

**CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF URBAN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS (CAUSA)
SACRAMENTO, CA (HOSTED BY SAN JUAN PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS ASSOCIATION)
EMBASSY SUITES, SCHOOL HOUSE MEETING ROOM**

MEETING AGENDA -- OCTOBER 21-22, 2016

Friday, October 21 (School House Meeting Room):

- ❖ 4:30 to 6:00 p.m. Registration and Happy Hour
- ❖ 6:00 to 7:00 p.m. Dinner
- ❖ 7:00 to 9:30 p.m. CAUSA Business
 - CAUSA Website
 - CAUSA Bylaws
 - CAUSA Treasurers ReportUnion/Association Report Outs (10 minutes each)

Door Prizes

Saturday, October 22 (School House Meeting Room):

- ❖ 7:00 to 8:30 a.m. Breakfast On Your Own - Complimentary Embassy Suites Garden/Breakfast Area
- ❖ 8:30 to 11:30 a.m. Break Out by Topics of Interest and Group Discussions
- ❖ 11:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. CAUSA Business
 - Spring Meeting DatesDoor Prizes

**CAUSA TREASURER'S REPORT
OCTOBER 21, 2016**

| DATE | DESCRIPTION | WITHDRAWAL | DEPOSIT | BALANCE |
|-------------|--|-------------------|----------------|----------------|
| 2/26/16 | 2016 Dues (As of 10/21/16 - dues continue outstanding for one association) | | \$1,503.00 | \$3,618.42 |
| 3/04/16 | CAUSA Meeting – Long Beach Host | | | \$3,618.42 |
| 5/17/16 | Website Deposit & set-up | \$250.00 | | \$3,368.42 |
| 7/08/16 | 2016 Dues | | \$149.25 | \$3,517.67 |
| 8/23/16 | Website Completion | \$250.00 | | \$3,267.67 |
| 9/07/16 | Website Host & Maintenance 9/1/16 - 12/1/16 | \$225.00 | | \$3,042.67 |
| 10/21/16 | CAUSA Meeting – Sacramento Host | | | \$3,042.67 |

CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF URBAN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS (CAUSA)

BYLAWS

DRAFT

ARTICLE I – Organization Name

The name of the organization shall be the California Association of Urban School Administrators hereafter referred to as CAUSA.

ARTICLE II – Purpose

CAUSA is the California Association of Urban School Administrators. The Association represents over 6,000 middle management administrators (both certificated and classified) from numerous school district union/associations in the State of California. CAUSA has existed for over two decades “Empowering Educational Leaders to Improve Working Conditions.” Ultimately, improved working conditions lead to improved student success.

ARTICLE III – Code of Ethics

- When CAUSA formally speaks on behalf of its membership, it does so with a united voice.
- Personal integrity, trust and honesty must form the basis of decision-making and actions of CAUSA.
- CAUSA members must uphold the honor and dignity of the profession in all their actions.
- Civility and mutual respect must characterize all interactions between and among members.
- All actions must be free from hostility or discrimination of any kind.

ARTICLE IV – Membership

The membership of this organization shall be limited to Professional Associations/Unions in the State of California that represent classified and/or certificated management/supervisory employees. Each Professional Association/Union shall pay annual dues to belong to CAUSA.

Annual dues shall be set by the CAUSA Board of Directors and shall be payable during the month of January each year. Dues shall include annual dues as well as per member dues.

Membership in CAUSA will be terminated if a member Professional Association/Union fails to pay dues and does not present a written request for an extension to the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors has the right to grant an extension of up to six months for payment of dues.

ARTICLE V – Affiliate Membership

Affiliate members are those who belong to organizations not directly representing classified and/or certificated management/supervisory employees but who have an interest in CAUSA (example, American Federation of School Administrators or other like groups). Affiliate members may attend CAUSA meetings by paying the registration fee but will not have a vote on matters that affect CAUSA and will not have a seat on the Board of Directors.

ARTICLE VI – Board of Directors

The CAUSA Board of Directors shall be comprised of the following Officers and members at large:

Chairperson; Vice Chair; Secretary; Treasurer; Members At Large (one for each member Professional Association/Union that does not hold an officer position).

The CAUSA Board of Directors functions are to:

1. Act as the planning body of CAUSA.
2. Approve expenditures from the CAUSA financial account. The financial account is managed by the CAUSA Treasurer.
3. Coordinate communications between CAUSA and the member Associations/Unions.
4. Set the meeting agenda for the twice yearly meetings.

ARTICLE VII – Appointments to the CAUSA Board of Directors

In the Fall meeting of the odd-numbered years, appointments will be made to the Officer/Member At Large positions on the CAUSA Board of Directors by the Board of Directors. One name will be solicited from each member organization.

Appointments are for a two-year period. There are no term limits for Officers/Members At Large.

During the two-year term, if a vacancy occurs in an Officer position on the Board of Directors, another Board of Directors member may be appointed to the officer position. If a vacancy occurs in a Member at Large position, the Association/Union may appoint a replacement.

ARTICLE VIII – Meetings

CAUSA meetings will be held each October and each March. Locations will typically rotate between northern and southern California member Associations/Unions.

The CAUSA Board of Directors will set the agenda for the meeting including approving any presenters/speakers.

The CAUSA Board of Directors will set the registration fee for meeting attendees.

Registration fees will be collected by the hosting Association/Union and all expenditures will be paid by the hosting Association/Union.

Any funds leftover from registration fees collected for the meeting will be returned to the CAUSA Treasurer. Hosting Associations/Unions will provide the CAUSA Treasurer with an accounting of meeting expenditures within thirty (30) days following the meeting. Hosting Associations/Unions must keep expenditures within the dollar figure of the registration fees collected or have prior approval of the CAUSA Board of Directors for additional funds from the CAUSA treasury.

A financial report will be presented by the CAUSA Treasurer at each meeting.

If a vote is necessary at a meeting, the outcome will be determined by a majority vote (50% + 1) of the members in attendance.

ARTICLE IX – Standing Rules

All records of CAUSA are to be maintained for seven (7) years.

The CAUSA Secretary shall be responsible for creating and maintaining minutes of all CAUSA meetings.

ARTICLE X –Bylaws

Bylaws will be set by the CAUSA Board of Directors and may be amended at any time as approved by a majority vote of the CAUSA Board of Directors.

A copy of the CAUSA Bylaws will be made available on the CAUSA Website.

These Bylaws are adopted by the CAUSA Board in Sacramento, California, on this 21st day of October, 2016.

Donis Coronel, Chairperson

Dennis Pedersen, Vice Chairperson

Juan Flecha, Treasurer

Suzanne Bender, Secretary

Cheryl Lee, Member-At-Large

Leroy Gaines, Member-At-Large

Ron Hoppe, Member-At-Large

Sara Danielson, Member-At-Large

10/18/2016

STRENGTH OF CAUSA

- Meeting Schedule Change? Thursday 1-530, Friday 9-430
- Recruitment. Ad in ACSA EDCAL, Invite others to attend; 1 rep no registration fee, make it a commitment.
- CAUSA sub group; create a Leg. Action Committee.
- Always have a speaker at CAUSA meetings.
- Keep website updated; link to newsletter and weekly updates. Send info to Donis.
- We are "Front-Line" Managers not "middle managers".
- CAUSA Rocks!

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- Sweetwater; New PD direction. Emphasis on Admin. Recruitment.
- Long Beach; Gave up "rounds" this year. Feels like a step backward. But at site level opportunity for classroom visits and teachers find it worthwhile.
- LA; before the content we need to look at the metric of what time and dollars are needed to support leadership PD.
- Sacramento; Very good conference, Partnership with Deloitte, Business auditing and leadership, "Business Chemistry" preceded by survey: guardian, pioneer, drivers, innovators etc. Deloitte paid for it-giving back to education, District paid conference fee, sites paid transportation.
- San Francisco; Instructional rounds- medical model , present problem of practice, centered on the learning of observers, collect specific evidence, non-judgemental
- SD; PD committee of union, annual spring conference, changing culture/ "customer service", "Swivel app on cell phone, hang on lanyard-camera and mic.
- SJ; Negotiated for District to match \$1,000per unit member per year to fund admins to go to PD, submit app to Executive Board, systems of professional growth (evaluation) non-traditional tool, time consuming but worth it.
- WCCUSD; Also has PD fund \$13,000 per year negotiated with district

WORKLOAD

- Add contract language that addresses conditions of work bargaining.
- MOU's with teachers unions that carry language specific to restrictions with class coverage in absence of subs. (Principals have to cover classroom).
- Constant and consistent message when meeting with Superintendent/Board Members. Keep driving the point across every meeting.
- Create a survey monkey which is sent to all of our representative members (CAUSA) to elicit common concerns. (Classified/Certificated).
- Have a united voice.
- Create a task force which can help us mimic "Hawaiian Paradise" results collective buy-in.
- Take collective buy-in to our superintendents as a united voice.
- Reclassification of Certificated/Classified duties to include i.e.: additional technology demands.
- Reasonable allocation of admin coverage at our schools. i.e.: number of students required to qualify for VP's. Work demand remains the same for all. K-12.

TEACHER RETENTION

- Policy Development with what is happening.
- Establish partnerships with Universities and Professor at school site working with interns.
- Classified to Certificated programs (grow your own, TTO).
- High School student recruitment.
- HR at the table.
- Teacher Induction program, Support.
- Administrative Ratios.
- Self-Care- vicarious Trauma.
- Ask Teachers "what support do you need to be retained".
- What do Administrators need to help retain people.
- Task Force, break down silo's .

CAUSA

Sacramento, CA

October 21 & 22, 2016

Report from Associated Administrators of Los Angeles

Juan A. Flecha, President

- I. LA teachers head is ready to incite a "state crisis" if union demands are not met
- II. Strategic plan lacks clear mission, so board agrees to champion '100 percent graduation,' but how?
- III. LAUSD Budget 2016-2017

Original budget (Before CDE decision) - \$450 million of Special Education spending counted as Targeted Investment.

Budget (After CDE decision) – Shift \$450 million in Special Education spending moving to base

Implications for 2016-17 – Set-aside of \$245 million of ending balances

Implications for 2017-18 – Realignment of resources from Base to Targeted Investment is necessary.

Cuts may be also be necessary if ending balances from 2016-17 are not available.

Possible consequences:

- Elimination of OPED trust contribution
- Zeroing of School Allocation Carryover
- 30% central office reduction
- Class size increases
- Administrative norm realignment

- IV. Treasurer's Report

While it's not clear what form a "state crisis" would take, Caputo-Pearl described a series of actions the union will undertake in coming months, beginning with a paid media campaign denouncing "billionaires ... driving the public school agenda" and a "massive" political mobilization to ensure the November passage of Proposition 55, which would extend a 2012 measure that raised taxes on high-earning residents to fund schools.

UTLA will then set its sights on the next Los Angeles Unified School District board elections.

"We must face off against the billionaires again in the School Board elections of 2017, and WE MUST WIN," Caputo-Pearl said, explaining that the next board would vote on a new contract. The union needed to help elect a board that would resist a "vigorous campaign to cut our benefits" by district leaders, he suggested.

But Caputo-Pearl isn't content to shape LAUSD's agenda. He hopes to organize the entire state.

"All of the unions representing LAUSD workers and the teachers unions in San Diego, San Bernardino, Oakland and San Francisco share our June 2017 contract expiration date," he said. "We have an historic opportunity to lead a coordinated bargaining effort across the state.

"Coordinated action could dramatically increase pressure on the legislature and fundamentally shape the debate in the 2018 Governor's race."

Caputo-Pearl stopped short of calling for a multi-city teacher strike, but pointing to a common contract expiration date that enabled "coordinated action" put it on the table.

The UTLA president had another white whale to harpoon: Proposition 13, the state's iconic 1978 initiative that capped property tax rates. Caputo-Pearl said he wanted to revive the union-backed "Make It Fair" campaign that sought to hike taxes on commercial property.

UTLA is in position to pursue an aggressive agenda because of its successful internal campaign to raise dues by 33 percent earlier this year and new joint affiliation with the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers. Now the union will launch an internal campaign to solicit more money from members in the form of PAC contributions, Caputo-Pearl said. Currently only about 20 percent of UTLA members donate to its PAC.

There will of course be organized opposition to Caputo-Pearl's vision for the future, and some of it may come from his own parent unions. While UTLA is by far the largest local of both the state NEA and AFT branches — the California Teachers Association and the California Federation of Teachers, respectively — these unions have their own officers and elected bodies that represent members throughout the state. Even if they agree with most of Caputo-Pearl's agenda, they may be wary of his ambition. Their leaders might remember that former UTLA President Wayne Johnson rode a 1989 teacher strike all the way to the presidency of CTA.

Caputo-Pearl's broad themes were underscored by a guest speaker: Karen Lewis, president of the Chicago Teachers Union and idol of advocates for more muscular union activism. She argued that teachers

LA SCHOOL REPORT

Commentary: LA teachers head is ready to incite a 'state crisis' if union demands are not met

LA SCHOOL REPORT

Strategic plan lacks clear mission, so board agrees to champion '100 percent graduation,' but how?

Posted on September 28, 2016 3:23 pm by Mike Szymanski

G+1 0

LA



School board members and facilitator Jeff Nelsen (far right) at USC's Caruso Catholic Center for a special committee meeting.

Unified's three-year strategic plan lacks a clear mission statement.

That was the consensus of an all-day school board session Tuesday. So the seven board members decided to fix it, landing on the goal of a 100 percent graduation rate. Yet the draft of the strategic plan remains light on exactly how to accomplish it.

Because even with every teacher and principal knowing that 100 percent graduation will be the ultimate goal for the district, the three-year plan presented by Superintendent Michelle King offers targets that expect only 81 percent graduation by 2018-2019, and only 52 percent of students getting a C or better in the A-G classes required for graduation. Board members agreed that while a 10-point increase in the graduation rate to

State of SCUSD and UPE

SCUSD is a large urban district located here in Sacramento. We serve close to 47,000 students in grades K-12. 39% of the total student population is Hispanic, 16.5% are Asian, 17% are Black, 18% white and 9.5% other. Enrollment has declined from a high of 53,000 students in the past 14 years. The district is unique in that while the district is predominately urban and Title 1, there are pockets of schools within the district that are not Title 1 and are less diverse than the district is as a whole. This phenomenon has led to huge inequities in school funding from site to site which has a negative impact on services available to students that are contractually capped due to over enrollment at their home schools and/or those on Program Improvement transfer status. In addition, a former superintendent designated some of the lowest achieving schools as "priority schools" and those schools receive the lion's share of school funding. This further affects the availability of support (both fiscal and otherwise) available to the remainder of the schools in the district. The teachers union as well as UPE have identified the gross disparity between funding and resource allocations between schools as a common area of concern for the current negotiation session. Fiscally, the district has a \$611.4M unfunded liability for lifetime health benefits offered to many of the labor partners (predominately the teachers and SEIU). There is also an unfunded liability of \$250+M (the district's share) in pension costs and a \$7M liability in vacation pay out. These liabilities have reached a point where it needs to be paid down in order to keep the district solvent. Note: the liability numbers above may not be totally accurate at this time due to district interventions to pay them down. However, due to the enormity of the numbers – they haven't changed much.

Sacramento City Unified has one of the strongest teachers unions in the state. Teachers have a benefit package that includes family health, dental, and vision care at no cost to the teacher. For teachers that have been with the district for more than 17 years their complete compensation package can top a principal salary. It is no secret in SCUSD that there is a complete lack of parity between the teachers' and site administrators' compensation packages. A recent study done

by a neighboring district (Elk Grove Unified – see attached) show that SCUSD is ranked 11/12 in total compensation with comparable and surrounding districts. One of the goals of UPE is to rectify that situation and bring the pay scales into alignment. We are currently awaiting the findings of a classification study done by the district two years ago to look into the salary hierarchy in SCUSD. It is our hope that the findings will work to our advantage as we prepare to begin negotiating a 3 year contract with the district. Our current contract expired in June of 2016.

Some of the main focuses for UPE during the upcoming round of negotiations include: Salary and benefits, work hours and workload, staffing formulas, longevity steps and columns, extended year contracts, continuing Ed; ACSA dues paid; stipends for administrators, and holiday pay.

Our executive director has also been working with the Classified Supervisors Association to investigate the viability of them becoming a 'sub-unit' within UPE, similar to the model developed by LA, San Diego, and others within the state.

Under the guidance of our executive director, Dennis Pedersen, UPE has made the following gains:

5% pay raise, removal of "Interim" designation, improved benefit package, K-8 salary adjustment, unit modification (recovering 30 positions), administrators displaced by school closures received Y-ratings for a year and placement at new sites, no March 15th notices in the past several years, clarification on 223 work year and a spirit of flexing days in lieu of days worked on non-work days, 210.5 day calendar increased to 211 with pay, challenging the SCTA principal evaluation at a couple of sites, legal and confidential representation. Most importantly, UPE is becoming a viable organization and a respected labor partner within SCUSD.

Respectfully,

Judy Montgomery, President, UPE

Elk Grove Unified School District

Comparability Study

March 21, 2016

Elementary Principal

Figure 49

| District | Position Title | Work Days | Salary Beg | Salary Max | HWB | Stipends/ Allowances | Max TC | Max TC Variance | Rank | Other |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------|-----------------|------|-----------|
| Fairfield-Suisun USD | Elementary School Principal | 210 | \$108,072 | \$142,658 | \$17,247 | \$1,920 | \$161,825 | 18.5% | 1 | None |
| Manteca USD | Elementary Principal | 214 | \$117,079 | \$146,113 | Included in salary | \$0 | \$146,113 | 7.0% | 2 | None |
| Folsom-Cordova USD | Elementary Principal | 208 | \$88,775 | \$124,014 | \$10,332 | \$6,201 | \$140,547 | 2.9% | 3 | None |
| San Juan USD | Principal, Elementary | 208 | \$88,195 | \$109,908 | \$23,638 | \$6,045 | \$139,591 | 2.2% | 4 | Longevity |
| Elk Grove USD | Elementary Principal | 207 | \$87,466 | \$117,783 | \$18,769 | \$0 | \$136,552 | 0.0% | 5 | Longevity |
| Twin Rivers USD | Principal Elementary School | 211 | \$89,126 | \$113,749 | \$13,620 | \$3,600 | \$130,969 | -4.1% | 6 | Longevity |
| Tracy USD | Elementary Principal | 204 | \$89,915 | \$109,289 | \$8,162 | \$5,638 | \$123,089 | -9.9% | 7 | Longevity |
| Lincoln USD | Elementary Principal | 213 | \$96,463 | \$111,716 | \$7,632 | \$2,200 | \$121,548 | -11.0% | 8 | None |
| Netomas USD | Elementary Principal | 210 | \$91,617 | \$106,209 | \$11,976 | \$0 | \$118,185 | -13.5% | 9 | None |
| Sacramento City USD | Elementary Principal | 211 | \$85,491 | \$108,249 | \$8,558 | \$0 | \$116,807 | -14.5% | 10 | Longevity |
| Lodi USD | Elementary Principal | 207 | \$99,928 | \$114,706 | Included in salary | \$1,500 | \$116,206 | -14.9% | 11 | Longevity |
| Elk Grove USD | Elementary Principal (Year Round) | 223 | \$100,885 | \$126,493 | \$18,769 | \$0 | \$145,262 | n/a | n/a | Longevity |
| Tracy USD | Elementary Principal (Year Round) | 219 | \$96,441 | \$117,215 | \$8,162 | \$5,638 | \$131,015 | n/a | n/a | Longevity |

Goings-on in West Contra Costa Administrators Association

- We have a new superintendent
 - Young; seems to have good instincts
 - Open to meeting with WCCAA
 - Personalized/differentiated principal professional development
 - Big difference in principal meetings—more interactive, less talking heads

- Shortage of teachers and classified classroom support
 - Major problem
 - Any ideas?

- Still working on opportunities for effective input
 - Getting our members on key committees
 - Examples: DLCAP, Budget, Safety
 - Meeting with key people
 - Examples: Superintendent, Assoc. Sups.
 - Working on strengthening and codifying Solutions Team

- Grappling with making WCCAA Board elections open and welcoming
 - Usually incumbents stay until they leave our unit
 - Thinking of changing nominations to “declaration to run”

- Beginning our third year of Mentoring Program for beginning principals
 - Rave reviews
 - Becoming an integral part of the District culture



May 19, 2016
The Honorable John King, Acting Secretary
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave. SW
Washington, DC 20202

Re: Technical assistance and guidance concerning Title II of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)

Dear Dr. King:

The American Federation of School Administrators (AFSA), the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP)—which collectively represent principals and other school leaders in the nation's 115,000 elementary, middle, and high schools—are writing to provide additional comments related to guidance on the definition of "school leader" in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), or certain provisions of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). In addition, we request guidance to states and districts regarding the new three percent set-aside for school leadership activities.

After participating in a recent Department-organized listening session on implementing Title II of ESSA, during which a great diversity of opinions surfaced on the statute's definition of "school leaders," we felt it important to convey our position on this issue directly. Section 8002 of the statute defines a school leader as: "a principal, assistant principal, or other individual who is an employee or officer of an elementary or secondary school, local educational agency, or other entity operating at an elementary school or secondary school; and is responsible for the daily instructional leadership and managerial operations in the elementary school or secondary school building." From this definition, we believe it is clear that Congress intended individuals who serve as principals, assistant principals, or other leadership staff *within school buildings* to be the focus of any programmatic or intervention outcomes where school leadership may be addressed.

At the aforementioned listening sessions, we heard comments suggesting that the definition does (or should) encompass principal supervisors, district superintendents, and even school board members whose primary place of work is outside of elementary or secondary school buildings, and whose primary responsibilities do not include the daily instructional leadership and managerial operations in a school. We believe that a plain reading of the statute does not support this interpretation, and would result in an expansion of the definition of a "school leader." If Congress had intended to include



superintendents, principal supervisors, or school board members in this regard, it would have identified them specifically in the definition.

Beyond the statute's text, the Department can infer Congressional intent to restrict the definition of school leaders to building-level employees from the fact that Congress provided support for non-building public school personnel in other sections of the law. In two places, the statute targets resources to "school leaders" and "coaches, mentors, and evaluators," suggesting two distinct groups. In the State Activities section of Title II, states are permitted to use their set asides for: "(II) developing and providing training to principals, other school leaders, coaches, mentors, and evaluators on how to accurately differentiate performance, provide useful and timely feedback, and use evaluation results to inform decision-making about professional development, improvement strategies, and personnel decisions (page 119)." In Title II's Local Uses of Funds section, LEAs are allowed to use their funds to develop and train both "school leaders" and "coaches, mentors, and evaluators" on how to accurately differentiate performance, provide useful and timely feedback, and use evaluation results to inform decision-making about professional development, improvement strategies, and personnel decisions (page 126).

In addition, the statute provides a number of support opportunities for all educators, whether in a school building or not. In the State Uses of Funds Section, the statute allows states to use their set-asides for:

"(x) providing training, technical assistance, and capacity-building to LEAs that receive a sub-grant under this part (page 121)

"(xxi) supporting other activities identified by the State that are, to the extent the State determines that such evidence is reasonably available, evidence based and that meet the purpose of this title ["1) increase student achievement consistent with challenging State academic standards; 2) improve the quality and effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other school leaders; 3) increase the number of teachers, principals, and other school leaders who are effective in schools; and 4) provide low-income and minority students greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders"] (page 122)."

In Title II's Local Uses of Funds section, LEAs can also use their allocations for:

"(H) providing training, technical assistance, and capacity-building in LEAs to assist teachers, principals, or other school leaders with selecting and implementing formative assessments, designing classroom-based assessments, and using data from such assessments to improve instruction and student academic achievement, which may

include providing additional time for teachers to review student data and respond, as appropriate (page 127).”

“(P) carrying out other activities that are evidence-based, to the extent the State (in consultation with LEAs in the State) determines that such evidence is reasonably available, and identified by the LEA that meet the purpose of this title (page 129).”

Finally and more practically, expanding the definition of “school leaders” to include other classes of public school educators may inflict substantial harm on the principals, assistant principals, and building-level leaders that the definition was designed to support. With limited and perhaps less federal funding available for Title II this year and in future years, expanding the “school leaders” definition may lead to further dilution of funding for building-level leaders if funds are steered to non-building administrators. Such an action would deprive principals, assistant principals, and in-building school leaders of the support and professional development they dearly need and inure to the detriment of students. Substantial research has shown that effective school leadership is second only to teaching among school-related factors in improving student achievement, and strong school leadership has the greatest impact in schools with the most need.

Although the base of research and evidence demonstrating the importance of principals and school leadership has grown, states and districts have unfortunately failed to dedicate sufficient resources for principal recruitment, preparation and retention, or on-going, sustained support for school leaders. In 2013, the U.S. Department of Education’s sample of local educational agency use of Title II funds under ESEA as authorized by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) found that forty-four percent of Title II, Part A funds were used for professional development for teachers and principals. However, of this amount, only 4 percent of district-level funds were directed towards building or supporting the professional capacity of principals. Little to no data was collected or is clear on the state-level use of funds for the professional support of principals. To address this issue, Congress provided report language (pg 90) in the FY 2015 Omnibus Appropriations Act (H.R. 83) that directed ED to provide states and districts with guidance on supporting professional development opportunities for principals to improve instructional leadership capacity, including but not limited to their role evaluating teachers.

Section 2101(c)(3) of ESSA denotes a critical permissive use of three percent of the state allotment total amount reserved for state level activities to support recruitment, preparation and provide on-going support for principals. This use of funds to build state capacity is in addition to an increased opportunity for districts to direct funds to support activities that would develop principals and school leaders. Given the research and what



is understood about the importance of the role of the principal, USED must emphasize both state and local prioritization of school leadership development and recognition of the need to provide principals and other school leaders with on-going support. Guidance to states should emphasize the need to identify interventions related to recruitment and retention of principals, and the opportunity to allocate three percent of funds available under this section to supplement a greater portion of state and local funds to support school leadership.

For all of these reasons, we strongly urge the Department to provide guidance that would bolster the role of the school building principal by encouraging states and local districts to maximize their Title II allocations for school leadership activities, and refrain from expanding the definition of "school leaders" beyond principals, assistant principals, and school personnel located in actual school buildings. Thank you for considering this request for clear guidance to the field that will result in improved student outcomes by strengthening leadership through our nation's school buildings and reinforcing the role of Pre-K-12 principals.

Sincerely,

JoAnn D. Bartoletti
Executive Director, NASSP

Gail Connelly
Executive Director, NAESP

Diann Woodard
President, AFSA



September 20, 2016

Honorable Roy Blunt
Chairman
Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education
Senate Committee on Appropriations
Washington, DC 20515

Honorable Patty Murray
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education
Senate Committee on Appropriations
Washington, DC 20515

Honorable Tom Cole
Chairman
Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education
House Committee on Appropriations
Washington, DC 20515

Honorable Rosa DeLauro
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education
House Committee on Appropriations
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Chairman Blunt, Ranking Member Murray, Chairman Cole, and Ranking Member DeLauro:

The American Federation of School Administrators (AFSA), the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP)—which collectively represent principals and other school leaders in the nation's 115,000 elementary, middle, and high schools—are writing to express our grave concerns regarding the proposed cuts to Title II, A of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) in both the Senate and House Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education (LHHS-Ed) funding bills, and the proposed elimination of the School Leader Recruitment and Support Program (SLRSP) in the House LHHS-Ed bill.

As you work together to finalize appropriations for Fiscal Year 2017 (FY 2017), we strongly urge you to recognize the critical importance of investing in our nation's school leaders. While leading research substantiates that teachers have the greatest influence on student achievement, many studies validate the importance of the role of the principal. Principals are recognized for their ability to influence a variety of factors that positively affect schools. They indirectly affect student outcomes by recognizing and supporting teachers, but they also directly influence schools by creating high-functioning learning environments. The evidence about successful schools is clear: A great teacher makes a great classroom, but only a principal can lead a school's success and sustain long-term improvements.

FY 2017 is an especially critical year, as states and school districts across the nation will be working to implement the requirements of ESSA for the first time. In order to ensure ESSA is implemented successfully, it is vital that our nation's school leaders - those ultimately responsible for the law's implementation - are afforded the full support they need. Therefore, investing in the following programs is essential, and we ask that you fund them at the maximum levels possible.

Title II, Part A

Research has shown that effective school leadership is second only to instruction as a factor in raising student achievement. However, a 2013 report from the US Department of Education on "The Use of Funds Under Title II" of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), shows that only 4% of federal dollars are spent on principal professional development. This is extremely troubling as Title II acts as the primary federal program to improve educator performance. As the roles and responsibilities of school leaders continue to expand, principals must be afforded additional opportunities for professional learning and growth as they work to improve teaching and learning in all schools.

Section 2101(c)(3) of ESSA denotes a critical permissive use of three percent of the state allotment total amount reserved for state level activities to support recruitment, preparation and provide on-going support for principals. However, if funding for Title II, Part A is not increased, it will be very difficult for states to take advantage of this new set-aside specifically for school leadership activities.

We thank and appreciate the Senate LHHS-Ed bill for including report language that asks the Department of Education to issue guidance informing states they can use Title II, A funds to support principals and provide much needed job specific professional development to aid them in successfully completing their plethora and ever increasing duties as school leaders, **and we urge Congress to fund Title II, Part A at no less than the ESSA authorization level of \$2.295 billion for FY 2017.**

School Leader Recruitment and Support Program

The School Leader Recruitment and Support Program (SLRSP), formerly the School Leadership Program, is the only federal program dedicated to recruiting, mentoring, and training principals, assistant principals, and other school leaders to serve in high-need schools. However, this program has seen decreased funding since FY 2012, hamstringing efforts to recruit, train, and develop effective school leaders to implement new federal, state, and local requirements. The SLRSP was strengthened in ESSA by providing aspiring principals with a pre-service residency that would last for at least one year along with focused coursework on instructional leadership, organizational management, and the use of data to inform instruction.

We were extremely disappointed to see the elimination of SLRSP in the House LHHS-Ed bill, as this will severely hamstring local efforts to recruit, train, and develop effective school leaders to implement new federal, state, and local requirements.

Therefore, we urge Congress to fund SLRSP at no less than \$30 million for FY 2017 and support school leaders at a time when the demands placed on their instructional leadership capacity have never been greater.

We recognize the challenges you face in crafting a final appropriations measure for FY 17. However, we hope you will consider the critical juncture our nation's school districts are facing, as they will work to implement new requirements under ESSA. And, we hope you will also consider the potential harm an under-investment in our nation's school leaders would cause.



A lack of support at this time will only result in detrimental effects on our nation's young people, our economy, and ultimately our global competitiveness. Thank you for your consideration of our requests, and we hope we can count on your support to fund these critical investments in our nation's school leaders, the schools they lead, and most importantly the children they serve.

Sincerely,

JoAnn D. Bartoletti
Executive Director, NASSP

Gail Connelly
Executive Director, NAESP

Diann Woodard
President, AFSA



Non-Regulatory Guidance for Title II, Part A:

Building Systems of Support for Excellent Teaching and Leading

U.S. Department of Education Non-Regulatory Guidance
Title II, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965,
as Amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015
XX, 2016

Transformative School Leadership



Ongoing Professional Learning for Principals and Other School Leaders

Effective principals, assistant principals, and other school leaders are essential to school success, particularly in schools with large numbers of students from low-income families and minority students⁸. Strong principals attract teachers with great potential for success, support the ongoing professional learning of teachers, and retain excellent teachers.

Recommended Strategies

SEAs and LEAs may use Title II, Part A funds to support school principals, through a variety of strategies such as:

- Partner with organizations to provide leadership training and opportunities for principals and other school leaders to hone their craft and bring teams together to improve school structures. (ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(viii) and 2103(b)(3)(B)).
- Offer community of learning opportunities where principals and other school leaders engage with their school teams to fully develop broad curriculum models. (ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(viii) and 2103(b)(3)(E)).
- Develop opportunities for principals and other school leaders to collaborate, problem-solve, and share best practices. (ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(viii) and 2103(b)(3)(E)).

A resource on how SEAs and LEAs may produce a large and steady supply of high-performing school principals and support their effective supervision is The Wallace Foundation's [Building Principal Pipelines: A Strategy to Strengthen Education Leadership](#). An additional resource that SEAs and LEAs may consider when selecting evidence-based interventions related to school leadership is [School Leadership Interventions under the Every Student Succeeds Act](#) from RAND Corporation. This report describes opportunities for supporting school leadership, discussing the standards of evidence, and synthesizing the research with respect to those standards.

⁸ See for example K. Leithwood (2004). "How Leadership Influences Student Learning." The Wallace Foundation. <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/pages/executive-summary-how-leadership-influences-student-learning.aspx>

Leadership in Action: Supporting Promising Principals

Many LEAs have developed effective supports for individuals transitioning into school leadership roles. For example, the **Maryland Department of Education** has developed a program for Promising Principals to provide promising leaders, most of whom are assistant principals, with a year-long professional development program that includes multi-day convenings, one-on-one coaching sessions with veteran principals, and the opportunity to receive feedback as they tackle challenges they will likely face as principals. In addition, the veteran principals that participate as coaches, selected due to their track records of success, have found that they gain professional development through this experience in coaching emerging leaders.

State-level Activities and Optional Additional Funding

Under Title II, Part A of the ESEA, SEAs have broad authority and flexibility in the use of State activities funds. SEAs may use some of these funds to improve the quality and retention of effective teachers. However, we strongly encourage each SEA to devote a significant portion of its State activities funds to improving school leadership; and in doing so consider its flexibility to reserve an additional 3 percent of Title II, Part A LEA subgrants for State activities that support principals or other school leaders. (ESEA section 2101(c)(3)).

Recommended Strategies

In addition to the examples of principal support activities identified above, SEAs have significant discretion when deciding how to use their State activities funds to support principals and school leaders. Allowable activities include:

- Reforming school leader certification, tenure systems, or preparation program standards and approval processes, so that school leaders have the instructional leadership skills to help teachers teach and students achieve (ESEA section 2101(b)(4)(B)(i));
- Developing or improving alternative pathways to school leadership positions (ESEA section 2101(b)(4)(B)(iv));
- Helping LEAs implement school leader evaluation and support systems that are based in part on evidence of student academic achievement (ESEA section 2101(b)(4)(B)(ii));
- Helping LEAs recruit and retain school leaders who are effective in improving student academic achievement through means that include differential and performance pay for principals in low-income schools and districts (ESEA sections 2101(b)(4)(B)(v) and (vii)); and
- Developing new school leader evidence-based mentoring, induction, and other professional development programs for new school leaders (ESEA section 2101(b)(4)(B)(vii) and (viii)).

Principal Supervisors

When developing strategies for supporting principals and other school leaders, SEAs and LEAs may use Title II, Part A funds to improve the effectiveness of principals, assistant principals, and other school leaders, which includes an employee or officer of an elementary or secondary school, LEA, or other entity operating a school who are “responsible for the daily instructional leadership and managerial operations in the elementary school or secondary school building.” (ESEA section 8101(44)).

Leadership in Action: Supporting Principal Supervisors

Principal supervisors enable principals to focus on improving instruction, rather than on administration and compliance. Some LEAs, such as **Tulsa Public Schools (TPS)** and **District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)** are investing in and expanding the importance of this position and have rethought the principal supervisor's job. TPS and DCPS give supervisors fewer schools to oversee to ensure they can provide adequate and individualized support for principals. The result is that principal supervisors are now fixtures in schools, conducting classroom walkthroughs to observe strengths and areas for growth, providing timely and meaningful feedback to principals, and helping to develop solutions to challenges. To truly support the role of the principal supervisor, LEAs must treat the position as critical and provide effective professional development for individuals filling this role. Under ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(vii) and 2103(b)(3)(B), Title II, Part A funds can be used to support those principal supervisors that actively and frequently take responsibility for helping principals with instructional leadership and the school's managerial operations.

By including principal supervisors who are responsible for the daily instructional leadership and managerial operations in the elementary school or secondary school building, the ESEA section 8101(44) definition of "school leader" acknowledges the importance of school leaders who are actively responsible for successful instruction and management in the school. This means that the ESEA considers those LEA staff, such as the principals' supervisors, who actively mentor and support principals and by doing so are themselves "responsible for the school's daily instructional leadership and managerial operations," to also be eligible for Title II, Part A funded support. (ESEA section 8101(44)). We encourage SEAs and LEAs to extend Title II, Part A-funded services to these principal supervisors to the extent that those individuals actively and frequently take responsibility for helping principals with instructional leadership and the school's managerial operations.

Supporting a Diverse Educator Workforce Across the Career Continuum



Research shows that diversity in schools, including representation of underrepresented minority groups among educators, can provide significant benefits to all students^{9,10}. In addition to benefits for all students, improving the diversity of the educator workforce may be particularly beneficial for minority students¹¹ helping to close the achievement gap. When considering how to better support educators, SEAs and LEAs should consider supporting a diverse educator workforce as a critical component of all strategies across the career continuum (for example, as framed

⁹N. Tyler, Z. Yzquierdo, N. Lopez-Reyna, & S. Saunders Flippin (2004). "Cultural and Linguistic Diversity and the Special Education Workforce: A Critical Overview." *The Journal of Special Education*, 38(1): 22-38.

¹⁰A. Egalite, B. Kisida, & M. Winters (2015). "Representation in the Classroom: The Effect of Own-race Teachers on Student Achievement." *Economics of Education Review*, 45: 44-52; T. Dee (2004). "Teachers, Race, and Student Achievement in a Randomized Experiment." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86: 195-210.

¹¹J. Grissom & C. Redding (2016). "Discretion and Disproportionality: Explaining the Underrepresentation of High-Achieving Students of Color in Gifted Programs," *AERA Open*, 2: 1-25; A. M. Villegas & J. J. Irvine (2010). "Diversifying the Teaching Force: An Examination of Major Arguments." *The Urban Review*, 42: 175-192.

AFSA Federal Policy Update

Department's long-awaited ESSA guidance touts principals, encourages states to provide professional development for them

Just in time for National Principals Month in October, the Department of Education released guidance on Title II of ESSA, which encourages states and locals to use federal funds on professional development specifically for principals. AFSA along with NASSP and NAESP issued a joint statement applauding the Department “for its uncompromised support for school leaders in the new guidance” and particularly “for highlighting the ability for SEAs to use federal funds for principal professional development under ESSA.”

The guidance contains strong language on the value of principals and school leaders. In one section, it states: “Effective principals, assistant principals, and other school leaders are essential to school success, particularly in schools with large numbers of students from low-income families and minority students. Strong principals attract teachers with great potential for success, support the ongoing professional learning of teachers, and retain excellent teachers.” In another section, the guidance encourages states to use 3% of its Title IIA subgrant funds “for State activities that support principals or other school leaders.” The last piece is particularly sweet for AFSA, which pushed hard for the law to set aside funds especially for principal professional development.

AFSA will continue working with our fellow principals groups to promote this beneficial language as ESSA is implemented at the state and local levels.

Congress keeps lights-on, delays Budget reckoning until December

For the third year in a row since the last government shutdown, Congress waited until nearly the midnight hour to pass a funding measure that would keep the government up and running. Just two days before the September 30th deadline, Congress passed a short term continuing resolution (CR) that keeps federal education funding on auto-pilot until December 9th 2016. As a result, all education programs will continue at last year's funding levels, with the exception of new programs authorized in the Every Student Succeeds Act which did not exist last year and thus received no funding then. Therefore, the new Student Support Academic and Enrichment Grants program (Title IV, Part A of ESSA), the flexible block grant that supports health and safety programs, well-rounded child academic programs, and technology, is not funded through this CR. A final deal will include funding for all new ESSA programs, including Title IV, Part A.

This year, Congress delayed action until late on the CR over emergency funding for Zika, the opioid abuse crisis, the Flint water pollution issue and flooding in Louisiana. Ultimately, Congress worked-out funding for all of these issues – but it took Senate Democrats blocking approval of the bill for Congressional leaders to agree to provide \$170 million in aid for victims of the Flint water crisis.

When Congress returns after the November 8th elections, it will have but a few short weeks to pass a final spending bill for fiscal year 2017 before the CR expires on December 9th. While it is unclear at this time how funding will play out before the end of the 114th Congress and the end of the Obama era, there are a few scenarios that could affect funding for education, which are described below:

1. Congress could pass an omnibus that funds all government programs for a full year, makes increases or decreases to existing education programs, and provides funding for the new education programs under ESSA, including the new flexible block grant. In this scenario, a new Congress and President would not have to deal with the appropriations process right at the beginning of a new session and administration.
2. Congress could pass a series of funding bills that only fund some non-controversial programs, like agriculture, military, veterans' affairs, and defense, while delaying decisions on other programs, like education, until next year.
3. Congress could pass a year-long continuing resolution that keeps government spending at its current levels and punts the funding issues to a new Congress and a new Administration. In this scenario, Congress would still most likely have to address funding for new programs, like the flexible block grant in ESSA.
4. Congress could fail to come to an agreement by December 9th and extend the continuing resolution until the beginning of the new Congress and Administration, forcing them to take up the issue immediately in January.

House CTE bill passes easily while Senate bill stalls

On September 13, 2016 the House passed, on a vote of 405-5, a bill to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act (CTE). Sponsored by G.T. Thompson (R-PA) and Katherine Clark (D-MA), this bill would reauthorize the US Department of Education's career and technical education program, which provides funds to school districts and community colleges to operate CTE courses. Amongst other things, the bill aims to more closely coordinate CTE course offerings with the needs of business.

All members of the House who spoke about the legislation highly praised it. Many talked about the improvements the bill makes to CTE programs including its focus on aligning courses with workforce needs, increasing flexibility at the local levels, and strengthening accountability measures. Other House members spoke about the high-needs skills gap and cited the predicted job shortages in many workforce sectors within their states including information technology, health care, manufacturing, aerospace, and engineering. There was wide recognition that participating in CTE programs today is not a second-rate option next to obtaining a four-year degree, but rather a first-rate and high-quality option for students and families to fill high-skilled high-paying jobs immediately after high school. Chairman Kline (R-MN) of the Education and the Workforce

Committee noted that CTE is a high-quality education opportunity, citing “countless success stories of high-skilled graduates with high-paying jobs and absolutely no student debt.”

Despite the virtually unanimous support for this bill on the House side, its prospects on the Senate side dimmed significantly before the Senate recessed. The Senate version of a CTE bill was pulled from the Senate HELP Committee’s markup schedule at the last minute due to Democratic objections to provisions that would restrict the implementation authority of the Secretary of Education. Democrats argued that the bill went too far in limiting the scope of the Secretary’s authority while Senate HELP Committee Chairman Alexander (R-TN) made it absolutely clear that he intended to rein in the power of the Secretary to implement and regulate education programs. Removing the bill from markup buys the HELP Committee some time to work out a compromise, hopefully saving CTE, a historically bipartisan program, from becoming a partisan nightmare.

AFSA on the Hill

AFSA is co-hosting a National Principals Month Capitol Hill briefing on October 13, 2016 that will explore additional ways to improve school leadership under ESSA. Information about the event is below:

National Principals Month Capitol Hill Event: Revolutionizing School Leadership Under ESSA

October 13, 2016 | 1:00–2:30 p.m. ET
B354 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.
Moderated by **Alyson Klein**, Education Week Politics K-12

Remarks from: SEP

- **Jayne Ellspermann**, NASSP President
- **Steven Geis**, NAESP President
- **Diann Woodard**, AFSA President

Panelists: SEP

- **Carol Hahn**, Principal at Bellows Spring Elementary, Ellicott City, MD 2015 Maryland National NAESP Distinguished Principal
- **Robert Motley**, Principal of Glenwood Middle School, Glenwood, MD 2006 Maryland NASSP Principal of the Year
- **Ernest Logan**, former principal of I.S. 55, D-23, Brooklyn, NY President of the Council of School Supervisors and Administrators, New York
- **Lee-Ann Stephens**, Teacher and equity coach SEP on special assignment with the St. Louis Park School District 2007 Minnesota Teacher of the Year

Watch it live at principalsmonth.org/livestream
[#ThankAPrincipal](https://twitter.com/ThankAPrincipal), principalsmonth.org/event/hill-event