TENNESSEE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION	
LEARNING CENTERED LEADERSHIP POLICY	**5.101**

Tennessee Learning Centered Leadership Policy

Contents

TENNESSEE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION	
LEARNING CENTERED LEADERSHIP POLICY	5.101

The Challenge

All states and school districts want successful schools that turn out graduates who are well-prepared to continue their education and succeed in chosen careers. Achieving this goal is much enhanced by putting at the head of every school a principal who knows how to lead the changes in curriculum and instruction that will result in higher levels of learning for all groups of students. Decades of research have revealed strong links between what principals do and how students perform.

In 2005 the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) received a significant grant from the U.S. Department of Education to work with two Tennessee universities to reinvent the principal preparation process. Further, SREB requested that the SBE and THEC jointly appoint a commission to oversee the development and implementation of a new system of instruction leadership development. The proposed learning–centered instructional leadership system policy requires the research based changes, needed to guarantee that every public school has an effective instructional leader.

In October 2005, a Leadership Redesign Commission was appointed jointly by the State Board of Education and THEC. The Commission was challenged to develop a comprehensive plan to redesign the current instructional leadership development system. The redesign components studied included how instructional leaders are currently selected, prepared, licensed, evaluated, and provided professional support. The Commission developed 14 recommendations for improving the current system and developed a plan to implement those recommendations. This policy is a result of those recommendations.

TENNESSEE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION	
LEARNING CENTERED LEADERSHIP POLICY	**5.101**

Summary

The Policy for the Tennessee Learning Centered Leadership System replaces in its entirety:

1. Policy 5.101 *Principal's in Tennessee Schools* July 1994
2. Policy 5.102 *Supervisor in Tennessee Schools*
3. *Administrator/Supervisor PreK-12 9* (Graduate level) *Licensure Standards* (including guidelines and program implementation standards

The Policy for the Tennessee Learning Centered Leadership System requires program approval and monitoring procedures in addition to those in the *Approval of Teacher Education Programs and Professional Education Units in Tennessee* for instructional leadership licensure programs. This new policy includes the following changes to the current instructional leadership development system:

New Standards: Tennessee Instructional Leadership Standards (TILS) will be used to align selection, preparation, licensure, evaluation, and professional development.

Collaboration: Partnerships between LEAs and universities/non-higher education program providers will be formalized and in writing.

Preparation Program Admission: Jointly developed admissions standards will be more rigorous and selective.

Preparation Curriculum: The TILS will form the foundation of a curriculum grounded in current practice, learning centered, and competency based.

Program Completion: Instructional leader program graduates will meet clearly defined standards.

I.   Preparation

a. Partnership Agreement

Ensuring that all schools have effective leadership begins with the principal selection and preparation process (Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, & Orr, 2007). Tennessee educational leaders are currently selected and prepared primarily at the university level. The process must be a dynamic collaborative effort between universities/non-higher education providers and the local education agencies (LEAs) they serve. It is critical that program providers and LEAs work together to identify and secure candidates for instructional leadership based upon local needs identified using student achievement data and emerging research about the dispositions and characteristics of exemplary school leaders (Darling-Hammond et al., 2007; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Bottoms, O'Neill, 2001). To ensure collaboration LEA-university/non-higher education program provider partnerships must be formalized and contain the following:

Required:

- The partnership agreement must be written and signed by both LEA and university/non-higher education program provider administrators.

- The partnership agreement will define how the partners will:
    1. create a shared vision and program design;
    2. meet the leadership needs of the LEA;
    3. support selected candidates; and
    4. provide high-quality field experiences.

- The partnership agreement implementation must be an identified priority in both organizations, as reflected in their mission, structures, regular practices and budgets.

- The partnership agreement will describe how leadership preparation programs and LEA partners will jointly establish and implement criteria and processes for screening and selecting promising candidates who demonstrate:
    1. expertise in curriculum and instruction,
    2. expertise in leadership, and
    3. have a track record of improving student achievement.

- The partnership agreement will describe how screening criteria and selection processes will be continually monitored, evaluated and improved.

- The partnership agreement will describe the membership, responsibilities and communication plans of the preparation program design teams and the partnership advisory councils.

- The partnership agreement will describe how the specific leadership requirements of the LEA will be addressed.

- The partnership agreement will identify a pool of resources available to provide candidates the support and conditions necessary to succeed in the leadership program. Resources may include but are not limited to: release time for course work and field experiences, tuition assistance, mentor stipends, learning materials and extra coaching as needed to master essential competencies (Fry, O'Neill, & Bottoms, 2006).

b. Candidate Selection

Process

Identifying and selecting high performers for leadership training is a daunting task for program providers and LEAs to manage. Candidate selection must be rigorous. Recruitment and selection of program candidates should help address targeted district hiring needs related to candidate experience, demographics, and projected leadership openings. LEAs and their preparation program partners must describe and implement a selection process that includes:

Required:

- How a set of criteria that conveys a clear description of the characteristics of applicants will be collaboratively developed.

- How the components of the selection process will be determined:
  1. application procedures and timelines;
  2. screening and evaluation procedures, including interview protocols, 360-degree evaluations, performance portfolios or other documentation formats, in-basket exercises, writing samples, scoring rubrics, etc.; and
  3. the district's and participant's obligations to each other.

- How information about selection criteria, application process, evaluation components, district/participant obligations, and required forms will be prepared and disseminated to all teachers and professional staff in the school districts, as well as any other groups of professionals who may be considered for the pool.

- How screening and evaluation committees members from university/non-higher education program provider faculty, LEAs, and exemplary practitioners will be selected.

- How consistent, ethical, and fair selection practices will be established and monitored.

- How agreed-upon reliable procedures for analyzing candidate data from multiple measures will be assessed.

Recommended:

- Conduct informational meetings with school faculties and other groups of potential applicants.

- Publish information about the selection of the leadership pool in the LEA's communication media, and keep all employees informed.

Criteria

Approved instructional leadership preparation programs will require that all candidate applicants hold a current teacher* license, have a minimum of three (3) years of successful education working experience, and submit a confidential application portfolio that contains the following:

Required:

- Copy of the most recent performance appraisal,

- Current professional development plan,

- Evidence of ability to improve student achievement and also demonstrated leadership in coaching other teachers to raise student achievement, *

- Evidence of knowledge about curriculum, instruction and assessment, *

- A personal statement of career goals and how the preparation program would assist the candidate in reaching stated goals,

- Recommendations as specified in partnership agreement,

- Evidence that describes qualities of collaboration, cooperation and relationship building,

- Demonstration of effective oral and written communications skills, and

- Successful completion of an interview conducted by a program admission committee that includes both P-12 instructional leaders and higher education faculty that can determine if the candidate has:
  1. Implemented innovative learning strategies in their classrooms;
  2. Shown good communications, human relations, and organizational skills;
  3. Used student data and work samples to make instructional decisions; and
  4. Demonstrated high ethical standards.

Recommended:

- Challenged students through rigorous, standards-based teaching.

- Integrated technology into daily teaching.

- Worked collaboratively on teaching/learning issues with teaching teams.

- Analyzed research and applied it to practice.

- Demonstrated leadership in the larger community.

- Demonstrated the ability to articulate and implement a vision.

- Shown commitment to continuous improvement.

- Shown evidence of leadership and management potential, including evidence of most recent accomplishments in the area of instructional leadership.

- Provide for joint screening by university/non-higher education program provider and school system leaders with assessment tools.

- Conduct observations and videos of classroom and peer teaching.

  * *The evidence and documentation shall be developed collaboratively between districts and university/non-higher education program providers.*

c. Preparation Curriculum

Critical success factors associated with instructional leaders who have succeeded in raising student achievement in schools have been identified. These factors, organized under three overarching competencies, should be the minimum driving force for instructional leadership preparation program redesign (Bottoms & O'Neill, 2001).

The Tennessee Instructional Leadership Standards (TILS) align with these critical success factors.

Competency I: Effective principals have a comprehensive understanding of school and classroom practices that contribute to student achievement through focusing on student achievement; developing a culture of high expectations; and designing a standards-based instructional system.

Competency II: Effective principals have the ability to work with teachers and others to design and implement continuous student improvement through creating a caring environment; implementing data-based improvement; communicating; and involving parents.

Competency III: Effective principals have the ability to provide the necessary support for staff to implement data-driven school, curriculum, and instructional practices through initiating and managing change; understanding the change process and using leadership and facilitation skills to manage it effectively; providing effective professional development; using time and resources in innovative ways to meet the goals and objectives of school improvement; maximizing resources; acquiring and using resources wisely; building external support; and staying current with effective practices.

Instructional leadership preparation program must develop a comprehensive and coherent standards based curriculum that is aligned with the TILS, NCATE/ECCL, ISSLC, (see Appendix A) and state accountability and evaluation requirements.

Curriculum and program philosophy must emphasize leadership of instruction and leading school improvement. Curriculum instruction must integrate theory and practice and stimulate reflection. Instructional strategies include but are not limited to problem-based learning; action research; field-based projects; journal writing; and portfolios that feature substantial use of feedback and assessment by peers, faculty, and the candidates themselves. LEA personnel must be included in the delivery of instruction to candidates.

Candidates must provide evidence of meeting competencies (a portfolio) at the mid instructional leadership licensure - beginning (ILL-B) level, complete a practicum project, develop a professional growth plan, and pass the SLLA to earn an advanced degree and a license as an instructional leader.

d. Practicum (Field based experiences)

Developing the competencies of an effective instructional leader requires more than reading books, engaging in academic discourse, and analyzing key concepts and skills of educational leadership. Becoming a competent leader also requires observing and analyzing a variety of good models of practice and then learning from one's own trial and error in the workplace. Prior to licensure, it is crucial that candidates demonstrate mastery of essential competencies under the watchful eyes of practitioners who know and use effective practices.

Quality field-based experiences must provide opportunities for candidates to translate professional standards into leadership skills to solve a range of school problems. This could be accomplished through observing, participating in and then leading teams of teachers in identifying needs, implementing interventions, and evaluating results that focus on improving teaching and learning (Fry, Bottoms, & O'Neill, 2005). In response to this research, it is required that Tennessee preparation program for instructional leadership candidates be redesigned to include the following:

> *Required:*

- Field experiences integrated throughout the entire program and activities aligned with standards and course curricula to provide just-in-time application and learning.

- LEAs and preparation programs collaboratively select the mentors based upon the selection criteria research for identifying exemplary mentors. Candidates' mentors may change during the program based upon the candidates' needs.

- Performance evaluations, conducted during all field experiences.

- Practicum seminars for candidates, conducted throughout the program.

- School-based activities that provide opportunities to apply the knowledge, skills and thought processes of a school leader, as identified in state standards and research on school leadership and incorporated in the preparation program's design.

- Learning experiences designed along a developmental continuum that progresses from observing (shadowing and other forms of observation) to participating in (being a part of a team, etc.) to leading school-based activities (being in charge of a committee) related to the core responsibilities of school leaders.

- Opportunities to work with diverse students, teachers, parents, and communities.

- Handbooks or other guiding materials that clearly define the expectations, processes and schedule of the practicum to participants, faculty supervisors, mentors and district personnel.

- Ongoing supervision by university/non-higher education program provider program personnel who have the expertise and time to provide frequent formative feedback on candidates' performance.

- Mentors who share the program's articulated vision of effective leadership, model the key leadership behaviors and practices aligned with the vision, know how to provide the required activities and guide candidates through them, and shape accountability for bringing candidates' performances to TILS.

- Rigorous formative and summative standards-based evaluations of a candidate's performance of core school leader responsibilities, using valid, reliable, and standardized instruments and procedures.

- Candidate defense of a practicum project, based on action research of a real-world school problem to a panel (containing faculty and LEA representatives and experts external to the LEA) (Fry et al., 2005).

To earn an advanced degree in instructional leadership or to complete a leadership program leading to licensure a candidate must:

- Develop an Evidence Portfolio documenting the competencies necessary to satisfactorily perform at the mid ILL-B level.

- Develop a PD Plan.

- Complete a practicum project that demonstrates the ability to improve student learning and present the results to an evaluation panel.

- Pass the SLLA.

e. Program Approval

Organizations Eligible to Offer Instructional Leadership License Preparation Programs

Organizations seeking approval to offer Instructional Leadership License preparation programs and to recommend candidates for licensure must meet the respective eligibility criteria. The following organizations are eligible:

1. Tennessee IHEs approved by the State Board of Education (SBE) for teacher education; and

2. Education-related organizations in partnership with Tennessee LEAs must meet the Organization Preconditions and Documentation (Appendix E) and the Professional Education Unit Standards (Appendix F).

3. Tennessee LEAs in Partnerships with Out of State Institutions of Higher Education.

   State approval for the issuance of the Instructional Leadership License (ILL) will be considered for partnerships established between Tennessee LEAs and out of state IHEs based on the following:

   • The out of state IHE must have current state program approval for administrator licensure preparation by a state other than Tennessee; and

   • The Tennessee LEA must submit to the State Department of Education a completed *Tennessee Learning Centered Leadership System Preparation Program Proposal Template* that responds to the required ILL program components.

The program approval process used for approval of partnerships between Tennessee LEAs and out of state IHEs is the program approval process described in this section of the *Tennessee Learning Centered Leadership Policy*.

Approval Process

Instructional Leadership Licensure (ILL) preparation programs in Tennessee are approved by the State Board of Education (SBE). The process of reviewing preparation programs for approval is managed by the State Department of Education (DOE). At the completion of the review process, the DOE submits recommendations to SBE for approval action. The program approval process includes four basic steps; 1) conditional approval, 2) onsite evaluation visit, 3) DOE recommendations, and 4) SBE approval action.

Step 1: Conditional Approval
The DOE grants conditional approval when the review of an ILL preparation program proposal is considered successful.

Review Process
Educator Preparation Providers must submit a proposal to offer a program leading to the Instructional Leader License to the DOE. The proposal must provide substantial information and supporting documentation regarding the implementation of the required components of the *Learning Centered*

Leadership Policy, including the partnership agreement, candidate selection, an alignment of the ILL preparation curriculum with the TILS, and the practicum requirements.

The DOE will review proposals and respond to the program within 90 days. Specific procedures for the conditional approval review process will be presented through guidance prepared by the DOE. Providers may not publicize programs as leading to licensure prior to receiving conditional approval.

Possible Outcomes

Conditional approval awarded – Programs may begin enrolling and subsequently recommending candidates for the instructional leader license.

Conditional approval denied – Providers may not recommend candidates for the instructional leader license or identify programs as leading to the instructional leader license. Providers may submit a revised proposal for consideration during the next review period.

Step 2: Onsite Evaluation Visit

At least six (6) months but no later than eighteen (18) months after completion of the ILL preparation program by the first cohort of candidates, a conditionally approved program hosts an onsite evaluation visit. The onsite visit is conducted by an Onsite Evaluation Team (OET) that is comprised of at least three members. The OET members are selected from a cadre of individuals who have been trained in conducting onsite evaluation visits. The OET may include current practicing exemplary instructional leaders, experts in instructional leadership preparation programs and other appropriate personnel. During the onsite evaluation visit, the DOE provides relevant orientation information and staff support to the evaluation team.

The OET focuses on the program provider's evidence that indicates the degree to which the required components of the *Learning Centered Leadership Policy* are successfully implemented. Evidence of candidates' successful progression through and completion of the preparation program as well as evidence of program completers' performance as instructional leaders is also considered by the OET.

Step 3: DOE Recommendations

In developing its approval recommendations for SBE action, the DOE process relies, primarily, on the OET Report and the program providers' response to the OET Report.

In finalizing the recommendations for SBE action, the DOE may consider evidence and documentation available to OET during the visit. The DOE may include program improvement suggestions. The recommendation options for SBE action include: 1) approval, 2) approval with stipulations, or 3) denial of approval.

Step: 4: SBE Action

SBE action on DOE recommendations may occur twice each year. For OET visits that occur during the fall semester, SBE action occurs during the following spring or summer. For OET visits that occur during the spring semester, SBE action occurs during the following fall or winter. SBE action is based on the following options:

- Approval. Full approval is unequivocal, but may be accompanied by statements of weakness. Annual progress toward correcting weaknesses must be reported to the DOE. The progress will be reviewed yearly and DOE staff will assist the program provider in developing a plan to correct weaknesses.

- Approval with Stipulations. Stipulations are specified critical deficiencies that must be addressed by the program provider prior to the granting of full approval. DOE staff will work with the program provider in establishing timelines for correcting the deficiencies. Full approval will be granted if the critical deficiencies are corrected within the stipulated timelines. If sufficient annual progress is made, approval with stipulations may be extended up to three years. At the end of a three-year period of extension or earlier, an onsite visit will occur. As a result of the onsite visit, the DOE will recommend to the SBE either full approval or denial of approval.

- Denial of Approval. If the SBE approves a recommendation of denial of approval, the program provider will have one year to correct deficiencies. Candidates enrolled in and completing the non-approved program during the twelve months covered by the notice of denial of approval will receive licensure upon the program provider's recommendation. DOE staff will conduct an onsite visit before the end of the twelve months. As a result of the onsite visit, the DOE will recommend to the SBE either full approval or denial of approval.

APPENDIX A

ORGANIZATIONAL PRECONDITIONS AND DOCUMENTATION

Appendix A

Organizational Preconditions and Documentation

Precondition #1. The institution/organization recognizes and identifies the unit that has responsibility and authority for the preparation of instructional leaders.

1.1 A letter from the institution's/organization's chief executive officer that designates the unit as having primary authority and responsibility for instructional leadership preparation programs.

1.2 A chart or narrative that lists all instructional leadership preparation programs offered by the institution/organization (including any nontraditional/alternative programs). The chart or narrative report should depict (a) the degree or award levels for each program; (b) the administrative location for each program—for example, School of Education, Department of Music; and (c) the structure or structures through which the unit implements its oversight of all programs. If the unit's offerings include off-campus programs, a separate chart or narrative as described above should be prepared for each location at which off-campus programs are geographically located.

1.3 An institutional/organizational chart of the institution/organization that depicts the instructional leadership preparation unit and indicates the unit's relationship to other administrative units within the institution/organization.

Precondition #2. A dean, director, or chair is officially designated as head of the instructional leadership preparation unit and is assigned the authority and responsibility for its overall administration and operation.

2.1 The job description and resume for the institution's/organization's head of the instructional leadership preparation unit.

Precondition #3. Written policies and procedures guide the operations of the instructional leadership preparation unit.

3.1 The cover page and table of contents for the documents that contain codified policies and procedures for the unit's operations, including policies and procedures pertaining to its candidates. [If policies and procedures are located on the Internet, photocopies of appropriate web page(s) that indicate links to applicable policies and procedures may be submitted as documentation for this precondition.]

Precondition #4. The instructional leadership preparation unit has a well-developed conceptual framework that establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work in P–12 schools and provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability.

4.1 A statement of the vision and mission of the institution/organization and unit.

4.2 A statement of the unit's philosophy, purposes, and goals.

4.3 A statement of the knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and education policies, that inform the unit's conceptual framework.

4.4 A description of candidate proficiencies aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional/organizational standards.

4.5 A description of the system by which the candidate proficiencies described in 4.4 are regularly assessed.

Precondition #5. The instructional leadership preparation unit regularly monitors and evaluates its operations, the quality of its offerings, the performance of candidates, and the effectiveness of its program completers.

5.1 A description of the unit's system for evaluating its operations, the quality of its offerings, the performance of candidates, and the effectiveness of its program completers.

Precondition #6. The instructional leadership preparation unit has published criteria for admission to and exit from instructional leadership programs and can provide summary reports of candidate performance at exit.

6.1 A photocopy of institution/organization published documentation (e.g., from a catalog, student teaching handbook, application form, or web page) listing the basic requirements for entry to, retention in, and completion of instructional leadership preparation programs offered by the institution/organization, including any nontraditional/alternative and off-campus programs.

6.2 A brief summary of candidate performance on assessments conducted for admission into programs and exit from them. This summary should include (a) the portion of Title II documentation related to candidate admission and completion that was prepared for the state and (b) compilation of results on the unit's own assessments.

Precondition #7. The instructional leadership preparation unit's programs are approved by the appropriate state agency or agencies, and, in states with educator licensing examinations and required pass rates, the unit's summary pass rate meets or exceeds the required state pass rate.

7.1 The most recent state approval letters, including or appended by a list of approved programs. If any program is not approved, the unit must provide a statement that it is not currently accepting new applicants into the non-approved program(s). For programs that are approved with qualifications or are pending approval, the unit must describe how it will bring the program(s) into compliance.

7.2 Documentation submitted to the state for Title II Higher Education Act reports, indicating that the unit's summary pass rate on state licensure examinations meets or exceeds the required state pass rate. If the required state pass rate is not evident on this documentation, it should be provided on a separate page. (This provision does not apply to units in states without examination requirements or required pass rates for licensure.)

Precondition #8. The institution/organization is accredited, without probation or an equivalent status, by the appropriate institutional/organizational accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

8.1.a. Current accreditation letter and/or report that indicates institutional/organizational accreditation status.

OR

8.1.b. Providers ineligible for accreditation must submit a clean audit, a business plan, and the answers to the following questions:

1. What security measures are taken by the unit to ensure the security and integrity of student records?

2. What documentation does the unit have to demonstrate that facilities are safe, secure, and healthy?

3. What are the unit's policies that ensure the availability of information about governing board members, faculty, and administrators?

4. What are the unit's policies related to requirements for degrees, certificates, and graduation; fees and other financial obligations of students; conflicts of interest; and non-discrimination and sexual harassment?

5. What are the unit's personnel qualifications and staffing ratios for support services?

6. What are the unit's policies related to faculty tenure, grievance, and discipline?

7. What are the policies related to academic and intellectual freedoms?

8.1.c. Organizations that are not higher education institutions must also submit:

1. Clean independent audits of a full set of financial statements of the legal entity offering instructional leadership preparation programs for the three years prior to submission of a program proposal which provide evidence regarding compliance with these preconditions. The audits should meet the standards of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants or other appropriate accounting standards generally accepted in the U.S.

2. The legal entity's 990 Form (non-profit organizations) or corporate income tax returns (for-profit organizations) for the past year.

3. A business plan that focuses on the unit being accredited. The business plan should include:

a. A business model that briefly describes the services to be delivered, the area to be served, the current and projected number of candidates, recruitment activities, a description of faculty, tuition costs, a budget narrative, etc.;

b. The most current approved unit budget;

c. Revenue and expense projections for the next two years, including funding streams, the length and percentage of funding from foundation grants, appropriated governmental funds, tuition, funds from elsewhere in the legal entity or its affiliates; costs of facility, payroll, maintenance, etc.;

d. A one to two page narrative describing unit revenue and expenditure projections for the next 4 years;

e. A one to two page narrative describing the relationship between the unit and the legal entity offering the educator preparation programs; and

f. If tuition based, the tuition refund policy should the transitional licensure preparation programs be discontinued by the unit.

Revised: 11/09

APPENDIX B

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT STANDARDS

Appendix B
Professional Education Unit Standards*

Conceptual Framework

A conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work in P–12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge-based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and/or institutional mission, and continuously evaluated. The conceptual framework provides the bases that describe the unit's intellectual philosophy and institutional standards, which distinguish graduates of one institution from those of another.

Standard 1: *Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions*

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Standard 2: *Assessment System and Unit Evaluation*

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

Standard 3: *Field Experiences and Clinical Practice*

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Standard 4: *Diversity*

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

Standard 5: *Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development*

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance. They also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

Standard 6: *Unit Governance and Resources*

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

* For more information go to NCATE website
http://www.ncate.org/public/unitStandardsRubrics.asp?ch=4

APPENDIX C

TENNESSEE INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP STANDARDS

Appendix C
Tennessee Instructional Leadership Standards

Recognizing the importance of engaging in a continuous improvement process, Tennessee seeks to transform what it means to be an effective instructional leader at all phases of a leader's career. This aim is accomplished by setting high standards for effective leadership based upon research and best practice, supporting leaders to reach those standards, and empowering districts to build a network of exceptional instructional leaders who get results. Operating from the belief that ethical behavior permeates the mindset and actions of every effective leader, the revised Tennessee Instructional Leadership Standards (TILS) embed the phrase, "ethical and effective instructional leader," into the opening stem of each leadership standard. The purposeful placement of this phrase articulates the intrinsic nature of ethical behavior in all facets of school leadership. Attributes such as honesty, respect, sound judgment, commitment, fairness, compassion, work ethic, and a genuine belief that all children can learn and grow, contribute to the foundation of ethical behavior connected to leadership. Effectiveness pertains to "educators' capacity to meet performance expectations, implement evidence-based practices, create and sustain conditions for effective learning, and increase student learning" (Learning Forward, 2011, p. 20). Based upon best practice and current research, and sharpened by the wisdom of experienced educators, the Tennessee Instructional Leadership Standards (TILS) identify core performance indicators of ethical and effective instructional leaders.

Standard A: Instructional Leadership for Continuous Improvement

An ethical and effective instructional leader facilitates professional practice that continually improves student learning.

Indicators:

1. Collaborates with stakeholders to establish and communicate a clear, compelling vision for continuous improvement.
2. Builds capacity of educators to provide all students a rigorous curriculum, aligned with Tennessee-adopted state standards.
3. Collaborates with educators to analyze and use multiple forms of data throughout the year to establish specific goals and strategies targeting student achievement and growth.
4. Leads educators to develop and execute interventions to address all students' learning needs, grounded in multiple sources of data (academic, social, and/or emotional).
5. Systematically monitors and adjusts progress toward established goals and facilitates procedures and practices leading to continuous improvement.

Standard B: Culture for Teaching and Learning

An ethical and effective instructional leader collaborates with stakeholders to create and sustain an inclusive, respectful and safe environment conducive to learning and growth for all.

Indicators:

1. Collaborates with stakeholders to establish and communicate a clear, compelling vision for a culture conducive to teaching and learning.
2. Leverages educator strengths to engage all students in meaningful, relevant learning opportunities.
3. Fosters a safe, respectful, and orderly environment for all.
4. Takes measures to actively involve families in the education of their children.
5. Models and communicates expectations for individual and shared ownership of student, educator, and school success.
6. Recognizes and celebrates improved educator and student performance related to school vision and goals.

Standard C: Professional Learning and Growth

An ethical and effective instructional leader develops capacity of all educators by designing, facilitating, and participating in collaborative learning informed by multiple sources of data.

Indicators:

1. Collaborates with stakeholders to establish, communicate, and facilitate a clear, compelling vision for professional learning and growth.
2. Implements and monitors a rigorous evaluation system using an approved Tennessee evaluation model.
3. Uses educator evaluation data to inform, assess, and adjust professional learning goals and plans.
4. Engages faculty and self in data-informed, differentiated professional learning opportunities for educators, aligned with the *Tennessee Standards for Professional Learning*.
5. Collaborates with others to induct, support, retain and grow/extend effective educators based on evidence of student and educator outcomes.
6. Identifies and supports potential teacher-leaders and provides growth opportunities in alignment with the *Tennessee Teacher Leadership Standards*.
7. Improves self-practice based on multiple sources of feedback, including performance evaluation results and self-reflection.

Standard D: Resource Management

An ethical and effective instructional leader facilitates the development of a highly effective learning community through processes that enlist diverse stakeholders and resources.

Indicators:

1. Strategically utilizes community resources and partners to support the school's mission, vision, and goals.
2. Includes a diverse set of educators and stakeholders in school improvement decisions.
3. Establishes, communicates, and enforces a set of standard operating procedures and routines aligned with district, state, and federal policy.
4. Performs all budgetary responsibilities with accuracy, transparency, and in the best interest of students and staff.