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Introduction

The UPPI Program Redesign Progress Continuum is the latest addition to the Quality Measures™ Toolkit, commissioned by The Wallace Foundation to assist program redesign teams in assessing their progress in the redesign of their principal preparation programs.

The continuum is informed by findings from the 2018 RAND report, *Launching a Redesign of University Principal Preparation Programs*, and is intended to support teams in their efforts to re-envision a pathway for redesigned, university-based principal preparation.

Using a self-assessment protocol, the progress continuum is designed to support redesign teams in self-assessing their progress toward goals using illustrative descriptions of research-based activities, behaviors, practices, and products that one might expect to see during each phase of the redesign process.

We gratefully acknowledge the input received from the Wallace team as well as feedback collected on early drafts from members of the UPPI redesign teams. It is our sincere hope that this progress continuum will be helpful to programs as they move through the principal preparation program redesign process.

How is the Progress Continuum Organized?

Selected areas of inquiry

The continuum is organized to support a self-inquiry method for determining progress in redesigning principal preparation programs in six selected areas of focus inquiry (AOI): 1) partner engagement, 2) program re-envisioning, 3) program redesign, 4) project management, 5) changes in candidate training experience, and 6) changes in candidate performance. Each area of inquiry is uniquely color coded to distinguish it from other AOIs.

Guiding questions and evidence-based indicators

Each area of inquiry is introduced using a guiding question that is adapted from the RAND report. In addition, a selected set of evidence-based indicators have been adapted from the Quality Measures™ Toolkit (2018) and are used to frame each area of inquiry.
Phases of progress

Four phases are used to define a pathway of progression through the redesign process for users. Phases are not intended to connotate a specific amount of time but, rather, are used to describe the types of activities and behaviors you would expect to see happening during each phase. Phases are intended to cohere but should not be viewed as a prescriptive, linear progression of to-do’s. The following table is used to describe each phase:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1: Beginning</th>
<th>Describes initial redesign team activities and behaviors you would typically expect to see at the beginning stages of the redesign process (e.g., norming, organizing, questioning, studying, brainstorming)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2: Emerging</td>
<td>Describes early changes in redesign team practices and products that demonstrate clarity of focus, shared understanding, redesign goals and objectives, and early evidence of progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3: Advancing</td>
<td>Describes observable and measurable changes in practices and products that demonstrate forward movement toward articulated redesign goals and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4: Accomplished</td>
<td>Describes observable, measurable changes in products and practices that demonstrate that redesign goals and objectives for the AOI have been accomplished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Descriptions of activities, behaviors, practices, and products for each phase of the redesign process are intended to be illustrative, and not exhaustive, of all the possible changes that you might see.

Examples of supporting evidence

Also included for each phase across all six areas of inquiry are examples of the types of artifacts that teams might want to consider using as evidence to support the self-assessment of their progress.
Areas of Inquiry and Guiding Questions

This diagram illustrates the six primary measures of inquiry for assessing UPPI redesign progress over the course of the five-year initiative. Question prompts from the RAND report are included to guide the self-assessment of progress for each measure.

- **PARTNER ENGAGEMENT**
  - To what extent and how did partners (districts, state accrediting agency, mentor programs) support the program change?

- **PROGRAM RE-ENVISIONING**
  - To what extent and in what ways have university providers re-envisioned their principal preparation programs?

- **PROGRAM REDESIGN**
  - To what extent and how did the university-based project leads manage the redesign process?

- **PROJECT MANAGEMENT**
  - To what extent and how did the university-based project leads manage the redesign process?

- **CHANGES IN TRAINING EXPERIENCE**
  - What changes in candidates’ training experiences within the five-year study time frame?

- **CHANGES IN CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE**
  - What changes in candidates’ performance can be observed and measured within the five-year study time frame?
QM Redesign Progress Continuums
**GUIDING QUESTION:**

To what extent and how did partners (districts, state accrediting agency, mentor programs) support the program change?

### AREA OF INQUIRY #1: PARTNER ENGAGEMENT

![UPPI Program Redesign Progress Continuum](https://example.com/progress-continuum)

#### PHASE 1: BEGINNING

- Preparing and organizing for meaningful and effective partner engagement

**During phase 1 you would expect to see:**

- Strategic partners being confirmed
- Memorandums of understanding drafted between partner organizations to clarify expectations and ensure institutional commitment
- Structures and norms for effective collaboration and communication being drafted and agreed upon
- Partner organizations contributing the time, financial, and human resources needed to accomplish UPPI redesign goals
- Structures and norms for effective collaboration and communication being operationalized

**Supporting evidence for phase 1 might include:**

- Partner commitment letters
- Memorandums of understanding
- Collaboration and communication protocols
- Norms for partner engagement

### PHASE 2: EMERGING

- Engaging as a collective partnership to establish shared purpose, norms, goals, and objectives

**During phase 2 you would expect to see:**

- A mission statement that communicates the shared purpose of the partnership being developed
- Clear and measurable goals for the program redesign initiative being established by the partners
- Partner roles and responsibilities for accomplishing redesign goals and objectives being clearly defined and agreed upon
- Measures for assessing progress toward intended outcomes being established and agreed upon
- Partners using structures and norms to conduct redesign work

**Supporting evidence for phase 2 might include:**

- Partnership mission statement
- Clear and measurable goals
- Defined partner roles and responsibilities
- Measures for assessing progress
- Observations of partners working together

### PHASE 3: ADVANCING

- Progressing toward partnership’s intended purpose, goals, and objectives

**During phase 3 you would expect to see:**

- Change prototypes being designed and implemented to improve training practices for aspiring school leaders
- Ongoing methods for collecting prototype data about what is or is not working to produce actionable data
- Ongoing adjustments being made to prototypes in response to data collection
- Recommendations for full implementation of effective prototypes of products and methods
- Recommendations to revise or abandon prototypes of products and methods based on pilot data
- Mutual accountability for progress results shared by all partner organizations
- Cycles of improvement processes and structures being adopted as one way to ensure high-quality leader preparation programs

**Supporting evidence for phase 3 might include:**

- Redesigned program products and methods
- Formative assessment measures used
- Implementation data
- Written progress reports
- Observations of change implementation

### PHASE 4: ACCOMPLISHED

- Achieved intended purpose, goals, and objectives for the partnership initiative

**During phase 4 you would expect to see:**

- Partnership goals and objectives for the UPPI redesign initiative accomplished
- Mutual partner accountability for accomplishing shared goals demonstrated
- A collaborative culture among partner organizations that is characterized by trust, mutual respect, and shared decision-making
- Alignment of data and human resources systems across partner organizations
- Processes for recruiting and inducting new partners to engage in a continuous improvement process for high-quality leader training institutionalized
- Partnership consistently using its platform to broaden the impact of high-quality leader preparation
- Partnership consistently using its platform to influence the state policy environment
- An institutional expectation that partner collaboration and engagement be required in order to change school leader preparation and training practices

**Supporting evidence for phase 4 might include:**

- Intra-agency tracking systems
- Partner recruitment protocols
- Institutional sustainability commitments
- Changes in state policy
- Changes in institutional policy
### GUIDING QUESTION:

To what extent and in what ways have university providers re-envisioned their principal preparation programs?

### AREA OF INQUIRY #2: PROGRAM RE-ENVISIONING

#### EVIDENCE-BASED INDICATORS:

- Understand program and context challenges
- Generate change ideas that provide feasible solutions for addressing identified challenges
- Communicate compelling images of redesign outcomes that build support
- Use graphic representations as tools to communicate clear vision
- Increase support for program change among faculty and partners

#### Phase 1: Beginning

- Gaining a deeper understanding of the issues and perspectives associated with redesigning a program in a partnership environment

**Supporting evidence for phase 1 might include:**

- Literature reviews
- Baseline program assessment data
- Site visit observations

#### Phase 2: Emerging

- A shared vision of the proposed program changes is used to both guide the work and communicate redesign goals to others

**Supporting evidence for phase 2 might include:**

- A set of promising change ideas
- Observations of consensus building

#### Phase 3: Advancing

- Prototypes of promising change ideas are drafted and feedback collected on the viability of each prototype design

**Supporting evidence for phase 3 might include:**

- Logic models and other visualization tools
- Draft budgets, staffing needs, other resources

#### Phase 4: Accomplished

- Based on user feedback from prototype pilots and results from additional feasibility studies, prototypes are recommended for full development and implementation

**Supporting evidence for phase 4 might include:**

- Logic model presentation
- Field test results presentation
- Recommendation and rationale
## AREA OF INQUIRY #3: PROGRAM REDESIGN

### GUIDING QUESTION:
To what extent and in what ways do change ideas address gaps in content and instructional methods to improve program coherence?

### EVIDENCE-BASED INDICATORS:
- Curriculum audits
- Gap analyses of:
  - Course content
  - Instructional methods
  - Clinical practices
  - Assessment practices
- Product prototype development and predictions
- Prototype testing and analysis of feedback
- Adaptations of the final products to user needs

---

### Phase 1: Beginning
Using professional leader performance standards as the reference point, conduct a full audit of program curriculum to identify gaps in program content, instructional methods, and assessment measures.

#### Supporting Evidence for Phase 1 Might Include:
- Curriculum audit
- Gap analysis
- Curriculum management software

---

### Phase 2: Emerging
Understanding priority findings and generating feasible change ideas and measurable/observable action plans for addressing identified program gaps.

#### Supporting Evidence for Phase 2 Might Include:
- Priority findings
- Change idea goals and achievable action steps
- Design principles

---

### Phase 3: Advancing
Prototypes of change ideas drafted using design principles and tested with users for feedback on utility and value.

#### Supporting Evidence for Phase 3 Might Include:
- Prototypes of change ideas
- Feedback survey results
- Pilot predictions

---

### Phase 4: Accomplished
Final products developed and implemented to determine impact of change idea on aspiring candidate and instructor experiences.

#### Supporting Evidence for Phase 4 Might Include:
- Final change idea products
- Revised gap analyses
- Implementation survey data (candidate experience, instructor experience)
**Area of Inquiry #4: Project Management**

**Guiding Question:**
To what extent and how did the university-based project leads manage the redesign process?

**Evidence-Based Indicators:**
- Organizing and Planning
- Launching
- Executing and Progress Monitoring
- Reflecting and Assessing

### Phase 1: Beginning
**Organizing and Planning**

- Leading the development and implementation of a solid project plan to guide the work of the redesign team
- Actively recruiting redesign team members
- Negotiating MOUs with partner organizations
- Troubleshooting any issues that come up during the “pre” launch phase of the project related to logistics, program, and/or systems constraints

**Supporting Evidence for Phase 1 Might Include:**
- Project plan
- Redesign team recruitment strategy
- Signed MOUs

### Phase 2: Emerging
**Launching**

- Facilitating a series of organizational meetings and activities to introduce the program redesign challenge and initial scope of work
- Establishing protocols for communication and collaboration
- Facilitating the review of QM program self-assessment data to confirm area(s) of focus for the redesign work with the team
- Sharing leadership responsibilities for executing the plan with other members of the team in order to build ownership and commitment and to ensure more efficient execution
- Troubleshooting any issues that come up during the launch phase of the project related to logistics, program, and/or systems constraints

**Supporting Evidence for Phase 2 Might Include:**
- Meeting agendas
- Communication protocols
- Task assignments

### Phase 3: Advancing
**Executing and Monitoring**

- Collaborating with mentor programs and partners to execute and monitor the completion of redesign tasks
- Facilitating and recording discussions as a way to document the process and recall decisions made
- Monitoring progress on task assignments and tracking due dates to ensure that work is completed on time and within budget
- Communicating progress in an effort to maintain strong levels of engagement with redesign partners and faculty
- Troubleshooting any issues that come up during the execution and monitoring phase of the project related to logistics, program, and/or systems constraints

**Supporting Evidence for Phase 3 Might Include:**
- Meeting minutes/recordings
- Progress tracking tools
- Written communications to partners/faculty

### Phase 4: Accomplished
**Reflecting and Assessing**

- Assessing results for each phase of the project management process
- Reflecting on specific areas of strength and specific areas of challenge from a project management perspective
- Documenting strategies used in order to address similar challenges going forward
- Mitigating constraints (external or internal) that threatened to interfere/interfered with the accomplishment of project goals
- Disseminating a comprehensive report of progress and lessons learned from their principal preparation program redesign work

**Supporting Evidence for Phase 4 Might Include:**
- Reflections
- Written summary report
- Assessment results for each phase
- Areas of strength/challenge
**GUIDING QUESTION:**
What changes in candidates’ training experiences can be observed and measured within the five-year study time frame?

### Evidence-Based Indicators:
- Candidate Admissions
- Coursework
- Clinical Practice
- Assessment and Evaluation

### AREA OF INQUIRY #5: CHANGES IN CANDIDATE TRAINING EXPERIENCE

#### Guiding Question:
What changes in candidates’ training experiences can be observed and measured within the five-year study time frame?

#### Evidence-Based Indicators:
- Candidate Admissions
- Coursework
- Clinical Practice
- Assessment and Evaluation

#### Phase 1: Beginning
- **Candidate Admissions**
  - A redesigned recruitment strategy
  - Valid and reliable predictor assessments used as part of the applicant screening process
  - Measures for determining applicant interest in and commitment to leading a chronically low-performing school
  - Candidate screening as potential hires by partner school districts

#### Phase 2: Emerging
- **Coursework**
  - Specific and measurable learning goals and instructional methods that are behavior-oriented and explicitly linked to Professional Standards for Educational Leaders
  - Course designs that explicitly connect course content with instructional methods and performance assessment measures
  - Courses are organized and sequenced to reflect an intentional developmental progression over the duration of the program

#### Phase 3: Advancing
- **Clinical Practice**
  - Culturally responsive methods for developing leader competencies at the personal, instructional, and institutional levels
  - Internships that are co-designed by program faculty and prospective employers
  - Clinical practice placement protocols that ensure a high-quality clinical experience for every candidate
  - Clinical supervision criteria that are clearly defined and directly linked to the competencies being developed
  - High-quality feedback and coaching tools and processes to support the development of specific and measurable competencies

#### Phase 4: Accomplished
- **Assessment and Evaluation**
  - Policy changes that require candidates to demonstrate performance-based leader standards
  - Changes in certification and licensing standards that are performance-based
  - Changes in school districts’ eligibility requirements for principal/assistant principal positions
  - Changes in mentor requirements for new leader positions through induction
  - Changes in principal/assistant principal performance-based evaluations that align with professional standards

#### Supporting evidence for phase 1 might include:
- Predictor assessments
- Redesigned recruitment strategy
- School district screening measures

#### Supporting evidence for phase 2 might include:
- Candidate learning plans
- Curriculum designs
- Course scope and sequence

#### Supporting evidence for phase 3 might include:
- Culturally responsive methods
- Co-designed internship guidelines
- Clinical practice placement protocol
- Clinical supervision criteria

#### Supporting evidence for phase 4 might include:
- Revised school district, institutional, and state policies
- Revised certification and licensing standards
- Revised mentorship program for new principals
- Performance evaluations
### Area of Inquiry #6: Changes in Candidate Performance

#### Guiding Question:
What changes in candidates’ performance can be observed and measured within the five-year study time frame?

#### Evidence-Based Indicators:
- Candidate Admissions
- Coursework
- Clinical Practice
- Assessment and Evaluation

### Phase 1: Beginning
**Candidate Admissions**
- Applicants who demonstrate dispositions compatible with those of successful school leaders
- Applicants who demonstrate interest in and commitment to leading chronically low-performing schools
- Applications that meet or exceed rigorous admission standards
- Applicants who meet or exceed pre-admission screening criteria
- Increase in the number of highly qualified applicants being admitted to school leader training programs

**Supporting evidence for phase 1 might include:**
- Application data
- Screening assessment results
- Interview data

### Phase 2: Emerging
**Coursework**
- Candidates accomplishing specific and measurable learning goals
- Candidates demonstrating behaviors that reflect Professional Standards for Educational Leaders
- Candidates who meet or exceed coursework expectations on using performance-based assessment measures
- Candidates who reflect a continuum of developmental progression over the course of their training

**Supporting evidence for phase 2 might include:**
- Candidate learning goals
- Candidate learning plans
- Candidate assessment results

### Phase 3: Advancing
**Clinical Practice**
- Candidates who demonstrate culturally responsive competencies at the personal, instructional, and institutional levels
- Candidates who demonstrate appropriate decision-making in applying knowledge and skills to a comprehensive set of real school situations
- Candidates who demonstrate the ability to coach teachers on methods of effective instruction
- Candidates who demonstrate the ability to solve complex problems
- Candidates who respond to focused feedback and coaching that supports the ongoing development of specific and measurable competencies

**Supporting evidence for phase 3 might include:**
- Candidate cultural competency data
- Candidate documentation of clinical experiences

### Phase 4: Accomplished
**Assessment and Evaluation**
- Increases in the number of candidates who demonstrate exit competencies that reflect more rigorous performance-based leader standards
- Increases in the number of candidates who are certified and licensed by the state and then hired as principals or assistant principals
- Increases in the number of candidates meeting school districts’ eligibility requirements for principal/assistant principal position vacancies
- Increases in the number of candidates hired by school districts into leadership positions, who remain for 3 or more years
- Increases in the number of candidates who meet or exceed performance expectations for new leaders

**Supporting evidence for phase 4 might include:**
- Quantitative and qualitative data showing increases
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