

UConn
NEAG SCHOOL OF EDUCATION



UCAPP Curriculum Self-Assessment
UConn UPPI Project
July 27, 2017

UCAPP Curriculum Self-Assessment

Dr. Sarah L. Woulfin
Neag School of Education
University of Connecticut

UCAPP Curriculum Self-Assessment

In Fall 2016, UConn received a four-year Wallace UPPI grant to redesign UCAPP (UConn Administrator Preparation Program). With the overarching vision of transforming Connecticut's principalship, UPPI-UConn will raise the coherence across program models, cohorts, and student experiences to ensure that all aspiring leaders are highly qualified and capable. The UConn UPPI team, including district partners, state administrators, UCAPP instructors and internship supervisors, UIC mentor program faculty, and UConn faculty, aims to improve UCAPP along several dimensions to prepare high-quality leaders for the state of Connecticut. UPPI-UConn is comprised of several overlapping teams: leader tracking system, curriculum, and internship.

The curriculum team used a cycle of inquiry to engage in a self-assessment of UCAPP's current curriculum from March through June 2017. The curriculum team is led by Sarah Woulfin and Erin Murray, and also includes Mike Buckley, Erin McGurk, Shelby Cosner, and Joanne Manginelli. Our self-assessment process involved reviewing existing curriculum materials, syllabi, and assessments from across courses and models to identify strengths and areas of opportunity, points of overlap and distinctions, as well as to identify and name problems associated with the UCAPP curriculum. As such, the team worked to find, identify, and name program and curricular problems as a step to advance tentative solutions, responses, and recommendations for improvement.

This self-assessment report documents the team's efforts and findings while also offering questions and recommendations. Thusly, the evidence gathered during the curriculum team's cycle of inquiry may be used to drive decision making to redesign UCAPP to improve principal preparation across Connecticut. After reviewing literature on principal preparation programs, this report describes the team's methodology for the self-assessment. The report then summarizes findings from the self-assessment of the UCAPP curriculum, and we generate potential action items, including new structures, systems, and activities to ameliorate the UCAPP curriculum.

Review of Relevant Literature

Principals are no longer merely managers inside the office; rather, they are responsible for transforming teaching and learning to yield equitable outcomes for children, families, and communities (Rigby, 2014; Theoharis & O'Toole, 2011). Recently, scholars have illuminated how and why principals serve a critical role in school improvement efforts, including hiring, evaluating, and retaining quality teachers (Mendels, 2012; Mendels & Mitgang, 2013; Mitgang et al., 2013; Turnbull et al., 2013a; Turnbull et al., 2013b).¹ It is clear that principals need robust capacity-building efforts to carry out these various leadership activities. These leaders gain knowledge and skills through an assortment of formal and informal learning opportunities.

¹ We acknowledge the efforts of Jon Carter in collecting and synthesizing literature on principal preparation.

Principal preparation programs and leadership development experiences play a vital role in preparing school leaders for the complex work of leading a school (Davis & Mendels, 2016; Ikemoto et al., 2016; Mendels, 2012; Turnbull et al., 2013a; Turnbull et al., 2016). Furthermore, policymakers, reformers, and practitioners are placing greater emphasis on principal preparation programs as a leverage point for systemic reform (Davis & Mendels, 2016; Ikemoto et al., 2016). Notably, Wallace UPPI is grounded in the theory of action that if university-based principal preparation programs improve, then principals will be more effective leaders to promote positive educational outcomes.

In the field of educational leadership, some scholars are beginning to study the nature and role of the curriculum and assessments in principal preparation (Albritton & Stacks, 2016; Anast-May et al., 2011; Boske, 2012; Bruner, 2008; Bustamante & Combs, 2011; Christman, 2010; Cosner et al., 2012; Crow & Whiteman, 2016; Darling-Hammond et al., 2010; Dentith & Peterlin, 2011; Diem & Carpenter, 2012; Diem & Carpenter, 2013; Everson & Bussey, 2007; Gordon, 2012; Guerra et al., 2013; Hackmann and McCarthy, 2011a; Hernandez & McKenzie, 2010; Herrity & Glasman, 2010; Jennings, 2012; Lumby & English, 2009; Marshall & Hernandez, 2013; Mendels & Mitgang, 2013; Mutchler, 2011; Osterman & Hafner, 2009; Richardson et al., 2013; Rodríguez et al., 2010; Scribner & Crow, 2012; Turnbull et al., 2013b). However, many questions remain about the affordances and limitations of various types of curricula and assessments in leadership development programs. As underscored by Crow & Whiteman (2016), it is necessary to take into consideration external and internal forces influencing principal preparation programs. We note that a few scholars are beginning to grapple with the principal preparation structures and routines enabling and constraining leaders' development of specific competencies. Cosner, et al., 2012 emphasize that program improvement is a multi-layered effort that involves time, resources, and human and social capital. In sum, it is necessary to advance our understanding of the necessary content, forms of assessments, and pedagogical structures that support the development of effective school leaders.

Framework

After reviewing the literature on principal preparation and the nature of curriculum, we applied a conceptual framework on the facets of curriculum. As shown in Figure 1, this framework considers three levels of curriculum: what content students know, what they can do, and what big ideas they understand. In this way, the framework treats knowing content as the basis for being able to carry out leadership moves and understanding deeper principles regarding leadership. For the purposes of the redesign project and the Curriculum report, we operationalize the framework as:

1. What topics/concepts from national and state leadership standards will students *know*
2. What leadership skills and strategies will students be able to *do*
3. What leadership principles will students *understand*

For example, we checked what topics about evaluating teachers did students have access to and have opportunities to *know*. Then we determined what leadership skills and strategies related to evaluation would students be able to *do*. Finally, we considered what principles regarding evaluation would students *understand*.

Figure 1 - Conceptual framework on curriculum (from: <https://curriculum.gov.bc.ca/rethinking-curriculum>)



Across this report, we discuss UCAPP's existing curriculum at each of these three levels. Yet certain pieces of our analysis and report focus more on particular levels. For example, we thoroughly mapped standards across syllabi and module plans, and those analyses indicate the topics students *know*—rather than what students will be able to *do*. Thusly, we describe some implications for future UPPI-UConn work, such as that the internship team should analyze the assessments methods for the leadership skills/strategies which students *do* during their internship experiences. We also express that we have low amounts of data on students' long-term understandings of leadership principles.

Methods

To conduct this self-assessment, we collected and analyzed a variety of data. First, we collected and analyzed an assortment of documents, including course/module syllabi and formal core assessments. We created an Excel spreadsheet listing all PSEL and Connecticut Leadership Standards and then coded each course/module syllabi for its coverage of those standards. We also conducted focus group interviews with current UCAPP students. It is necessary to note that, as of June 2017, we have completed/scheduled 5 focus groups. We aim to conduct approximately 5 more focus groups in September 2017 to capture additional students in the traditional model and with UCAPP alumni. The curriculum team met on four occasions, which provided opportunities to analyze and discuss patterns, share observations, and plan next steps for analysis. For example, for the April 2017 curriculum meeting, each team member reviewed standards mapping documents and completed a graphic organizer on the coverage of standards. These documents were also treated as data sources for this report.

Findings

This report discusses a series of findings on what content students are exposed to, what students are encouraged to do, and what they are expected to understand about school leadership. Thusly, in the following sections, we share findings related to assessments, standards coverage, syllabi, courses, and other learning opportunities. These findings are grounded in an assortment of forms of data, and we also note gaps in our evidence-based on certain features of the curriculum. In sum, we document strengths and areas of opportunity across multiple dimensions of the UCAPP curriculum.

Assessments. UCAPP's common core assessments represent an area of coherence that is strongly controlled by NCATE accreditation expectations which are based on the now outdated ELCC standards.² UCAPP administers six core assessments across program models (Traditional, PLUS, Residency). Therefore, all students are expected to have the content knowledge, leadership capabilities, and academic skills to successfully complete each of these six assessments. We analyzed the six assessments, with attention to their ties to major PSEL standards and the nature of their work products. Table 1 summarizes the assessments. We then discuss points on how these assignments assess what students know, do, and understand.

² UCAPP met national NCATE accreditation in 2015 and is scheduled for renewal under CAEP (which uses PSEL) in 2021.

Table 1 - Current Core Assessments

Assessment & Course/Module	PSEL standard	Work product
Leadership theory of action <i>School Leadership and the Administration of Educational Organizations</i>	Standard 1: Mission, Vision, and Core Values	Document: Draft a 1-page leadership theory of action with 3-5 if/then statements on high leverage leadership strategies
Policy analysis <i>Contemporary Educational Policy Issues</i>	Standard 9: Operations and Management	Paper: Discuss a current state education policy and how implemented
Observation cycle write-up <i>Supervision of Educational Organizations/Talent Management</i>	Standard 6: Professional Capacity of School Personnel Standard 7: Professional Community for Teachers and Staff	Report: Conduct observation cycle and write-up the pre-observation conference, feedback to teacher, growth plan, and reflection
Evaluate a program in district/school <i>Program Evaluation for School Improvement/Organizational Leadership</i>	Standard 10: School Improvement	Report: Conduct a program evaluation, analyze data/evidence, and write up results
Curriculum analysis & action plan <i>Curriculum Lab/Instructional Leadership</i>	Standard 4: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment	Report: Evaluate the written, enacted, and learned curricula
School climate analysis and action plan <i>Creating and Sustaining a Positive School Climate/Organizational Leadership</i>	Standard 5: Community of Care and Support for Students Standard 8: Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community	Report: Evaluate a climate issue and draft an action plan for improving the climate

First, we determined a few trends on the content assessed by the set of six core assessments. These trends relate to the knowledge-level of the curriculum.

- Most assignments clearly address a single PSEL pillar standard, and this provides indication that most courses concentrate on approximately one PSEL pillar.
- Two PSEL pillar standards are not directly addressed by the current program assessments. This raises questions about when and how UCAPP students are assessed on their knowledge and skills matching those standards.
 - NPBEA PSEL Standard 2: Ethics and Professional Norms and Standard 3: Equity and Cultural Responsiveness are *not* explicitly assessed by the program's core assignments.
- Some (2/6) assessments relate to the nature of curriculum and instruction in schools. This indicates that a few assessments strongly tie to the domain of instructional leadership and reflects trends in the field of educational leadership.
- Of the current assignments, zero explicitly tie to social justice leadership or cultural responsiveness. While acknowledging that the capstone project is related to the PSEL Equity standard, we propose that this is an area for growth in UCAPP's core assessments. It is necessary to consider whether and how social justice leadership and culturally responsive leadership are assessed within other assessments or other student experiences. We also note that this reflects a gap between the espoused UCAPP and Neag vision and mission and currently instituted core assessments.

Second, we analyzed assessments to surface patterns on what students were expected to do through these core assessments.

- Most (5/6) assessments entail application of UCAPP content to students' school contexts. In this way, assignments are not abstract, academic exercise, and they are experiential in nature and tailored to system/organizational conditions in students' context. For instance, students are asked to bring materials / data from their sites or engage with teachers, or interview educators to learn more about a topic. This also shows that many assignments offer a window to link students' internship experiences with coursework. We encourage additional ties between the internship and course assessments.
- In contrast, a student in a traditional cohort mentioned that the policy paper involved regurgitating knowledge from the policy course but that all other assignments were experiential in nature. Notably, the policy course is an

introductory summer course and is structured in a manner more decoupled from school activities.

- Most (4/6) assessments involve the use of evidence and/or data analysis. In this way, the assignments provide additional opportunities to engage in data-based decision making and to practice the steps of the continuous improvement process. Furthermore, students were collecting and analyzing data individually but were rarely required to lead others in studying and reviewing data. We commend the ongoing opportunities for students to analyze data and generate plans. We note that, in the future, students could have opportunities to practice collaborating with educators around data analysis and decision making.
- In terms of work products required by these assignments, papers were the most commonly employed type of work product. A few assignments (2/6) involved an oral presentation. As a team, we discussed the affordances of assessment products being authentic in nature and offering opportunities to practice administrative skills, such as memo writing and public speaking.

Third, the student focus groups provided a few other points on UCAPP core assessments. In particular, students tended to not feel that assignments were overly challenging. A student in a traditional cohort mentioned that drafting the school improvement plan was the most challenging, yet beneficial, assignment, and that they felt appropriately supported to complete it. It is important to note that this plan is typically drafted by individual students rather than in an authentic, team-based manner. However, several students asserted that assignment directions were nebulous and they appreciated greater clarity. A student in a PLUS cohort didn't feel that the assignments were connected to coursework, resulting in disjointedness. Overall, this student perceived gaps between the content, teaching, and assessments.

Finally, the curriculum team noted a few problems of practice associated with core assessments:

1. Assignments do not match internship experiences
2. Few assessments of students' equity-oriented leadership (PSEL 3.0: Equity and Cultural Responsiveness)
3. Variation in the clarity and specificity of core assessment directions
4. Lack of opportunities to calibrate assessment scoring across instructors
5. Each core assessment is coupled to a single course, rather than building on each other
6. Program Evaluation assignment is unclear, particularly what type of initiative or instructional model the students should evaluate

7. Climate assignment could have a stronger tie to creating a positive learning environment for all students (weave in issues of equity, family engagement, and special populations)

Standards. To answer questions about the foci, coherence, and quality of the UCAPP curriculum, we mapped the alignment of syllabi with PSEL and CT Leadership standards. We extend thanks to Joanne Manginelli for leading the data management on standards coverage. This segment of the team's self-assessment hones in on the concepts UCAPP expect that students will *know*. We note that Wallace is conducting a crosswalk of these standards to facilitate additional discussion around the intersection of these sets of expectations for leadership development.

While coding the coverage of standards in syllabi/modules we attended to standards-alignment within courses or modules in addition to coverage across models. As a team, we analyzed documents and carefully reviewed PSEL and CT Leadership standards; this permitted us to code the content of formal curriculum materials. We also had productive conversations regarding distinguishing between superficial and deep coverage of standards. That is, how do we not only quantify the coverage of particular standards but also ascertain the quality of how we teach key standards reflecting UCAPP's values and mission. As a team, we discussed the necessity of also analyzing the standards-alignment of UCAPP pedagogy as well as informal instructional materials.

Table 2 summarizes trends across 115 standards for UCAPP's four strands (Traditional, PLUS Hartford, PLUS New Haven, Residency). Across strands, we noticed high coverage of leadership mission and vision (PSEL 1). We also coded high coverage for Community of Care and Support for Students (PSEL 5) across models. School Improvement (PSEL 10) was relatively high across models.

At the same time, we noticed moderate coverage of ethics and professional norms (PSEL 2). In certain ways, we understand that this standard could be taught implicitly throughout courses, internship experiences, and workshops. We determined moderate coverage of curriculum and instruction (PSEL 4) across program models. We also detected inconsistencies in the coverage of Family-Community Engagement standards (PSEL 8) across models. This means that some models placed greater weight on Family Engagement as compared to others. In particular, Family Engagement was rarely addressed in Traditional syllabi.

In contrast, Operations (PSEL 9) was weakly embedded across models. Finally, we coded Equity (PSEL 3) as moderate coverage in PLUS Hartford and NH and Residency, while relatively lower coverage in the traditional model.

Table 2 - Summary of Coverage of PSEL Standards

PSEL pillar standards	Traditional	PLUS Hartford	PLUS New Haven	Residency

Standard 1: Mission, Vision, and Core Values	***	***	***	***
Standard 2: Ethics and Professional Norms	**	**	**	**
Standard 3: Equity and Cultural Responsiveness	*	**	**	**
Standard 4: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment	**	**	**	**
Standard 5: Community of Care and Support for Students	*	*	**	**
Standard 6: Professional Capacity of School Personnel	***	***	***	***
Standard 7: Professional Community for Teachers and Staff	**	**	**	**
Standard 8: Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community	*	**	**	*
Standard 9: Operations and Management	*	*	*	**
Standard 10: School Improvement	***	**	***	***

***= High coverage **=Moderate coverage *=Low coverage

In addition to these patterns on the coverage of PSEL anchor standards (i.e., 1.0, 2.0, 3.0), we determined a set of standards with high coverage across models/strands.

Across strands, HIGHER coverage of:

1. Development of vision
2. Align and focus curriculum, instruction, and assessment
3. Safe, caring school environment; coherent systems of support
4. Place children at center; lead w/ interpersonal and communication skill
5. Recruit, hire, support, develop, and retain effective and caring teachers and other professional staff; develop professional knowledge, skills, practice
6. Use methods of continuous improvement
7. Adopt systems perspective

We note that these standards relate to UCAPP's vision of developing reflective principals who are well-versed in issues of teaching and learning and capable of leading systemic change. In this way, our quantitative analyses of standards coverage yielded patterns that reinforce UCAPP's vision for preparing future leaders. We also note that a couple students mentioned that they felt they were participating in a standards-based curriculum.

Areas of Opportunity of UCAPP Standards Coverage

The Curriculum team reanalyzed the set of PSEL standards with lower coverage across program models. We focused upon 12 PSEL standards and considered new ways to address these standards in UCAPP. We prioritized a set of standards which appear vital for school leaders; these PSEL sub-standards are listed in Table 3. We recommend melding some standards into existing courses while teaching other standards through workshops or the internship. Furthermore, we express that instructors should have additional opportunities to grapple with these standards and to reflect upon effective ways to engage in standards-based principal preparation instruction.

Table 3 - PSEL objectives to prioritize in curriculum redesign

Priority in revision (High, Medium, Low)	PSEL Standard	Incorporate into existing course / module OR workshop OR other method	Comments
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the school's mission and vision and adjust them to changing expectations and opportunities for the school, and 	- add to Program Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - students should practice by revising theory of action document -students should understand the notion of developing a yearly

	changing needs and situations of students		Continuous Improvement Plan that aligns with District / BOE Goals
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employ valid assessments that are consistent with knowledge of child learning and development and technical standards of measurement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Curriculum Lab; Supervision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - students need a strong understanding of standardized assessments (public scores and ranking of schools) as well as local assessments to guide instructional practices
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote the effective use of technology in the service of teaching and learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Curriculum Lab - Supervision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - role/nature of technology in personalized learning and intervention -aware of teacher rubrics and the extent to which a teacher uses technology to enhance learning and to house/gather data
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cultivate and reinforce student engagement in school and positive student conduct 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Climate - Supervision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - leader's role in PBIS -knowledge of Character Education programs and the impact on student engagement
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are approachable, accessible, and welcoming to families and members of the community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Admin. of Ed Org - Climate - Internship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - understanding the importance of outreach to families and community
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand, value, and employ the community's cultural, social, intellectual, and political resources to promote student learning and school improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Climate - Internship - Workshop 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - understanding the importance of knowing the community and needs to drive educational program
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are responsible, ethical, and accountable stewards of the school's monetary and nonmonetary resources, engaging in effective budgeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Budget workshop - Internship: activities on managing a range of resources for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - should read news articles on misappropriation of funds by education leaders

	and accounting practices	school improvement	
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide moral direction for the school and promote ethical and professional behavior among faculty and staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Admin. of Educational Org. - Internship - Legal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - should drive ToA - should be present throughout supervision / evaluation
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote the preparation of students to live productively in and contribute to the diverse cultural contexts of a global society 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Curriculum Lab 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -understanding the importance of a culturally responsive curricula -cultural awareness
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Build and sustain productive partnerships with public and private sectors to promote school improvement and student learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Admin. of Ed Org - Family Engagement/ Climate - Internship 	
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and promote leadership among teachers and staff for inquiry, experimentation and innovation, and initiating and implementing improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Internship -Program evaluation -Supervision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -how do leaders cultivate other skills in becoming teacher leaders
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan for and manage staff turnover and succession, providing opportunities for effective induction and mentoring of new personnel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supervision - School Improvement 	

Connecticut Leadership Standards Coverage

Similar to our analysis of the coverage of PSEL standards, we determined how UCAPP syllabi and module plans reflected Connecticut Leadership standards. Table 4 summarizes the curriculum's alignment to Connecticut Leadership standards. Overall, we noted a high degree of coverage of the Connecticut standards, and this reflects that these standards were used by program faculty and instructors to shape the curriculum.

Table 4 - Coverage of Connecticut Leadership Standards

CT Leadership Standard	Traditional	PLUS Hartford	PLUS New Haven	Residency
Performance Expectation 1: Vision & Mission	***	***	***	***
Performance Expectation 2: Leading for teaching and learning	**	**	**	***
Performance Expectation 3: Systems for safety and high performing learning environment	*	*	**	**
Performance Expectation 4: Collaborate with families and stakeholders	*	***	***	**
Performance Expectation 5: Ethics and integrity	**	**	**	**
Performance Expectation 6: Awareness and advocacy on education system, policy, legal issues	**	***	***	***

Across models, there was high coverage of Vision and Mission (PE 1) and relatively high coverage of Policy (PE 6) and Teaching & Learning (PE 2).

We detected lower coverage of Organizational Systems and Safety (PE 3), and this links to the Climate course. We also detected lower coverage of Collaborating with Families (PE4). This relates to other findings on UCAPP's treatment of family engagement and equity-oriented leadership.

The curriculum team generated a few problems of practice regarding standards:

1. Variability in standards coverage across models (Traditional vs. PLUS vs. Residency)
2. Lower coverage of family-community engagement

3. Lower coverage of positive learning climate-culture
4. Lower coverage of operations

Syllabi. Over the course of the team's analyses of UCAPP curricular materials, we determined a few patterns in the structure and format of syllabi.

- Some syllabi listed all PSEL standards that are addressed in the entirety course (i.e., standards-aligned course), while other syllabi list standards matched to each class session (i.e., standards-based instruction/activities/learning experiences). These differences could lead to differences in the enactment of standards based instruction.
- Some syllabi listed the major standards (e.g., 1.0, 2.0) while other syllabi listed the specific sub-strand (e.g., 1.4, 1.5, 2.3). We strongly encourage all lead instructors to edit syllabi to include the sub-strand standards.
- PLUS-Hartford syllabi each covered about 30 standards per module, and other models had more variation in number of standards covered per syllabus. Many traditional syllabi covered about 19 standards per course.
- Some syllabi provide greater detail on key questions or course activities than others

We have several remaining questions on aspects of syllabi and how syllabi can be revised to reflect program goals and better structure students' course experiences and leadership development. Thus, how can syllabi bridge from what we expect students to *know* to what we expect students, as future leaders, to understand and do. This points to the need for syllabi to include higher-order questions related to essential understanding linked to each course/module. The Curriculum Team proposes that this could be a lead instructor-retreat activity. This also points to the need to link internship activities, in which students carry out projects and *do* leadership skills and strategies, to coursework. As such, internship activities/projects could be listed on syllabi and tagged with relevant standards. In this way, the Curriculum and Internship Redesign teams could collaborate on this task to refine UCAPP syllabi.

After reviewing the format of all UCAPP syllabi/modules, we identified a few problems of practice:

1. Variability in the specificity on standards covered in the course
2. Variability in the level of detail on course objectives and activities
3. Gaps in succinctly describing the essential questions serving as the rationale for the course and the major understandings which will be gained as a result of the course

Coursework. The curriculum team documented the structure and sequence of courses in each program model. We summarize key contrasts across the models and share visuals on each model.

Traditional. Aspiring leaders in the traditional model enroll in six classes with each carrying 3-University credits. Classes are taken over a consecutive, 22-month period. Students take each course in the prescribed order with their cohort; this is represented by Figure 2. The traditional model was instituted over twenty years ago.

Figure 2 - Traditional Course Sequence



As shown in Figure 2, students progress from Administration and Policy (summer courses) to Supervision and Program Evaluation (Year 1 courses). In Year 2, students engage in the Curriculum and Climate courses. The order of the classes is to ensure students have had opportunities to learn and practices skills associated with CAT. Yet we lack evidence on the influence of this sequence for student learning. Each course is taught by one instructor, so students typically encounter approximately 6 instructors as part of their program experience.

PLUS Hartford.

Figure 3 - PLUS Hartford Modules



- Four Modules that spiral across the 22-month program
- For 4 semesters, students experience 3-4 weeks on each module
- Four instructors
- District-specific content
- Content and topics build from semester to semester
- Some assignments build over multiple semesters
- PLUS Hartford is launching its third cohort in July 2017

PLUS New Haven.*Figure 4 - PLUS New Haven Modules*

- Four modules that spiral over the 22-month program
- For 4 semesters, students experience 3-4 weeks on each module
- Four instructors
- District-specific content
- Modules align with the LEAD CT framework
- PLUS NH is in the middle of teaching its

Residency.*Figure 5 - Residency Modules*

- Four modules that are cycled through the 11-month program
- Three instructors
- Students work as an administrator in a school 4-days per week, attending an 8-hour class each Friday
- Modules align with the LEAD CT framework
- Content matching turnaround competencies
- There have been three residency cohorts

There are affordances and drawbacks to the traditional course and module formats. The traditional course format provides a long block of sustained focus on a given strand of leadership. In addition, the traditional course format is deemed highly legitimate by the University and other stakeholders. Students in the traditional model shared that they noticed connections between the courses, but they were making these reflections on their own, rather than through the intentional design and pedagogy.

The module format offers strengths as well. We note that the modules provide additional windows for internship projects to line up with modules. With respect to modules, as a course format, students noted positive attitudes towards this format. They acknowledged that, although the modules “didn’t make sense at first,” the rotating modules addressed things they needed at that time. They spent time reviewing what they had done, but each module built upon the other. A couple other students from the PLUS cohorts mentioned how the modules built on each other. This reveals that different students with different sets of leadership preparation experience had a range of attitudes towards modules. We note that several students asserted benefits from returning to concepts as a part of PLUS’ spiraling, module method.

Our team identified a few problems of practice on the format of coursework:

1. CAT places pressure to sequence coursework in a particular way
2. Module format necessitates counternormative collaboration among instructors
3. University barriers to instructors teaching modules

Other facets of curriculum. In addition to the UCAPP courses and modules, UCAPP’s curriculum is also comprised by institutes and workshops. These facets of UCAPP were initiated to broaden students’ exposure to critical content

Institutes.

- Special Education Institute- facilitated by CAS during the post-Year 1 summer.
 - Addresses technical aspects of Special Education leadership
 - The Curriculum team expressed points of concern related to siloing special education topics in an institute which could hinder aspiring leaders’ understanding of the need to integrate Special Ed practices into all angles of leadership and school improvement.
- School Law Institute- during winter intersession of Year 2
 - Addresses how school leaders interpret and respond to legal issues

Workshops. Workshops began in 2015 to supplement the core. They teach content in an applied, hands-on manner and typically address course gaps and provide valuable skills for aspiring leaders. Each workshop is a 3-hour session on a specific topic which is facilitated by UCAPP staff/instructors. Many of the workshops deal with skills and strategies that novice principals commonly struggle with. In this way, the workshops center on practical, or highly relevant, strands of leadership as opposed to leadership theory. Here is a summary of workshop offerings from the past two years.

Year 1 Workshops (2015-2016).

- Spring 2016
 - Introduction to Budget
 - Introduction to Planning & Placement Teams (PPT)
 - Introduction to Scientific Research-Based Interventions (SRBI)

Year 2 Workshops (2016-2017)

- Fall 2016
 - Introduction to Planning & Placement Teams (PPT)
 - Advanced Situational Leadership – Special Education Leadership
 - Introduction to Scientific Research-Based Interventions (SRBI)
 - Introduction to Planning & Placement Teams (PPT)
 - Situational Leadership 1
- Spring 2017
 - Introduction to Budget
 - Advanced Budget
 - Cultivating Leadership Teams
 - Situational Leadership 2
 - PK3 Leadership
 - Crisis Management
 - Job Search: Resumes & Interviews
 - Job Search: Mock Interviews

It is necessary to note that most workshops are connected to operations and technical dimensions of the principalship. A few workshops addressed content related to Special Ed and instructional leadership. The INSPIRE graduate survey results also encourage additional workshops on policy, family engagement, and use of technology.

Recommendations for Redesign

Stemming from the self-assessment, the Curriculum team has identified and named problems of practice and offers several recommendations for redesign. Importantly, many of the recommended shifts overlap with the domains of redesigning UCAPP's internship and pedagogy. Our recommended shifts involve both short and long-term changes. Some short-term changes are technical changes, while many long-term changes are adaptive in nature, requiring professional learning opportunities

and/or shifts in mindset. We note that it would be beneficial for an UPPI team, in collaboration with other instructors, to create a curriculum theory of action model to structure improvements to the UCAPP curriculum. To insure coherency, most of these changes should occur under program leadership and may involve piloting, testing, and refining new approaches while progressing with the UPPI redesign. Finally, many of these items for redesign require supportive mechanisms so that change occurs and so that practices diffuse in a consistent and effective manner to benefit student leadership development.

Assessments.

1. Post standards on assessments
2. Tie assessments to internship or other contextualized leadership activities
3. Revise assessments so that students have additional opportunities to engage in continuous improvement cycle and/or data based decision making
4. Revise rubrics to match key standards and competencies
5. PD for instructors on assessing student work and providing feedback for improvement

Standards.

1. Strengthen/deepen the relationship between PSEL anchor standards and courses
2. Boost the coverage of certain standards, particularly related to family engagement, operations, and equity
3. PD for instructors and internship supervisors on focal standards for their courses and how to teach those standards
4. PD for instructors on equity-oriented leadership and managerial leadership. This is in response to our evidence that the current iteration of the UCAPP curriculum is weighted towards instructional leadership.

Syllabi.

1. Create common syllabus template- with common language on objectives, assignments, expectations, UConn policy
2. Post key standards on each syllabus
3. List related internship experiences on syllabi
4. Revise Climate syllabus to reflect state & district policies related to PBIS and RTI, Special Education issues, and to embed concepts linked to equity-oriented leadership
5. Integrate Special Education leadership objectives into Curriculum Lab and Climate

Course structure & sequence.

1. PD for instructors to link together discrete courses and to return to central concepts, strategies, and skills

2. Collect additional data on influence of traditional and module formats on students' leadership development
3. Collect information on structural and institutional conditions enabling and constraining the traditional and module formats

Other facets of curriculum (e.g. workshops).

1. Create a catalog of workshops
 - List all workshop offerings in the UCAPP Handbook
2. Increase attendance at workshops
3. Additional workshops on family engagement and operations

Conclusion

Over the past four months, the curriculum team has engaged in a variety of activities to investigate the current state of UCAPP, particularly the content students have opportunities to *know*, *do*, and *understand*. We appreciated the opportunity to learn more about multiple curricular features of UCAPP. We collaborated to dig into the curriculum and assessment materials utilized by instructors and experienced by students. We applied a continuous improvement frame while analyzing multiple forms of evidence on UCAPP. And we strove to reflect on areas of opportunity while also acknowledging strengths and successes of this principal preparation program. In so doing, we condensed findings on the nature of UCAPP's curriculum and generated next steps for refining this program. Further, UPPI team members can create action steps matching, and in response to, results of the curriculum self-assessment.

This report points out gaps in data collection and analysis, particularly on the impact of curricular elements on student learning and leadership practice. Therefore, our team acknowledges that the leader tracking system will enable the program to obtain additional data on leader outcomes after engaging in the UCAPP curriculum. We also note that some curricular elements have been institutionalized to a greater extent (e.g., traditional course format) as compared to others. Finally, we are grateful for the support and assistance of all members of the UCAPP and UPPI teams.

References

- Albritton, S., & Stacks, J. (2016). Implementing a Project-Based Learning Model in a Pre-Service Leadership Program. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 11(1), n1.
- Anast-May, L., Buckner, B., & Geer, G. (2011). Redesigning Principal Internships: Practicing Principals' Perspectives. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 6(1), n1.
- Anderson, L. M., Turnbull, B. J. (2016). Building a stronger principalship, vol. 4: Evaluating and supporting principals. *Policy Studies Associates, Inc.* Retrieved from: wallacefoundation.com.
- Boske, C. (2012). Sending forth tiny ripples of hope that build the mightiest of currents: Understanding how to prepare school leaders to interrupt oppressive practices. *Planning and Changing*, 43(1-2), 183-197.
- Bruner, D. Y. (2008). Aspiring and practicing leaders addressing issues of diversity and social justice. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 11, 483-500.
- Bustamante, R. M., & Combs, J. P. (2011). Research courses in education leadership programs: Relevance in an era of accountability. *International Journal of Education Policy and Leadership*, 6(3), 1-11.
- Cosner, S., Tozer, S., & Smylie, M. (2012). The Ed. D. Program at the University of Illinois at Chicago: Using Continuous Improvement to Promote School Leadership Preparation. *Planning and Changing*, 43, 127-148.
- Christman, D. E. (2010). Creating social justice in early childhood education: A case study in equity and context. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 5, 107-137. doi:10.1177/194277511000500304
- Crow, G. M., & Whiteman, R. S. (2013). *Program features of educational leadership preparation: An update of what we know* (UCEA Program Improvement Project for the Wallace Foundation). Charlottesville, VA: UCEA.
- Crow, G. M., & Whiteman, R. S. (2016). Effective preparation program features: A literature review. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 11(1), 120-148.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Meyerson, D., LaPointe, M., & Orr, M. T. (2010). *Preparing principals for a changing world: Lessons from effective school leadership programs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Davis, J., & Mendels, P. (2016). Improving principal preparation programs: Five themes from the field. *The Wallace Foundation*. Retrieved from: wallacefoundation.com.

- Dentith, A. M., & Peterlin, B. (2011). Leadership education from within a feminist ethos. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 6, 36-58. doi:10.1177/194277511100600201
- Diem, S., & Carpenter, B. W. (2012). Social justice and leadership preparation: Developing a transformative curriculum. *Planning and Changing*, 43(1-2), 96-112.
- Diem, S., & Carpenter, B. W. (2013). Examining race-related silences: Interrogating the education of tomorrow's educational leaders. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 8, 56-76. doi:10.1177/1942775112464962
- Everson, S. T., & Bussey, L. H. (2007). Educational leadership for social justice: Enhancing the ethical dimension of educational leadership. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 11(2), 176-187.
- Gordon, S. P. (2012). Beyond convention, beyond critique: Toward a third way of preparing educational leaders to promote equity and social justice (Part 1). *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 7(2).
- Guerra, P. L., Nelson, S. W., Jacobs, J., & Yamamura, E. (2013). Developing educational leaders for social justice: Programmatic elements that work or need improvement. *Education Research and Perspectives*, 40(1), 124-149.
- Hackmann, D. G., & McCarthy, M. M. (2011a). *At a crossroads: The educational leadership professoriate in the 21st century*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Hernandez, F., & McKenzie, K. B. (2010). Resisting social justice in leadership preparation programs: Mechanisms that subvert. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 5, 48-72.
- Herrity, V. A., & Glasman, N. S. (2010). Training administrators for culturally and linguistically diverse school populations: Opinions of expert practitioners. *Journal of School Leadership*, 20, 57-76.
- Ikemoto, G., & Kelemen, M., Tucker, P., & Young, M. (2016). Improving state evaluation of principal preparation programs. *The Wallace Foundation*. Retrieved from: <http://www.wallacefoundation.com>.
- Jennings, T. (2012). Sexual orientation topics in educational leadership programmes across the USA. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 16, 1-23.
- Lumby, J., & English, F. (2009). From simplicism to complexity in leadership identity and preparation: Exploring the lineage and dark secrets. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 12, 95-114.
- Marshall, J. M., & Hernandez, F. (2013). "I would not consider myself a homophobe": Learning and teaching about sexual orientation in a principal preparation

- program. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49, 451-488.
doi:10.1177/0013161X12463231
- Mendels, P. (2012). Principals in the Pipeline: Districts Construct a Framework to Develop School Leadership. *Journal of Staff Development*, 33(3), 48-52.
Retrieved from: wallacefoundation.com.
- Mendels, P., & Mitgang, L. D. (2013). Creating strong principals. *Educational leadership*, 22-26. *Retrieved from: wallacefoundation.com.*
- Mitgang, L., Gill, J., & Cummins, H. J. (2013). District matter: Cultivating the principals urban schools need. [A report from the School Leadership project of the Wallace Foundation.] New York, NY: Wallace Foundation. *Retrieved from: wallacefoundation.com.*
- Mutchler, S. (2011). Deliberative democracy: A promise and a challenge for preparing educational administrators. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 6(1).
- Osterman, K. F., & Hafner, M. M. (2009). Curriculum in leadership preparation: Understanding where we have been in order to know where we might go. In M. D. Young, G. M. Crow, J. Murphy, & R. T. Ogawa (Eds.), *Handbook of research on the education of school leaders* (pp. 269-318). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Richardson, J. W., Imig, S., & Ndoeye, A. (2013). Developing culturally aware school leaders: Measuring the impact of an international internship using the MGUDS. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49, 92-123.
doi:10.1177/0013161X12455055
- Rigby, J. G. (2014). Three logics of instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 50(4), 610-644.
- Rodríguez, M. A., Chambers, T. V., González, M. L., & Scheurich, J. J. (2010). A crosscase analysis of three social justice-oriented education programs. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 5, 138-153.
doi:10.1177/194277511000500305
- Scribner, S. P., & Crow, G. M. (2012). Employing professional identities: Case study of a high school principal in a reform setting. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 11, 243-274.
- Theoharis, G., & O'Toole, J. (2011). Leading inclusive ELL. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(4), 646-688.
- Turnbull, B. J., Anderson, L. M., Riley, D. L., MacFarlane, J. R., & Aladjem, D. K. (2016). Building a stronger principalship, vol. 4: The Principal Pipeline Initiative in Action. *Policy Studies Associates, Inc.* *Retrieved from: wallacefoundation.com.*

- Turnbull, B. J., Riley, D. L., & MacFarlane, J. R. (2013b). Building a stronger principalship, vol. 2: Cultivating talent through a principal pipeline. *Policy Studies Associates, Inc. Retrieved from: wallacefoundation.com.*
- Turnbull, B. J., Riley, D. L., & MacFarlane, J. R. (2015). Building a stronger principalship, vol. 3: Districts taking charge of the principal pipeline. *Policy Studies Associates, Inc. Retrieved from: wallacefoundation.com.*
- Turnbull, B. J., Riley, D. L., Arcaira, E. R., Anderson, L. M., & MacFarlane, J. R. (2013a). Building a stronger principalship, vol. 1: Six districts begin the principal pipeline initiative. *Policy Studies Associates, Inc. Retrieved from: wallacefoundation.com.*
- Young, M. D., Crow, G. M., Murphy, J., & Ogawa, R. T. (Eds.). (2009). *Handbook of research on the education of school leaders*. New York, NY: Routledge.



UConn
NEAG SCHOOL OF EDUCATION