

ADMINISTRATOR AND COUNSELOR RECRUITMENT, PREPARATION, AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

INTRODUCTION

Effective administrative leaders and school counselors are crucial to the development of multiple pathways approaches. This chapter addresses some of the key issues in the preparation and professional development of administrators and counselors. The chapter discusses the skills and competencies necessary for administrative leaders and counselors in multiple pathways programs.

Administrative Leadership

Demographics

Although California has a fairly large administrative workforce (27,846 in 2008-2009), little is known about this group's characteristics (DataQuest, 2009). California administrators include superintendents, principals, and superintendent/principals (Edsource, 2007). Of these, approximately 60 percent are female, and 40 percent are male.

Drawing California data from a nationwide study on administrators conducted by Darling-Hammond and Orphanos, the Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning (CFTL) released a report on California school principals in February 2009. Of the 1,086 elementary and secondary principals the authors surveyed, 189 were from California. The responses of the California principals were similar to those of principals across the country. They had typically 15 years of prior teaching experience (14 nationally), 58 percent had served as assistant principals (59 percent nationally), and across the country elementary principals were more likely to be women, and secondary principals were more likely to be men. The report states that only 22 percent of the high school principals in California plan to stay in their jobs until retirement (Darling-Hammond & Orphanos, 2007).

Currently, there are no comprehensive studies of California's administrator workforce. However, we know that in certain areas of the state, the student enrollment rates are increasing, while at the same time, the current "baby boomer" administrator workforce is aging and moving closer to retirement. Therefore, *potentially* at the time more administrators will be needed in certain counties due to increasing enrollments, higher rates of administrators will be leaving the workforce due to retirement.

The Administrator's Job in California

Leadership is a balancing act for both superintendents and principals; they must be business managers, community leaders, and instructional leaders, holding themselves and others accountable for student success. Tension exists between leading to fulfill a vision (long term)

and managing day-to-day operations (Edsource, 2007). The National Governors Association (NGA) described three modes of principal leadership: the entrepreneur, the organizer, and the instructional leader. The entrepreneur develops and sustains a focus on instructional improvement and student learning while protecting teachers from external intrusions. The organizer brings innovative individuals, ideas, programs, and strategies to improve teaching, along with engaging parents and community, into a coherent effort. The instructional leader builds data-driven communities that hold all individuals accountable for student learning and instructional improvement, using time and resources for teacher professional development (National Governors Association, 2003).

The CFTL describes the job of California principals as tough and getting tougher: “To function as effective leaders, principals must be much more than able fiscal and operations managers. They must be able to recognize, shape and support strong instruction and to develop the kinds of organizations that create a culture of learning for students and teachers alike” (Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning, 2009).

Darling-Hammond and Orphanos (2007) write that the demands on principals are greater in California than in other states because of high pupil to staff ratios, less support from their districts, the high cost of living coupled with the low per-pupil expenditures, and lower staffing levels requiring principals to “wear many hats.” California principals may also be challenged with serving more students living in poverty and English learners, who are seriously at risk of academic failure if they do not receive substantial help. More and more, principals are being called upon to lead significant reform efforts, and many report feeling under prepared to meet these challenges (Darling-Hammond & Orphanos, 2007). Required testing and API performance measures, especially in underperforming schools, result in great pressure on school principals. Multiple pathways implementation is no exception, and it will require principals to work differently and, in some cases, to take on new responsibilities.

Skills and Competencies Necessary for Leaders of Pathways

Successful implementation of multiple pathways approaches will require administrators, teachers, and counselors who are prepared to provide instruction, guidance, and support to students in academic courses, in CTE courses, and with work-based learning. The *California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs)* includes a provision for candidates to know how to strengthen the school through community, business, institutional, and civic partnerships (California School Leadership Academy, 2001). To implement multiple pathways, administrators need to understand networking and collaborating with industries and businesses in their communities. The current credentialing programs may not go far enough to adequately prepare administrators to work in multiple pathways programs.

While it is commonly accepted that all administrators need to be leaders committed to high-quality, rigorous instruction, an added dimension of instructional leadership is of particular importance to implement multiple pathways programs. Administrators must master content knowledge in specific subject matter and the pedagogy needed for students to learn the subject matter (Stein & Nelson, 2003). Administrators of pathways programs must be committed to and understand how to bridge the divide that traditionally exists between career and technical content

and academic content. The successful administrator must understand the value of theory and application in both domains and how they add value to each other when integrated.

Further, district administrators need to know how principals and teachers learn in order to provide an effective organizational environment that supports teachers and others to work collectively, and to learn from one another. Thus, the instructional leader in multiple pathways programs has to provide the collaboration time, structures, and strategies for academic and CTE teachers to work together and to participate in professional development.

The successful administrator of multiple pathways programs must collaborate with industry, labor, business, and postsecondary education partners to design programs and provide internships for students. The administrator should model strategies for engagement and collaboration by engaging students, parents, and the community and fostering collaboration among teachers.

In its work on multiple pathways, ConnectEd has defined a fully developed pathway as having leadership that is shared across a team consisting of the principal, program director, teachers, and business and community partners. The leadership team is expected to collaborate effectively in planning, implementing, and sustaining the multiple pathways program. In addition, leaders should be motivated to develop and maintain a high-quality pathways program (LaPlante & Stearns, 2008).

For example, Mt. Diablo Unified School District participates in the Contra Costa Workforce Development Task Force, a county collaborative that is integral to its multiple pathways program. The task force provides speakers and sponsors a business-education collaborative. Mt. Diablo administrators consider this collaborative an important resource for preparing district and school administrators, as well as teacher leaders, to work effectively in multiple pathways. Its staff meets regularly with a countywide group of educators, bringing back what they have learned to their respective sites within the district. Mt. Diablo views this resource as helping it create a sense of urgency to improve its high schools, building a shared vision, and informing parents. Regular meetings of the principals with district administrators are a key strategy for moving the district forward.

Administrator Preparation

While leadership is critical to successful multiple pathways programs, as it is for any educational program, no specific preparation programs are available to district administrators or high school principals for implementing multiple pathways (Grubb, 2008). Credentialing for California administrators involves an initial preparation or pre-service program that includes coursework and field experiences. It also includes two years of participation in an induction program or on-the-job training. In addition, professional development for credentialed administrators is limited.

Induction. Conventional wisdom suggests that support for beginning administrators is desirable, yet there is little research demonstrating what type of learning opportunities enable principals to become more effective. Induction for administrators is mentioned in the CCTC *Standards for Quality and Effectiveness for Administrative Services Credentials*. However, these standards

leave the design of the induction to the candidate, the credential supervisor, and a district mentor. Specifications are not provided. The standards allow excellence to assume different forms in different environments, and the judgment of whether a program meets the standards is left to professionals trained to interpret them.

In California, the New Administrator Program (NAP) is one induction option for first- and second-year principals. NAP is a joint project of the New Teacher Center at UC Santa Cruz in partnership with the Association for California School Administrators (ACSA). The New Teacher Center also trains principal coaches through the Coaching Leaders to Attain Student Success (CLASS) program.

Another induction option for new principals is the Educational Leadership Development Academy (ELDA) in the School of Leadership and Education Sciences at the University of San Diego. ELDA was created in partnership with the San Diego Unified School District and funded by the Eli Broad Foundation. The ELDA New Leaders Program provides coursework and support for site leaders who are in their first or second year of school administration. Novice administrators take university coursework, and each student has a mentor who supports, guides, and counsels him or her through the critical early years of administration. Mentors and the novices meet regularly to discuss instructional and operational issues and to strengthen practice. Coursework in the New Leaders program is aligned with the *CPSELS*.

The induction programs do not provide an explicit emphasis on preparing these administrators to work effectively in multiple pathways programs or integrate CTE approaches (Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson, 2005).

Ongoing Professional Development

There is a need for *leadership* development for principals and other administrators to be effective in multiple pathways. Strong leadership development programs provide:

- Research-based content focused on learning, quality instruction, professional learning, organizational development, data analysis, change management, and leadership skills
- Curricular coherence that links goals, learning activities, and candidate assessments based on standards for leadership competence
- Problem-based learning methods that connect theory and practice, and teach both problem-framing and problem-solving techniques
- Cohort groups that encourage collaboration and teamwork
- Collaboration between the program and school districts so the program is linked to the school's efforts
- Field-based internships or coaching that connect intellectual and practical work under the guidance of a coach who can model, guide reflection, and provide feedback (Darling-Hammond & Orphanos, 2007)

Similar characteristics of high-quality professional development for principals were outlined by the NGA and included:

- Focus on student learning and the specific problems practitioners face.
- Reinforce and sustain group work and collaboration among teachers, principals, and district personnel.
- Link directly with day-to-day work in schools and classrooms.
- Sustain a consistency of focus over time.
- Use feedback from teaching and learning to inform program development and evaluation. (National Governors Association, 2003)

Darling-Hammond and Orphanos (2007) discuss the limited professional development available for California school administrators. For the most part, principals must pay for their ongoing professional development. The primary professional development program the state sponsors is AB 430 (Nava), Administrator Training Program, for school principals and vice-principals to administer the state-approved curriculum. Now in Tier III flexibility, this program is voluntary, except for principals and vice-principals who work in schools identified for state intervention for improvement. This training does not address helping principals implement multiple pathways.

The California School Leadership Academy (CSLA), a successful state resource and program for training administrators, was nationally recognized for its quality. Other states have adapted the CSLA model, but the California program has been eliminated (Darling-Hammond & Orphanos, 2007).

ACSA recommends additional state-level funding for local professional development programs for teachers, counselors, and administrators; expansion of the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program to include CTE, incentive funding for local CTE planning, and the development of CTE internships. In addition, ACSA recommends that a CTE component be added to professional development programs for administrators (Association of California School Administrators, 2008). It is important to note, however, that these programs are all impacted by Tier III flexibility.

The NGA brief emphasizes that states have limited influence over professional development for principals, since most professional development occurs at the district level. However, NGA recommends that states can hold professional development providers accountable to the standards of high-quality professional development programs. The National Staff Development Council also has standards that could guide the development of such programs. States will need to develop common delivery and performance expectations and work closely with districts and providers to implement the expectations, and to provide incentives for practicing principals to participate in the improved programs.

For the statewide implementation of multiple pathways, California will need to establish more induction and professional development programs for principals that fulfill the standards and recommendations above, with the additional condition that these programs be developed to address the competencies and skills that administrators need to implement multiple pathways programs.

SCHOOL COUNSELORS

Counselor Demographics and Senate Bill 1802

School counseling programs in California have made substantial improvements since 2003. However, California has limited means to collect data on school counselors, and no comprehensive studies of these professionals currently exist to accurately determine supply, demand, and distribution.

The California *Education Code 49600* states that the “governing board of any school district may provide a comprehensive educational counseling program for all pupils enrolled the schools of the district.” In 2003 the *AB 722 Study of Pupil Personnel Ratios, Services and Programs* showed California was facing severe challenges with student support. It stated, “The major difficulties in attracting and retaining credentialed pupil support services personnel are lack of adequate funding and district budget limitations” (CDE, 2003). In 2005, California, and Los Angeles Unified School District in particular, were harshly criticized in reports concerning California’s high levels of dropouts. In response, Senate Bill 1802 was passed in 2006, providing supplemental funding to California districts to increase the number of middle and high school counselors.

The Supplemental School Counseling Program (SSCP) for grades seven through twelve constituted a major reform in California’s educational system. The program’s intent was to improve the ratio of students to counselors to 500:1 for middle schools and 300:1 in high schools. For 2008-2009, 29,668 counselors are working in California, up from 24,895 five years ago (DataQuest, 2009).

A California Research Bureau survey of middle and high school counselors found that 90 percent of them received their school counseling credential in California, which requires that they have demonstrated expertise in academic, personal/social, and career development counseling. In addition, 60 percent of counselors possessed additional credentials for teaching, administration, or specialized credentials or a certificate to work with a particular group of students (e.g., reading specialist, special education, bilingual education, or CTE) (de Cos, 2009).

Although SB 1802 (Chesbro) made a positive impact, in response to the state’s economic crisis, SSCP funds were among the state categorical programs placed in Tier III flexibility (CDE, 2003). These flexibility provisions authorize local educational agencies to use these categorical funds for any educational purpose over a five-year period ending July 1, 2013. Although the numbers of school counselors affected by these changes will not be known until the fall California Basic Educational Data System reporting cycle, indicators are that many school counselors who were funded by SB 1802 lost their jobs.

California's Results-Based School Counseling and Student Support

In 2006, the CCTC provided the following description of the primary roles of school counselors in California:

The primary roles of school counselors are to provide educational counseling services in grades 12 and below, including preschool, and in programs organized primarily for adults. Those services would include the following: develop, plan, implement and evaluate a school counseling and guidance program that includes academic, career, personal and social development; advocate for the high academic achievement and social development of all students; provide schoolwide prevention and intervention strategies and counseling services; provide consultation, training and staff development to teachers and parents regarding students' needs; and supervise a district-approved advisory program as described in *Education Code* Section 49600 (Pupil Personnel Services Credential Programs: School Counseling, School Psychology, School Social Work, Child Welfare and Attendance, 2006).

In 2007 the CDE released the *California Results-Based School Counseling and Student Support Guidelines*. The document aligns with California law, follows the framework of the American School Counselor Association's National Model for School Counseling Programs, and helps districts to establish school counseling and student support teams that include home and community resources to provide support for students to succeed. It also provides guidelines for districts to use data to design, intervene, and evaluate school counseling services to students (CDE, 2007).

The CDE guidelines clearly state that school counseling programs should provide guidance, counseling, and student support in academic, career, and personal/social development. The academic domain "centers on supporting and helping students to experience academic success, produce high-quality work, and be prepared for a full range of options and opportunities after high school. The academic area includes acquiring skills in decision making, problem solving, and goal setting" (CDE, 2007, p. 11). The career domain "provides the foundation for students to develop skills, attitudes, and knowledge that facilitate the transition from school to the world of work and from various jobs across the life career span in today's modern workforce. Within this domain students may explore career interests and options, participate in service-learning projects, perform apprenticeships, and plan and pursue postsecondary study" (CDE, 2007, p. 11).

From 2005 through 2007, the California Association of School Counselors (CASC) led an effort to develop standards of practice for school counselors in California. CASC reported that local expectations for school counselors and their role sometimes directly contradicted the training counselors received in their preparation programs. Despite the increase in counselors hired throughout the state due to SB 1802, at least 29 percent of California school districts had no counseling programs. Further, when new school counselors were hired, many of them received job descriptions that severely limited their ability to offer the services and programs they were trained to provide (California Association of School Counselors, Inc., 2007). The standards were developed to provide guidelines for districts and schools to use school counselors more

effectively. These documents established that academic and career counseling were key responsibilities for school counselors.

The California Research Bureau, however, provided their survey results of middle and high school counselors in California that indicate there is room for improvement with school counseling services (de Cos, 2009). An overwhelming majority of respondents indicated familiarity with the national standards for school counseling programs and SB 1802. For those familiar with SB 1802 and who had received funding, the schools had changed the number of school counselors employed, extended their counseling services, and supplemented their career guidance programs. However, less than half of the respondents indicated familiarity with the state's career technical education standards and the national Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS) foundation skills and competencies for employment (de Cos, 2009). Approximately 50 percent of the responding principals and counselors indicated they offered a career development curriculum. Of the high school level respondents, 70 percent reported that their schools offered a career development curriculum. Slightly more counselors (71 percent) than principals (61 percent) indicated that their school counseling program provided career counseling.

CONCLUSION

Successful implementation of multiple pathways will depend on skilled administrators who are prepared to partner with industry, business, and community partners; and counselors who are prepared to collaborate with teachers to provide guidance and support to students in both the academic and career domains. California has a number of challenges to overcome to prepare and retain the number of administrators and counselors who can fulfill these roles.

REFERENCES

- Association of California School Administrators. (2008, February). Career Technical Education Position Paper. Retrieved July 18, 2009 from <http://www.acsa.org/FunctionalMenuCategories/Media/TalkingPoints/CTE/CTEPositionPaper08.aspx>.
- California Association of School Counselors, Inc. (2007). *The California standards for the school counseling profession*. San Bernardino, CA: Author.
- California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2001). *Standards of quality and effectiveness for administrative services credentials*. Sacramento: Author
- California Department of Education. (2003). *Assembly bill 722 study of pupil personnel ratios, services, and programs*. Sacramento: Author.
- California Department of Education. (2007). *California results-based school counseling and student support guidelines*. Sacramento: Author.
- Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning. (2008). *California's teaching force: Key issues and trends 2008*. Santa Cruz, CA: Author.
- Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning. (2009). *Strengthening California's system for preparing and supporting principals: Lessons from exemplary programs*. Santa Cruz, CA: Author.
- California School Leadership Academy. (2001). *California professional standards for educational leaders*. San Francisco: WestEd. Retrieved August 8, 2009 from http://www.wested.org/online_pubs/cpsel_standards.pdf

- LaPlante, A. & Stearns, R. (2008). *Multiple pathways program assessment rubric*. Berkeley, CA: ConnectEd: The California Center for College and Career.
- Darling-Hammond, L. & Orphanos, S. (2007, March). *Leadership development in California*. Institute for Research on Education Policy and Practice. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.
- DataQuest. (2009, September 16). Retrieved September 10, 2009 from the California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit, website: <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>
- Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M.A., & Meyerson, D. (2005). *School leadership study: Preparing successful principals. Review of Research*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Educational Leadership Institute, Stanford University. Retrieved October 12, 2009 from http://www.srnleads.org/data/pdfs/sls/sls_rr.pdf
- de Cos, P. L. (2009). *The careers project: Survey of representatives of business and industry in California*. Sacramento: California Research Bureau.
- DuFour, R. (2001). In the right context: The effective leader concentrates on a foundation of programs, procedures, beliefs, expectations, and habits. *Journal of Staff Development*, 22(1). Retrieved August 22, 2009 from <http://www.nsd.org/news/getDocument.cfm?articleID=297>
- EdSource. (2007, November). *Superintendents and Principals: Charting the Paths to School Improvement*. Mountain View, CA: Author.
- Elmore, R. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Washington, DC. Albert Shanker Institute. Retrieved August 25, 2009 from <http://www.ashankerinst.org/downloads/building.pdf>
- Firestone, W. A., Mangin, M. M., Martinez, C. M., & Polovsky, T. (2005). Leading coherent professional development: A comparison of three districts. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41(3), 413-448. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fullan, M. (2002, May). The change leader. *Educational Leadership*, 59(8), 16-20. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Retrieved September 13, 2009 from http://www.cdl.org/resource-library/articles/change_ldr.php
- Futernick, K. (2007). *A possible dream: Retaining California teachers so all students learn*. Sacramento: The Center for Teacher Quality, California State University. Retrieved September 17, 2009 from: http://www.calstate.edu/teacherquality/documents/possible_dream_exec.pdf
- Grubb, W.N. (2008). Challenging the Deep Structure of High School: Weak and Strong Versions of Multiple Pathways. In Oakes, J., and Saunders, M. (Eds.), *Beyond tracking: Multiple pathways to college, career, and civic Participation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Little Hoover Commission. (2007, November). *Career technical education: Creating options for high school success*. Sacramento: Author.
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices Issue Brief: Improving Teaching and Learning by Improving School leadership. (2003). Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved September 16, 2009 from: <http://www.nga.org/Files/pdf/091203LEADERSHIP.pdf>
- Pupil Personnel Services Credential Programs: School Counseling, School Psychology, School Social Work, Child Welfare and Attendance. (2006, January). Retrieved August 19, 2009 from <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/credentials/leaflets/cl606c.pdf>
- Stein M.K. & Nelson, B. (2003). Leadership content knowledge. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25(4), 423-449. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Weschler, M.E. and Shields, P. M. (2008). *Teaching quality in California: A new perspective to guide policy*. Santa Cruz, CA: Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning.
- WestEd. (2006). A Statewide Assessment of California's Technical Education System. San Francisco: WestEd for the California Department of Education and the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.