

SURVEY OF CCSSO PRINCIPAL-FOCUSED ACTION GROUP PARTICIPANTS 2016-2017

SEPTEMBER 2017

**Derek L. Riley
Julie Meredith**



1120 20th Street NW, Suite 200N, Washington, DC 20036

Prepared for Council of Chief State School Officers

As evaluation partners to the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), Policy Studies Associates administered the following survey to participants in two school principal-focused action groups convened by the CCSSO over the 2016-17 school year. Each action group convened teams of state staff for a series of facilitated in-person meetings and webinars through which each state could develop and carry out action plans that identified a problem of practice and strategies for rapid implementation. Teams included state education agency (SEA) division directors, program managers, and line staff. Twenty-eight states joined the groups, with a shared interest in working on principal evaluation and support and/or principal professional learning.

The survey was administered to participants in the action groups in spring 2017. Fifty-five participants from twenty-five states responded to the survey, with a seventy percent response rate.

The purposes of the survey were to promote group participants' awareness and networking around shared priorities and to provide formative feedback to the CCSSO for future work with the state groups. The development of survey questions was informed by issues discussed by participants in group meetings, research in the field of school leadership, and input from CCSSO managers. Data from this survey is included in a September 2017 report titled "State Efforts to Strengthen School Leadership: Insights from CCSSO Action Groups."

Survey of CCSSO Principal-Focused Action Group Participants

The CCSSO has asked Policy Studies Associates to conduct a survey of state-level participants in its two principal-focused action groups—one focused on principal evaluation and support and one on principal professional learning. We intend this survey to directly benefit participating states in two ways: 1) we will report on state work and priorities to promote awareness and networking within the action groups and 2) we will provide CCSSO with specific feedback from states that can inform improvements to action group activities.

This survey is estimated to take 12-14 minutes to complete. Your individual responses will remain confidential and will not be identified outside of the study team. Responses about state work and priorities may be aggregated and shared at the state-level, but any feedback on CCSSO activities will be aggregated at the action group level (thereby masking respondents). Please give candid responses!

Background

1) Did you participate in any activities offered through the two CCSSO principal-focused action groups (e.g., webinars; in-person meetings in New Orleans, Las Vegas, and/or Tampa; action planning)?

- Yes
- No *[Skip to end of survey]*

2) Which, if any, of the following activities related to the Principal Evaluation and Support action group did you participate in? [Select all that apply.]

- Webinar – Kick-off September 8, 2016
- Webinar – November 3, 2016
- Webinar – December 1, 2016
- Development of action plan (i.e., “rapid prototype plan”)
- Webinar – January 12, 2017
- In-person Meeting – Las Vegas, February 16-17, 2017
- Webinar – March 30, 2017
- Other
- I did not participate in activities related to the Principal Evaluation and Support action group

3) Which, if any, of the following activities related to the Principal Professional Learning action group did you participate in? [Select all that apply.]

- Webinar – Kick-off August 29, 2016
- In-person Meeting – New Orleans, October 3-4, 2016
- Webinar – November 1, 2016
- Webinar – December 5, 2016
- Development of action plan (i.e., “problem-of-practice plan”)
- Webinar – January 12, 2017
- In-person Meeting – Tampa, February 7-8, 2017
- Webinar – March 14, 2017
- Other
- I did not participate in activities related to the Principal Professional Learning action group

Interactions with Other States

4) *[For respondents who selected activities in Q2 and Q3]* Related to these action groups, with which states: 1) have you had and 2) would you like to have substantive conversations about principal-related work? [Select all that apply in each column.]

	<u>I have had</u> substantive conversations	<u>I would like to have</u> substantive conversations
Alabama	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arizona	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arkansas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
California	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Connecticut	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Delaware	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Department of Defense	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Georgia	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hawai'i	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Idaho	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Iowa	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Kansas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Kentucky	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Louisiana	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Michigan	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mississippi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Missouri	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Nevada	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
New Jersey	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
North Carolina	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ohio	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pennsylvania	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Rhode Island	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
South Carolina	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tennessee	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Virgin Islands	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Washington	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Wisconsin	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

5) *[For respondents who selected activities in Q2 but not Q3]* Related to the Principal Evaluation and Support action group, with which states: 1) have you had and 2) would you like to have substantive conversations about principal-related work? [Select all that apply in each column.]

	<u>I have had</u> substantive conversations	<u>I would like to have</u> substantive conversations
California	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Georgia	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hawai'i	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Kentucky	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Michigan	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mississippi	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Missouri	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Nevada	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
New Jersey	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pennsylvania	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Rhode Island	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
South Carolina	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Washington	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Wisconsin	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6) *[For respondents who selected activities in Q3 but not Q2]* Related to the Principal Professional Learning action group, with which states: 1) have you had and 2) would you like to have substantive conversations about principal-related work? [Select all that apply in each column.]

	<u>I have had</u> substantive conversations	<u>I would like to have</u> substantive conversations
Alabama	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arizona	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arkansas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
California	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Connecticut	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Delaware	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Department of Defense	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Georgia	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Idaho	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Iowa	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Kansas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Kentucky	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Louisiana	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Michigan	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Missouri	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Nevada	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
New Jersey	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
North Carolina	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ohio	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Rhode Island	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tennessee	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Virgin Islands	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Wisconsin	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7) [For respondents who selected “would like to have substantive conversations” in Q4, 5, or 6] You indicated you were interested in future conversations with one or more states. Please tell us what you would like to talk about with the states you identified.

Areas of Past Progress and Current or Emerging Priority

The next 6 questions ask you identify areas of past progress and current priority for your state's principal-related work. Your answers are important and will inform action group participants and the CCSSO. Please select all that apply in each column.

8) Related to principal standards, which are your state's areas of:

	Past progress or accomplishment	Current or emerging priority
Developing or revising principal standards	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Aligning principal standards with PSEL	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Developing or revising assistant principal standards	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9) Related to principal preparation, which are your state's areas of:

	Past progress or accomplishment	Current or emerging priority
Revising administrator licensure requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Developing programs or resources for principal preparation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Revising accreditation process or criteria for principal preparation programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

10) Related to principal evaluation, which are your state's areas of:

	Past progress or accomplishment	Current or emerging priority
Developing or revising the principal evaluation system	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Aligning the principal evaluation system to leader standards	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Promoting the use of evaluation data for principal development	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

11) Related to principal support and professional development, which are your state's areas of:

	Past progress or accomplishment	Current or emerging priority
Developing programs or resources for the professional development of <u>novice</u> principals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Developing programs or resources for the professional development of <u>veteran</u> principals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Developing programs or resources to develop principals of <u>low-performing or hard-to-staff schools</u>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Developing programs or resources for principal mentoring or coaching	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improving principal capacity to provide feedback and develop teachers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Using Title II.A set-aside funds for principal development programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

12) Related to principal supervisors, which are your state's areas of:

	Past progress or accomplishment	Current or emerging priority
Developing or revising principal supervisor standards	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improving principal supervisor practices in the support and development of principals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improving principal supervisor implementation of the principal evaluation system	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

13) Related to principal-focused systems management, which are your state's areas of:

	Past progress or accomplishment	Current or emerging priority
Communicating state priorities and systems related to school leadership	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Getting stakeholder buy-in for principal support or evaluation systems	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Measuring implementation fidelity or outcomes of principal support or evaluation systems	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Building state capacity to administer principal support or evaluation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Coordinating across SEA divisions around principal support or evaluation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Integrating principal support or evaluation with ESSA school improvement plans	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

14) What are the 3 most prominent challenges in your state’s work related to principal development, evaluation, or professional learning? [Select up to THREE.]

- Limited support from state policymakers or prominent stakeholders (e.g., associations, large districts, the public, higher education, SEA colleagues)
- Limited state authority over district policy
- Variation in school or district context, size, or needs across the state
- Challenges in SEA capacity (e.g., number of staff, turnover, limited expertise)
- Limited communication or coordination across SEA units
- Uncertainties in federal or state policy or funding
- Limited existing resources
- Insufficient number of promising candidates for principal roles
- Other (please specify): _____

Feedback to CCSSO

15) We would like to know if you benefited from participation in the principal-focused action group(s). To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the benefits of participating in the group(s)? [Select one in each row.]

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
Overall, I benefited	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Helped me reinforce the importance of principal-related work with other state officials	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Helped me get new ideas from other states’ experiences	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Helped me get new ideas from experts or resources	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gave me time to collaborate with in-state colleagues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Provided assistance targeted toward my work or needs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Helped focus my attention on a specific problem or actionable piece of work (e.g., through an action plan)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

16) If possible, please give a brief example of something you gained, learned, or did differently related to your participation in a principal-focused action group.

17) The CCSSO is considering the design of future action groups, such as which activities to increase, continue, or decrease. Based on your experience, what do you recommend CCSSO does with each of the following action group activities? [Select one in each row.]

	Increase emphasis	Continue as is	Continue but modify	Decrease emphasis	Don't know
In-person meetings <u>overall</u>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Facilitated discussion with other states at <u>in-person meetings</u>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Presentations from other states at <u>in-person meetings</u>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Presentations or assistance from experts at <u>in-person meetings</u>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
State team time for state-specific work at in-person meetings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Virtual meetings <u>overall</u>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Facilitated discussion with other states <u>in virtual meetings</u>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Presentations from other states <u>in virtual meetings</u>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Presentations or assistance from experts <u>in virtual meetings</u>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cross-state work facilitated by CCSSO	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Action plan development and implementation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Individualized assistance or feedback from CCSSO or experts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Access to resources developed or curated by CCSSO	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

18) What are the most promising ways for CCSSO principal-focused action groups to ensure the usefulness of participation? [Select all that apply.]

- Provide accessible information about what each state is working on and has accomplished (e.g., brief overviews, links to resources)
- Provide policy briefs or guidance on specific issues identified by action groups
- Offer monthly “office hours” with CCSSO and/or other experts
- Offer “critical friends” virtual meetings to support implementation of your state plan
- Refine strategies that promote cross-state discussion and sharing
- Increase interaction during webinars
- Host calls with two or three states on shared priorities
- Increase need sensing or state input during CCSSO planning
- Provide agendas for meetings and/or webinars earlier
- Hold an in-person meeting to kick-off action group work
- Increase coordination across CCSSO action groups/offering
- Provide assistance in strategically planning my state's use of assistance from various providers (e.g., CCSSO, federal Content and Regional Comprehensive Centers, federal Regional Education Labs, National Governors Association, large research organizations, Wallace and other foundations)

19) [For respondents who selected “Provide assistance in strategically planning my state’s use of assistance from various providers” in Q18] Which sources of assistance do you believe could be very useful on principal-focused work?

- CCSSO
- Federal Content and Regional Comprehensive Centers
- Federal Regional Education Labs,
- National Governors Association
- Wallace Foundation
- A university
- Other (please specify): _____
- Other (please specify): _____
- Other (please specify): _____

20) In your own words, what recommendations do you have for future CCSSO action groups? Your recommendations can be specific or broad and might address types of activities, strategies for cross-state interaction, facilitation/delivery, resources, topics of focus, and so on.

State Participation in Action Groups

21) Do you believe your state has the right people participating in the action group(s)? We are interested in whether there is the needed representation of those who can inform, make, and carry out decisions related to action group work.

- Yes, the team has the right types of participants
- Somewhat, but the team would benefit from the inclusion of other types of participants
- No, the team is missing the types of participants that are essential to carry out its work
- I do not know

22) To help with CCSSO future planning, how essential are the following types of team members for principal action group work to be implemented meaningfully?

	Essential	Important	Less Important	Don't know
Cabinet-level staff (e.g. Asst Supt)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Director of division for evaluation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Director of division for C&I and/or PD	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Program manager or implementation staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Leader of regional delivery units (e.g., ESU, RPDC, BOCES, ESC, RSC, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Leader of state principal association	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Thank you for taking our survey. Your response is very important to us.