

# **Administrator Professional Certification**

*Candidate Handbook for Panel Presentations*

Updated July 2011



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>PROGRAM OVERVIEW</b>	<b>5</b>
Standards and Quality Evidence	5
Program Structure and Requirements	6
<b>CANDIDATE ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>6</b>
Integrated Products	6
Required Product	7
<b>PANELISTS</b>	<b>7</b>
Objectives	7
Purpose	7
Assessment Tools	7
Participation	7
Prerequisites	8
Qualities of Effective Panelists	8
<b>ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>PANEL PROCEDURES</b>	<b>9</b>
Procedures for Candidates Rated “Approaching”	10
<b>ATTACHMENT A</b>	
Washington Principal/Program Administrator Standards-Based Benchmarks	<b>13</b>
<b>ATTACHMENT B</b>	
Evidence Rubric: Evaluation of Products	<b>17</b>
<b>ATTACHMENT C</b>	
Panelist Notetaking Guide	<b>23</b>
<b>ATTACHMENT D</b>	
Score Report	<b>24</b>



## PROGRAM OVERVIEW

### Standards and Quality Evidence

Washington's Professional Certificate program for administrators is guided by state standards for administrator preparation and development, which are based on the national standards of the Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC). In Washington, these standards have been benchmarked at three levels: residency certificate, professional certificate, and career.

Standards, by their nature, are stated in fairly general terms, articulating a broad set of principles for effective practice. They identify *what* is important, but do not specify in detail exactly *how* those principles take concrete form in the everyday life of a school leader.

The Professional Level Benchmarks are not designed to be an exhaustive or final list, and should never be viewed as a checklist. School leadership is highly contextual, and each candidate in a Professional Certificate program has a unique work environment. Schools differ in many ways: they range from small to large, rural to urban, old to new. Each is embedded within a particular community having a particular makeup and set of values; each has its own unique history that influences current behaviors; and each is comprised of a unique set of individuals with their own values, beliefs, and personalities. Given those differences, there will never be a single right answer to the dilemmas of leadership.

Despite this, successful leadership is not random. Washington's leadership standards are supported by research and a broad professional consensus on what constitutes "best practice." The goal of the Professional Certificate program is to apply those principles to the leadership tasks facing candidates, and to provide a structured, reflective environment in which candidates can determine what "best practice" looks like in their school.

Increasingly, evidence for achievement of standards is being expressed in terms of outcomes. What the leader *does* is less important than what the leader *achieves*. Accordingly, the evidence presented should focus on the effect that good leadership has on the people, climate, and operations of the school. Evidence should clearly, consistently, and credibly show how the administrator has met each of the standards. This should require as little inference as possible. In order for the evidence to be convincing and credible, it needs to clearly show the administrator's work over time, in multiple aspects/areas of their work, and include stakeholder voice. Quality evidence helps answer the question "how do you know what you know?"

## **Program Structure and Requirements**

All Professional Certificate (ProCert) programs include the following three phases:

### Entry Seminar

The program provides an orientation to the process and to the benchmarks. The candidate completes a self-evaluation using a 360 instrument approved by your program. The candidate develops a Professional Growth Plan.

### Professional Growth Plan Implementation

The candidate gathers evidence on the benchmarks and develops capacity in the major areas of focus; this may include implementing new strategies and participating in a variety of professional development activities.

### Panel Presentation

The candidate presents evidence to a panel including practicing administrators.

## **CANDIDATE ASSESSMENT**

### **Integrated Products**

The demonstration of the standards will be highly contextual. That said, there are leadership priorities that are common regardless of situational differences. Because the standards are stated broadly, it can be challenging to link them in a meaningful way to the daily demands of administrators. For this reason, there are four Products that can help structure your thinking about how the standards relate to your work. The four Products are:

1. The Administrator as Advocate for Student Learning
2. The Administrator as Communicator and Change Agent
3. The Administrator as a Leader in Building Community
4. The Administrator as Manager of the Organization

Although these products are focused on specific dimensions of administrator work, they are not intended to be projects that go above and beyond your current work. They allow you to determine what you need to be working on, and merely provide a structured way of thinking about that work. Of these, Product 1 will serve as the basis for the presentation to the panel. The other three are available for candidate use as needed.

## **Required Product**

All candidates will complete Product 1: The Administrator as Advocate for Student Learning. Product 1 is based on Standard 2.

The Produce 1 Narrative is due from the program to PESB no later than two weeks prior to the panel presentation. Artifacts are not included in the narrative. The narrative is to be 10-12 pages in length. All three strands of Standard 2 must be addressed.

Sample Product 1 Narratives may be viewed at <http://www.k12.wa.us/certification/Administrator/ProCert-process.aspx>.

## **PANELISTS**

### **Objectives**

1. To assess Product 1 to determine if the candidate demonstrates “at standard” practice.
2. To recommend the candidate as approaching standard (residency level), meets standard (professional level), or exemplary (career level).

### **Purpose**

1. Accountability:  
The panel provides external validation of candidate performance.
2. System Improvement:  
The panel provides feedback to the candidate regarding professional growth. The panel also provides feedback to the university/Educational Service Districts (ESDs) for program improvement.
3. Collaboration:  
The panel provides a collaboration mechanism between practitioners, universities, ESDs, and the state.

### **Assessment Tools**

The panel will use the Panel Presentation Rubric and the Notetaking Guide to determine if the candidate demonstrates standard(s) at the approaching (residency/pre-service), met (professional), or exemplary (career) level.

### **Participation**

The panel will include at least three members. Every attempt will be made to have current building and district administrators comprise the majority of panelists. Representatives from approved Administrator ProCert Programs may also participate.

### **Prerequisites**

- Currently practicing administrator, recently retired administrator, or Administrator ProCert Program representative (principals and program administrators holding residency certificates are not eligible to serve as panelists). Panelists must live/work in Washington.

- Complete state training session
- No conflict of interest
  - Do not/have not supervised candidate
  - Do not work in same district
  - Are not faculty, adjunct faculty, or PEAB members for candidate's program

### **Qualities of Effective Panelists**

- Understand professional level standards and benchmarks
- Understand the ProCert process
- Have pre-read each candidates' Product 1 Narrative
- Have strong interpersonal skills (tact; friendliness; active listening; collaborative attitude)
- Observe confidentiality
- Are objective and open-minded
- Ask thoughtful questions
- Provide a fair review; not a "rubber stamp" or "tribunal"
- Answer the question "is the administrator demonstrating a positive impact on student learning and 'at standard' performance? How do we know?"

### **ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

- Panel Chair: The chair will facilitate the presentation and the team discussion.
- Panelists: Panelists will come prepared having read any advance materials. They will attend to the presentation and take notes. Panelists will be respectful of the candidates and of other panelists. They will maintain confidentiality and professionalism.
- Candidate: Candidates will send (via the program) their Product 1 Narrative at least two weeks prior to the panel. They will arrive prepared and with all necessary materials for the presentation. Candidates will follow the presentation timeline shown on the next page.
- Observers: Observers are limited to the following: panel members in training, ProCert program personnel, PEAB members, association representatives, and state representatives. Observers may take notes but shall not ask questions of candidates or make comments to the panelists. Panel members in training may attend all portions of the panel, including the panel discussion and feedback.

## **PANEL PROCEDURES**

A CPU, digital projector, and screen will be provided. Candidates are welcome to bring their own technology.

### **Candidate Presentation (25 minutes, including set up)**

- All three strands of Standard 2 must be addressed in the presentation.
- Candidates are not required to bring their complete portfolio for the presentation, only the artifacts (up to ten) that support the presentation.
- Candidates provide panelists with their contextual background such as school or district demographics.
- Candidates will share an overview of their key intervention, strategies, and evidence.
- Candidates must link their evidence directly to the positive impact it had on student learning and not rely on panel members to make inferences.
- Candidates must be clear on the extent of their leadership, for example, whether they had direct involvement vs. oversight. In other words, avoid the term “we” and instead name the group/person involved.

### **Panel Questions (15 minutes)**

- This question period is intended to solicit any further information needed to confirm the candidate meets the standards.
- Panelists will not use this time for discussion, feedback, or inquiry about points of interest. Panelists who may be intrigued or would like more information about a certain strategy or resource may discuss with the candidate following the panel.

### **Panel Discussion and Decision (10 Minutes)**

- The candidate and observers will exit the room during panel discussions.
- Discussion will begin with each panelist sharing recommended ratings for each standard and the key evidence seen/heard.
- With input from the panel, the chair will complete the Score Report.
  - The feedback will be constructive and specifically describe what was effective and/or areas for growth.
  - The panel may suggest resources or support for areas of growth.
  - Feedback will be directly related to either the standards, quality of evidence, or overall organization.
  - The panel may also provide strategies/resources to further enhance or improve areas that are already at standard.

### **Panel Feedback and Discussion with Candidate (10 Minutes)**

- The panel chair will summarize the panel’s feedback and provide a copy of the Score Report form to the candidate.

## **PowerPoints**

Using PowerPoint slides during a presentation is not required, but it is highly encouraged. Candidates should consider:

- The audience is comprised of experienced administrators from across the state. They understand the criteria in Standard 2. However, they may or may not be aware of the specifics of your intervention.
- Limiting the words on the page
- Including pictures and graphics, but limiting distractions such as moving objects.
- Most presentation rooms will not have wireless access. Embedded video may not work.
- Using quotes from students and/or staff to show positive impact and stakeholder voice is a valid source of evidence, although it cannot stand alone.
- Providing trend data/show data over time to demonstrate impact on student learning. Take note – the inability to do so clearly is a major factor leading to being scored at the approaching level.
- Bringing a hard copy of the PowerPoint for each panelist. Should the power go out during the presentation, the show will go on!

## **Artifacts**

Bring one copy of your artifacts for each panelist, up to ten artifacts total. While there is not a page limitation, do keep in mind that the panelists need to be able to read this documentation while listening to your presentation.

Fancy binders are not needed, a staple in the upper left corner is sufficient. Do not bring one set of materials for the panelists to share. Evidence on a poster of presentation board is acceptable as long as it is easily readable by all panelists.

Consider what artifacts best support your intervention. Trying to show the panel *everything* you did to meet the standard is not recommended.

Label your artifacts, including standard and strand addressed. Add page numbers for quick reference. It is most effective to order the artifacts in the order of your presentation.

One of the major reasons candidates are rated as approaching is a lack of student-based data. Be sure your artifacts show student data over time. Also, be sure that the number of students tracked is representative. In a large comprehensive high school, tracking twenty students over time may not be a representative sample (depending on the focus of your intervention), but it might be in a small private school.

## **Procedures for Candidates Rated “Approaching”**

Candidates rated as approaching on Standard 2 will present to a second panel. The candidate will first work with the program for help with remediation.

The second panel will have a copy of the original score report so they can judge if the deficiencies have been met. The panel will only rate the approaching strands of Standard 2. Although the scope of the second panel presentation may be limited in the number of strands focused on, candidates will still have the full presentation time of 25 minutes.

Candidates must provide a full Product 1 narrative to the program a minimum of two weeks prior to the panel presentation. The narrative will be provided to the panel as background materials for the presentation.



# **Attachment A**

Washington Principal/Program Administrator Standards-Based Benchmarks



## STANDARD 2

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by **advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.**

### ***Strand 1 Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture***

#### Pre-Service (Residency Certificate)

Understands that student learning is the fundamental purpose of schools. Identifies the features of a site-specific culture. Analyzes how the school culture affects student learning. Uses a variety of skills and strategies to design systems that respect and support a culture of diversity in order to promote success of all students. Engages in the creation or implementation of a School Improvement Plan that supports a culture of continuous learning.

#### Professional Certification

Identifies the site-specific culture within the broader context of the district-wide culture. Creates a School Improvement Plan that utilizes skills and strategies to assure students and parents from diverse racial, ethnic, cultural, and language groups work together cooperatively to develop a group identity that promotes the success of all students. Uses understanding of the school and district culture to analyze the ways current systems and programs, including technology, are affecting student learning.

#### Career

Empowers the stakeholders to define, maintain, and monitor the ways in which the site-specific culture is affecting student learning. Collaborates with other administrators to give and receive feedback on effectiveness of expectations, implementation, respect and fairness in improving the overall systems and programs reflective of the school learning culture.

### ***Strand 2 Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining student learning***

#### Pre-Service (Residency Certificate)

Understands theories of how student learning is structured for understanding, learning experiences are designed to engage and support all students in learning, assessment is used to direct learning, effective learning environments are maintained, and students are prepared to live and work in our changing world. Knows how to use a continuous cycle of analysis and technology to ensure that all students have equitable opportunities to learn and to meet high standards.

#### Professional Certification

Uses EALRS, GLEs, research, assessment data, and district recommendations to help make district-wide curriculum decisions as well as site-specific curriculum decisions.

Uses classroom-based assessment, district achievement, state measures, and demographic data to identify the barriers to student learning to ensure that all students have equitable opportunities to learn and to meet high standards.

### Career

Establishes role as instructional leader. Supports skillful teaching that empowers students to take ownership of and to monitor their learning processes. Builds greater capacity for system support for student learning in collaboration with parents, peers, and district staff.

## ***Strand 3 Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining Professional Development***

### Pre-Service (Residency Certificate)

Understands process for using data to create professional development systems. Understands that professional development is embedded within a continuous learning process, including technology proficiency. Knows processes for effective use of School Improvement Plans to support professional development. Knows processes for coaching teachers and conducting staff evaluation using a professional growth plan to improve student learning.

### Professional Certification

Uses a continuous cycle of analysis to create and monitor professional development systems that have a positive impact on student learning. Takes responsibility for effectively supervising and coaching staff to ensure only quality educators are in the classroom. Supports staffs' capacity to use technology to analyze student learning data to establish building goals and direct creation of professional growth plans. Uses professional growth plans to conduct staff evaluations.

### Career

Focuses staff dialogue on student learning using a variety of sources of information. Facilitates systems that focus staff on reflection, collaboration, and peer mentoring to support successful completion of teachers' professional growth plans. Builds staff leadership in creating and maintaining student-centered building goals. Learns from and with peers to gather and interpret data to build greater capacity for professional development support.

# **Attachment B**

Panel Presentation Rubric



### Administrator Professional Certification Panel Presentation Rubric

Elements	Approaching - 1	Meets - 2	Exceeds - 3
Narrative	<p>Narrative does not address all the guiding questions, is limited in depth and detail in the reflection and analysis. There are spelling and grammatical errors present in the document. Some information may not be adequately explained, such as acronyms. The candidate’s specific role in the intervention is unclear.</p>	<p>Narrative includes clear responses to the guiding questions with adequate depth and detail in the reflection and analysis. There are no significant spelling/grammatical errors. All questions in the narrative template are fully addressed. There is clarity on the candidate’s role in the intervention.</p>	<p>Narrative includes clear and specific responses to all guiding questions with significant depth and detail in the reflection and analysis. The candidate writes clearly and professionally. All questions in the narrative template are fully addressed. There is clarity on the candidate’s role in the intervention.</p>
Artifacts (with copies for all panelists)	<p>Data/artifacts are less convincing/credible, are limited and demonstrate one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lack of relationship to contextual needs/school improvement goal(s)</li> <li>○ No positive impact on student learning or reflection/analysis if impact was not positive</li> <li>○ Single context</li> <li>○ One-time only data/information</li> <li>○ No relationship to school improvement</li> <li>○ Limited stakeholder voice.</li> <li>○ Evidence/data not apparent for all strands of Standard 2.</li> </ul> <p>Candidate does not align data/information, has weak rationale, or does not demonstrate positive impact on learning or reflective analysis. Candidate reflection/next steps are minimal.</p>	<p>Data and artifacts combine to present substantiated evidence that show:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Alignment with contextual needs and alignment with school improvement goal(s)</li> <li>○ Positive impact on student learning or reflection/analysis if impact was not positive</li> <li>○ Different contexts</li> <li>○ Data collected at multiple points/over time</li> <li>○ Relate to school improvement</li> <li>○ Stakeholder voice</li> <li>○ Data presented addresses two or more of the following: achievement, demographic, perceptual, contextual.</li> <li>○ Evidence/data for each strand of Standard 2</li> </ul> <p>Candidate uses data to convincingly substantiate claims of positive impact on learning or reflective analysis about the data and next steps.</p>	<p>Data and artifacts combine to present substantiated evidence that show:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Alignment with contextual needs and alignment with school improvement goal(s)</li> <li>○ Positive impact on student learning</li> <li>○ Different contexts</li> <li>○ Data collected at multiple points/over time</li> <li>○ School improvement</li> <li>○ Stakeholder voice</li> <li>○ Achievement, demographic, perceptual, and contextual data</li> <li>○ Evidence/data for each strand of Standard 2</li> </ul> <p>Candidate triangulates data/information to demonstrate rationale and positive impact on learning or reflective analysis about the data and has identified specific next steps.</p>



Elements/Expectations	Approaching - 1	Meets - 2	Exceeds – 3
Panel Presentation	<p>Competencies demonstrated clearly align with a majority of the strands/descriptors at the Residency Level. Candidate has professional growth goals aligned to the Residency Level of the state standards. The data provided is not a representative sample of the candidate’s students. Candidate does not articulate the ability to make a positive impact on student learning. Candidate is unable to provide adequate information in response to panel questions. Data is insufficient to substantiate claims.</p>	<p>Candidate demonstrates competency in each of the strand/descriptors at the Professional Level. Candidate has professional goals aligned to the Professional Level of the state standards. Candidate is specific and clear in response to panel questions. Data provided is an adequate representative sample of the candidate’s students. Data presented adequately supports claims. If the data does not show a positive impact on student learning, the candidate is able to clearly state future plans that will likely show student growth.</p>	<p>Competencies demonstrated clearly align with a majority of the strands/descriptors at the Career Level. Candidate has clear and specific professional goals aligned to the Career Level of the state standards. Data provided demonstrates depth and significance in the impact of learning on students. Data presented strongly supports claims. Candidate skillfully and professionally links the data to positive impact on student learning. Candidate is able to be specific and clear in response to panel questions.</p>

# **Attachment C**

## Panelist Notetaking Guide



Professional Certification for Administrators  
Notetaking Guide

Candidate Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**Standard 2: Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.**

Standards/Criteria	Notes/Evidence Presented
<p><b>1 Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies <b>site-specific culture</b> within the broader context of the district wide culture.</li> <li>Creates a School Improvement Plan that utilizes skills and strategies to assure students and parents from diverse racial, ethnic, cultural, and language groups work together cooperatively to develop <b>a group identity that promotes the success of all students.</b></li> <li>Uses understanding of the school and district culture to analyze the ways current systems and programs, including technology, are affecting <b>student learning.</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Questions to Ask:</b></p>
<p><b>2 Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining student learning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uses EALRS, GLEs, research, assessment data, and district recommendations to help make district wide curriculum decisions as well as site-specific <b>curriculum decisions.</b></li> <li>Uses classroom-based assessment, district achievement, state measures, and demographic data to identify the barriers to student learning to ensure that all students have <b>equitable opportunities</b> to learn and to meet high standards.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Questions to Ask:</b></p>
<p><b>3 Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining Professional Development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uses a <b>continuous cycle of analysis</b> to create and monitor professional development systems that have a positive impact on student learning.</li> <li>Takes responsibility for <b>effectively supervising and coaching</b> staff to ensure only quality educators are in the classroom.</li> <li>Supports staffs' capacity to use <b>technology</b> to analyze student learning data to establish building goals and direct creation of professional growth plans.</li> <li>Uses <b>professional growth plans</b> to conduct staff evaluations.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Questions to Ask:</b></p>
<p><b>Use this notetaking guide and the Administrator Professional Certificate Rubric to recommend a score for Standard 2.</b> Score: 1=Approaching, 2=Met, 3=Exemplary</p>	<p><b>Standard 2 Score (required):</b></p>

# Attachment D

Score Report

Administrator Professional Certification  
Score Report

Candidate Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Score:**

Write consensus score of 1 (approaching – residency benchmarks); 2 (met – professional benchmarks); or 3 (exemplary – career benchmarks)

**Standard II Score:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments and Feedback:**

Strengths:

What we would need to see to be more convinced: *(label each comment by strand if approaching)*

Suggested resources for further information (research, people, professional development etc):

**Panelist Signatures**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name