

SUMMARY



Building Blocks 5, 6 & 8

An Abundant Supply of Highly Qualified Teachers
Professional Work Environments
Leadership Development

BUILDING BLOCK 5

ASSURE AN ABUNDANT SUPPLY OF HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS WITH THE NECESSARY DISPOSITIONS, KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

SUMMARY

All of the world's top-performing education systems regard high teacher quality as a linchpin of their strategy to produce high student achievement with equity. From a regulatory standpoint, there are only two options for doing this. One is to control quality at the point of entry into the postsecondary institutions whose graduates will become teachers. The other is to control entry into the profession at the point at which graduates of teacher education institutions become teachers. The first is done by regulating which institutions are allowed to provide teacher education and by regulating the criteria for admission to teacher education programs. The second is done with licensure.

The top performers place much more emphasis on the former than the latter. This makes sense because controlling quality with licensure, after the prospective teachers have been through a teacher education program, is very wasteful. These countries want a system that will produce the highest quality at the lowest cost. That drives them toward strategies that emphasize quality control at the source, when high school graduates are making their decisions about what they want to do.

This strategic stance leads to certain outcomes. First, the top performers put substantial effort into collecting and analyzing data on teacher demand and supply. They want to be sure that they are educating as many teachers as they will need in each arena in which they will need teachers, but they do not want to prepare many more than they need. Because, in most of these countries, the ministry of education funds the higher education institutions directly, it can allocate the slots that are needed each year based on the projected needs.

But knowing how many teachers you will need is no guarantee that you will get them, much less that you will get the quality you want. To get high quality applicants, they do several things. First, they make sure that the compensation offered teachers, especially beginning teachers, is comparable to the compensation of beginning high-status professionals in their society. Some countries specify in legislation a requirement that the ministry track the compensation being offered, for example, to beginning engineers or to their top-level civil servants, and then peg the salaries of beginning teachers to those benchmarks and adjust them annually to make sure they are keeping pace.

But these countries know that compensation alone will not attract the young people they want. To get graduates who could be engineers, architects, accountants or doctors, they know they have to offer working conditions comparable to the working conditions these young people could expect if they entered professions like these. So they have made major changes in the way they organize and manage their schools to make them less like places where blue collar workers work and more like places that high status professionals work (See the summary for Building Block #6 for a description of these working conditions and compensation regulations).

Next, these countries create other incentives to make the choice of a teaching career attractive to the high-quality candidates they seek. Shanghai, for example, offers free room, board and tuition at their teachers' colleges to their top high school graduates and, in addition, offers to pay them a modest salary while in college. In exchange, the students have to agree under contract to serve as a teacher for five years after being hired as a teacher.

But the most important policy for assuring high quality in their teachers used by the top performers is to make it hard to get into a teacher education program. The most dramatic instance of this policy in action can be found in Finland, which at one time had close to 50 institutions offering teacher education. They shut down all of them and reopened only eight, all of them in their research universities. So, no one can become a schoolteacher in Finland who cannot meet the entrance standards of their top universities. Other countries have been moving in this direction, too. It is harder, usually much harder, to get into teacher education programs in the top-performing countries than in any state in the United States.

All of the top-performing countries surveyed recruit their teachers from the top half of high school graduates going to college. Three of them recruit from a significantly smaller and higher performance band.

These countries have discovered that, when they make it hard for poorly prepared high school students to get into their teacher education programs, well-prepared students who would not have considered going into teaching, instead decide to do so. Even these well-prepared students cannot be assured of getting a place in their teacher education programs. Only 10 percent of the applicants to teacher education programs are admitted in Finland. The country with the "lowest" standards only admits 27.5 percent of those who apply. We know of no undergraduate teacher education program in the United States that accepts less than 100 percent of those who apply if they meet the university's general admission requirements, whatever those requirements may be.

Because our teacher's colleges typically admit 100 percent of the high school graduates who get into the university, they do not, aside from Massachusetts, have any admission requirements designed to determine whether the applicant might make a good teacher. That is not true in the top-performing countries. These countries typically have admissions criteria that include not just academic qualifications, but also measures of the degree to which the applicant can connect with young people and their enthusiasm for teaching as a vocation.

Because these countries do a better job of getting their high school graduates to high standards and because these countries then select the students for admission from a substantially higher performance band of their high school graduates than we do, their future teachers enter college with a much better command of the subjects they will teach than our teachers do and, even more important, they leave college with a much better command of those subjects.

In many of the top-performing countries, elementary school teachers are required to specialize in either their native language and social studies or mathematics and science. In college, these future elementary school teachers must either major or minor in these

subjects. This is in stark contrast to the United States, where elementary school teachers are expected to teach all subjects. Many of our elementary school teachers did not like mathematics or science, and took as little of it as possible in schools and less in college. Their command of these subjects is shaky at best. This simply does not happen in countries that require their elementary school teachers to specialize and to at least minor in the subjects they will teach while in college.

The top performers not only make sure that their future teachers have a deep command of the subjects they will teach, but they also make sure that they have a strong command of the craft of teaching them. They require extended practicums in schools, typically under the strong guidance of master teachers, people who have been certified both as excellent mentors and as excellent teachers.

There are no “alternative routes” into teaching in any of the top-performing countries, as this is defined in the United States. Anyone who wishes to become a teacher must meet all the requirements that anyone else has to meet. Nor are these demanding criteria waived in the face of teacher shortages because they do not have teacher shortages.

None of the top-performing states we surveyed matched the profile just presented of the top countries. None have a policy that would require them to source their teachers from the top half of college-going high school graduates. None limit the right to offer a teacher education program to high status post-secondary institutions. None have pegged their teachers’ compensation to compensation in high-status professions. None have instituted large-scale programs to change the way schools are organized and managed so as to make teaching attractive to highly qualified high school graduates. None has offered a free college education or a salary to highly capable high school graduates if they commit to a career in education. None have required their elementary school teachers to specialize in mathematics and science. Alone among the states, Massachusetts has instituted a rigorous assessment of teacher’s content knowledge which aspiring teachers must pass to be licensed in the state, more rigorous than the widely-used Praxis tests. Eleven states, including the top-performing state New Jersey, have begun to administer a well-regarded test developed at Stanford University to measure teacher’s craft knowledge.

Like the other states, Maryland requires its teacher education institutions to meet the standards of the relevant accrediting body. But those are very low standards compared to the standards of the top performers in other countries. Recently the Maryland State Department of Education became an alternative accrediting body for the state teacher education programs. The state could use this authority to raise standards.

Maryland is the only state we analyzed that conducts supply and demand studies of teachers. It shares that data with the teacher education institutions, which have volunteered to adjust their openings in the relevant programs in the light of the data. Maryland cannot, of course, do as good a job of matching supply to demand because the state does not control the number of slots in each institution allocated to training teachers for particular specialties.

The state Task Force on Teacher Education has recommended the use of financial incentives to attract high quality high school graduates willing to commit to teaching in high-needs schools. This recommendation has been incorporated in the draft ESSA proposal to be submitted to the U.S. Department of Education. Senate Bill 666, passed in 2014, would respond, in part, to this recommendation by setting up an incentive fund for prospective teachers. Maryland residents who have moderately high high school GPAs and composite scores on the SAT or ACT, and pledge to teach in a high-poverty Maryland school, are eligible to receive 100% of tuition, room, board and fees at a Maryland public institution of higher education, or 50% at a private institution. Following graduation they must teach in high-needs schools for at least the number of years in which they received state funding. However, this incentive has not yet been funded.

Maryland does require that all teacher education participants have an internship experience in a designated professional development school. This experience must last at least 100 days, which is comparable to the residencies in the top-performing countries.

The licensure exams used in Maryland are the same as those used by most American states; they are set to a standard of content mastery far below that expected of young people entering the teaching profession in the top-performing countries.

With these specific exceptions, our findings for Maryland were the same as those for the other states we surveyed described above.

QUESTIONS FOR MARYLAND

Does Maryland want to:

1. Source its teachers from the top half of the students graduating from high school who are going on to college?
2. Limit admissions to teacher education programs to students who have a very strong academic record and have a strong capacity for connecting with young people and a strong vocation for teaching?
3. Limit the right to offer a teacher education program to a subset of universities with selective admissions programs or to students who meet a higher criterion for admission than many existing universities?
4. Require its universities to establish programs for elementary school teachers to specialize in either mathematics and science or English and social studies?
5. Forgive tuition, room and board at Maryland's public universities for students in the top—say—five percent of their high school classes if they commit to serving in Maryland schools when they get their license to teach, provided that they meet the university's admissions standards?
6. Adopt the teacher licensure standards being used in Massachusetts or similarly rigorous standards, for both content mastery and mastery of craft?
7. Abolish 'alternative routes' into teaching?

BUILDING BLOCK 6

REDESIGN SCHOOLS TO BE PLACES IN WHICH TEACHERS ARE TREATED AS PROFESSIONALS, WITH INCENTIVES AND SUPPORT TO CONTINUOUSLY IMPROVE THEIR PRACTICE AND THE PERFORMANCE OF THEIR STUDENTS

SUMMARY

Through the first half of the 20th century, the elementary and secondary schools were competing with the professions for the relatively small number of people with university degrees. Because the schools needed so many teachers, the people designing the new mass education system needed to find a way to organize and manage the schools so they could make the best use of normal school—not university—school graduates. Indeed, the record shows that the designers of this system wanted as teachers young women who could be let go when they got pregnant and would cause as little trouble as possible while employed. Taking a cue from the hugely successful industrial enterprises springing up everywhere, policy makers chose to rely on the managers of their school systems to organize and run schools that would deliver the basic skills to their students. That is why most schools were built on a model in which administrators closely supervised the work of faculty who were never called blue-collar workers, but who were treated like blue-collar workers. Though our teachers now have at least bachelors degrees, the management model has hardly changed at all. The schools are still organized in pretty much the same way and teachers' roles have not budged.

Over the last thirty years, however, the top-performing countries have largely left this model behind and moved toward ways of organizing schools based not on the turn-of-the-last-century industrial model, but instead on a much more professional model of work organization.

In this new model, there are many fewer people in the central office, telling the schools what to do and how to do it. Much more of the resources available for public education go to the schools, much less to the whole infrastructure above the schools. Teachers are told what the goals are and then given the resources and support they need to enable their students to reach them, and they have much more freedom as they decide how to get their students to the standards the state has established for them. The faculty do not work alone, they spend a lot of time working together in teams to develop better ways of doing almost everything. Even when they are teaching, their classrooms are lined with other teachers, who will later critique their work and come up with ideas for improving the lessons the teacher they were watching was teaching. The drive to get better and better never stops. Master teachers give master classes for other teachers. Teacher teams research the world's best practices on, say, teaching reading to young children whose mother tongue is different from the language used in class, and then, using that research, design their own lessons, carefully evaluating whether they are getting the results they want and changing course in the light of their evaluation data, in the same way a development team in an engineering company might. Teacher teams that are getting exceptional results are asked to write articles for refereed journals, and to present their findings to other teachers in the district, province, even the whole country, in much the same way that researchers and engineers in high-tech firms routinely do.

This professional model of work organization produces much better results than the old mass production factory model in the top-performing countries. But, as with any high status profession, it only works if the professionals are very well educated and highly trained. But there is a twist. It turns out that implementing this model is a powerful tool for recruiting top high school graduates to school teaching. That is especially true if this model is implemented along with the kinds of career ladders in teaching that have been pioneered in Shanghai and Singapore and are now spreading among the top performers.

In the United States, the job the schoolteacher does is the same on the day before retirement that it was on the young teacher's first day on the job. If a teacher wants advancement, she has to leave teaching for school administration. Increased compensation is largely based on time in service and credit for courses that may or may not improve the teacher's skills. In the first few years of teaching, the beginner has a strong incentive to learn enough to survive. But, after that, there is no incentive at all to get better at the work.

That is, of course, not true in the high-status professions, where, as one gets better and better at the work, one rises through the ranks, getting more authority, responsibility, status and compensation as one goes up the ladder. The absence of such a system is a very important reason why very capable high school graduates avoid teaching and many of our best young teachers leave the field. In Singapore and Shanghai, and increasingly elsewhere, there is a formal career ladder in teaching. At the step on the ladder that signifies that the teacher has become highly competent, the ladder branches in one direction to the rank of master teacher and in the other to school principal. In some countries, these two positions are compensated at the same level. The presence of such systems have proven to be a very important lever in the tool kit of the top performers as they seek top high school graduates to go into teaching and create incentives for them, once hired, to get better and better at the work they do.

We now turn to a listing of the key features of the systems we have been describing, and a comparison of the degree to which Maryland and the top-performing American states implement systems with these features.

Forms of school organization in which teachers are given a lot of time to work together in teams to improve teaching and learning in a systematic way

In the countries that have made the most progress toward the new professional forms of work organization, up to 70% of a teacher's time in school is not spent in front of classes teaching, but is instead spent working in teams to consult with each other about particular students who are not performing as they should; developing a plan of action for them and get them back on track; tutoring individual students who can only make the progress they need to make with one-on-one attention; visiting with parents or others in the community whose help is essential in improving the performance of particular students; visiting each others' classrooms to observe a new lesson developed by a team being taught for the first time to critique and improve it; watching a master teacher at work to learn from her; visiting a class being taught by a new teacher as part of a regular mentoring program for that new teacher; but, more than any of these, to participate as a member of a team with an assignment to substantially improve instruction in the school by researching, developing, evaluating and implementing a better way to teach some part of the curriculum. Teachers typically meet by grade for an

hour each week and by subject matter for an hour each week. It is often the case that classroom-sized rooms are set aside for each grade in which teachers have cubicle offices equipped with phones and computers, to facilitate the work they do together as well as informal professional communication.

None of the states we surveyed, including Maryland, have implemented such systems statewide.

Well-developed career ladders that structure a professional career in teaching

In the top performing jurisdictions countries with the best-developed career ladder systems, progression up the career ladder is typically based on meeting a set of criteria showing that the teacher is 1) highly skilled at teaching, 2) both a good contributor to the work of teacher teams (at the lower rungs of the ladder) and a good leader of teams (at the upper rungs of the ladder), 3) an effective mentor of both new teachers and teachers lower on the ladder (especially important for teachers on the upper rungs of the ladder) and 4) skilled at the kind of action research that teacher leaders are expected to lead to improve the performance of the school and its students. None of the states we surveyed has a statewide career ladder system of any kind. Baltimore has recently begun a preliminary form of such a system, but it is not yet as robust as the systems described above. Maryland does incentivize teachers to pursue National Board Certification by offering them \$2,000 (to be doubled to \$4,000 starting in 2019), but this is not the same as a career ladder in teaching because it does not offer teachers new roles and responsibilities as they get progressively better and better over the course of their entire careers.

Strong support for new teachers

The top-performing countries typically require that new teachers participate, when first hired, in mentoring programs lasting one to three years, with a reduced teaching load, under the close supervision of a teacher who has reached the position of master teacher on the teacher career ladder. In some countries, full licensure for the new teacher is conditional on the agreement of the mentor that the new teacher fully meets the standards set by the ministry of education.

Massachusetts and New Jersey require that new teachers be mentored for one year following certification. Maryland requires that new teachers be mentored for three years. New Hampshire does not require mentoring. In Maryland, Massachusetts and New Jersey, mentors are self-selected and receive minimal training for mentoring. None of these states require that the mentors be master teachers or that they meet an established standard of effectiveness as mentors, as is the case in the top-performing jurisdictions. One of the reasons that the mentoring programs of the states we surveyed do not require that mentors be master teachers is that they do not have state criteria for designating teachers as master teachers, because they do not have career ladders that would have required them to create such criteria.

Policies designed to enhance the professional role of teachers and to enable teachers to drive and not just respond to the process of school improvement

None of the states we surveyed, including Maryland, have policies intended to give teachers the skills they need to become effective action researchers, to encourage schools to use research methods to systematically analyze the worldwide research

literature before undertaking projects to improve the performance of their schools, to use research methods to evaluate the effectiveness of their school improvement initiatives, to publish the results of their investigations in juried publications run by universities or to disseminate the results of their research to other schools in their districts or other districts.

QUESTIONS FOR MARYLAND

Does Maryland want to:

1. Create an initiative designed to provide incentives and support to Maryland schools and districts to design and implement new forms of professional work organization of the kind being adopted in the top-performing countries, including greatly reducing the teaching load of teachers and giving the them much more time to work in teams to systematically improve instruction? Is there a way to do this that is coordinated with the measures Maryland might take to improve teacher quality in the state?
2. Build on the start that has been made in Baltimore to create a statewide career ladder for teachers as robust as the best systems in the top-performing countries and to use such a system as the basis for allocating leadership roles for teachers in the state and for compensating them?
3. By law, make teachers' compensation competitive with compensation in the high- status professions?
4. Build on its current program for mentoring new teachers to require that mentors be master teachers, reduce mentors' teaching load to give them the time to mentor new teachers, give mentees reduced time teaching in order to observe other teachers and participate in teacher team meetings, give mentor teachers a significant role in deciding whether their mentees should get a full license to teach?
5. Create an initiative designed to a) give teacher teams the research skills they would need to carefully evaluate the claims researchers and educational material publishers make about the effectiveness of their research and develop data gathering and analysis plans for their action research on improving their own instruction in the school improvement projects? b) Encourage universities to create refereed journals for teachers' research? and c) Encourage teachers unions, school boards, universities and others to develop opportunities for teachers whose research is particularly useful to share their research results with others throughout the state?

BUILDING BLOCK 8

CREATE A LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM THAT DEVELOPS LEADERS AT ALL LEVELS TO MANAGE THE NEW SYSTEMS EFFECTIVELY

SUMMARY

Schools in the United States are typically larger, sometimes much larger, than in the rest of the world. Because that is so, and because mass education systems in other countries developed later than in the United States, and so were less influenced by the mass production industrial model of organization, most schools in other countries were, until recently, run by head teachers who continued to teach part time. That is why the people who run schools in other countries are more often called 'heads' than 'principals.' It is also true that ministries of education typically play stronger roles in making policy in these countries than state departments of education do in the United States, and school district offices in the suburbs and cities of these countries are much smaller than district central offices in the United States. Among the consequences of these differences is that schools and principals in other countries typically have much more autonomy than is the case for school principals in the United States. Principals spend much more time in those countries working with their faculties on improving teaching and learning, coaching their staff and building a strong school culture, and much less time gathering data for the central office and responding to its directives. Central offices in the United States tend to favor principals who are compliant, whereas the local central office in these other countries is too small to bother the principals much and the ministry is too far away.

Because of this history, most of the top-performing countries did not until recently give a lot of thought to or make much policy about the sourcing, training and regulation of school leaders.

In retrospect, this gave them a big advantage. Over the last 30 or so years, as these countries realized that they had to redesign their systems to get much better student performance without spending much more money, they realized that their school heads needed to play a very special role in this transformation. Their principals would be required to lead the charge at the local level. They would need to understand the new professional model of school organization and they would have to have the skills needed to make it work. These countries were very focused on implementation of the new model, and, early on, they saw their school heads as the key to implementing it successfully.

By way of contrast, principals in the United States do not see themselves as head teachers, deeply steeped in teaching and learning, admired by the faculty for their skills as a teacher, a true colleague. Instead, they see themselves as the central office sees them, as school 'administrators,' a term that comes from the factory floor, not from the school world. These other countries could create an approach to the sourcing, education, training and further development of school leaders from scratch. In the United States, it will be much harder, because there is a very well-established system for doing all these things that does not fit with the new design for organizing and managing schools and schooling very well at all.

In many ways, the top performers approach the sourcing, education, training and support of school leaders in much the same ways as they approach those functions for teachers.

First, in the top-performing countries, in contrast to the latest practice in the United States, no one becomes a principal who has not been a first-rate teacher. They treat their school professionals like professionals. In the minds of the people who head the education systems in these countries, the heads of law practices are attorneys, the heads of engineering firms are engineers, the heads of medical practices are physicians and so it is natural to expect that the people who head schools must have demonstrated strong competence as a teacher.

Second, just as these countries pay a lot of attention to the quality of the pool from which they select their teachers, they also pay a lot of attention to the quality of the pool from which they select their school leaders. Some of the countries that are leaders in this arena actually got this idea from a close study of the development of leaders in the U.S. military. In this case, it means that current school leaders are expected to give many teachers opportunities to lead small, short-term teams and to make good judgments about which of them appear to have what it takes to become a good leader. Having identified them, they are then expected to give them a carefully chosen set of such opportunities, with more and more responsibility over time. This selection of progressively more challenging assignments is supposed to be matched with increasingly powerful opportunities to develop the skills that the individual will need to meet the next challenge. The ministry typically structures a carefully chosen array of such opportunities, ranging from a short course at the university to an assignment overseas for as long as several months to benchmark one or more national education systems.

Because everyone knows that the best opportunities are offered to those who have demonstrated the most skill and dedication and the greatest potential, opportunities for professional development are eagerly sought after, and when offered, are quickly taken as an honor and not an obligation to be suffered through. Just as in the United States Army, and in the typical large law firm, people in mid-level and upper level echelons are judged in part on their ability to identify and groom the talent the organization will need, and their own advancement is based in significant measure on their skill at these crucial tasks.

This system of carefully grooming and mentoring teachers for leadership positions of increasing responsibility and authority is well understood by everyone in the system. In some systems, required course work is specified along with a required apprenticeship to a designated master principal. In other systems, these requirements are present but less formalized. But mentoring and apprenticeship to highly competent school leaders is a common thread that runs through the top-performing systems.

The process of grooming and mentoring does not end when teacher leaders become assistant principals, vice-principals and then principals. School leaders have their own career ladders in the best of these systems and the top of the ladder is not the job of principal. It runs into the local central office and into the ministry of education. Promising principals are offered the opportunity to get advanced degrees, up to and through doctorates, at state expense. They are expected to serve in many kinds of schools, especially in schools serving large populations of disadvantaged students, as a

condition of moving up the ladder. At every step of the way, advancing leaders are exposed to a widening array of knowledge, moving, as they go up the ladder, from the tactical to the strategic, just as in the American military and in strong companies. And, again, at every step of the way, the 'curriculum' is designed to deepen the leaders' ability to implement the overall design embraced by the state, in all its parts and pieces.

The aim throughout is to give these leaders the insights, skills and knowledge needed to build a first-rate staff and then create an environment in which that staff will want to do the best work of which they are capable, stretching all the time to get better and better. These principals do not see their job as keeping school. They see their job as designing and leading high performance organizations with very high expectations for their students and the skill and knowledge to help them reach those expectations: inspiring, strategic, skillful, knowledgeable, empathetic, hard driving and deeply moral.

In the top performing systems, the training of the teachers and the training of school leaders are closely aligned with each other and with the state's policies on standards, curriculum, assessment and school design and organization. That alignment, combined with a strong orientation toward apprenticeship in carefully selected schools, makes it possible for the state to develop school faculties ready to hit the ground to implement very complex designs for school improvement as a real team.

We know of no state that has a statewide system in every district for identifying teachers with strong leadership potential and deliberately developing that potential over a period of many years with a carefully selected, progressively more challenging set of assignments, coupled with a set of matching opportunities for professional development. However, in 2014, Maryland created the Governor's Promising Principals Academy, which draws from all 24 districts in the state and serves up to 48 candidates per year. Prince George's County has partnered with the National Institute for School Leadership to create an aspiring principals program designed to create a talent pipeline for aspiring principals in that county.

Like many other states, Maryland has requirements for getting licensed as a principal that involve time in service, completion of an approved program and passing a test. But the programs are not very selective, have no way to screen candidates for their leadership potential and depend on passing a test that was found by a recent study to be ineffective at predicting the job performance of school principals. Massachusetts is using a performance test that would appear to be better suited to its purpose.

All of the states we benchmarked have adopted the National Policy Board's Professional Standards for Education Leaders (PSEL, formerly known as ISLLC standards) for school principals, but it is not clear what that means in terms of the content of the preparation programs they participate in or the skills that their principals actually have. This list of skills, in any case, is not intended to match up with any particular state's design for its education system, which distinguishes these standards from those used in the top performing countries. This is a very important distinction. The standards for training school principals in the top-performing countries are based on the specific designs those countries have developed to produce superior student performance with very small school-to-school variation in student performance. They are intended to guide institutions in putting together professional development and training plans that are geared to that strategy. The PSEL standards are geared to no strategy. They are consensus standards for running the system that now prevails in the

United States. That system, on the whole, is producing mediocre results at very high cost. The standards in the top-performing countries are intended to help those leaders understand their country's strategy for getting high student achievement and equity at a deep level and acquire not just general skills but the specific skills needed to fully implement that strategy.

One of the benchmarked states did just that, at a very important point in time. David Driscoll, Massachusetts Commissioner of Education when the famed Massachusetts Education Reform Act was passed, developed his strategy for implementing this complex and very comprehensive reform program, he turned to the National Institute for School Leadership to put virtually all the principals in the state through an extensive executive development program intended to give these school leaders the knowledge and skills they would need to implement new legislation intended to change the whole system in ways that in many respects mirrors the strategies used by the countries that lead the world's league tables in elementary and secondary education. At the time, Driscoll concluded that leadership training would be the most efficient and the most effective way to get the job done. His school principals became the point of the spear for the legislation that vaulted Massachusetts to the head of the pack.

QUESTIONS FOR MARYLAND

Does Maryland want to:

1. Require its school districts to develop and implement systems to identify teachers who show promise as leaders and mentor and groom them for leadership positions, first as teacher leaders and then as school leaders? Does it want to require school districts to do the same thing with their school principals: to structure a sequence of leadership positions in the district, and evaluate and reward their senior staff based on their record of identifying and successfully grooming the leadership talent the district will need in the years ahead?
2. Develop a statewide system of career ladders for principals and other school leaders, perhaps in tandem with a career ladder for teachers? Require school leaders, as a condition of going up that ladder, to serve in schools serving high proportions of disadvantaged students along the way?
3. Limit the availability of school leadership positions to people who have demonstrated that they are excellent teachers?
4. Structure a carefully developed array of professional development opportunities for school leaders that includes not only high-quality instruction in leadership at business schools and schools of education, but also opportunities to benchmark education systems in other states and countries in carefully structured programs designed to broaden their horizons and improve the state's awareness of important developments in school practice and leadership worldwide?
5. Begin to think through a leadership strategy for implementing the Commission's recommendations that involves teacher leaders, school leaders, district leaders and state leaders in one coordinated, multi-year program of leadership development that will get the whole state on the same page for the rollout of the Commission's recommended program?