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INVITATION

Dear Colleagues

It is with pleasure that we invite your contribution to the development of a system of standards for school leadership in Australia by taking part in a national consultation process.

The Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) is undertaking a project on behalf of the National Institute for Quality Teaching and School Leadership to provide advice on options for a national system for assessment against school leadership standards. Recognising that a national approach should be driven by the profession, ACER is undertaking a consultation with principals and other key stakeholders, canvassing the issues that need to be addressed in developing a national system.

In Australia, as in many other countries, there is a great deal of interest in ways to improve recruitment, preparation, continuing professional development and recognition of school leaders. Leadership standards are part of this debate. There are many different models and frameworks for school leadership currently operating in Australia as well as elsewhere. ACER has prepared a consultation paper which draws on a critical review of these developments and raises questions for discussion about the development and application of national standards for prospective and established principals in Australia.

The views of the profession elicited through this consultation will feed directly into the draft paper on options for a national approach to the development of standards and professional certification for school leaders. A further opportunity for the profession to feed into the development of options will be provided by a National Forum which will be held in Canberra in late November. We will advise about the Forum details shortly.

We look forward to hearing your views on the issues raised in the ACER paper.

Yours sincerely

Fran Hinton
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Accompanying this issues paper is a second document – a consultation questionnaire that provides a guide to preparing your organisation’s response to this issues paper.

Who is this document for?

The issues paper and consultation questionnaire are intended for all professional associations, education authorities and other stakeholders, such as universities and parent groups.

The consultation questions are intended to draw upon the expertise and experience groups and agencies with an involvement or interest in leadership standards and professional learning for school leaders.

Why is this consultation taking place?

The purpose of this current consultation is to identify some of the main issues that might be associated with introducing a national approach to the development and implementation of school leadership standards.

Timeline?

August – 14th October 2005.

Any questions?

Please contact Michelle Anderson andersonm@acer.edu.au or telephone (03) 9835 7410.
SECTION 1    STANDARDS FOR SCHOOL LEADERSHIP PROJECT

PROJECT SUMMARY

The National Institute for Quality Teaching and School Leadership (NIQTSL) recently commissioned the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) to conduct a project reviewing approaches to standards for school leadership and certification.1

The main stages in the project include:

- A critical review of national and international developments in leadership standards and approaches to certification
- Development of an issues paper for consultations with relevant professional organizations, education authorities and other stakeholders
- Synthesis of responses to the issues paper and preparation of a final report identifying options for the development and introduction of a national certification system.

A key focus of the project is on reviewing how different countries and jurisdictions have approached the development and implementation of school leadership standards. The purpose of the project is not to propose or develop a single model of leadership standards, but to analyse existing models and develop a set of principles and options for future action.

ACER’s project brief was to explore standards that might be relevant to prospective and established principals. This work would be linked to the existing MCEETYA National Standards Framework and the work that NIQTSL is developing on advanced standards for teachers.

BACKGROUND

In March 2004 the Allen Consulting Group (ACG) reported on an extensive consultation it had conducted about the proposed National Institute for Quality Teaching and School Leadership (NIQTSL). That consultation revealed widespread support for the establishment of NIQTSL as a body that could make a distinctive contribution to the reputation and standing of the profession. In particular, the ACG consultation revealed strong endorsement in the profession of the key role that professional standards play in guiding improvement in teaching, leadership and educational outcomes.

The current ACER project and consultation process builds on this earlier work, and the current work being carried out in states, and provides further opportunities for professional participation in shaping school leadership standards.

The peak principal associations spoke with a common voice in recognising the importance of delineating the role of teacher and school leader, and in recommending that support for leadership development activities be a prime focus of the NIQTSL and the organising concept for achieving quality teaching. The ACG report noted that,

The leadership development needs outlined by principals include providing structured practical support for existing principals…as well as providing learning pathways for aspirant leaders and support for teachers in leadership roles.

1 The terms certification and accreditation are regarded here as synonymous. In this project certification is an endorsement by a professional body that a person has attained a defined level of knowledge and professional performance. Accreditation is an endorsement by a recognised agency that a course, or program, or institution meets specified standards.
Professional standards and certification for school leaders are now recognised as one of the core function areas of NIQTSL. While recognising that leadership is a property that pervades effective organisations, there is no doubt that everyone has a common interest in ensuring that school principals and others in senior administrative positions are well prepared and recognised for the work they do.

There is a distinct role that school leaders play in enabling schools to reach standards of effective school functioning. Principals are proficient, for example, in leading and managing change and building accountable professional communities in their schools. They know how to establish shared professional values to guide teaching practices and how to provide leadership roles for others. There is room for recognising the critical importance of other forms of leadership in schools in standards for accomplished teachers. Most standards for accomplished teaching reflect the view that accomplished teachers provide leadership in a wide range of areas, not only within their schools but also in the wider profession.

In the lead up to the establishment of NIQTSL, professional associations recognised that the new body had significant potential to enable them to provide professional leadership in areas that they could not provide for themselves separately. These included, for example, the development of profession-wide standards and the establishment of a professional certification system to give recognition to those who could demonstrate they had attained the standards.

**REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE**

Members of the ACER project team have been reviewing professional standards for prospective and established principals in different countries and across educational jurisdictions in Australia.

The review of the literature is being accompanied by correspondence with key internationally recognised scholars in the school leadership field. Information has been sought, initially, from across the 31 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries.

The key questions guiding the review include:

- Who determines the standards for school leadership? How, and on what basis?
- What are their purposes?
- What is included in the standards? How are the standards organised and structured?
- How is professional learning organised to assist prospective school leaders and school leaders to reach the standards? Who are the providers? How are the activities funded?
- Who assesses whether practitioners have attained the standards? What forms of evidence are used and how is the assessment conducted?
- What are the incentives for teachers and school leaders to invest in professional learning and certification?
- What evidence is there about the impact of the standards and certification?
- What issues are associated with the introduction and operation of a professional learning and certification system?

In 2001 the OECD conducted an international review of public sector leadership development (Bush & Glover, 2005). The review identified trends for:

- Developing systematic strategies for leadership development
- Setting up new institutions for leadership development
- Linking existing management and training to leadership development
- Defining a competence profile for future leaders
- Identifying and selecting potential leaders
- Encouraging mentoring and training
- Keeping leadership development sustainable
Significant changes in leadership development are reflected in these trends. Our review of literature echoes the OECD findings. Noted is an increased presence of ‘agencies’ with the specific responsibility for school leadership. These ‘agencies’ either exist currently (e.g. Austria’s ‘New Leadership Academy’; England’s ‘National College for School Leadership’); are at the proposal stage (e.g. New Zealand’s ‘The Auckland University National College for Educational Leadership’; Consultation by the Scottish Executive for the establishment of a ‘Leadership Academy’ by the end of 2005) or embryonic thinking stage (e.g. Canada: An Ontario ‘Leadership Institute’). Conversely, changes are occurring that are yet to be formally published (e.g. the Dutch Principal’s Association’s development of a standard for primary principals in the Netherlands). In many cases these agencies are playing key roles in facilitating the development of professional standards.

Of central interest for this consultation are the purposes professional standards set out to serve. From our review there appears to be significant congruence in the purposes and uses of standards. Significant differences arise from how the professional standards are conceived and developed.

A brief overview of the purposes and uses of professional standards for principals follows. Section Three of this paper discusses issues around the meaning and development of professional standards. A more detailed account of work on professional standards will appear in the literature review being prepared for NIQTSL as part of this project.

**Purposes of professional standards**

The most common purposes for school leadership standards are to provide a framework for the profession preparation and ‘certification’ of prospective principals and to provide a framework for continuing professional learning for established principals.

Woven through these purposes is the intent for professional standards to inspire and challenge. These challenges include:

- Changes to the function and scope of school leadership
- Improving the quality of teaching and learning
- Increasing the number and improving the quality of eligible individuals for principal posts
- Improving the quality of ongoing professional learning opportunities for principals

Historically, the field of leadership is a product of the twentieth century. It has been a focus of international interest amongst scholars from numerous academic disciplines, although principally psychology and business management. As part of the development of the field, various schools of thought emerged. These have generated different understandings of leadership that, in their turn, have fallen in and out of favour. At different times, these perspectives have accorded varying significance to the characteristics and capacities of high status and powerfully positioned individuals, the features of the contexts in which such individuals work, or a combination of individual and contextual features.

The 1980s and 1990s witnessed the emergence of the so-called “new” leadership. This trend, which sought to distinguish clearly between the work of organisational leaders and managers, emphasised the centrality of vision, the importance of personal charisma and a capacity for organisation-wide transformation. Recently, this understanding of leadership has been particularly prominent among school policy-makers and reformers. In the new millennium, however, a reaction has set in and leadership scholars are now searching for “post-heroic” forms of leadership, of which the most prominent example is distributed leadership (e.g. Gronn, 2003).
In the current educational reform climate in many countries of devolved, site-based, self-managing schooling, principals are increasingly held accountable for the broad and diverse portfolio areas of school operations. The principal’s role responsibilities have expanded and their experience of the work has intensified. These developments have prompted a growing recognition amongst employing authorities, professional bodies and the tertiary sector that there are significant limitations to the idea of individual principals as “super” leaders. That is, the improvement of schools as complex learning environments is increasingly believed to require a critical mass of organisation-wide and unit-level leaders. This recognition accounts for the recent upsurge of interest in forms of distributed leadership, the increased popularity of teams and school-level capacity-building. This is reflected in different models of school leadership being established, both in Australia and overseas (e.g. New Zealand; England). For example, “co-principalship” of schools and “teacher leaders”.

Far from diminishing the role of principals this shift from “individual super leader” to an acknowledgement of ‘distributed leadership’ in effective organisations brings new challenges to the principalship of schools (e.g. how opportunities to participate are widened and developed). The guiding conception of what it means to be a principal has changed. Documenting these changes is important to the writing of professional standards.

Coupled with these changes is mounting evidence of a crisis of confidence about filling the large number of principal vacancies emerging as the “baby boomer” generation of school leaders retire (e.g. Lacey, 2002). There is some argument that any new certification requirements might act as a barrier to the encouragement of teachers into leadership. A vigorous counter argument is that unless authorities are much more explicit about the developmental pathways and support for leadership they will be less successful in attracting new leaders. Examples from Australia and internationally demonstrate active development of standards-based professional learning for principals by professional associations and employing authorities. This is most evident in the preparation and induction phases of school leadership. Focussed attention is being given to the processes associated with these phases with a view to improve the quality of leaders with specific and relevant capabilities.

**Professional standards – a brief overview of the international and local landscape**

Standards for school leadership appear in the literature around the mid-to-late 1990s in, for example, Australia, England, New Zealand, Scotland, USA and Wales.

A widely used set of standards is the United States Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium’s (ISLLC’s) Standards for School Leaders, developed in the mid 1990s. Six standards each begin with the phrase “A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by…”

1. facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared ad supported by the school community.
2. advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning.
3. ensuring management of the organisation, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, ad effective learning environment.
4. collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilising community resources.
5. acting with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manner.
6. understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal and cultural context.
Each of these “standards” is then elaborated in terms of the specific knowledge; dispositions and performances of effective principals. Forty US states have used or adapted the ISLLC standards. Murphy (2005) provides a useful update and review of criticisms of the initial ISLLC standards.

Standards need constant revision in the light of new research and professional knowledge. The table below compares the key areas included in two sets of standards for headteachers in England.

England: National Standards for Headteachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key areas</td>
<td>Key areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Strategic direction and development</td>
<td>1. Shaping the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teaching and learning</td>
<td>2. Leading learning and teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leading and managing</td>
<td>3. Developing self and working with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Efficient and effective deployment</td>
<td>4. Managing the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Accountability</td>
<td>5. Securing Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Strengthening Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Different approaches to the development of leadership standards are apparent in Australia. A common approach in all jurisdictions is the use of leadership frameworks that identify different stages of the pathways towards principalship. In NSW for example, the leadership framework identifies the learning needs of aspiring leaders; the induction for new school leaders; and the support and development of current school leaders.

Capability or competency frameworks are used in most parts of Australia to describe the work of principals. Queensland, for example, describes these in terms of six leadership ‘roles’, Accountability; Leadership in Education; People and Partnerships, Management; Change; Outcomes. In the Australian Capital Territory (ACT) Schools Authority, the work of leaders is described in terms of “domains” - Strategic Management, Self Management, Leading People, Organisational Management; and Communication. Victoria and Western Australia use performance against capabilities or attributes to measure different levels of performance or standards for principals. Similar developments are evident in Tasmania.

Uses of professional standards

The review notes other uses for standards in addition to guiding certification and ongoing professional learning. Professional standards are being used to guide:

- selection of principals
- position descriptions for principal vacancies
- performance management of principals
- an individual’s self-assessment at a transition point (e.g. a new job)
- the development of ‘accounts of practice’ to bridge the relationship between the standards and the experience of what it means to be a principal in a variety of contexts.

The next section gives a general idea of a standards-guided professional learning system. Section three explores in more detail standards development. The start of each section contains a diagram. The diagram represents the main components of a standards-based professional learning system for school leadership. The shaded area denotes the main focus of discussion for each section.
SECTION 2  
THE IDEA OF A STANDARDS-GUIDED PROFESSIONAL LEARNING SYSTEM

Most professions develop a system to support and encourage their members to develop toward high, profession-defined standards of practice. The main purpose behind professional standards is to delineate the knowledge base that underlies effective practice as a guide to professional self-assessment, learning and assessment for certification.

The standards articulate what a profession believes its members should know and be able to do, based on professional values, research and the experience of highly regarded practitioners. In this way, a profession aims to provide the public with an assurance of quality in return for the trust that the public places in professional bodies to develop and implement standards of practice.

Professional bodies usually provide some kind of certification or accreditation to members of the profession who attain those standards. While certification is a valuable form of recognition in itself, professions are also concerned to ensure that their certification is seen as credible by the public and useful to employers for various purposes such as selection and career progression.

The essential components of a fully functioning standards-guided system for professional learning are:

- **Profession-defined standards** that describe effective practice and provide goals and direction for professional learning over the long term
- **An infrastructure for professional learning** that enables practitioners to develop the attributes and capabilities embodied in the standards
- A credible, voluntary system of **professional certification**, based on evidence that the standards have been attained.
- Selection procedures and career paths that provide **recognition and incentives** for those who gain professional certification.

Taken together, these components form a ‘system’ of interdependent and mutually supportive parts. Take one away and the system loses its capacity to function effectively as an instrument for encouraging and recognising evidence of professional learning. The interlocking character of these components is captured in the figure at the top of this page.

Each of these components of professional learning will be discussed in turn later in this issues paper. There are two purposes of standards that need to be distinguished here, each serving important, but different requirements. The first is the topic of this issues paper, where the standards are developed by professional bodies for the purposes of professional learning and recognition. The second is for the purposes of performance management, and is properly the responsibility of employing authorities. The first is based on the expectation that prospective and established school leaders should keep up with developments in research and knowledge in their area of teaching and meet standards for accomplished practice. The second is based on the undeniable requirement that school leaders fulfil their contractual duties. The standards for these two purposes will be similar, but the audiences are different.
SECTION 3
STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT

THE MEANING OF “STANDARD”

Dictionaries give two inter-related uses of the term “standard”: to rally, as around a banner, or flag (standard); and to measure.

As rallying points, standards aim to articulate core values that professionals seek to make manifest in their practice. Developers of professional standards will be guided by conceptions of quality practice. Standards, by definition, are statements about what is valued.

As measures, standards not only describe what practitioners need to know and be able to do to put these values into practice; they describe how attainment of that knowledge is to be assessed, and what counts as meeting the standard. A standard, in the latter sense, is the level of performance on the criterion being assessed that is considered satisfactory in terms of the purpose of the evaluation.

When standards are used as measures of performance, there are three essential steps in their development. These are:

1. Defining what is to be measured (e.g. what is good leadership?) These are often called the content standards
2. Deciding how it will be measured, or how relevant evidence about practice (leadership) will be gathered, and
3. Identifying what counts as meeting the standard, or how good is good enough. This leads to performance standards.

As in educational measurement generally, content standards set out the domain of what is to be assessed. They set out the main areas of (a school leader’s) responsibilities and provide elaborations on what the standards means in terms of leadership practice. Well-written standards point to how evidence about capability and performance will be gathered, and how decisions will be made about whether the standards have been met. While content standards define the scope of (a school leader’s) work, performance standards are needed to tell us how good a (school leader’s) performance needs to be in relation to the standards.

This definition is a useful reminder that a complete definition of standards needs all three components above. That is, content standards (what are we measuring?), rules for gathering evidence (how will we measure it?), and performance standards (how good is good enough and how will we judge the evidence?)

DEVELOPING STANDARDS

The main tasks involved in standards development usually include:

- Developing a guiding conception of school leadership
- Defining the scope of a school leader’s work
- Delineating what school leaders should know and be able to do
- Establishing processes for writing standards
- Validating the standards
Typical issues that arise in carrying out these tasks include identifying the knowledge base about effective school leadership and developing valid procedures for writing and validating the standards.

**Developing a guiding conception of school leadership**

Any set of professional standards needs a guiding conception of quality practice and why it is important. This usually takes the form of a set of foundational values or core principles setting out in general terms what *all* practitioners, (school leaders in this case) should know and be able to do, regardless of where they practice. This conception guides the development of more detailed descriptions of practice, as set out in the standards.

Fullan (2001), for example, draws on the image of leadership as one of “mobilising people to tackle tough problems” in developing his more detailed *Framework for Leadership*. Most commentators define leadership as a form of influence in which a person is believed to have a capacity to lead others to do willingly what they would not otherwise do (although it is important to acknowledge that leadership scholars have not achieved a consensus on the meaning of leadership). Leadership standards usually then go on to set out the areas of school functioning where leadership action is needed.

**Delineating the scope of the standards for school leadership**

Standards developers must make early decisions about the *scope* of the standards; in this case, the scope of the work of school leaders (principals?). What should be included in the “domain” of standards for school leadership? What should be in, what should be left out? Delineating the scope, or domain, is of central importance when deciding the nature and form of evidence that needs to be produced in making certification decisions.

It is not possible for developers of profession-wide standards to include everything that principals do, or are expected to do, within particular education systems or school jurisdictions. Professional standards do not replicate, or replace, position, or role, descriptions specific to particular employing authorities. Procedures for performance management remain the responsibility of the employer. This is a common situation for most professions. It is important to distinguish leadership standards from the specific areas in which leadership or management action may be required as part of the job within particular school systems.

Box 1 sets out one of six *Areas for Leadership Action* in the CECV Standards for Leaders in Catholic Schools. While *Leadership in the Faith Community* is a critically important area for leadership action in Catholic schools, it is unlikely that this area would be included in a set of profession-wide standards for school leaders. Other areas of leadership, specific to particular employers, might include knowledge about data and staff management systems, for example.

### Box 1

**Example: Area of Leadership Action**

1.0 The Faith Community

**Components:**

1.1 *The Catholic identity of the school*

School leaders actively and collaboratively promote, maintain and enhance the Catholic identity of the school.

1.2 *Education in life and faith*

School leaders actively and collaboratively promote, maintain and enhance an education in faith, and opportunities for faith development.

1.3 *Celebration of life and faith*

School leaders actively and collaboratively promote, maintain and enhance processes for reflection, prayer and liturgical celebration.

1.4 *Action and social justice*

School leaders actively and collaboratively uphold a commitment to social justice and action in the school and wider community.
Defining what school leaders should know and be able to do

This is the core work of standards writers. There are many different approaches to writing a set of professional standards, but a key task for a professional body is to initiate and support the development of leadership standards using processes that lead to a strong sense of professional ownership.

Generally, processes for developing standards include:

1. A review phase – the function of this phase is to inform and gather information about the current knowledge base about school leadership and standards development.
2. The establishment of a committee(s) phase – the function of this phase is to establish a group(s) who will act as the dedicated ‘engine room’ for the coordination; writing and consultation.
3. A consultation phase – the function of this phase is to build commitment; gather and harness the views and opinions of those affected by the standards.
4. A publication and use phase – the function of this phase is to raise awareness of the existence of the standards and embed the standards into the certification system.

One approach when writing standards it is to begin with a vision of quality practice and use a backward mapping technique. In the case of standards for principals, this process might start with a vision of “what conditions would we see in a school that was functioning effectively and providing high quality opportunities for student learning?” These might be written up as case examples of standards in action.

A next step might then be to ask, “what would a school leader need to know and be able to do to establish and sustain those conditions?” This would be followed by a process for identifying tasks that school leaders should perform to provide evidence of what they know and can do. The final step in developing a complete set of standards is to establish procedures for judging that evidence fairly and reliably.

Standards writers aim to identify the unique features of what school leaders know and do, as compared with others who work in schools. While the context of each school is different and the experiences of school leaders varied, standards aim to capture what effective school leaders know and do, and the principles that underpin their practice, no matter where they work.

School leadership standards seek to identify the central tasks of leaders in schools, wherever they work. Leading and managing change might be one example. Building a strong and accountable professional community in their school might be another. The clearest and most useful standards are written with assessment in mind; that is, the writers are constantly conscious of the need for the standards to point to actions that could be observed.

Content validity of standards refers to whether the standards identify correctly the knowledge, skills and attitudes possessed by effective leaders. Validity in terms of certification ultimately refers to whether the process of assessment for certification discriminates between more and less effective leaders in terms of improving the quality teaching of and learning.

Once standards writers have established the scope and the ‘content’ of the domain of leadership standards, they have a complex task of deciding how the domain will be structured or carved up. The diagram below summarises the “Standard for Headship in Scotland”. The developers of “The Standard” have used a backward mapping approach that starts with a focus on student learning and the educational purposes of schools. The Standards works backwards from these purposes to identify the professional actions required of effective headteachers, and the roles they must play, if they are to provide vision, direction and high standards. The ‘contributory elements’ then identify the knowledge, skills, and values that would be important, presumably, in the preparation and on-going professional learning of headteachers.
The development of standards serves to legitimate and authorise a body of practice-related knowledge. Standards developers draw on empirical research wherever possible as well as the experience of successful practitioners.

Who drives the standards development varies significantly from country to country. For example, in the Netherlands principals drove the development of standards for the Dutch Principals Academy. In Wales and England the profession was engaged in the process, but the Ministry (in Wales) and the Department for Education and Skills (in England) initiated and controlled the process.

Over the years people have noted some difficulties associated with the development of standards. Leithwood and Steinbach (Forthcoming) propose an overarching set of seven meta-level standards for evaluating the adequacy of school leadership standards. These standards argue for and against the use of particular knowledge in standards development. The authors propose that:

1. Standards should acknowledge persistent challenges to the concept and practice of leadership
2. Standards are claims about effective practice and should be justified with reference to the best available theory and evidence
3. Standards should acknowledge those political, social and organisational features of the contexts in which leaders work that significantly influence the nature of effective leadership practices
4. Standards should specify effective leadership practices or performances only, not skills or knowledge. The authors say that choice of knowledge to teach is based on an assumed (logical) relation between knowledge and practice.
5. Dispositions should not be included in any standards
6. Standards should describe desired levels of performance not just categories of practice
7. Standards should reflect the distributed nature of school leadership – not just individual school head capacity but ‘standards that take the school as the unit of analysis’.
These are demanding, but useful, “meta-level standards” for standards writers. The authors argue that these seven standards will lead to more defensible sets of standards for school leaders in the future. Experience suggests it is critical to provide standards development committees with professional writers.

While standards set out to provide a consensus about good leadership practice, such as building professional community in schools, they do not “standardise” the means by which those standards are brought to life in practice. That school leaders should build a strong professional community in their schools would be regarded as a non-negotiable by most standards developers, but how they do this would be a matter for their professional judgment given the local context, not any specific procedure set down in the standards. See Box 3 for one approach being taken by countries to demonstrate performance of standards.

Each set of standards reviewed for this project was developed through varying lengths of consultation and inquiry. The longest was four years from the Dutch Principals’ Academy. The average appears to be somewhere between 12 and 18 months. Ownership is critical, but it is difficult to achieve up front in the development process. Ultimately, a sense of ownership has to be built over time, through consultation and validation processes and use of them for professional learning and self-assessment. Ownership also depends, eventually, on the quality of the standards.

**Box 3**

**Example: Standards and Accounts of Practice**

England, Scotland and Wales are developing case accounts of practice to strengthen the relationship between standards for principals and experiences of the school leadership role. This may also facilitate familiarisation of the local context in which the standards are to be attained and understanding of the rapid changing nature of the role. This increased ‘real-time’ responsiveness means people do not have to ‘wait’ for ‘on-the-job’ in-service training. Underpinning this approach appears to be the belief that transparency, through sharing, will act as an incentive for those considering a headship role in schools.

Variations in standards for school leadership exist within and between countries. Generally, however, content standards set out to clarify what the profession believes school leaders should get better at over the long term. In other words, there is an element of stretch explicitly inherent to the writing of most standards.

**Establishing valid procedures and processes for writing standards**

Professional standards need to be able to withstand challenges to their validity. These will come from within and without the profession. There are two aspects to validity here. One is to do with the content of the standards, discussed above. The other is to do with the procedures used to develop them.

If the procedures for developing standards are to be regarded as valid and legally defensible, it is important to ensure:

- the integrity and independence of the body responsible for developing the standards;
- that the standards developing body is composed primarily of those who are already highly accomplished practitioners;
- that the diversity of perspectives in the profession is represented;
- that the process of defining the standards is developed on a sound scientific basis and that the process of developing the standards be formally documented; and
- that a wide sampling of agreement is sought for the standards from the major professional groups regarding the appropriateness and level of standards.
These procedures indicate, perhaps counter intuitively, the need for some separation or distance between the relevant professional association and the body ultimately responsible for the quality of the standards. This is to avoid potential dangers in some professions of the relationship becoming a little too cozy and not necessarily placing the public interest first. While this is unlikely in education, it is still an issue to be considered. Procedural validity calls for professional standards bodies that are genuinely independent and can act without fear or favour.

Validating the standards
Validating the standards identifies the knowledge and capabilities of effective leaders. Validating standards in this sense involves a process of consultation with highly regarded practitioners and researchers about the content of the standards. A tougher validity test is whether principals who implement a particular set of standards actually do provide higher quality opportunities for students to learn than those who do not. It is clear that validation in this sense would take many years of research.

SECTION 4
PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATION

Professional certification is an endorsement that a professional body gives to a member who has attained a specified set of performance standards. Certification by a professional body is usually:

- available to all members of the profession;
- based on assessment of performance (not an academic qualification, although such qualifications may have a valuable role in preparing for certification);
- portable and belong to the person (not a job or position or classification specific to a school or employing authority).

As mentioned earlier, professional associations had expressed strong support for a national system of school leadership standards and certification in the lead up to the establishment of NIQTSL. Employing authorities had also emphasised the need for more effective professional learning pathways and programs for future and established school leaders. A national professional body seemed to have the potential to enable both to achieve together what they could not achieve separately.

Professional associations believed the NIQTSL would enable them to enhance their contribution to professional leadership through the development of:

1. profession-wide standards for aspiring and experienced school leaders, and
2. A certification system for those who attained the standards;
3. Professional learning activities and programs to support school leaders in their development toward the standards.
In other words, the professional associations were seeking to develop a system of standards and certification to promote professional learning akin to that provided in other professions. A credible professional certification system could provide long-term direction and incentives to professional learning and a valuable quality assurance service to employers and the general public about the capacity of applicants for school leadership positions. Employing authorities would have a vital role to play in the development and operation of certification systems.

Calls for national standards and certification have come from several directions over recent years. These include: the report of the Senate Employment, Education and Training Committee (1998), *A Class Act*, which called for a national system for professional certification for teachers and school leaders; the 2003 report of the Commonwealth Department of Education, Science and Training Review of Teaching and Teacher Education, *Australia’s Teachers, Australia’s Future*; and the *National Statement from the Teaching Profession on Teacher Standards, Quality and Professionalism* facilitated by the Australian College of Educators.

MCEETYA has provided a focus for national cooperation and coordination in this area through its Teacher and School Leadership Capacity Working Group. MCEETYA’s National Framework for Professional Standards for Teaching shows the inter-relationship between standards for teachers and school leaders. The Framework provides a key point of reference potentially, around which future collaborative work between professional associations and employing authorities can be organised.

Taken together, the above trends indicate that the time is ripe for circumstances for creating such a system. It is clear there is a lot of “bottom up” activity going on among professional associations that demonstrates their ability to develop high quality professional standards. At the same time, there is widespread recognition from state and territory governments, teacher unions and the Commonwealth Government that there are advantages to be gained by all from the development of a national framework for school leadership standards. It is increasingly common to hear senior government officials say that the development of professional standards is not their business; rather, it is something they are looking for the profession to do.

The NIQTSL board has decided that professional standards and certification for school leaders will be one of its core function areas. As employing authorities see evidence that certification is a credible indicator of professional learning and capacity they may choose to recognise it in a variety of ways that suit their purposes. Of the new body, there is still a need for further investigation and discussion about the possible ways in which this function could be provided and their relative benefits.

Many have pointed to the potentially valuable role that a professional learning and certification system could play in strengthening the profession. Such a role could make a valuable contribution to the work that employing authorities are doing already to recruit, prepare and retain effective school leaders. Systems for professional standards and certification are complementary to, not a replacement for, the quality assurance and professional learning that employers provide.

As in any profession, proponents believe employing authorities should not be expected to take responsibility for all professional learning and quality assurance. School leaders have a responsibility to keep up with profession-defined standards of practice, which, by definition, cannot be specific to particular employers. The aim of the standards-based system is to build a system for which teachers and school leaders, individually and collectively, feel ownership and responsibility. Everyone has much to gain from a stable and effective professional learning system with the capacity to engage all teachers and school leaders.
WHY CERTIFICATION?

The previous section provided a definition of professional certification and placed it in the context of recent and related developments in education. It is important to note that this definition left very open questions about how a standards-guided professional learning and certification system might be implemented in a specific context. These questions are taken up in the next section of this issues paper and in the questionnaire.

The literature review has indicated that, while the elements of standards-based professional certification systems are similar across countries, they are implemented in very different ways. The National College of School Leadership in England, for example, is very different in operational terms from the Dutch Principals Academy in the Netherlands (See Tables 1 and 2 below).

A professional certification function enables the profession to build its own infrastructure for defining standards, promoting development over the long term toward those standards and providing recognition to those who reach them. In other words, it enables the profession to build a professional development system guided by profession-defined standards, as distinct from the fragmented and non-sequential nature of much PD provision. The psychological importance of professional certification as an incentive, and as a source of recognition, should not be underestimated.

A standards-based professional learning system places teachers and school leaders in a more active relationship to their professional development than traditional course-based forms of professional learning. This is where standards have a central role to play. A characteristic of effective designs for professional learning is that they involve teachers and school leaders in the identification of what they need to learn and in the development of the learning experiences in which they will be involved. This is what happens when school leaders think about the evidence they might provide about their practice in relation to the standards.

Effective experiences and activities may take many forms, including workshops, seminars and courses, but these need to be complemented by learning in the workplace that arises, for example, from taking on leadership roles, initiating change, receiving feedback and reflecting on the experience. A voluntary professional learning system linked to certification also has a greater capacity than traditional modes of course provision to engage most teachers and school leaders in effective forms of professional learning.

A second, related, purpose of a professional learning and certification system is to provide a valuable quality assurance service to employers and the public about the capacity of applicants for school leadership positions. Advanced certification for school principals can also provide school systems with credible and independent evidence of professional achievement that is they can use in their own systems for providing recognition. Professional certification, as quality assurance, should be distinguished from performance management procedures that are properly the responsibility of employing authorities. Certification is, potentially, a way of facilitating the movement of school leaders across school sectors.

A professional learning and certification system strengthens the contribution that the profession makes to the quality of teaching and learning in schools. The capacity to articulate what counts as accomplished practice is a necessary condition for any professional body if it is to claim a right to greater involvement in policy questions. The ability to define practice and reinforce standards for practice are the defining credentials of a professional body, the foundations for public credibility and trust. The existence of external professional standards is important because it institutionalises the idea that professionals are responsible for looking outward at challenging conceptions of leadership practice in addition to looking inward at their values and competencies.
LEVELS AND SPECIALIST AREAS FOR STANDARDS AND CERTIFICATION

The issues here concern the underlying architecture of the standards. Standards can be structured according to career stage or level and areas of specialism. Two levels for principals are common in the literature – one for prospective and one for established principals – though there are countries with more (See Table 1 for examples). The same set of standards can serve both purposes by indicating two different levels of expected performance on the standards.

Table 1: Levels and specialist areas of certification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Certification Organization</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Area of Specialism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Ontario College of Teachers (OTC)</td>
<td>Entry level</td>
<td>Entry Level and Specialist area – integrated children’s centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>National College for School Leadership (NCSL)</td>
<td>Entry Level</td>
<td>Entry Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Dutch Principals’ Academy (DPA)</td>
<td>Advanced Level only</td>
<td>Advanced Level only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (ESPB)</td>
<td>Entry Level</td>
<td>Entry Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>American Board for Leadership in Education (ABLE) [A NBPTS Model]</td>
<td>Advanced Level only</td>
<td>Advanced Level only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some countries, leadership standards are differentiated according to school phase, such as early childhood education, primary, middle and secondary, or according to size of school and location (e.g. remote, rural, urban) (See Box 4 below). The nature of what effective school leaders need to know and be able to do in these different contexts is regarded as different.

Box 4

Example: Certification Levels and Areas of Specialism

England’s National College for School Leadership delineates five phases of school leadership learning provision. These phases are Emergent, Established, Entry to Headship, Advanced Leadership and Consultant Leadership. Until recently only one area of certification existed: The Entry to Headship via the National Professional Qualification in Headship (NPQH). This certification became mandatory for first time headteacher appointments in April 2004. However, via the College’s Community Leadership Strategy and the wider policy drive of ‘Every Child Matters – Change for Children’, a new area of certification has been introduced. The National Professional Qualification for Integrated Centre Leadership (NPQICL) is aimed at developing leaders of integrated children’s centres. Like NPQH it is equivalent to one third of a Masters degree. The program is located within the ‘Emergent’ leadership phase. It is overseen by a multi-agency advisory group drawn from education, health and social care. The program also has a private sector focus group. NCSL has been commissioned to develop a set of Early Years leadership standards. These will be developed in consultation with the sector and envisaged available by December 2006.

Another issue is whether national certification, irrespective of level or specialism, would be ‘for life’ or require ‘renewal’. The general trend and recognition for life-long learning and development, as an indicator of what it means to be a professional, may suggest the latter. How would this be determined, for example: by length of time (5-10 years) and on what basis is an issue for early consideration?

In the USA – in the state of Kentucky graduates – of preparation programs, who do not assume an administrative post within five years, must take additional professional development to maintain their certification every five years. The regulatory body, the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSPB), may revoke administrator certification if an administrator fails to complete ongoing approved professional development experiences within every two-year period.
Voluntary or Mandatory Certification?

Knowledge-based standards of practice – be they for principals or teachers – emanate from two main sources. First, statements of standards may be produced by teacher or principal professional associations. Second, such standards may be defined by employing authorities or public sector agencies. These sources from which standards originate will have an important effect on the status accorded standards by practitioners. In the former case, profession-derived standards and certification are likely to be voluntary. In the second instance, employer mandated standards and certification will tend to be compulsory and, in the case of principals, conduct in accordance with such standards may form part of the regular principal appraisal required by employers to fulfil the provisions of principals’ employment contracts. However, this dichotomy does not always apply. In the Netherlands (the Dutch Principals’ Academy), the profession has driven the development of the standard, in close liaison with the employer and other key stakeholders. The profession is now working on a recommendation to the employer group for mandatory certification, based on the standard (See Table 2 for examples).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Status of certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada – Ontario</td>
<td>Mandatory certification based on the Standards of Practice for the Teaching Profession, and Ethical Standards for the Teaching Profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Mandatory certification based on the six key areas in the National Standards for Headteachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Voluntary certification but developing a recommendation to the Department of Education to mandate starter qualifications for the profession, based on the DPA Standard, in 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Mandatory certification based on the six standards in the School Leaders Licensure Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Mandatory certification based on the Department of Education to mandate starter qualifications for the profession, based on the DPA Standard, in 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA ABLE (Proposal only)</td>
<td>Voluntary certification underpinned by standards to be developed by the profession and facilitated by ABLE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box 5 provides an overview of the approach being taken in England to their entry level to headship certification programs.

Example: Voluntary and Mandatory Certification

England, Scotland and Wales have recently introduced mandatory certification programs. For example, England’s National College for School Leadership’s (NCSL) National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH) was a voluntary program for the first five years. At this time participants had their fees fully subsidised. The national certification was recognised by universities through the award of points towards a Masters degree. In April 2004 NPQH, it became a mandatory program for all first time headteachers. Certification is still recognised in the same way and the costs are now 80% subsidised by the College for most state schools. Following a similar path is the new NCSL’s National Professional Qualification for Integrated Centre Leadership (NPQICL). The introduction of this certification program is voluntary. This decision to make the certification program voluntary or mandatory is underpinned by the belief that the latter will slow down the leadership pipeline. The mandatory status of a program, already drawing on a shrinking pool of applicants, was believed to act as a disincentive for people to apply for the leadership role. Instead, a phased-in mandatory status is believed to allow time to stimulate enough interest and therefore build up a sufficient pool of potential aspiring leaders in the system.
METHODS FOR GATHERING AND ASSESSING EVIDENCE FOR PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATION

In any system for professional learning and certification, decisions need to be made about the requirements for satisfactory professional learning and certification. How will evidence of professional learning be gathered? What kinds of evidence indicate that the standards have been met?

A significant trend in the development of standards is that they are increasingly performance-based standards. This means that they describe what effective school leaders know and are able to do rather than listing courses that need to be completed for certification\(^2\). Accompanying this trend is the development of authentic tasks that teachers and school leaders undertake and document, as a vehicle for professional learning, and to provide evidence of attaining the standards.

A variety of methods for gathering or documenting evidence of professional learning can be found in the literature. The most frequently cited evidential basis of performance is the concept of a portfolio that contains a range of ‘entries’, providing multiple forms of evidence related to the standards. Together, the entries document professional growth over time. Entries may also take a variety of forms. These may be paper-based, or in the case of the Dutch Principals’ Academy, part of a digital portfolio.

Box 6 provides a summary of a portfolio task developed by ACER for the Catholic Education Office (CEO) Melbourne, called Leading and Managing Change. This structured portfolio task is designed so that teachers and school leaders can tell a story of how they led and managed a change effort in an important area of their school. Completion of the portfolio task provides performance evidence of how they met one of the core elements of the CEO standards.

Box 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Standards of Practice for Leaders in Victorian Catholic Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example of a portfolio task: Leading and Managing Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The portfolio task invites teachers and school leaders to document an initiative in which they led and managed a change effort with colleagues in their school. Their project will have aimed to meet an important need related to student learning by enhancing the quality of teaching in their school. In their entry, they describe the evidence for the need, their project plan, what happened during the implementation of their project, the improvements in teaching and learning that took place, and finally they reflect on what they have learned about leading and managing change (8-10 pages).

The level of professional involvement in developing assessment procedures for certification and in training assessors to assess portfolio entries varies greatly. For example, in England professional involvement appears low in the former and the latter is determined through a combination of four day NPQH training and additional local provider support. This may include, assessors shadowing more experienced assessors or co-tutoring arrangements. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards uses teams of teachers to develop ideas for its portfolio entries, as part of its certification process. These ideas are carefully trialled with other teachers to test their feasibility – and their capacity to provide convincing and consistent evidence relevant to the standards they are supposed to be assessing. All the assessments of entries for National Board certification are conducted by trained, paid assessors, who are teachers who work in the same field as those whose portfolios are being assessed.

\(^2\) “Performance” in this sense should be distinguished from “performance management” systems used by particular employing authorities
The potential for professional participation in all phases of the process of developing methods for gathering and assessing evidence for certification is very high. It is vital for the credibility of any professional certification system to assure the quality and consistency of these methods. Their validity, reliability, generalisability and fairness must be demonstrated. This requirement would appear to call for centralised procedures to ensure quality control of methods for gathering and assessing evidence. Fairness not only requires that the methods for gathering evidence are “authentic” (i.e. valid). It also requires that they be comparable, for example, in terms of the number of tasks and the amount of evidence that applicants have to provide for certification. Assuring credibility and consistency would seem to be an appropriate role for a national professional body. Credibility in professional certification also calls for rigour and consistency in methods for training the people who will assess evidence.

SECTION 5
CREATING AN INFRASTRUCTURE FOR STANDARDS-GUIDED PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

A key component of any professional standards and certification system is the infrastructure created to support standards-based professional learning. This infrastructure can include a wide variety of providers and activities.

Typical providers of professional learning for principals include professional associations, employing authorities, ‘leadership academies’ of various types and universities, among others. Increasingly, the workplace itself and networks of schools provide sites for professional support and learning. Professional learning activities may take many forms, including formal courses for qualifications, conferences, mentoring programs, self-directed study and local support networks. From the perspective of teachers and principals, though, these activities may sometimes seem fragmented and non-sequential.

Professional standards give long term direction to professional learning, especially when linked to some form of professional recognition, such as certification. Professionals seek activities that will help them to move toward meeting the standards, or they develop such activities themselves with colleagues. Providers, in turn, shift the nature of their activities to meet the needs of the ‘market’. The profession thereby gains greater influence over its professional learning system. Employing authorities gain better prepared professionals.

Increasingly, the process of preparing evidence for certification is designed so that the tasks necessarily engage professionals in effective modes of professional learning. This may happen, for example, through workplace-based learning programs, or the preparation of a series of entries for a portfolio, such as that described in Section three (Box 6).

Professional certification agencies need not be providers of professional learning themselves. Their main role is to ensure that the standards and certification processes are seen as rigorous and credible by employing authorities and the public, as well as Professional associations, in collaboration with governments and employing authorities are typically major providers of infrastructure support for standards-based professional learning activities.
This is where the standards and methods for gathering evidence are brought to life. Issues here are to do with the architecture and delivery of professional learning opportunities and their relationship to the standards.

Key questions involved in creating an infrastructure for professional learning include:

- How to maximise the involvement of practitioners in the creation and delivery of learning opportunities?
- How to build productive relationships among practitioners and a range of individuals, groups and organisations who can provide valuable support for standards-based professional learning (e.g. local support groups, hubs and networks; consortiums; practice-based workplace learning; university courses)?
- How can state and local professional associations best support preparation for professional certification applicants?

Involving practitioners

Normore (2004) and others identify some of the shifts evident in professional preparation and ongoing professional learning for school leaders and in who delivers such learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academics delivering programs</td>
<td>Practitioners or practitioners in collaboration with academics delivering programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-site course-based programs</td>
<td>Increased practicum work-place learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual learning</td>
<td>Collaborative problem-solving and mentoring / coaching / peer support learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>A mixture of e-learning and face-to-face</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provision of standards-guided professional learning

Among the countries included in the literature review, there is a wide range of providers of professional learning for prospective and established principals. In some countries, there is an marked shift from universities being the dominant provider of educational administration programs to being one of a cast of many. This has given rise to the formation of different relationships for standards-based professional learning. In the USA, for example, the responsible agency for certification in Connecticut (Connecticut State Department of Education) is a provider along with the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Regional Education Service Centres, The Connecticut Association of Schools and most school districts. The Dutch Principals’ Academy (DPA) in the Netherlands, on the other hand, refers to itself as not offering continuing education courses but as cooperating with two principal training agencies which use the standard and assessment developed by professionals through the DPA.

Generally, each of the agencies responsible for certification plays some role in the selection of providers. Thus, the National College for School Leadership in England contracts out the delivery of the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH) to nine regional providers. The most striking departure from this approach is a 2001 proposal for an American Board for Leadership in Education (ABLE) and advanced certification of principals and superintendents. Its emphasis is on profession-developed standards and ways of gathering evidence of performance against the standards. Underpinning the ABLE proposal is a belief that if the components of the certification system are credible (i.e. standards and assessment) then providers will develop professional learning activities to support candidates for ABLE certification and employers will provide recognition and support.
Costs, and who covers these, are clearly important issues in providing courses for prospective school leaders. Box 7 provides an example of costs in England to complete the NPQH.

**Box 7**

**Example: Incentives and recognition**

The cost to complete England’s NPQH varies according to school-type and access route into the program. The maximum cost is approximately $8,499 (Aus). This cost is 80% subsidised, by the National College for School Leadership for most state schools. Generally, there is an expectation that the school will pay the remaining 20%. Equally, by being certified an individual is eligible to participate in other NCSL leadership development phases of professional learning. Sometimes these additional learning opportunities also give rise to the possibility for new short- or long-term career paths (e.g. consultant leaders). Certification also provides points towards accreditation routes into University Masters degrees.

**SECTION 6 BUILDING SUPPORT AND RECOGNITION FOR CERTIFICATION**

An essential component of any professional certification system is that employing authorities and the general public regard it as a credible indicator of meeting professional standards. Tasks including in building credibility include:

- Demonstrating the validity of the certification as an indicator of professional development
- Encouraging the development of a market for school leaders with a professional certification.
- Providing a service that employers find credible and valuable
- Providing a process that engages school leaders in effective forms of professional learning – that adds value to the professional learning that employing authorities already provide
- Providing a service that assists employing authorities with recruitment and selection of school leaders

Professional bodies need to prove to employing authorities and the general public that their certification provides valid evidence of professional development and future performance. Certification should be a reliable indicator that a member of the profession has demonstrated that they have attained the knowledge and capabilities as described in the standards. In the case of leadership, certification should be based on a valid record of accomplishment in providing effective leadership in schools, whether as a prospective or an established principal.

Credibility is essential if certification by a professional body is to win support and recognition. With credibility, certification provides a valuable, independent quality assurance service to the employers that they may have difficulty providing themselves. Moreover, a credible professional learning and certification system provides a valuable service to the profession itself. By indicating a capacity to define and apply standards, it enhances the status of the profession in the eyes of the public and employing authorities.
It takes time and research to build a professional learning and certification system that is valid, reliable and fair. Credibility cannot be won overnight. Apart from the NBPTS, we have found few professional learning and certification systems in education that have conducted research and development on the reliability of their procedures.

With increasing credibility, employing authorities begin to provide various forms of recognition for professional certification. Some ways in which certification might provide a useful service to employers were mentioned earlier. Entry-level certification might be useful in encouraging leadership in schools, in guiding professional learning, and in recruitment and selection. It might provide teachers with stepping stones from the classroom, to teacher leadership, and on to wider leadership roles in the school.

Certification might also provide a service to employers seeking to provide challenging standards and recognition to accomplished principals. Professional certification, in this way, might provide schools and school systems with a complement, or alternative, to performance management.

WE NOW INVITE YOUR RESPONSE TO THE QUESTIONS POSED IN THE CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRE (SEE DOCUMENT 2).
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