothy Waters and Robert Marzano (2007) confirmed that the stronger the district leadership, the more likely that student achievement will improve. However, that leadership must include a clear goal-setting process that is supported by the school board, central office administrators, and school-level administrators.

A report from the Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy at the University of Washington has similarly concluded that we will need to transform central office staff if we truly hope to achieve significant improvement in student learning. “Central offices and the people who work in them are not simply part of the background noise in school improvement. Rather, school district central office administrators exercise essential leadership, in partnership with school leaders, to build capacity through public systems for teaching and learning improvements” (Honig, Copland, Rainey, Lorton, & Newton, 2010, p. iii).

Of course, focus on transforming schools cannot be the sole focus of all district and school administrators. Leadership and management are both essential components of any organization, but they serve very different roles. Management assures that the organization is operating efficiently and effectively. Leadership results in change. Leadership in the 21st century is no longer a fixed role. In a fluid, dynamic environment where innovation rules, leadership is only an occasional act that can come from any direction including outside the group. Showing leadership means convincing others to change direction. It is time to separate leadership and management (McCrimmon, 2008).

This applies to school-based leaders as well as district leaders. “A principal’s primary focus must be on instructional leadership, concentrating efforts on practices, policies, and programs that influence student achievement. No longer can the principal be expected to juggle managerial tasks at the expense of instructional quality” (McIver, M., Kearns, J., Lyons, C., & Sussman, M., 2009, p.31).

This thinking is echoed by Cheryl Lemke (2010), President and CEO of an education technology consulting firm: “Innovative leaders do not delegate creativity and innovation; they lead it. And innovative leaders cultivate a climate of critical and creative thinking that takes on challenges” (p.1).



Providing the leadership needed for transforming schools will require significant changes in the preparation of educational leaders. As Thomas Glass (2006) of the University of Memphis points out, “Superintendent preparation and training has remained substantially unaltered for a half century. State certification requirements drive the content and activities for preparation programs housed in higher education institutions” (p. 1). The Harvard Graduate School of Education, created a new doctorate of education leadership degree program which Dean Kathleen McCartney has described as being focused on teaching its students “how to create change, how to be entrepreneurial, how to create a strategy and stick with it” (Harvard Magazine, 2009, p. 1)

Transformation of our schools will also require principals who are prepared to lead, who are committed to exploring ways to improve instruction and thus to increase student achievement. M. Christine DeVita, President of the Wallace Foundation, in her introduction to the foundation’s report *Getting Principal Preparation Right*, stated: “Yet study after study has shown that the training principals typically receive in university programs and from their own districts doesn’t do nearly enough to prepare them for their roles as leaders of learning” (Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, & Orr, 2007). A McREL report on school-based leadership emphasized that we need to expand “leadership preparation programs that help principals become more effective leaders of instruction...” and to provide “opportunity for experienced leaders to share their

professional wisdom through mentoring programs” (McIver, Kearns, Lyons, & Sussman, 2009, p.3).

Transformation will require leadership not only from central office and building administrators but also from teachers. Wells and Maxfield (2010), university professors and former school administrators, have concluded that:

Teacher leaders show the greatest promise for the important work that needs to be done with changing schools; superintendents are the leaders for this vision to occur; and universities have a fundamental role in the training of all leaders for these transformative roles” (p. 8).

But preparation will be necessary for teachers to become transformational leaders. “To develop visionary and effective leadership on a wide scale, state and local career ladders should include pathways for a subset of expert teachers to receive high-quality training for roles as principals, as well as mentors and curriculum leaders...” (Darling-Hammond, 2010, p. 323).

A number of education experts have concluded that the demands on school administrators will continue to be overwhelming. A meta-analysis of school leadership by McREL identified 21 responsibilities of an effective school leader. Principals trying to meet all of these responsibilities will most likely have little time or energy to get beyond the management responsibilities, and the demands of becoming a “change agent” could easily not be met. The solution is obvious: “If school leadership is the responsibility of a leadership team within a school as opposed to the principal acting as lone leader, all 21 responsibilities can be adequately addressed” (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005, p. 99).

This idea of teaming for leadership is reiterated by Richard Dufour and Robert Marzano in *Leaders of Learning* (2011). “If school and district leaders are to create the conditions that help more students succeed at learning at higher levels, they must build the capacity of educators to function as members of high-performing collaborative teams” (p. 86). However, a key to the success of leaders and leadership teams is that they “need as much autonomy as possible to pursue excellence, to innovate, and to build a culture that passionately pursues the best that the district can be. Most important, they need the freedom to take risks without constant fear of punishment” (Abbate, 2010, p. 37).

“If school and district leaders are to create the conditions that help more students succeed at learning at higher levels, they must build the capacity of educators to function as members of high-performing collaborative teams”

If the design and implementation of the transformation of schooling is to be a major responsibility of education leaders, it must play a significant role in their evaluations. Historically, administrator evaluation has most often been limited to judgments about their management skills.

The evaluation of school and district leaders' performance has a long history, primarily in the realm of personnel evaluation. In that regard, school and district systems have long made use of relatively simple devices such as an annual visit by a superintendent, a checklist of behaviors, a formal review at the time of contract renewal to render a "report card" on the work of individuals in traditional administrative positions (Portin, Feldman, & Knapp, 2006, p. 2).

However, research shows that superintendent evaluation today tends to be "performance-based and aligned with the goals and priorities of the district" (Borba, 2011). Thus, it is imperative that district transformation be a major goal so that it is always a strong feature of the superintendent's evaluation.

Similarly, school-based leader evaluation also needs to be focused on more than management skills. "*Evaluation systems must include clear expectations about the behaviors of effective school-level leaders and provide feedback for future growth and development*" (McIver et. al., 2009, p. 34). Evaluation systems should not discourage leaders from working towards transformation, but that often happens. "In these settings, principals are likely to resort to tactics that may produce short-term gains on test scores but that are unlikely to produce meaningful change in school culture and practice..." (Vitcov & Bloom, 2010).

Transforming our schools will require a re-interpretation and expansion of district and school leadership. "It is time to let go of the charismatic individual leader who has it all figured out. No single person can unilaterally bring about substantive change in an organization" (Dufour & Marzano, 2011, p.1). And there is reason to believe that such transformation can happen if Richard Lee Colvin of Teachers College, Columbia University is correct. At the 2007 Wallace Foundation National Conference, he concluded that "Over the past eight years, leadership has come out of almost nowhere to become an issue that is now seen as 'a bridge to school reform,' capable of linking all other reform strategies" (Colvin, 2007, p. 15).

Transformational leadership is often characterized by the Four I's that were identified by Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005, p. 15):

- *Individual consideration*
- *Intellectual stimulation*
- *Inspirational motivation*
- *Idealized influence*

Providing such leadership for the transformation of Connecticut's schools will certainly require a significant re-definition of who will lead, how they will lead, and how such leaders will be prepared.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: The role and responsibility of the Superintendent of Education should be clearly defined in the statute. The authority of the superintendent has to be commensurate with responsibilities.

If there is to be effective leadership in the effort to transform schooling to a learner centered system, there can be no ambiguity as to who is responsible for what; and those in leadership positions need to be empowered to meet the responsibilities that they will have.

The statutory specifications regarding the position of Superintendent of Education must include the following:

- A. The Superintendent answers to the Regional Board of Directors.
- B. The Regional Board makes decisions regarding policy matters, the annual budget, the hiring, supervision and evaluation of the Superintendent, and NOTHING ELSE.
- C. The Regional Board has a five year limit on the length of the contract that it agrees to with the Superintendent

If there is to be effective leadership in the effort to transform schooling, there must be coherence in the alignment of the authority and responsibility in a district. In addition, the Board of Directors must be restricted in its activities to only those responsibilities that are related to the Board's role as the representative body for the community that is served by the Superintendent. The Superintendent must have the discretion to lead and manage the district in accordance with the goals that have been set by the Board for the district. Finally, effective leadership must have continuity and not be adversely affected by statutory limits. Without continuity of effective leadership, systemic district improvement is extremely difficult to achieve.

Recommendation 2: Systemic efforts need to be in place for the development of the capacity of the school system and school leaders to lead transformation efforts.

For schooling to be transformed, those who lead school systems and schools will have to serve as change agents while at the same time managing all aspects of schooling. This is akin to renovating a house while living in it. There is little in the current preparation programs for school system and school leaders that prepare them for this type of leadership.

Recommendation 3: The evaluation of school system and school leaders needs to be based on their success in leading transformation efforts as well as on their success in managing the other demands of schooling. Leaders will be unlikely to lead transformation efforts unless their performance is based in large part on how well they meet this responsibility.

Recommendation 4: When principals and teachers share leadership, teachers' working relationships are stronger and student achievement is higher. Schools and districts should support both formal and informal leadership positions through a variety of incentives and professional learning opportunities.

Bibliography

- Abbate, F. (2010, March). Education leadership in a culture of compliance. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 91, 35-37.
- Borba, A. (2010). The superintendent's evaluation: bridging the gap from theory to practice. *The School Administrator*. Retrieved October 15, 2011 from <http://www.aasa.org/content.aspx?id=12766>.
- Carr, A. (2010, May 18). The most important leadership quality for CEOs? Creativity. Retrieved October 11, 2011 from www.fastcompnay.com/1648943/creativity-the-most-important-leadership-quality-for-ceos.
- Colvin, R. L. (2007). Beyond buzz: Leadership is moving to the heart of school reform. In *Education Leadership: A Bridge to School Reform*, a report on the Wallace Foundation's National Conference, October 23-24, 2007, pp. 9-16.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: how America's commitment to equity will determine our future*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., Meyerson, D., & Orr, M. (2007). Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Executive Summary. Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.
- Dufour, R. & Marzano, R. (2011). *Leaders of learning: How district, school, and classroom leaders improve student achievement*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- ECRA Group: Research and Analytic Solutions for Education and Healthcare Leaders. (2010). District leadership. Retrieved October 12, 2011 from www.ecragroup.com/publicimages/District_Leadership.pdf.
- Glass, T. (2010, April-May). Preparing superintendents for building teacher leadership: Implications for university programs. *The International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 5. Retrieved October 11, 2011 from Connexions, Rice University at <http://cnx.org/content/m34390/latest>.
- Harvard Magazine (2009, September 9). Rethinking public education leadership. Retrieved October 14, 2011 from <http://harvardmagazine.com/2009/09/preparing-new-leaders-for-k-12-education>.
- Honig, M., Copland, M., Rainey, L., Lorton, J., & Newton, M. (2010). Central office transformation for district-wide teaching and learning improvement. Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington. A report commissioned by the Wallace Foundation.
- Houston, P. (2001, February). Superintendents for the 21st century: It's not just a job, it's a calling." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82, 429-433.
- The Institute for Educational Leadership (2001). *Leadership for student learning: Restructuring school district leadership*. Washington, D.C.
- The Leadership and Learning Center (2011). *Activate: A leader's guide to people, practices, and processes*. Englewood, CO: Lead + Learn Press.
- Lemke, C. (2010, October 26). The seven steps to innovative leadership. Retrieved on October 11, 2011 from Converge, at <http://www.convergemag.com/policy/The-7-Elements-of-Innovative-Leadership.html>.
- Marzano, R., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School Leadership that Works: From Research to Results*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- McCrimmon, M. (2008) 21st century leadership: The changing meaning of leadership. Retrieved October 11, 2011 from <http://mitch-mccrimmon.suite101.com/21st-century-leadership-a46534#ixzz1aJkMvlCd>.

- McIver, M., Kearns, J., Lyons, C., & Sussman, M. (2009). Leadership: A McREL report prepared for Stupski Foundation's learning system. Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Mendez-Morse, S. (1992a). Leadership characteristics that facilitate school change: Characteristics of leaders of change. Austin, TX. Retrieved October 15, 2011 from www.sedl.org/change/leadership/character.html.
- Mendez-Morse, S. (1992b). Leadership characteristics that facilitate school change: Conclusions. Austin, TX. Retrieved October 15, 2011 from www.sedl.org/change/leadership/conclusions.html.
- Miller, K. (2004). Creating conditions for leadership effectiveness: The district's role. Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning. Retrieved October 18, 2011 from http://www.mcREL.org/PDF/PolicyBriefs/5042PI_PBDistrictLeadershipBrief.pdf.
- Plecki, M., McCleery, J., & Knapp, M. (2006). Redefining and improving school district governance. Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington. A report commissioned by the Wallace Foundation.
- Portin, B., Feldman, S., & Knapp, M. (2006). Purposes, uses, and practices of leadership assessment in education. Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington. A report commissioned by the Wallace Foundation.
- Reeves, D., (2009). *Leading change in your school: How to conquer myths, build commitment, and get results*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Vitcov, B. & Bloom, G. (2010, December). A new vision for supervision of principals. *The School Administrator*. Arlington, VA, 11. Retrieved October 16, 2011 from <http://www.aasa.org/SchoolAdministratorArticle.aspx?id=17164&terms=Vitcov>.
- Waters, J. T. & Marzano, R. (2006). School district leadership that works: The effect of superintendent leadership on student achievement. Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Waters, J. T. & Marzano, R. (2007). The primacy of superintendent leadership. In *Connecting: Education, Leadership, and Community* (pp. 13-18). Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Wells, C., & Maxfield, C. (2010, April-May). Preparing superintendents for building teacher leadership: Implications for university programs. *The International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 5. Retrieved October 11, 2011 from Connexions, Rice University at <http://cnx.org/content/m34390/latest>.

OTHER CHAPTERS in the NEXTED Report

Complex Problems

Raise the Bar

Make It Personal

Make It Personal By Design

Start With Early Childhood

Retool Assessments and Accountability

Offer More Options and Choices

Boost Quality

Involve Students and Parents

Leverage Technology

Continue Transformation

The original report and the related Background Papers can be found and downloaded from the NEXTED web site.

<http://www.ctnexted.org>