MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Preparing World-Class Students

Lillian M. Lowery, Ed.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • MarylandPublicSchools.org

TO: Members of the State Board of Education

FROM: Lillian M. Lowery, Ed.D.

DATE: October 31, 2012

SUBJECT: COMAR 13A.07.10 (New)
COMPREHENSIVE PRINCIPAL INDUCTION PROGRAM
PERMISSION TO PUBLISH

PURPOSE:

This regulation sets out the requirements for a comprehensive principal induction program for new principals. It provides guidance for local school systems in establishing such programs, while describing the minimum support a new principal needs. Recognizing that situations are not the same in all local school systems, these regulations establish the basic components of an induction program while allowing flexibility for local school systems to build on their current programs.

BACKGROUND/HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE:

Maryland has long believed that effective instructional leadership provided by the principal is key to sustaining school improvement in any school. In 2005 the State Board of Education adopted the Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework, describing the knowledge and skills principals need in order to be effective instructional leaders. Student achievement over the years compared to other states is at least in part due to how much principals have grown in this regard.

However, if Maryland is to eliminate the achievement gap and reach world-class status, principals must be prepared in their first year on the job to assume instructional leadership responsibilities from the outset of their careers. Prior experience, appropriate coursework, and an effective principal induction program are critical if we are to sustain and indeed exceed the gains Maryland has seen over the years. The Wallace Foundation has suggested in a recent publication that among the five lessons learned in leadership training, principals need high-quality mentoring and professional development tailored to meet individual and district needs.

Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) staff reviewed similar regulations and legislation in other states. The first draft of the proposed regulation was shared with all superintendents. It was also discussed in a conference call with Dr. Carl Roberts, Executive Director of the Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland (PSSAM). Dr. Roberts then invited two local superintendents to meet with staff and him to discuss and help think through the proposed amendment further. Following that meeting staff completed a final revision, which is attached to the memorandum.

In July 2011, the Maryland State Board of Education passed regulations to implement teacher induction programs. MSDE believes that a comprehensive principal induction program is the next logical step in that regard.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

MSDE wishes to implement a new regulation providing for comprehensive principal induction programs in all LEAs. This proposed regulation allows for flexibility among LEAs while providing for basic components that should be present in all induction programs. This regulation would be a companion regulation to the Comprehensive Teacher Induction Regulation (13A.07.01).

ACTION:

Request that the Board grant Permission to Publish the proposed new regulation at 13A.07.10 Comprehensive Principal Induction Program.

LML:jf

Attachments

Title 13A STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Subtitle 07 SCHOOL PERSONNEL

Chapter 10 Comprehensive Principal Induction Program

Authority: Education Article, §§2-205(c), 5-206-1, and 6-202(b), Annotated Code of Maryland

.01 Scope.

This chapter applies to a comprehensive induction program for new principals. The purpose of this regulation is to provide guidance for local school systems to establish a high quality induction program that addresses critical professional learning needs of new principals, improves instructional quality, and helps inductees achieve success in their initial assignments, resulting in improved student learning and higher retention in the profession. The induction program that each local school system designs shall reflect coherence in structure and consistency in focus to ensure an integrated, seamless system of support. Recognizing that "one-size-fits-all" induction programs do not meet the needs of new principals, these regulations establish the components of an induction program, allowing local school systems to build on their current programs.

.02 Incorporation by Reference.

In this chapter, the Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework is incorporated by reference.

.03 Definitions.

A. In this chapter, the following terms have the meanings indicated.

B. Terms Defined.

(1) "Mentee" means a public school principal who is the recipient of the services of a mentor.

(2) "Mentor" means an individual who possesses the attributes set forth in Regulation .06 of this chapter.

(3) "New principal" means a principal who is:

(a) New to the position; or

(b) A veteran who is new to the local school system.

(4) "Executive Officer" means a principal's supervisor who evaluates the principal COMAR 13A.01.04.02.

.04 General Requirements.

A. Each local school system shall have a comprehensive induction program for new principals. Such programs should be differentiated based on the needs of the principal and should include such components as:

(1) Locally designed orientation program for all principals new to the principalship and/or local school system;

(2) Ongoing support from a mentor.

(3) Appropriate levels of staffing to plan and coordinate all induction activities;

B. All principals new to the position or to the local school system shall participate in induction activities in year one. Beyond year one, participation in induction activities will be a local decision.

C. To the extent practicable given staffing and fiscal concerns, local school systems shall consider minimizing system-wide responsibilities in the new principal's first year.

.05 Mentoring Component of the Comprehensive Induction Program.

A. A local school system shall identify full-time or part-time mentors to support principals during their comprehensive induction period.

B. In collaboration with the mentor, the new principal shall identify areas for focus of his/her professional growth.

C. Mentors shall:

(1) Demonstrate a knowledge base and skills to address the performance evaluation criteria and outcomes to be met by each mentee; and

(2) Have been a principal and have been rated as satisfactory or effective or be a retiree from a local school system and have been rated as a satisfactory or effective principal.

D. Local school systems shall provide ongoing training for mentors as appropriate.

.06 Evaluation of the Comprehensive Induction Program.

Local school systems shall evaluate the effectiveness of the comprehensive induction program.

.07 Date of Compliance.

Local school systems shall be in full compliance with this chapter by July 1, 2014.

.08 Reporting Requirements.

By September 1, 2014 and each five years after, each local school system superintendent shall certify to the State Superintendent of Schools that the Comprehensive Principal Induction Program meets the minimum requirements set forth in Chapter .01 of this regulation

IMPACT STATEMENTS

Part A
(check one option)

Estimate of Economic Impact

❑ The proposed action has no economic impact.

This depends on the individual LEAs. Many LEAs already have comprehensive principal induction programs that will satisfy the regulation. Those that do not have considerable flexibility in structuring such a program. Thus it is difficult to determine what the impact would be since it is within each LEA's control.

or

❑ The proposed action has an economic impact. Complete the following form in its entirety.

I. Summary of Economic Impact.

II. Types of Economic Impacts.	Revenue (R+/R-) Expenditure (E+/E-)	Magnitude
A. On issuing agency:		0
B. On other State agencies:		0
C. On local governments:		Most LEAs already have a comprehensive principal development program. In those instances, where such a program does not exist, there may be minimal costs to the LEA depending upon how they choose to structure their induction programs. They have great flexibility in implementing such programs.

	Benefit (+) Cost (-)	Magnitude
D. On regulated industries or trade groups:		NA
E. On other industries or trade groups:		NA
F. Direct and indirect effects on public:		Schools with principals who are better prepared to serve

III. Assumptions. (Identified by Impact Letter and Number from Section II.)

Part B
(check one option)

Economic Impact on Small Businesses

X The proposed action has minimal or no economic impact on small businesses.

or

❑ The proposed action has a meaningful economic impact on small businesses. An analysis of this economic impact follows.

Impact on Individuals with Disabilities
(Check one option)

X The proposed action has no impact on individuals with disabilities.

or

☐ The proposed action has an impact on individuals with disabilities as follows:

Part C
(For legislative use only; not for publication.)

A. Fiscal Year in which regulations will become effective: **FY15**

B. Does the budget for fiscal year in which regulations become effective contain funds to implement the regulations?

❑ Yes X No

C. If "yes," state whether general, special (exact name), or federal funds will be used:

D. If "no," identify the source(s) of funds necessary for implementation of these regulations:

E. If these regulations have no economic impact under Part A, indicate reason briefly:

This depends on the individual LEAs. Many LEAs already have comprehensive principal induction programs that will satisfy the regulation. Those that do not have considerable flexibility in structuring such a program. Thus it is difficult to determine what the impact would be since it is within each LEA's control.

F. If these regulations have minimal or no economic impact on small businesses under Part B, indicate the reason and attach small business worksheet.

Comparison to Federal Standards
(Check one option)

X There is no corresponding federal standard to this proposed regulation.

or

❑ There is a corresponding federal standard to this proposed regulation. Please give corresponding federal standard and if the regulation is not more restrictive or stringent give justification.

or

❑ In compliance with Executive Order 01.01.1996.03, this proposed regulation is more restrictive or stringent than corresponding federal standards as follows:

(1) Regulation citation and manner in which it is more restrictive than the applicable federal standard:

(2) Benefit to the public health, safety or welfare, or the environment:

(3) Analysis of additional burden or cost on the regulated person:

(4) Justification for the need for more restrictive standards: