

educational considerations

KANSAS STATE
UNIVERSITY

College of Education




Kansas State University
has a long history of
providing high quality
masters and doctoral
programming in
educational leadership,
with programs
tailored to meet the
specific and varied needs
of working professionals.

In 1987, K-State pioneered the leadership academy concept, wherein the university partners with school districts or other educational organizations to collaboratively design and deliver relevant, flexible degree programming through a unique blend of delivery systems and theme-based content serving a wide range of field-based needs and interests. The first academy was held in collaboration with Topeka USD 501. Recent or current masters-level academies include partnerships with Geary County USD 475, Salina USD 305, Topeka USD 501, and Dodge City USD 443. Additionally, doctoral cohort partnerships are operating at Kansas State University-Salina, Topeka, and in collaboration with the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum in Kansas City, Missouri.

Program Principles

- Program completers earn either a Master of Science (M.S.) or a Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree from Kansas State University.
- M.S. programs consist of a minimum 30 semester credit hours.
- Ed.D. programs consist of a minimum 94 semester hours beyond the bachelor degree.
 Up to 30 hours from an accredited masters degree may be included in the total.



Program Theme(s)

M.S.-level academy themes are collaboratively established between the university and academy partners. Ed.D cohorts follow a similar design. In general, participants develop individual leadership capacity by focusing on themes of understanding organizational structure, developing collaboration skills, and developing problem solving and effective leadership skills, along with content mastery. More specific program themes may be developed based on partners' unique needs and interests.

Costs and Other Support

Support mechanisms are independently established by the partnering organizations. Common support features for M.S.-level academies often include some release time for professional development, and financial support for textbooks, materials, supplies, and internship opportunities. Ed.D cohorts commonly are pursued by individuals, rather than school districts—consequently, release time is the most common support feature. In all cases, participants typically fund their own tuition and fees.

Admission and Selection

- A minimum 15 participants is required. Admission is competitive.
- Generally, participants are able to show three years teaching experience; show commitment to lifelong learning; demonstrate knowledge of effective instruction and willingness to apply research to best practices; show willingness to conduct research to improve their sponsoring organization/district; and exhibit commitment to participate in requirements in all aspects of the program.
- Participants must meet admission criteria of the K-State Graduate School and meet all additional requirements for admission to the Ed.D. program in educational leadership.

Delivery Design

- Delivery is collaboratively established between the university and partners/participants.
- Delivery is by cohort design for duration of content delivery.
 In the Ed.D., participants later complete the internship and dissertation on individualized schedules.
- A typical delivery design is patterned on one day per week from 4:30–9:30 p.m., consisting of integrated coursework that blends seminar and project-style work with mediated delivery enhancements.

Location

Session locations are determined collaboratively with participants. Courses are significantly enhanced by online activities.

www.coe.k-state.edu/departments/edlea



educational considerations

BOARD OF EDITORS

David C. Thompson, Chair Kansas State University

Chad Litz, Chair Emeritus Kansas State University

Faith E. Crampton University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

R. Craig Wood University of Florida

EXECUTIVE EDITOR

Faith E. Crampton

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Mary L. Hammel, Assistant to the Editor Kansas State University

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Patrick B. Forsyth University of Oklahoma

William Fowler George Mason University

Janis M. Hagey

National Education Association

William Hartman

Pennsylvania State University

Marilyn Hirth Purdue University Robert C. Knoeppel Clemson University

Martha McCarthy Loyola Marymount University

Mary McKeown-Moak Moak, Casey, and Associates

F. Howard Nelson

American Federation of Teachers

Allan Odden

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Margaret L. Plecki University of Washington Catherine Sielke

University of Georgia

William E. Sparkman University of Nevada-Reno

Lenford C. Sutton Youngstown State University

Julie Underwood University of Wisconsin-Madison

Deborah A. Verstegen University of Nevada-Reno

James G. Ward

University of Illinois-Champaign-Urbana

Special Edition:

Kansas Educational Leadership Institute:

A Partnership to Collaborate and Share Resources to Support Professional Growth of Educational Leadership Needed in Kansas Schools and the Nation

Guest Editor:

Dr. Andy Tompkins

Elizabeth Funk, Ed.D.

Table of Contents

Foreword Dr. Diane DeBacker	1
Theory into Practice: A Cry From the Field for Innovative Leadership Development Dr. Debbie Mercer and Dr. Scott Myers	2
Case Study in the Power of Collaboration: Planning Process for the Kansas Educational Leadership Institute Dr. Mary Devin Contributors: Dr. Debbie Mercer, Mr. Mike Mathes, Dr. Tom Trigg, and Dr. Sharon Zoellner	6
From Vision to Implementation: KELI's First Year Dr. Mary Devin	12
The Influence of Mentoring on Developing Leaders: Participants Share Their Perspectives Dr. Donna Augustine-Shaw and Dr. Elizabeth Funk	19
Illuminating the Path: Evidence of Initial Success and Implications for the Future Dr. Donna Augustine-Shaw	27
Closing Supporting the Professional Growth of Educational Leaders Dr. Elizabeth Funk	37
Sign-Off	40

www.coe.k-state.edu/EdConsiderations/





Educational Considerations is published and funded by the College of Education at Kansas State University. *Educational Considerations* invites subscribers for only \$13.00 annually.

Please see the subscription form in this issue or access it online at www.coe.k-state.edu/edconsiderations/subscription.html.

PUBLICATION INFORMATION

Educational Considerations is a peer-reviewed journal published by the College of Education, Kansas State University. Educational Considerations and Kansas State University do not accept responsibility for the views expressed in articles, reviews, and other contributions appearing in this publication. In keeping with the professional educational concept that responsible free expression can promote learning and encourage awareness of truth, contributors are invited to submit research-based manuscripts related to educational leadership and policy.

Educational Considerations is published at least two times yearly. Editorial offices are located at the College of Education, Bluemont Hall, 1100 Mid-Campus Drive, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506-5301. Correspondence regarding manuscripts should be directed to the Executive Editor at fecrampton@gmail.com. No remuneration is offered for accepted articles or other materials submitted.

By submitting to Educational Considerations, the author guarantees that the manuscript is an original work, is not under consideration for publication elsewhere, and has not been previously published. The University of Chicago's Manual of Style, 16th edition, is the editorial style required. Authors may select from two citation systems: note (footnote) or author-date, as described in Chapters 14 and 15 of the manual, titled "Documentation I" and "Documentation II," respectively. For note style, footnotes with full details of the citation should be listed at the end of the manuscript. No bibliography is needed. Tables, graphs, and figures should be placed in a separate file. An abstract of 150 words must accompany the manuscript.

Manuscripts should be submitted electronically to the Executive Editor, Faith Crampton, at fecrampton@gmail.com as an e-mail attachment. Complete name, address, telephone number, and email address of each author should be included in the body of the e-mail and on the title page of the manuscript. Authors are required to provide copies of permission to quote copyrighted materials. Queries concerning proposed articles or reviews are welcome. The editors reserve the right to make grammatical corrections and minor changes in article texts to improve clarity. Address questions regarding specific styles to the Executive Editor.

Subscription to *Educational Considerations* is \$13.00 per year, with single copies \$10.00 each. Correspondence about subscriptions should be addressed to the Executive Editor at fecrampton@gmail.com.





Office of the Commissioner

785-296-3202 785-291-3791 (fax)

120 SE 10th Avenue * Topeka, KS 66612-1182 * www.ksde.org

It is with great pleasure that I write the Foreword for this edition of *Educational Considerations*. When Dr. Thompson requested that I contribute to the journal with the Foreword, I was flooded with memories of scouring through issue upon issue of *Educational Considerations* as I was working on my doctorate in Educational Administration at Kansas State University several years ago. *Educational Considerations* has a rich and long history of being a practitioner's journal and this issue continues with that tradition.

The lead article, "Theory into Practice: A Cry From the Field for Innovative Leadership Development", by Dr. Debbie Mercer and Dr. Scott Myers, sets the stage for the story of the Kansas Educational Leadership Institute (KELI). Dr. Mercer, Dean of the College of Education at Kansas State University, and Dr. Scott Myers, Director of Teacher Licensure and Accreditation at the Kansas State Department of Education, eloquently describe the journey that has resulted in the KELI. As they write in their piece, casual conversations among the Kansas State Department of Education, United School Administrators, the Kansas School Superintendents Association, the Kansas Association of School Boards, the Kansas Leadership Center and Kansas State University's College of Education led to the formation of an institute devoted to mentoring superintendents and school leaders. It's important to keep in mind that each of the organizations mentioned above had their own mentoring programs in place. Some of the programs were successful and others just beginning to grow. What's remarkable about the birth of KELI is that each organization saw the benefit of working together to create a better model. Each organization was willing to contribute their expertise to create the first educational leadership institute in Kansas.

In her article titled, "Case Study in the Power of Collaboration: Planning Process for the Kansas Educational Leadership Institute", Dr. Mary Devin, along with contributors Dr. Debbie Mercer, Mr. Mike Mathes, Dr. Tom Trigg, and Dr. Sharon Zoellner, shares how a spirit of collaboration over several years led to the opening of KELI's doors two years ago. The quote "Alone we can do so little; together we can do so much" by Helen Keller describes precisely the type of teamwork by many people to accomplish what some skeptics said was impossible. How appropriate that this article was written by Dr. Devin, an award-winning superintendent, and the founding director of KELI. It is because of Dr. Devin's vast experience as a leader and her true dedication to education that KELI was established and has been successful. Also instrumental in establishing KELI was Dr. David Thompson, Professor and Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership at KSU. Dr. Thompson had, for many years, seen the necessity for bringing the various partners together to build a leadership institute for all of Kansas. He was not only the inspiration for KELI but he also worked with KSU to provide the initial funding and housing on the beautiful campus in Manhattan. Dr. Thompson's persistence and true collaborative nature made a dream possible and begins a legacy that will be with Kansas education for many, many years. Thank you Dr. Devin and Dr. Thompson!

Additional articles in this edition of *Educational Considerations* provide a historical perspective of KELI from what is nearly a play-by-play account of the inception, to the opening, to the first two years of KELI by Dr. Donna Augustine-Shaw in her piece titled, "Illuminating the Path: Evidence of Initial Success and Implications for the Future." This article is a must-read for anyone interested in establishing a statewide leadership institute. With author and guest editor Dr. Elizabeth Funk, Dr. Augustine-Shaw continues the story of KELI with perceptions of first year superintendents and their mentors.

It has truly been my honor to contribute to this issue of *Educational Considerations*. The Kansas Educational Leadership Institute is one that will benefit countless teachers, leaders and students for many generations. On behalf of the Kansas State Department of Education, congratulations on the success and future of KELI.

Diane M. DeBacker. Ed.D. Commissioner of Education

Educational Considerations 1

hey m. Sebucker



Theory into Practice: A Cry From the Field for Innovative Leadership Development

Dr. Debbie K. Mercer and Dr. Scott Myers

Dr. Debbie K. Mercer, a former public school educator, is Professor and Dean of the College of Education at Kansas State University.

Dr. Scott Myers, a former superintendent, is Director of Teacher Leadership and Accreditation at the Kansas State Department of Education and Adjunct Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership at Kansas State University.

Teamwork is the ability to work together toward a common vision. The ability to direct individual accomplishments toward organizational objectives. It is the fuel that allows common people to attain uncommon results. – Andrew Carnegie

Leaders make the difference. This is uniquely evidenced in school districts where a single superintendent impacts the lives of so many children, teachers, staff, and community members every day. With so much responsibility, the need to mentor the ongoing professional learning and development of this key leader is critical.

We are well aware that our world, and thus our schools, is changing. Technology, economics, curriculum demands, federal and state policy, and changing student demographics are all impacting schools. We understand the importance of a 21st century leader to positively impact students and teachers.

This philosophy is grounded by Wagner, et al., in describing a new kind of administrative team that "needs to learn to take on two jobs at once—running the school or district they have, and leading an improvement process to create the school or district they must become" (2006, p. 214). Our view of leadership as a learned process is based on Rost's definition of leadership as "an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes" (1991, p.102). This perspective lays this foundation for a learning and leading model of professional development for school leaders.

Kansas has a well-articulated process for school leader preparation programs. State standards are currently being updated and are based on the foundational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 1996 and more currently, 2008 (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2008). Accredited institutions of higher education must document, through a rigorous program review process, that candidates meet these standards. This process, guided by state regulations, ensures that "the focus is on assessment evidence that demonstrates teacher

candidate proficiencies, accompanied by appropriate contextual information that will assist trained program reviewers" (KSDE, 2007). Further, each potential superintendent must successfully complete a content test developed and administered by Educational Testing Service (ETS) prior to recommendation for licensure. This effective program preparation process is strong and has ensured Kansas' school leaders have the knowledge and skills needed to be effective leaders.

However, these preparation programs only lay the foundation for the soon-to-be practicing school leader. While standing on a foundation of an effective preparation program, he/she begins the work of managing the district and creating a vision for the district. Induction into the executive leadership role is often a stressful time. While much more attention has been placed on mentoring new teachers (Scherer, 1999; Villani, 2002; and Portner, 2008) far less research has examined the value of a mentor for beginning school leaders. Further, many states even have mandatory mentoring requirements for beginning teachers (Portner, 2008). Again, a smaller but growing number require mentoring for new superintendents. The field itself often takes on this work, responding from within to provide support to new executive leaders.

Kansas provides one such example of a field-based response for executive leadership support. The professional organization, Kansas School Superintendent Association (KSSA), developed a one-to-one mentoring program for new superintendents where a new superintendent was paired with a more experienced practicing superintendent. However, initially the parameters of this mentoring program were overly broad and lacked definition. There was an expectation the practicing superintendents serving as mentors would make contact with the mentee superintendent early in the academic year and then on a monthly basis, but the content of those meetings was left entirely up to the mentor and mentee. Over time, it became obvious that a more focused approach to the operation of the mentor program was necessary. To meet this need, leadership from KSSA generated an itemized list of tasks/concerns for the mentor superintendent and the new superintendent to address on a monthly basis. This list then became the roadmap for the mentor and the mentee to follow throughout the year. While this adjustment to the program provided more structure to these monthly conversations, it did little to help the new superintendent build the leadership capacities needed to successfully lead a school district. The topics themselves dealt more with managerial tasks such as convening the calendar committee or being sure to inform the patrons of the district about inclement weather procedures. Also important to note, none of these conversation topics were research-based or tied to any validated list of nonnegotiable tasks superintendents need to address in order to ensure quality educational experiences for the students of the district.

Albeit well intentioned, as could be expected with such a loosely designed program, the results of the efforts of this program varied widely. Some new superintendents felt they had great support, others not so much. This was due to the particular strengths and weaknesses of the mentor superintendents, compatibility issues within certain mentor/mentee

pairings, the physical proximity of the mentor to the mentee, and the availability of the mentor to spend the necessary time with the new superintendent in light of the fact they had other professional and personal responsibilities to address in their own districts.

Along with the pragmatic issues previously discussed, another roadblock put before this fledgling program was the lack of regulation to make the participation mandatory for all new superintendents. So, unless a new superintendent had the vision to see that s/he would benefit from being involved in a "formal" mentor/mentee program, s/he had little provocation to take on yet one more thing to address in an already busy schedule. And, unfortunately, the new superintendent simply didn't know what s/he didn't know at this point, as this was the first time to serve as a superintendent. So, all too often the new superintendent put his/her head down and bulled ahead in his/her new position, rarely taking the time to step back away from the issues to ensure the efforts taking place were being effective. These concerns, and others, led to a statewide examination of induction and mentoring for all new superintendents.

The State had initial conversations as part of the Kansas Educational Leadership Commission (KELC), a large initiative to take an in-depth look at leadership needs. Membership on this commission consisted of representation from schools, higher education, business, professional organizations, State Board of Education, State Board of Regents, and the Governor's Office. This group expanded beyond the original 18 members to further flush out the recommendations. Their final report was issued in May 2008.

One concern arising from this process was the need for professional development for school leaders. Three key recommendations arising from the Commission's work (2008) are worthy of revisit as we examine the needs in Kansas:

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

"The Commission believes that the continuing education of school leaders can be dramatically improved through the targeted use of state policy. In this regard, the Commission recommends that a Kansas Education Leadership Initiative be created to provide high quality continuing education programs to school leaders, under the direction of the Kansas State Department of Education.

The Initiative should have sufficient resources to provide quality services, including a director and sufficient staff to operate the entity effectively on behalf of school leaders throughout the state. Operations and programs should be shaped by an advisory board of practicing school leaders and university faculty members appointed by the Kansas State Department of Education in consultation with the appropriate professional organizations.

The Initiative should be built with and operate based upon the following key elements:

- focus on the ISLLC standards that are at the heart of learning-centered leadership in Kansas;
- adhere to the principles of professional development promulgated by the National Staff Development Council;

- focus on sustained learning experiences that promote deep organizational change;
- mesh with the pre-service education provided by universities and colleges;
- extend and enhance partnership among the KSDE, universities, school districts, and professional associations;
- foster extensive networking among school leaders throughout the state; and
- promote opportunities for coaching.

The Commission envisions an initiative that develops comprehensive continuing education programs for school leaders. Initially, the focus should be on creating core programs that appeal to a wide variety of school leaders. As operations ramp up, these core programs should be supplemented with specialized offerings for educators in specific leadership roles (e.g., assistant principals, director of human resources).

The Commission recommends that policy be developed to require each licensed school leader to participate in at least one of the comprehensive programs provided by the initiative every five years; that is, as a requirement for license renewal." (KELC, 2008, p. 8-9).

Additionally, two recommendations focused on Administrator Induction:

ADMINISTRATOR INDUCTION

"The Commission concludes that currently insufficient attention is being devoted to helping new school administrators acclimate to their roles and responsibilities. We, therefore, recommend the development of policy to strengthen the school leader internship process already in play in the state.

First, we recommend a required two-year induction program for all new school leaders in Kansas.

Second we recommend the drafting of policy language to support the development of programs for the required induction experience. To begin with, we recommend that the KSDE be charged to (1) review induction-related activity from around the U.S. and capture benchmark models and (2) delineate the essential elements of high quality programs. KSDE should distribute this information widely so that districts can create highly effective induction programs for their school administrators.

In addition, we suggest that policy language be crafted to require the KSDE, in conjunction with universities, districts, and professional associations, to (1) build four model induction programs and (2) have those models piloted in districts throughout the state. The models should be designed so as to capture the diversity of administrative arrangements in operation throughout Kansas. For example, one model might be designed to support superintendents who also assume principalship responsibilities.

We recommend that resources sufficient to undertake the development, piloting, and distribution of work be provided. We also recommend that an evaluation of pilot programs and a sample of district-developed programs be conducted, and that resources necessary to undertake this assignment be provided. Part of the evaluation should address cost benefit questions (KELC, 2008, p. 9).

The Commission believes that coaching for leadership should be a central element of the overall design for strengthening school leadership throughout the state. Leaders, whether emerging or experienced, become more effective as a result of strategic leadership coaching. Therefore, we have woven this important strategy into recommendations 4, 8, and 9 as follows:

We also recommend the development of various centers throughout the state where educators can acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to become teacher leaders and effective coaches or to support the development of teacher leadership in schools and districts. (4);

Establish a system of training for all school leaders in both the use of the evaluation system and the core ideas on which the system is built (e.g., learning focused leadership, effective coaching) (8); and

The Kansas Education Leadership Initiative should be built with and operate based upon the following key element: to promote opportunities for leadership coaching (9)." (KELC, 2008, p. 9-10).

Other recommendations discussed preparation program improvements and modifications and leader evaluation. These issues are critical pieces of the entire leadership development process in Kansas.

The idea of a more formalized statewide approach to mentoring school leaders incubated in the minds of many for the next couple of years. Informal conversation between key education organizations began taking place two years later. Key leadership at KSDE provided the spark, which was quickly combined with leadership from the original Commission. Casual conversations led to "what if" excitement and the internal demand for action was strong. Uniting in the mission of providing mentoring support and professional development for school executive leaders remained the focus as many possibilities were discussed. It became quickly evident that the conversation needed to be broader if an initiative this big were to come to fruition.

The Kansas State Department of Education's Teacher Education and Licensure Division, Kansas State University's College of Education, United School Administrators of Kansas, the Kansas School Superintendents' Association, Kansas Association of School Boards, and the Kansas Leadership Center all pledged interest and support for this initiative. The first formal gathering took place at the Kansas Association of School Boards in Topeka, Kansas. Partners from the organizations began the dialogue about what existed to support new school superintendents, what was needed, and how we might move ahead with strengthening a state-wide approach to supporting and mentoring new school leaders. The Kansas Educational Leadership Institute (KELI), as it was immediately named, was taking shape.

Vince Lombardi is credited with saying, "Individual commitment to a group effort – that is what makes a team work, a company work, a society work, a civilization work." That is also what is making KELI work...individual commitment, organizational commitment, and a state commitment "to support professional growth of educational leaders needed in Kansas schools for the 21st Century."

References

Council of Chief State School Officers. 2008. Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008. Washington, D.C.

Kansas Educational Leadership Commission. May 2008. *Final report and recommendations*. Topeka, Kansas, USA: Kansas State Department of Education.

Kansas State Department of Education. 2007. Institutional handbook for program approval. Topeka, KS: KSDE.

Portner, Hal. 2008. *Mentoring new teachers*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

Rost, Joseph, C. 1991. *Leadership for the 21st century.* New York: Praeger.

Scherer, Marge. 1999. *A better beginning: Supporting and mentoring new teachers*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Villani, Susan. 2002. *Mentoring programs for new teachers: Models of induction and support*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

Wagner, Tony, Robert Kegan, Lisa L. Lahey, Richard W. Lemons, Jude Garnier, Deborah Helsing, Annie Howell, and Harriette T. 2006. *Change leadership: A practical guide to transforming our schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.



Case Study in the Power of Collaboration: Planning Process for the Kansas Educational Leadership Institute

Dr. Mary Devin

Contributors: Dr. Debbie Mercer, Mr. Mike Mathes, Dr. Tom Trigg, Dr. Sharon Zoellner

Dr. Mary Devin, a former Kansas superintendent, is Associate Professor of Educational Leadership at Kansas State University, and is the Executive Director of KELI.

Dr. Debbie Mercer is Professor and Dean of Education, Kansas State University; Mr. Mike Mathes is Superintendent, USD 345, Topeka, KS; Dr. Tom Trigg is Superintendent, USD 229, Overland Park, KS; and Dr. Sharon Zoellner is Superintendent, USD 416, Louisburg, KS.

Alone we can do so little; together we can do so much. – Helen Keller

Systematic statewide support for the recruitment, development, and retention of quality leaders in schools and school districts was not a new idea in Kansas in late 2010, but at best it was at an elusive concept. Diverse groups had considered it among components of a long-range commitment to move Kansas education quality from good to great, but no plan for creating such a system was in place. What, then, would make the difference when another round of vision-makers gathered? The author presents the case that it was a strong sense of *collaboration* that made the difference and stimulated movement from vision making to implementation of a system to provide for support of educational leadership.

A spirit of collaboration had been building in Kansas over time. This was a state that had been focusing on improving student learning long before *No Child Left Behind* mandates were introduced, and various agencies and professional organizations had hosted conversations about the role of the state in providing the educational leadership needed for the 21st Century. The importance of quality leadership was becoming a shared value among diverse stakeholder groups, but the system was not changing.

The work of an 18-member commission created in July 2007, the Kansas Education Leadership Commission (KELC), illustrates the point. KELC was a partnership among government, public education, and private industry. Its membership was broad-based and represented the diverse size and geographic location of school districts, educational philanthropy, state administrator professional organizations, and administrator preparation programs. It included chairs of state governing bodies for K-12 and higher education systems, the president of the state teachers' association, two state legislators, a member of the governor's staff, and leaders from the private business sector. An educator and a private sector member co-chaired the Commission and funding for the work

came from the Wallace Foundation, the Kansas Health Foundation, and the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE). Dr. Joseph F. Murphy, Professor of Education, Department of Leadership, Policy & Organizations, Vanderbilt University, was engaged as facilitator of the Commission's work and authored the final recommendations based on the work of its members.

The Commission spent 10 months working on its charge: to develop a set of policy recommendations for the design, implementation, and improvement over time of a system of leadership for learning in Kansas. In May 2008, leaders of KELC presented 12 recommendations to the Kansas State Board of Education. Three of the Commission's recommendations involved a systematic approach to direct support for educational leadership (KELC, 2008, p. 14):

Recommendation 9: Construct and fund leadership initiatives to provide continuing education programs for school leaders.

Recommendation 10: Rebuild the induction program for school leaders across the first two years on the job including crafting policy to support the development of model programs.

Recommendation 11: Emphasize the importance of coaching to the professional development of school leaders.

The Kansas State Board of Education accepted the recommendations, but again, no plan for implementation was put in place. A year and a half later, pilots were underway to assess three principal mentoring models. While the opportunity to examine existing models was a step forward, a very small number of principal mentors were being trained and the number of new principals receiving the mentoring support was insignificant compared to the number of principals statewide. Further, there was little prospect of any funding beyond the three-year grant providing that mentor training. Nothing of lasting significance had been done related to mentoring of district superintendents. Again, agreement on a vision produced no large-scale change to the system in place.

However, the influence of the KELC work had not completely ended. Two years later, five district superintendents attended a weeklong seminar on mentoring new leaders at Harvard University. That fall the director of state licensure convened a small group of educational leaders to participate in a conversation exploring a state and possible national center supporting educational leadership. Those invited to the discussion were thoughtfully selected to determine if there was interest in establishment of a center supporting leadership, statewide and possibly beyond. The short list included top state department staff charged with implementing state policy on licensing school and district administrators, the Associate Dean of Education and Department Chair of educational leadership from a state research university, and executive leaders from the three major state professional organizations that represented school boards, school administrators, and civic leadership. University participants in the conversation were selected based on the strong leadership programs at that university, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels, and because of the leadership department's reputation for and experience

with collaborating with others. Those receiving the invitation may not have expected a different result, but they did observe this was bringing together a different mix of stakeholders.

The meeting included a discussion of benefits of such a system; connecting theory and practice; collaboration as innovation; research from others such as Ohio, Delaware, and the Alliance to Reform Educational Leadership; the connection to licensure renewal; engaging the community/business ties; and building leadership capacity. Those present quickly iden-tified three points of shared commitment: 1) Post-licensure programs supporting the development of leadership were absent in Kansas; 2) Mentoring and induction programs should include introducing new leaders to functions and operations of the state board of education, the legislature, and professional organizations, and the development of advanced skills for writing/affecting policy issues; 3) Education leaders, particularly at the district level, need access to opportunities for professional growth in leadership and for a safe place to talk and network. Timing for this exploration was advantageous because a revision of state standards for leadership was scheduled to begin soon. The state's willingness to be an active partner was essential because any change would have to be compatible with state license policy regarding initial licenses and renewal of professional licenses for school administrators. The state department staff proposed the state's role was looking for active partners. In response to the invitation for collaboration, those attending agreed to engage a broader-based group of stakeholders in the conversation.

The Kansas State University College of Education and its Department of Educational Leadership committed support for such a leadership center, continuing a long-established and recognized practice of collaboration, innovation, and partnerships. Within a few weeks of the proposal discussion with KSDE, the Department Chair had secured the full support of the Dean of the College of Education and the pledged involvement of the entire department faculty. The College of Education agreed to provide space and administrative support, including a part-time executive director-like individual who would provide regular and systematic organization, support, and leadership. There were still major unknowns—uncertainty of funding sources for one, but the passion supporting the common goal and the collective belief in the power of collaboration provided the impetus for moving forward.

Invitation to others to join the initiative

To move the positive reception in the first conversation forward, the KSDE Director and the KSU Associate Dean agreed to co-chair an initiative seeking systematic support for educational leadership and issued an invitation to key leaders in the education community to further discuss the development of an Executive School Leadership Center in Kansas for both practicing executive leaders and aspiring school leaders. Those willing to attend would be considered the steering committee, so selecting whom to invite was critical. Others joining the KSDE and university leaders who had attended the first small group meeting, included the president and past president of the professional association representing school superintendents and the chairperson of a committee

appointed by that organization to identify a quality mentoring/induction program for first year superintendents. Chief executive officers from the school boards association, the united school administrators organization, and a center supporting civic leadership; plus two practicing superintendents and the five superintendents who had attended the Harvard seminar on mentoring at state department expense completed membership of the planners group. Wording of the invitation was carefully chosen to emphasize the common values and goals already identified. The initiative was described as an effort to form a collaborative relationship between KSDE, KSU, and the leading professional organizations representing district superintendents and school boards to unify support efforts.

The search for partners was expanding. To frame the conversation, research-based materials were distributed in advance to those planning to attend. Information was sent to provide background material on the concept of a centralized approach to supporting leadership. (Fullan, 2008; NASBE, 2009; Wallace Foundation, 2010; Miller, Devin & Shoop, 2005).

The first discussion item at the meeting exposed the shared interests of the 16 leaders assembled. Individuals were asked to respond to the question, "What are you looking for (from this initiative)?" Their responses fell into six general categories: mentoring (5), partnerships and networking (4), professional growth opportunities beyond mentoring (4), succession model (1), standards revision (1), and enhancing civic leadership (1). The group noted the connectedness of the expectations, reinforcing the need and the opportunity for working together to make a difference. Framework of a leadership center could include, but not be limited to, leadership preparation programs, mentoring, and induction as well as professional growth opportunities for veteran school leaders. Other agenda items included opportunities for the university staff to share examples or partnership experiences and for those attending the Harvard executive leadership seminar to review that experience and to report outcomes from committees formed to share important information with district leaders across the state. The intent of these agenda items was to pull together outcomes from efforts of the individual entities and use these collectively to move the idea of a leadership center forward. A collaborative leadership style was apparent as brainstorming for planning this initiative got underway.

One superintendent offered that such a center for leadership would be a flagship for providing growth for all educational leaders. A state department staff member added the need to think systemically, addressing both content and context, and another superintendent described such a center as a catalyst for developing continuous improvement among educational leaders, stretching them beyond comfort zones. There was consensus that a center for leadership could support new leaders, support current leaders, and attract new people into the system. Ultimately impact would spread to student performance, school boards, superintendents, principals, and would build leadership capacity throughout the educational system. It was evident the group shared a common commitment to the concept; now the challenge was to find a workable plan of implementation. This would be a test of the power of collaboration they hoped to maintain.

In the next weeks, the co-chairs assigned each participant to one of three working subgroups. Again, collaboration was supported by thoughtful assignments; each subgroup was representative of the make-up of the larger group. Subgroups were to address specific charges as follows:

- a. *Professional learning*—Develop themes/strands/format for a professional development leadership institute.
- b. *Mentoring*—Identify a research-based mentoring plan for new superintendents.
- c. *Enterprise* (structure/governance)—Address priorities, timeline, and funding.

A current superintendent chaired each subgroup, reinforcing the connection between any implementation plan and field practice where the work occurs. The next meeting was set just five weeks away and each subgroup was to meet independently before then to prepare a report to share at that time. Given that period included the winter holiday season, the schedule would test participants commitment to the initiative.

Subgroups report on their work

The second whole group meeting was in a time slot during the annual statewide conference for district leaders, in keeping with the spirit of collaboration. As subgroups reported, overlapping topics revealed both similar and varying approaches to issues, but collaborative attitudes continued. The professional development subgroup was first to present its work:

- Timeline: Priority for professional development (beyond mentoring/induction of first year leaders) would target practicing superintendents in the first year.
- Content: Six areas of leadership responsibility were proposed as the framework for professional development programming for a leadership center: Vision/Goal Setting, Effective Resource Management, Superintendent/Board relations, Curriculum/Instruction/Assessment, Parent/Community Relationships, and Developing Leadership/Succession Planning.
- Action: Survey practicing superintendents and use the results to address guiding questions:
 - What are current problems/issues for school administrators? (Consider needs based on experience of leaders and demographics of districts;
 - What offerings are currently available (from professional organizations, agencies, etc.) and how can they be coordinated to provide effective professional development;
 - 3) What additional support is needed to address problems/issues and to balance growth opportunities in the six areas of professional responsibility for leaders;
 - 4) Where is the expertise needed to provide the professional development programming needed?
- → Immediate action the committee proposes to undertake: Conducting a survey of practicing superintendents to address the guiding questions.

Second, the Enterprise subgroup reported on its progress:

- Priorities: Professional development of both new and experienced leaders is the priority; programming should begin with superintendent mentoring. The proposed university position should be given specific responsibilities for coordination and training of mentors and others.
- Timeline: Proceed with hiring of the university position, hire two mentors and provide content and philosophy training to ensure consistency, work with stakeholder groups to schedule six professional development learning sessions during the year, assign mentors and hold the first professional learning session prior to the start of the new school year.
- Funding: The Kansas State College of Education should dedicate faculty responsibilities to the coordination duties and provide office space and meeting space. Funding is still needed for compensating mentors and general operations.
- Other: Create an advisory board to provide guidance (not governance) that is representative of the partners involved in the planning and representative of the demographics of Kansas school districts. Provide a monthly checklist/newsletter for new leaders. If funding for hiring mentors is not available, consider using practicing superintendents as mentors.

The third subgroup presented a PowerPoint describing a mentoring program for new superintendents. Their proposal was built on the work of a superintendents' association committee in place the past year that had been working on design of such a program and on activities from the Harvard Institute that five superintendents had attended the summer before. The sub-group's presentation was grounded in research and practice and based on a collaborative partnership involving the state department of education, the college of education, civic leadership center and the state professional associations respectively representing school boards and administrators.

- Role of the Mentor

 providing support by phone, email and on-site, participating in the evaluation of the mentoring program, and assisting in preparation and delivery of professional development sessions.
- Requirements for mentors— Success as a Kansas superintendent and completion of mentor training.
- *Timeline* Year 1: Focus on mentoring. Year 2: Add advanced seminar series.

At the conclusion of the discussion, each subgroup agreed to accept a continuing assignment to be completed for the next session. Enterprise would prepare drafts of a vision statement, an organizational chart, an official name, a suggested logo, an update on the university job search, and recommendations related to needed changes in language in existing regulations. The professional development subgroup would prepare and administer the survey of current superintendents, analyze results, and prepare a recommendation related to programming for professional growth of leaders. Mentoring would prepare job descriptions, a timeline for mentor/mentee interaction, and describe training needs of mentors. All members would reflect on what words should be defined and

what additions to the timeline were needed. The subgroups would have two months to complete assignments before the next whole group meeting. Subgroups were to share work so connections would be in place and final decisions for taking action steps could be put in place at the next meeting.

Final planning session concludes with a decision for action

In the intervening period, members of each subgroup met as needed to continue the work. Perhaps because each group included representatives from all of the major partners participating in the conversation, communication across groups was exceptionally effective and when the whole group reassembled, it was ready to take action. At the final whole group meeting of the planners, the mentoring subgroup presented a description of an ideal mentoring program for superintendents, including definitions of terms; points of emphasis; job descriptions; and components of mentor training based on the Harvard Leadership plan. The professional development subgroup shared results of the survey of all Kansas superintendents, based on a 49% response rate across the 284 Kansas superintendents. Table 1 is a brief summary of results of the subgroup's survey, showing the top two choices for professional development from the six broad categories of leadership responsibility, by years of experience.

Table 1 | Results of a 2011 survey of practicing superintendents ranking professional development needs in 6 areas of leadership responsibility

Experience	First Choice Category	Second Choice Category
1 Year	Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment	Developing Leadership/ Effective Resource Management/ Vision (3-way tie)
2-4 Years	Effective Resource Management	Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment
5-10 Years	Effective Resource Management	Developing Leadership
10-15 Years	Effective Resource Management	Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment
15-20 Years	Effective Resource Management	Parent Community Relations/ Vison, Goal Setting (tie)
Over 20 Years	Effective Resource Management	Developing Leadership

The same survey also queried respondents on the subsequent descriptors in each of the six broad categories of leadership responsibilities (see Table 2).

The final report was presented by the Enterprise subgroup that proposed the name *Kansas Educational Leadership Institute*. The proposal was specific in describing structure and governance, yet was open to incorporating programming based on work of the other two subgroups. Significant in the proposal was a commitment by the College of Education to make a substantial fiscal investment in the new Institute. The final product of the planning process rested firmly on collaboration among the members and the entities they represented.

Table 2 | Results from a 2011 survey of practicing superintendents regarding descriptors of six broad categories of leadership responsibilities

Experience	Vision/Goal Setting	Effective Resource Management	Superintendent/ BOE Relationships	Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment	Parent Community Relations	Developing Leadership
1 Year	Strategic Planning	Budget	Role of Supt. and BOE	Data Analysis/ Guaranteed Viable Curriculum	Partnerships	Team Building/ District Leadership
2-4 Years	Strategic Planning	Budget	Role of Supt. and BOE	Guaranteed Viable Curriculum	Partnerships	Team Building/ District Leadership
5-10 Years	Strategic Planning	Budget	Role of Supt. and BOE	Guaranteed Viable Curriculum	Partnerships	Team Building/ District Leadership
10-15 Years	Monitoring and Evaluate Progress	Time	Communication	Guaranteed Viable Curriculum	Advocacy	Team Building/ District Leadership
15-20 Years	Strategic Planning	Budget	Succession Planning	Guaranteed Viable Curriculum	Advocacy Partnerships (tie)	Succession Planniing within Organization
Over 20 Years	Strategic Planning	Human Capital	Role of Supt. and BOE	Guaranteed Viable Curriculum	Advocacy	Team Building/ District Leadership

Major examples of this powerful collaboration included these excerpts from the Enterprise presentation:

- The mission statement: "...to collaborate and share resources to support professional growth of educational leaders needed in Kansas schools for the 21st Century."
- A Statement of Collaboration At Its Best: The KELI partners have entered into a collaborative agreement to provide advanced leadership development and mentoring for educational leaders, to be provided in a progressive, safe, and reflective environment. The collaborative calls for: retreats centered on deep learning, onsite mentoring by experienced professional mentors, ongoing support and professional development, expansion to Kansas education leaders at all levels, high quality collaboration for best inputs, and high quality assessment of outcomes.
- Proposed logo: Six interlaced circles, each one representing the major color taken from the logo of each respective partner.
- Governance structure: Themes of partnership and collaboration that would direct the programs of the leadership institute are described in the figure (at right).

Acceptance of the Enterprise proposal presented on March 30, 2011 produced a partnership across six state organizations/agencies: the Kansas Association of School Boards, the Kansas Center for Leadership, the Kansas School Superintendents Association, the Kansas State Department of Education, the Kansas State University College of Education/Department of Educational Leadership, and the United School Administrators of Kansas.

Figure | Leadership Institute Governance Structure

Level of Responsibility	Membership	Responsibility
Steering Committee 8-10 members based on the partnership	Two KSU representatives appointed by the Dean One representative appointed by each of the other partners Two members elected at large from the Advisory Council Director as ex-officio (non-voting) facilitator	Assist Executive Director with strategic planning, development and articulation of vision, selection of program offerings and procedures and process to implement Institute programs Coordinate sharing of partnership resources
Advisory Council 15-20 members depending on number of partners	Two representatives of each partner except KSSA (6) and USA (3) Guperintendent members adequate to represent district leadership in small, medium, large, rural, urban settings as appointed by KSSA Director as ex-officio (non-voting) facilitator (Revised by St. Com. 5/23/11 and 6/16/11)	Provide recommendations to Steering Committee and Executive Director Participate in two-way dialogue regarding vision, priorities, implementation, sharing of resources, and effectiveness of programming Assist in collaboration between Institute and partners

Representing that partnership, the College of Education proceeded immediately to establish the Kansas Educational Leadership Institute. The Executive Director position was filled and work began to implement the structure and programs of service to educational leaders as outlined by the partners' agreement for the 2011-2012 school year.

Why the outcome was different this time

Planners were asked to share their thoughts on why this time, planning produced action. Responses included:

- "The process was successful because it involved the necessary people to get it off the ground. There were candid conversations about funding, participation, and the outcomes we hoped to achieve. There is never enough communication with a process such as this, but I felt we did a good job of keeping all the organizations involved."
- "I would encourage those interested in creating such a program to seriously consider putting a holistic team together. The success is born from having all the right voices at the table during the process. Careful consideration of the make-up of the planning team will pay great benefits down the road."
- "Our team was strong and very engaged. We collected artifacts and shared them with the larger team and also in a presentation to new superintendents."
- "Strong spirit of collaboration. Everyone saw the vision for what this could be and was excited to contribute."
- "It (the collaboration) was unprecedented."
- "It was critical to have the state department at the table. They are the driver related to program approvals, licensure applications and renewals. However, it is important the field sees (the state department) as more than an enforcer, but a true partner with their best interests in mind."
- "The right people were involved. All had the united passion of supporting Kansas's school leaders. This synergy allowed us to make progress, to value perspectives, and to dialogue freely."
- "The spirit of collaboration is alive and well! The turf
 wars that so often destroy a project such as this were
 minimal. The united mission allowed us all to look
 past what is best for me to what is best for us as we
 move this initiative forward."

Conclusion

What made the difference when this process began in 2010? DuFour defined collaboration as: "A systematic process in which people work together interdependently, to analyze and impact professional practice in order to improve individual and collective results (2008). Collaboration was the recurring theme throughout the planning process that produced the Kansas Educational Leadership Institute. McREL research on the result of collaboration (McREL, n.d. p.46) defined a purposeful community as one with the collective efficacy and capability to use all available assets to accomplish purposes and produce outcomes that matter to all community members

through agreed upon processes. The right voices had been invited to this conversation. The connection to the policy role of the state agency was essential, but it was the way everyone involved worked together that made the ultimate difference. The collaboration among the six partners produced a purposeful community that accomplished what other Kansas conversations had failed to do. The result was a structure on its way to being a systematic statewide support for the recruitment, development, and retention of quality leaders in schools and school districts, an outcome that will long matter to all members of the educational community.

References

DuFour, Richard D. 2008. *Revisiting Professional Learning Communities*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

Fullan, Michael, and Ben Levin. Commentary: The Fundamentals of Whole-System Reform: A case study from Canada. *Education Week*. Published online: June 12, 2008.

Kansas Educational Leadership Commission. 2008. *Final report and recommendations*. Topeka, Kansas, USA: Kansas State Department of Education.

Miller, Teresa, N., Mary Devin, and Robert J. Shoop. 2005. *Closing the Leadership Gap*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

NASBE. 2009. Building the Capacity of State Education Agencies to Support Schools. *NASBE Policy Update*, 17(1).

Wallace Foundation. (n.d.). What States and Districts can do together to improve school leadership. Retrieved November 2010, from www.wallacefoundation.org.

Waters, T. & Greg Cameron. The Balanced Leadership Framework: Connecting vision with action. McREL. Denver: McREL.



From Vision to Implementation: KELI's First Year

Dr. Mary Devin

Dr. Mary Devin, a former Kansas superintendent, is Associate Professor of Educational Leadership at Kansas State University, and is the Executive Director of KELI.



Kansas Educational Leadership Institute

Coming together is a beginning, staying together is progress, and working together is success.

Henry Ford

Great ideas alone won't produce large-scale change. Careful attention to the implementation phase of the change process is essential. The Kansas Educational Leadership Institute (KELI) moved from planning to implementation on March 30, 2011 when planners approved the proposal for what was to become a statewide systematic support system for the recruitment, development, and retention of quality leaders in schools and school districts in Kansas and possibly beyond. Those involved in the planning and those charged with implementation knew they were creating something out of the ordinary for two reasons. First, collaboration of this magnitude involving so many major state agencies and organizations interested in educational leadership was truly unusual in Kansas. Second, while mentoring programs for teachers and even principals were not unusual, planners had been unable to find a model for a system of mentoring and inducting first year superintendents in any other state.

At that time the Kansas licensing process required first year superintendents to participate in a year-long mentoring/ induction program. However, while the requirement was enforced by submission of a document of completion signed by the mentor, there were neither standards nor content specifics describing what the mentoring/induction experience should include. The result was tremendous disparity in program quality across the state. The priority for KELI's first year was mentoring and induction of superintendents serving in the position for the first time, in a context adding quality and consistency to the existing system for licensure of Kansas school district leaders. Fortunately, among the collaborating partners were those with the knowledge and the authority to make this happen.

A grand opening celebration on May 12, 2011 introduced KELI's ambitious agenda with much ado, but KELI's beginnings were modest by any measure. As pledged to the KELI planners, the Dean of the College of Education provided KELI

with two staff positions. The executive director had years of experience as a school superintendent and was familiar with state department of education programs. The experienced events coordinator was part-time, but recognized for success in working with other school related service programs in Kansas. The College of Education's commitment to the initiative was further demonstrated by the personal involvement of the educational leadership department chair and the associate dean. It is unlikely KELI would have survived the challenges of the first few months without their active participation and guidance.

KELI's physical presence emerged as an additional label on the event coordinator's door. Administrative assistants in existing assignments in other offices took on additional chores as needed to provide clerical support for KELI. In the third month a graduate assistant was assigned to KELI.

The greatest majority of operational funding for that first KELI year came from the Dean of the College of Education who set an amount aside in the college budget for that purpose, in addition to the salaried staff time already committed to KELI during the planning process. Other resources came from a grant of \$36,479, which KELI received from the university's Division of Continuing Education as part of that division's efforts to encourage new program development. With the \$500 fee each district would pay to receive KELI services, there was sufficient funding for implementing the priorities for KELI's first year.

Even with immediate attention to implementation, time was short; the duty year for Kansas superintendents begins on July 1. In spite of that timeline, KELI staff and supporters shared a sense of optimism that mentoring/induction support would be available as new superintendents began the school year. Identifying the number and location of new leaders and securing sufficient qualified mentors to serve them was intended to be the first goal for KELI staff. What they discovered was that a number of steps were required to establish KELI as an institute within a major university bureaucracy before services could actually be offered.

Establishing an entity

KELI staff learned that an independent center of service operating inside the university, but steered by collaborative efforts of five outside organizations, was something new. It was concluded that KELI would be classified in the legal structure as a collaborative institute, rather than a legally recognized partnership. Even though personnel in all university offices encountered were extremely helpful and supportive of KELI's needs, answers to questions about how KELI could be authorized to do business were not readily available and often had to be carefully crafted so as to be compatible with university practice for situations sometimes only remotely similar.

Several interchanges with the university director of purchasing and the university attorney were necessary. Statements of expectations and job descriptions became legal documents between KELI and mentors, who had to be established as independent expert contractors in order to comply with bidding regulations. Mentees were required to sign a formalized agreement to participate in the KELI program. In addition,

budget-monitoring offices needed to open fund accounts to allow KELI to conduct business transactions.

The executive director and the events coordinator learned that KELI would not able to receive money or issue payment for any expenses until all these pieces were in place. In spite of the need to match new superintendents with mentors by July 1, it would be months later before KELI was able to receive payment for programs in place, compensate mentors for services, or pay any operating expenses incurred. Fortunately, because this was a collaborative venture, partners explained the unusual situation to participants and those who were to become KELI mentors made themselves available to new leaders on their own. They also volunteered to work on details of the mentoring program immediately, although it would be September before KELI was officially authorized to conduct business transactions. Patience and good assistance from all those involved in the university and beyond eventually led to completion of all requirements and the Kansas Educational Leadership Institute was authorized to do business.

While moving through establishment requirements, operational work was underway. KELI staff prepared materials and meeting folders and designed stationery that displayed a KELI logo comprised of six intersecting ovals, one in each of the primary colors of a partner logo. A footer on all products displayed the individual logo of all partners as a border, a constant reminder of the collaborative spirit behind KELI.

Building an identity

A sound business operation was the first step, but it was just as important for KELI to establish credibility in the professional community. Those efforts were underway immediately after planners agreed to collaboratively support the Kansas Educational Leadership Institute. A presentation by planners to the state board of education in early May 2011 previewed the result of the planning process and the coming implementation of a support system for leadership. The grand opening celebration for KELI was hosted by the College of Education a few days later in the newly constructed Leadership Studies building on campus. All superintendents in the state, elected officials, and other dignitaries were invited to the introduction of KELI to the professional community. A corporate benefactor funded a nationally recognized guest speaker and the Dean of the College of Education and the state Commissioner of Education delivered special remarks to emphasize the importance of this event. Executive leaders from KELI partners endorsed the collaborative undertaking. A united message had been sent to the education community; this was an important step toward the shared goal of systemic support for the recruitment, development, and retention of quality leaders in schools and school districts in Kansas.

Superintendents were given more information about KELI programs at summer meetings of professional organizations. First year and veteran superintendents who attended completed an informal questionnaire asking them for suggested topics to explore in deep learning sessions and for time-frames most convenient to attend such sessions outside local districts. This information was useful in planning professional learning events later in the KELI year.

KELI staff communicated personally with each new superintendent statewide, extending the invitation to participate in the KELI mentoring/induction program. Representatives of KELI presented informative sessions at annual conferences of the state department of education, the association of school boards, and the united school administrators, introducing the new service to membership across the partner organizations. Information was provided for partner newsletters and other communications. A KELI website displayed photos of KELI events and continued to invite qualified professionals to apply for mentoring assignments in future years. Emails regularly updated partners and members of the KELI service audience of events and current progress on long-term goals.

There was an additional major incentive to enroll in the KELI program. KELI's mentoring/induction program satisfies the state requirement to move from an initial leader license status to the professional leader endorsement, a necessary step in the career advancement of all education administrators. The state department of education sent a letter endorsing the program to each first year leader, which the state defined to include those new to the chief executive seat as well as those in Kansas for the first time, with limited experience outside the state. Districts were charged \$500 to secure the KELI mentoring/induction services for their executive leader—a fee well below the cost of providing such a service and an amount the state department of education agreed to reimburse to the district upon the superintendent's successful completion of the KELI program. This scholarship arrangement allowed districts to access quality support for leadership development without cost.

Addressing priority one

In spite of procedural difficulties and delay in the capacity to conduct regular business, KELI leaders continued to sense the urgency of beginning work immediately on priority one mentoring/induction of first year superintendents across the state's 284 school districts. The executive director immediately began contacting eligible mentors exploring their interest in working with KELI, but it was some time before the number of first-year position holders was finalized because superintendent vacancies were often like dominoes. Filling one position opened another, and the last vacancy sometimes produced a first time leader. Unexpected late resignations extended the turnover process into mid-July when the last opening was filled (which turned out to be a first-year-in-Kansas superintendent). Almost unbelievably, KELI managed to secure enough mentor power to support 26 first year Kansas district leaders by the first week in July. Details of the mentoring/ induction program itself were not yet articulated, but the mentor/mentee connection had begun.

In terms of establishing program details and describing completion requirements, it was clear from the start that the "one size fits all" approach would not work. In Kansas, a state license for district level leadership is required for any administrative position in the central office. An "initial license" is the entry level of licensure. Holders of this license have three years to meet requirements for adding a "professional endorsement" to the district leader license. Many first year superintendents

previously served in district level positions such as program directors or assistant superintendents that gave them experience with leadership beyond the school building. First year superintendents from previous district positions would already have earned the professional endorsement. This was almost always the case in larger districts where multiple central office positions were common. On the other hand, of the 26 first year leaders in the KELI mentee group, fourteen were principals the previous year without previous central office experience and holding the entry-level leader's license. This happened most often in small districts, and there were many of those in Kansas. Looking further into differences in district size, in the very smallest of districts the superintendent was also a building principal. These dual superintendent/principal positions would need yet a different set of mentoring/induction supports from the KELI program. Finally, the decision by the state department to require a year of mentoring and induction for superintendents in their first year in Kansas, whether or not they had any previous central office experience outside of Kansas, added a fourth dimension of differentiation. The KELI mentoring/induction support system would have to support first year leaders falling into four categories:

- Superintendents in the first year as an administrator in any district position (no central office experience, initial license status, seeking professional license endorsement)
- Superintendents in the first year as chief executive (experience as directors or assistant superintendents, professional license status earned in previous district assignment, interested in license renewal)
- 3) Superintendents with limited experience as chief executive in another state (first year in Kansas, initial license status in spite of some outside Kansas experience, seeking professional license endorsement)
- 4) Superintendent/Principal dual assignments (both district leader and the principal for at least one elementary, secondary, or K-12 school, initial license status, seeking professional license endorsement).

Mentors would work with mentees in all four categories and would need to adjust to the varying challenges of leading in districts from less than 100 students K-12, to a large district with over 10,000 students.

The published job description announcing KELI mentor openings included responsibilities of mentoring and coaching superintendents, participating in development of KELI procedures, and assisting in the assessment of the effectiveness of KELI programs. Qualifications required of applicants aspiring to be mentors included demonstrated mentoring skills, successful experience as a district leader in Kansas, experience in program development and interest in working with from one to five mentees. Information about the scope of work and how to apply for mentor positions was sent to related professional organizations to share with members, posted on appropriate placement centers in the state, and posted on the KELI website. These efforts produced a limited number of excellent candidates. However, best results came from direct KELI staff and partner contacts with respected recent, but not current, district leaders. KELI was looking for individuals with a proven

track record who were committed to building leadership capacity for the future for Kansas schools.

For compensation purposes, mentors were contracted experts with the amount of compensation determined by the number of mentees covered by the contract. Each mentor received the equivalent of one-mentee-credit beyond the actual number served for responsibilities related to program planning, delivery, and assessment. Mentors indicated in applications how many mentees they would be willing to serve and the executive director constructed the final assignments. Mentor location became somewhat of a guiding factor in recruiting mentors and as mentor/mentee assignments were made. KELI hoped to find qualified mentors residing in proximity to the new leaders who were literally spread across the four corners of the state. Travel expenses were reimbursed by KELI and multiple district assignments took distance into consideration in order to reduce windshield time for mentors, but it was impossible to avoid considerable travel time for some. When all mentor and mentees were placed, mentor assignments ranged from a single district, to as many as five different district locations.

The mentoring design recommended by the planning team called for mentors who were not currently in superintendent positions because of the time required for mentors to be in mentee districts. However, due to the short timeline and the number of new superintendents to serve, in the first KELI year, two of the nine mentors were sitting superintendents. Off-setting the concern about time outside the district, both were quite experienced in their present assignment, had participated in the KELI planning process, and were familiar with the concepts and expectations underlying KELI's services. Both agreed to mentor two new superintendents located in geographic proximity. While using current superintendents was not the first choice for KELI leaders, they were pleased to have an opportunity to assess the feasibility of using practitioners as mentors, should that become a necessity in the future. To complete the mentor corps for July, two college leadership department staff members who were former superintendents each mentored one new leader for the first two months until the final mentoring position was filled.

Details of the KELI Mentoring/Induction Program

Directions from the planning committee outlined major concepts to guide the mentoring/induction program, but KELI staff and KELI mentors needed to work out the details of a successful program. The final product must carry out guidelines from the planners and appropriately recognize experiences earlier in the year already underway. After the description of the program was complete and had been reviewed by the state department, the KELI Steering Committee approved requirements for successful completion of the KELI mentoring/induction program on September 30, 2011. Mentors then shared requirements with the new leaders who would be responsible for meeting them. Because they had been kept apprised of likely components as the list was constructed and because credits were given for pertinent early-in-the-year activities already completed, this late start did not handicap first year leaders.

The planners recommended mentors make on-site visits twice each month and make use of available technology for additional interactions as needed. In practice, mentors and mentees discovered after only a couple of months that one on-site visit was preferred by the mentees, who were struggling with time management issues. Email and telephone emerged as the almost exclusively used technology, although there was a brief but unsuccessful effort by one group to use Google Plus. Technology outcomes most likely reflected a combination of the particular individuals involved and the lack of training provided for mentors or mentees for increasing technology skills.

Another part of the mentoring/induction design called for mentors to observe the new leader in designated performance situations and to introduce mentees to state board of education meetings, the legislature, and the state superintendents council. Mentees were also required to participate in professional organization conferences and deep learning sessions focusing on leadership development. Mentors monitored and provided feedback on those experiences. Mentors turned in monthly logs documenting contacts with mentees, including site visits and other interactions. When all logs had been turned in and tallied for the year, collectively, mentor time with mentees exceeded 700 hours. Overall, the interaction between mentor and mentee was consistently rated as the most effective element in the KELI mentoring/induction program.

Mentor Training

On more than one occasion during planning that preceded implementation of KELI, planners discussed the difference between mentoring and coaching and which of the two would best support new leaders. In practice, mentors found they needed to perform as both mentor and coach and they needed to know when to engage in either role. They wanted to focus on building leadership capacity, not creating dependence, and they recognized coaching training would help them accomplish this. The mentors had confidence in their personal mentoring skills as a result of years of personal experience in the chief executive position, but they recognized they were not as skillful in using effective coaching techniques. This observation on the part of the mentors themselves was very important to the success of KELI's first year.

Neither planners nor KELI staff had been able to locate a state model for mentoring superintendents, but there were multiple options available for training coaches. KELI mentors and staff explored several possibilities and reached consensus on contracting with certified coaching trainers from Coaching for Results, Inc., whose trainers had experience as Kansas school administrators. The trainers agreed to customize their regular training model by incorporating the concepts of leadership coaching for school administrators from the work of Karla Reiss (2007). To prepare for the scheduled two-anda-half days of training, mentors read *Leadership Coaching for Educators: Bringing out the best in school administrators* (Reiss 2007). Training days were spaced to allow mentors to practice application of the new skills between sessions and to self-assess their increasing proficiency. Considering the long years

of experience the mentors represented, KELI leaders were apprehensive about how the role of learner would be accepted by these competent professionals. Mentors, however, were apt students, eager to learn the new skills and open to participating in the training activities. This training was a critical factor in setting the KELI mentoring/induction program quality beyond existing mentoring practices in the state. Sharing these training experiences also produced a bond among the nine mentors, allowing them to get to know each other and to appreciate individual talents within the group. Beyond the group sessions, trainers offered mentors personal phone coaching opportunities. Three mentors participated in this voluntary extension of the coaching training.

Mentors also met quarterly to assist staff in putting in place routines and procedures for conducting KELI's business and addressing its goals effectively. Timelines, forms, accountability records, routine communication with mentees, and guidelines for operations in general were developed with the intent of forming efficient and convenient practices. Mentors assisted with assessment of current services and with outlining the process for reporting mentee progress to the state department for licensure requirements. Mentors were an important influence and an invaluable resource in the development of these operational practices.

Governance

The master plan guiding KELI implementation included a governance structure that was a careful blend of the voices of the six collaborating partners with deliberate attention to two-way communication with practitioners in the field. As the major funding source, the College of Education leadership was given oversight for fiscally related matters. Major decisions about programming rested with the KELI Steering Committee, which was representative of the founding partners. Advisory Council, representative of the field KELI was serving, was designed to provide two-way communication links with practitioners. Partners appointed the respective members to serve on both bodies.

The Steering Committee

Partners had direct representation on the KELI policymaking body. Planners gave the College of Education two seats on the steering committee, since it was the primary funding source. Other partners had one position each. KELI was fortunate that individuals appointed to the partner seats on the steering committee were both well informed and committed to the mission of supporting leadership development. The state department official who had originally opened the conversation and had been a key contributor throughout the planning process agreed to assume that partner seat on the steering committee herself. The Associate Dean of the College and the Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership accepted the College positions on the steering committee. The presence of these leaders on the top KELI governance structure was critical because this meant voices of the key decision makers related to financial resources and to professional compliance matters were present in the discussions regarding KELI's future. The Kansas Leadership Center

chose to leave its steering committee position vacant and to participate on only the advisory council for the first year. The association representing school boards appointed its key staff member who was responsible for leadership development and the state superintendents' professional organization appointed a superintendent who chaired a sub-group during the planning process and was part of the discussions shaping KELI. The state umbrella association of united administrators appointed its current president who was also president of the state association for secondary school administrators. This individual brought a principal's perspective to the conversation, which was important because KELI services were expected to expand to the building level in the third year. The KELI Steering Committee was situated well for guiding implementation of the plan approved on March 30, 2011, and its members were connected to important communication links with KELI stakeholders. The first KELI Steering Committee meeting was a conference call on May 23, 2011, following the grand opening session. Its first face-to-face session followed a few weeks later on June 16.

The final two seats on the KELI Steering Committee were set-aside in the governance plan to be elected at large by the KELI Advisory Board from its membership. First, however, the steering committee needed to establish by-laws to guide its own operations including details regarding the establishment of the advisory council. These bylaws were self-adopted rules for the regulation and management of KELI business and programs. The steering committee approved bylaws on September 30, 2011 that officially established the name of the organization and its mission:

The mission of the Kansas Educational Leadership Institute is to collaborate and share resources to support professional growth of educational leaders needed in Kansas schools for the 21st Century.

The steering committee set dates to meet quarterly or when needed throughout the year and agreed to have the executive director chair meetings. There would be no officer positions. With bylaws in place and partner appointments finalized, the last two steering committee members were elected at the first meeting of the advisory council.

The steering committee also approved an ambitious five-year plan for the organization. After the initial year priority of mentoring/induction of first year superintendents, in year two planning would begin for mentoring/induction of first-year principals. The priority for the third year would be implementation of the service for principals. Deep learning opportunities for new and veterans expand to include both superintendents and principals in year four and by year five will target new and veteran leaders at all levels.

Adoption of the KELI five-year plan was significant beyond giving direction to program growth over time. Based on the elements present in this approved plan, the state department of education recognized KELI as an area professional learning center and recognized KELI's program as officially meeting the mentoring/induction required of new superintendents to move from initial to professional license status. As an area professional learning center, KELI was further authorized to

award professional development credits that could be used by any administrator toward the five year license renewal cycle.

KELI Advisory Council

The newly formed seventeen-member KELI Advisory Council met for the first time on November 29, 2011, and agreed to meet quarterly throughout each year. Membership on the advisory council was designed to reflect the demographics of educational leaders in Kansas. The partner representing the superintendents' professional association named five superintendents from districts of different sizes and geographic areas. The united administrators organization designated one principal from each elementary, middle, and high school levels. Other partners appointed two members from their organizations at large. Two advisory council members (one superintendent and one elementary principal) were elected by that body to serve also on the Steering Committee. Perhaps because the list of prospective members now extended beyond members of the planners circle, assembling the advisory council took longer than KELI staff expected. Partners wanted to find representatives who could contribute ideas and skills, but they also wanted leaders willing to spend the time KELI would need.

Deep Learning Series (Let's Talk)

Planners made it clear that development of leadership skill did not stop with first year executives. Deep learning opportunities for both new leaders and veterans were part of the vision shared by the partners. KELI offered three such sessions during the second semester of the first year. Topics selected emerged from discussions on current issues during advisory council meetings and from mentors interactions with new leaders. KELI marketed the series of sessions as "Let's Talk" because each brought together experts on current high priority issues and veteran district leaders who could talk about what was being done related to these issues in real districts of varying sizes and resources. The first session brought together legal advisors and school leaders. The second featured implementation of technology initiatives, and the third Let's Talk session focused on preparing for implementation of the common core state standards.

All three sessions were rated very high in evaluations completed by those attending. The interaction between experts and practitioners was important, but leadership teams attending indicated the information shared by their peers was even more useful. Both first year and veteran leaders took home examples of what was possible based on success in districts not unlike theirs.

The goal for these sessions was to establish KELI's reputation as a professional learning center. Since there was no budget for wide spread marketing, facility costs, or for securing nationally recognized experts as presenters, these first year sessions were not expected to draw large numbers or to bring in excessive revenue. Still, making these events successful involved more than choosing good topics and presenters. Partners contributed in-kind services such as providing the location without charge, making their own experts available as presenters at no cost, publicizing the sessions in newsletters and electronic databases, and distributing registration infor-

mation. KELI used resources from the Division of Continuing Education grant and contracted with that division to manage registration and meeting logistics. Partner involvement, DCE support, and the KELI events coordinator's experience with event management produced the standard of excellence KELI sought for the debut in this area and managed to produce a sufficient level of attendance to yield a slight positive revenue gain.

First year accomplishments

The scope of this account is to describe the first year of operation of the Kansas Educational Leadership Institute. Evidence of its effectiveness will be presented in later writings. In general, however, it is clear that in its first year the Kansas Educational Leadership Institute accomplished positives on which to build future year programs.

- All but one of the first year superintendents in Kansas in school year 2011-2102 chose to participate in the Kansas Educational Leadership Institute and received support for individual professional growth in leadership from July through June.
- Twenty-six first year superintendents completed the initial KELI mentoring/induction program year and by the end of June had received well over 700 hours of mentor time as logged collectively by the nine KELI mentors.
- These first year leaders were introduced to the larger educational community in the state and beyond.
 They participated in deep learning sessions and began forming networks with peers that are likely to continue for many years.
- By completing the KELI program, thirteen first year superintendents met the requirements for adding the district leader professional endorsement on their teaching credential.
- Thirteen other KELI participants who had added the professional endorsement while in other district level positions, earned credits toward renewing current credentials in the future.
- Mentors were pleased with the results of their work with new leaders. One mentor described the year as a great personal professional development for both mentees and mentors.
- KELI was established as an area professional learning center. Over one hundred superintendents from across the state participated in KELI's first series of deep learning opportunities.
- Procedures were put in place for year two of support for new year superintendents.

Looking ahead

A substantial measure of the success of any first year operation is the foundation it establishes for future years. In that respect, there are many KELI positives. KELI is emerging as a source of leadership support for school and district leaders. Communication links are growing between KELI and the broader educational community. Even turnover in the key state department position working with the initiative has not

detracted KELI from its progress on implementing the vision shared by the planners.

Leadership must learn not only from what works, but also from what doesn't work. KELI staff learned a great deal from its Year 1. There were no disasters, fortunately, but there was much that could be built on to become more effective and efficient in Year 2.

- Procedures are being refined, timelines adjusted forward to the extent possible.
- Getting a support system in place by July 1 will continue to be challenging because of the operational timelines for changing position holders in Kansas school districts.
- The less intense support system for Year 2 district leaders will attract more participants if Years 1 and 2 are combined in a longer-term relationship and presented to leaders and boards of education earlier.
- Finding dates for events with no conflicts with other activities is impossible. It is better to select a date early and work through conflicts as encountered.
 Flexibility and collaboration will be essential components of planning.
- Communication with district leaders is extremely important; mentors are the number one link with those in the mentoring/induction program.
- Early efforts place much priority on the relationship piece of the mentor/mentee connection. As KELI becomes more established, more time and resources can be focused on bringing research and best practice to practitioners.

Kansas education is in a time of great transformational change in almost every area. Accountability systems, performance evaluation, and accreditation requirements are all changing. It is important for KELI deep learning activities to be centered by the topics of greatest current concern to leaders. But KELI is about leadership and what makes KELI different is bringing experts and practitioners together to focus on the leadership that makes best practice and compliance initiatives work in real school districts.

A meaningful recognition of the role KELI is expected to play in the future is its appearance on the College of Education portion of the university's 2025 Strategic Direction Action Plan and Alignment document (p.5)

Key Activities and Goals #4:

Provide quality service learning and international experiences of students and faculty and to increase service to communities through systematic engagement of students and faculty (e.g. KELI, PDS, and the military (Theme IV)

Point 2. Support the development and growth of the Kansas Educational Leadership Institute (KELI)

N. Establishment of KELI opportunities for new school leaders [T1-1]

Ongoing support of KELI program and demonstrated impact of KELI on participants and their districts [T1-1]

Conclusion

In many ways KELI staff and supporters accomplished more that first year than they expected. Some had suggested it would take a year of preparation before actual implementation could start, but planners wanted leaders in the field to receive support as quickly as possible. Mentors' skill and commitment produced meaningful support throughout the entire school year; a major improvement in the support for educational leadership development statewide. The support and active involvement of key decision makers across the partner organizations turned a year of planning and creating into a year of immediate productivity and promise for the future.

References

Bylaws, Operational. "Kansas Educational Leadership Institute." KELI, 2011.

Cheliotes, Linda M. and Marceta A. Riley. 2012. *Coaching conversations: Transforming your school one conversation at a time*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin.

Kansas State University. "K-State 2025 Strategic Direction Action Plan and Alignment". College of Education, 2013.

Reiss, Karla. Leadership coaching for educators: Bringing out the best in school administrators. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press, 2007.



The Influence of Mentoring on Developing Leaders: Participants Share Their Perspectives

Dr. Augustine-Shaw and Dr. Elizabeth Funk

Dr. Donna Augustine-Shaw is Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership at Kansas State University and has served as a classroom teacher and a building and district level administrator including superintendent of schools.

Dr. Elizabeth Funk, a graduate of the University of Mary Hardin-Baylor, has worked as a public school teacher and administrator. Learning requires feedback. When leaders ask, "How am I doing?" they gain valuable insights into how they affect the performance of others. – Kouzes & Posner

Introduction

In an age of continuous and rapid change, today's school superintendents face a litary of unique challenges as they lead individuals and organizations through tumultuous and unpredictable times. Superintendents must be extraordinary leaders, and preparation programs should equip district leaders with the skills necessary to lead their districts toward success. However, without an ongoing and structured mentoring program, superintendents in their first or second year of service may feel overwhelmed as they take on the daunting challenge of leading school districts through the inherent challenges and complexities of the job. Today's superintendent wears many hats and must master a variety of skills. Alan, Robin, William, and Craig (2005) stated, "Educational leaders are required to be knowledgeable not only in traditional areas of organizational management, board and community relations, resource management, and personnel, but increasingly in newer areas of classroom assessment and accountability systems - end quote (p. 77)."

Superintendent mentoring programs may help new administrators bridge the gap between what they enter their new leadership position knowing, and what they need to know in order to grow while on the job. All educational leaders must embrace and model the practice of lifelong learning.

Superintendents have a multitude of opportunities to impact organizations, influence children's lives, and improve entire communities (Houston, 2001). However, the complex responsibilities and stressors of the job may contribute to a high turnover rate that can be destructive to an educational environment. Superintendent longevity has a positive effect on student achievement (Waters & Marzano, 2006); yet, superintendent turnover rate is not well studied. Nonetheless, Sparks (2012) maintained, "stability at the central office has been linked to a greater likelihood of success for new education initiatives" (p. 2).

Many new superintendents quickly begin to feel out of touch with the day-to-day work of students and teachers as the routine demands related to administrative issues, political challenges, and emergency situations occupy the majority of their time (Hatch & Roegman, 2012). Kouzes and Posner (1995, 2007) described how successful leaders seek out opportunities to improve, innovate, and implement change. Unfortunately, many new district administrators have few opportunities to learn alongside seasoned mentors in the field. Superintendents must continue to learn on the job, but some may be working in isolated silos, miles away from colleagues who are able to identify with the work related challenges.

Moreover, many Kansas superintendents face the challenge of working hundreds of miles from colleagues who wear similar hats and work in comparable roles (see Figure 1). Often the closest professional mentors or peers live hours away, making face-to-face collaborative opportunities rare. Furthermore, many superintendents are simultaneously serving as campus principals and do not have fellow administrators in the district to collaborate with. The Kansas Educational Leadership Institute (KELI) is an organization designed to bridge this mentor/mentee gap through a framework of support intended to help novice school leaders grow and thrive.

Still in its second year of infancy, the KELI organization continues to receive strong, positive feedback from its mentees and mentors. Some second year superintendents stay on with KELI for an additional year of support, confirming the value and importance of a structured plan for developing

Mentors

educational leaders. KELI's mission to share resources in support of the professional growth of educational leaders in Kansas may serve as a model for other states across the nation. The KELI participants demonstrate collaboration at its best. Through a structured framework, KELI mentors facilitate professional leadership development and significant learning opportunities with their mentees in a safe, reflective, and progressive environment.

Description of Kansas Mentees

In its first year of operation (2011-2012), KELI provided mentoring and induction to 26 first year Kansas superintendents. Thirteen of these first year superintendents held an initial Kansas license. The remaining 13 new superintendents held a professional Kansas license. At the conclusion of KELI's first year of support, all 26 superintendents completed requirements to gain a full professional Kansas license or earn credits towards professional license renewal (see Table 1, p. 26). Superintendents in KELI's cohort one led districts of varying enrollment (e.g., 69% districts with 1,000 students or less, 27% districts with 2,000-7,000 students, and 4% with over 10,000 students).

In 2012-2013 one year later, KELI provided mentoring and induction to 22 first year Kansas superintendents. Nine of the first year superintendents in KELI's second year of support held an initial Kansas license and 13 new superintendents held a professional Kansas license. All mentees in this second cohort were in-line to complete requirements for a full





Figure 1 | Location of 2011-2012 KELI Mentors and Mentees

20 Vol. 41, No. 1, Fall 2013

Mentees

Figure 1 (continued) | Location of 2012-2013 KELI Mentors and Mentees



professional license or earn credits towards license renewal (see Table 1). Superintendents in KELI's cohort two led districts of slightly different enrollment categories (e.g., 82% districts with 1,000 students or less AND 18% districts with 1,000-2,000 students).

Description of Professional Mentors

Nine experienced Kansas superintendents delivered mentoring support to 26 new superintendents in the first operational year of KELI (2011-2012). Two of these superintendents were current practitioners and seven were former superintendents (see Table 2, p. 26). The nine mentors each had a combined average of 13 years of experience. Seven mentors served 22 first year superintendents in 2012-2013 and had a combined average of 15 years experience as a superintendent. As depicted in Table 2, all seven mentors were former Kansas superintendents. However, as recommended in the original program design, KELI was able to avoid staffing practicing superintendents in its second year. This recommendation was based on expectations for mentors working within the overwhelming time demands already placed on sitting district leaders.

KELI secures contracts with qualified mentors to provide support for first year superintendents. The executive director selects the cadre of mentors based on an application process and consideration of an applicant's professional qualifications including experience as a successful Kansas superintendent, executive mentoring/coaching skills, and interest in serving one to five mentees. Geographic proximity to current year mentees is an important and, at times, challenging consid-

eration (see Figure 1). The contractual agreement between KELI and each mentor establishes compensation guidelines. All mentees and mentors complete professional agreements delineating responsibilities, scope of work, and participation requirements.

Program Goals

The Kansas Educational Leadership Institute's mission is to collaborate and share resources to support professional growth of educational leaders needed in Kansas schools for the 21st century. A five-year plan guides the comprehensive planning efforts of KELI's partner-based steering committee. The advisory council's representation consisting of field practitioners forms a second tier in KELI's governance structure. KELI's mentoring and induction program targets mentoring experiences as the primary method of support. The mentoring experience involves veteran superintendents sharing knowledge and skills with novice leaders as the key element bridging the gap between limited support in Kansas and a program rooted in quality processes and research. Mentoring sessions between new leaders and experienced superintendents consist of on-site face-to-face interaction and are critical components of the program. (Initially mentors facilitated two monthly face-to-face sessions but adjusted expectations to one face-to-face session a month to honor the demanding schedules of new superintendents). Mentors agree to submit verification of face-to-face sessions with mentees through a written log.

In 2012-2013, mentors also scheduled an additional coaching phone call to follow-up on important items with mentees

and target questions to encourage deeper reflection. This additional phone contact was piloted and dropped following feedback from mentors that time and mentee needs warranted a more integrated approach. Mentees also had continuous access to the assigned mentor through phone calls or technology-assisted communication. Mentor planning and preparation for each session provided focus, targeted individualized needs, and utilized time effectively.

Quality training for KELI mentors incorporates formal coaching presentations and skill development customized to needs identified by program mentors. Coaching training in Year 1 included two and one-half days designed to build initial understanding of coaching skills and application in the educational leadership setting. In Year 2, coaching training involved one day of support focused on practicing and sustaining coaching skills. The focus and engaged learning provided in these training sessions strengthened the understanding and skill level of mentors. As a part of each training session, mentors also participated in a review of operational procedures, expectations, program design, and networking. These regularly scheduled meetings, planned by the executive director, provided an important resource for mentor learning, feedback, and sharing.

Unique resources and opportunities benefit mentees participating in the KELI program. First year superintendents receive a monthly checklist of timely topics and events composed by practicing superintendents. Checklists outline typical tasks and responsibilities common to the superintendent's role. In 2012-2013, a feature was added to better respond to the needs of smaller-sized school districts. Checklists incorporated topics for new Kansas superintendents leading smaller districts who often have multiple positions and responsibilities embedded in the superintendent's role.

In addition to the monthly checklists, mentors attend two performance demonstrations in the academic year and provide timely feedback to the mentee on their observations. Mentees and mentors typically recognize a local board of education meeting as a critical performance demonstration activity for the new superintendent. Observing a board of education meeting provides the mentor with a first-hand glimpse of superintendent/board relations, important political nuances, and priorities of the district. Furthermore, initial experiences outlined in KELI program requirements include an opportunity to attend key Kansas professional organization and association meetings to increase networking and connections with other leaders. Mentees attend one state board of education meeting and one superintendent organization meeting, culminating the experiences with a narrative reflection of their learning. Mentees also offer a final reflection on their experience as a first year superintendent in May.

Another component of the KELI structure provides the mentee with exposure to deep learning opportunities each spring. In 2012-2013 potential resources for mentees were expanded through required attendance at four training/executive learning sessions to encourage growth and networking. Two meetings included options for new superintendent workshops, regional meetings, and annual conferences. Cohort group meetings and other executive leadership training sessions ful-

fill this requirement. Upon successful completion of the KELI mentoring and induction program, first year superintendents may apply for their professional license or earn credits toward renewal of their professional license. The sending district is also eligible for reimbursement of the \$500 participation fee upon successful program completion.

KELI offers superintendents completing the first year program with an opportunity to participate in an additional year of less intensive support. In this model, KELI mentors formally contact mentees once each quarter. Whenever possible, the original mentor is assigned to continue work with the mentee during Year 2. Additionally, mentees can contact mentors as needed throughout the year. As the focus of these contacts, mentors of second year superintendents help the mentees discover resources to address issues or challenges they face. Second year superintendents continued to receive monthly checklists and are invited to attend KELI cohort sessions and professional learning activities at a reduced rate. Seven of KELI's former first year superintendents enrolled in the second year program.

Participant Perceptions

In January 2013, all mentees and mentors in the KELI program received questionnaires and were asked to share perceptions regarding the program of support offered by KELI. Fifty-one percent (51%) of former mentees/mentors responded to the questionnaire, providing keen insight into participant perceptions. Each group had the opportunity to respond to a total of five open-ended questions of similar emphasis.

The first question posed to KELI mentees and mentors asked them to share their perceptions on how mentoring experiences influenced the professional practice of mentees. Mentoring experiences were defined as face-to-face, on-site observations, and phone contact. In the second question, respondents shared how KELI activities (i.e., professional organization meetings, conferences, and training) and KELI resources (i.e., monthly checklists, research support, and coaching tools) provided a means for reflection on the impact of these activities and resources on mentee professional relationships and work, and mentor skills. In their reflections on the third question, mentees and mentors specifically commented on how involvement in the KELI program guided future thinking, confidence, and leadership preparation. KELI mentees and mentors commented on program activities providing the most help and having the greatest impact on question four. The last question targeted second year superintendents and mentors and asked if their perceptions changed from Year 1 regarding the support offered or needed. Four mentors and ten mentees responded with reflections to help define Year 2 program needs.

Perceptions from program participants were analyzed for common themes. Building leadership capacity through interaction with experienced mentors, structured networking, and expectations for learning exemplified the alignment in KELI's program goals and the expectations important to achieve a professional Kansas license. Increasing confidence through these experiences became a positive theme in mentee/mentor responses. Additional themes emerged around a safe

and trusting environment, face-to-face mentoring, reflective practice, and networking. Mentees overwhelmingly noted the helpfulness of face-to-face mentoring as impacting their practice, while mentors consistently affirmed the value of professional training to develop deeper coaching skills. KELI mentees shared thoughts around recommended program participation, avowing personal commitment to the significance of the program.

Safe and Trusting Environment

A prominent theme that emerged from the collected data centered on a safe and trusting environment. Both mentees and mentors agreed the formation of a trusting relationship provided the catalyst for mentees to feel "safe" and supported. The KELI mentor, through training and expertise, understood the importance of this critical first step. One mentor indicated, "It was a safe and professional consultant relationship, as the superintendent position can be very isolating and lonely." Mentees shared that the reassurance and encouragement from the mentoring experience was critical to their initial year in the position. One mentee commented, "I was the lone administrator in our district serving as K-12 principal/superintendent. It was nice to have someone to call, knowing that there was someone on my side."

The support and positive reinforcement from mentors echoed by both respondent groups validated the work of the new superintendent. One mentor expressed that the KELI program presented a confidential setting in which new superintendents had an "outside set of eyes and ears to serve as a sounding board" for local district issues and the responsibilities of the new position. Overall experiences were noted as being valuable and rewarding by both mentees and mentors. One mentor concluded, "I would have liked to have had such support in my first year as a superintendent."

Face-to-Face Mentoring

A second equally strong theme identified from mentee and mentor responses surrounded the value of face-to-face mentoring. Both mentees and mentors reiterated the irreplaceable benefit of face-to-face mentoring. This interaction provided an intensive and individualized approach to address the needs of each district's unique setting. One mentee noted, "My experience was wonderful. I didn't use the phone-a-friend option much but really enjoyed the face-to-face meetings. This greatly influenced my practice." Mentees described their mentors as effective and active listeners. One mentee reflected that the mentoring experience "served as therapy for me to be able to tell my stories to someone not affiliated with the district." One superintendent new to the position shared:

"I believe it helped me get a clearer picture of the expectations for the superintendent. There is so much to learn, even for someone in education for many years. Having a successful mentor on-site to listen and advise was very helpful."

The majority of face-to-face sessions occurred on-site at the local district. This allowed a mentor to serve as a tremendous resource on common issues for new superintendents. Mentors cited understanding and monitoring the district budget, local board relations, and stakeholder communications as topics in

which mentors worked alongside their mentees during these sessions. "Honestly, they were all very helpful," one new superintendent shared:

"Moreover, I have been an administrator for 20 years so the responsibilities of the position were not necessarily new to me but the specific district questions and scenarios that occurred were what I really needed the advice on how to handle. The budget was the toughest part for me."

The on-site presence allowed the experienced superintendent to better understand the culture, needs, and goals of the district. "The face-to-face time also provided opportunities for planning and problem-solving with a trusted resource who had valuable experience" confirmed one mentee. One new superintendent contended:

"The KELI experience has been a lifesaver so far during my first year as superintendent. It has given me peace of mind that any problems or issues that come up, I have a contact that can guide me through them. It has been great to be able to sit down one-on-one and discuss school issues and have someone to bounce ideas off of."

Mentee after mentee reinforced the value of face-to-face mentoring and the relationship developed with their mentor as having the greatest influence and impact on their practice. One mentee noted, "By far, the face-to-face meetings with my mentor have been most valuable. They are individualized, topic specific and solution-oriented." Another mentee shared, "Easily the biggest help was being able to sit down with my mentor and get actual advice pertaining to real problems on the job. There is no way to replicate this type of help other than face-to-face."

Reflective Practice

Mentees and mentors in the KELI program indicated that opportunities for reflection influenced their professional practice. Mentors explained how asking questions encouraged the mentees to think and reflect deeply. In reflective dialogue, mentees gained confidence by developing an increased awareness of the impact of their decisions and actions.

KELI professional learning requirements provided the opportunity for mentees and mentors to reflect in cohort settings twice during the year. The benefit of these encounters was best described by one mentee. "It was nice to meet with other first year superintendents and hear about what they were experiencing. Sometimes it was 'ignorance-loves-company' feelings and other times we learned from each other and were often able to offer suggestions."

Mentee and mentor groups confirmed the value of monthly checklists in reflecting on and pacing the work of the new superintendent. "The monthly checklist has been invaluable! It is a great way to give us reminders of what typically would be done during that month. I will save these for years to come." remarked one mentee. One mentor joined the chorus, "The monthly checklists are great reminders of things the mentees need to be addressing."

Networkina

Mentees voiced the importance of networking with other professional leaders and with new superintendents that had similar concerns and goals. Building these relationships affirmed that other first year executives were "going through some of the same struggles." The professional learning sessions (e.g., state board meeting, superintendents' organization, regional summits, and conferences) allowed new superintendents, sometimes accompanied by their mentors, to see the importance of professional associations and getting to know other leaders in the state. Another mentee stated, "Opportunities of this kind have led to networking and provided a pathway for becoming better informed. Finding local opportunities for effective professional development for this role can otherwise be difficult and expensive." Yet another mentee shared, "Having these [KELI activities] didn't make the first year experience seem guite so daunting or lonely." A final mentee stated:

"These activities showed me the breadth of this position and helped me see the value of networking. The superintendent is a connector from their school district to the outside world both locally, state-wide, and nationally. Without these requirements, I would not have understood this as soon as I did."

Building Leadership Capacity

A major goal of the KELI program for first year superintendents centers on resources and support networks that build leadership capacity. Through participation in KELI's mentoring and induction program, mentors shared perceptions and observations about mentees related to increased leadership capacity (e.g., future thinking, confidence, and preparation). Messages shared by mentors included statements such as, "helps with confidence," "more assured," and "definite impact on future decision-making." A KELI mentee stated, "It is nice to learn from others and examples instead of by making mistakes and learning things the hard way. It has definitely helped me be a stronger leader." A mentor agreed, stating the KELI program provided mentees "direction when they need it, it helps them work through some tough issues, it provides an outside source to confide in, and it helps them develop confidence in the job they are doing".

Furthermore, mentees confided that structured conversations and collaboration embedded in the KELI program aided them in decision-making and in gaining confidence. "Knowing at least one person supports my decision is powerful" indicated one mentee. Several mentees added reflections on the confidence they had gained to make decisions on tough issues as a result of their participation in the KELI program and through the support of the mentor. "The dynamics of each district are different and having a one-on-one mentor allows pin-pointing specifics that help." A mentor commented:

"It allows them [the mentees] the opportunity to bounce ideas off an experienced support person who has the inclination to help them learn as the issues come at them at breakneck speed. This should build their capacity to fly on their own."

Mentors specifically commented on the value of coaching training in assisting them to guide deeper thinking around problem solving strategies and strengthening capacity of the new district leader. The coaching training helped support the individual professional growth of mentors by helping them gain skills in questioning, active listening, and probing rather than "just solving their problems for them [the mentees]." One mentor exclaimed that in a recent phone conversation with a second year superintendent, the mentee commented that the mentor "was using that coaching stuff now" when the question was rephrased for the mentee to consider and think more about.

Mentors suggested that building leadership capacity through the use of coaching techniques was a hallmark of the KELI program. The theme of building leadership capacity in the new superintendent through coaching techniques was highlighted by mentors. "The coaching training has been excellent and has helped us all to be better and more effective listeners and given us skills in asking reflective questions" remarked one experienced mentor. Another mentor reiterated the value of the coaching training by stating, "The active listening and questioning techniques stressed in coaching training enabled mentors to help mentees "come up with an answer to their problem" and thus, increase their growth and capacity.

Mentee Affirmation of KELI Support

KELI mentees shared and affirmed the value of participating in KELI's first year support program. Sixteen of the 22 mentees specifically stated they would elect to participate in the KELI mentoring and induction program again and the six remaining respondents expressed high regard for the program and the support they received. "As a new superintendent, I didn't know what I didn't know. That is where the KELI program provided invaluable information and guidance. I would absolutely participate again." Another mentee reported, "The KELI program was just what I needed to make it through my first year." All 22 responses of mentees affirmed the value of their experiences.

At least two mentee reflections resulted in a change of attitude during and after participation in the KELI program. One mentee stated, "I was reluctant to be a part of this program from the beginning... Now that I am in the program, I think it is a great program for beginning superintendents." Another mentee noted similar feelings, "I am not a new superintendent, and at first I was not real excited about this scenario. I am glad that I participated and would certainly recommend it, as well as do it again." One mentor confirmed, "I believe the program design is excellent. I also believe that the KELI program is only as good as the mentor and mentee working together allow it to be." One added mentor recognized, "how much the mentee wants to invest makes a significant difference." Thus, individual commitment impacted the quality of the experience in some cases.

Reflections From Year Two Participants

Perceptions offered by mentees and mentors in their second year as superintendent or mentor demonstrated positive feelings in KELI's ability to address the needs of the first year

superintendent. One mentee stated, "I realize so much more about what is coming and when." Mentees shared that the transition of support to Year 2 seemed logical dictating a need for less intensive support. Mentees and mentors agreed that location, district size, and demographics are critical variables to consider in assigning mentors to mentees. The closer the geographic location, the less distance plays a part in availability. Similarly, needs of large and small districts, rural and urban, dictated different conceptual understanding of district issues and solutions. A mentee stated:

"My initial feeling was that I didn't see the mentor as 'necessary.' That feeling changed rather quickly. I believe the mentor as a KEY to my success in my current position. The only problem I see with it was the distance between my mentor and me."

Although most mentees reiterated the need for less support in transitioning to Year 2, two mentees poignantly reflected the need to build on their mentee/mentor relationship even more. "While last year was a blur, I think the need for peer relationships is even greater the second year" remarked one mentee. Likewise, the second mentee shared:

"Obviously, I need less support and guidance in many areas of day-to-day operations. However, I'm now taking some risks and tackling bigger issues. Thus, I've actually asked advice of my mentor and fellow superintendents more this year than last year."

One mentor agreed, "New superintendents need work on developing vision and planning to move their districts forward" and in establishing high expectations for performance-based accountability. In keeping with the spirit of professional learning activities included in the KELI program framework, one mentee also reiterated how important involvement in professional organizations was through their KELI program participation.

Powerfully stated by one mentee, "The bottom line for me is that I know my mentor is always available...and that type of safety net provides tremendous peace of mind." A mentor concurred, "The mentor is the most trusted person in their [mentee's] life...the relationship established in the first year is one that will carry on for years following."

Implications and Conclusion

The Kansas Educational Leadership Institute's vision to develop support for Kansas leaders showcased marked success in its initial year of operation. The five-year plan painted a clear picture of the comprehensive commitment of partners and professionals to make this vision a continued reality. Through dedicated efforts and responsive planning, KELI's mentoring and induction program for new superintendents provided a solid foundation to equip new district leaders with the skills and strategies to tackle the challenging environments in which they lead. The value of the KELI mentoring program, as evidenced in the perceptions of new superintendents and veteran mentors, alike, will warrant a strong focus on sustainability. Leadership for the 21st century calls for deep learning opportunities in content knowledge and processes to facilitate change. KELI's mission aligned with these goals provided

a critical link to support first year superintendents and energize successful leadership efforts in Kansas.

An implication for practice is an impetus for KELI's mentoring and induction program for first year superintendents in Kansas to maintain a focus on responsiveness to changing needs. The educational landscape is changing like never before, encompassing massive shifts in national educational trends, state initiatives, and local district challenges. Kansas leaders must have access to the most current research, highly experienced and trained mentors, and a mentoring/induction program that is flexible in design. KELI program developers and partners must listen carefully, plan strategically, and adapt successfully to provide the critical link that offers support for the challenges inherent in the political and dynamic role of the superintendent. This must be accomplished while maintaining program strengths that participants have identified.

A second implication for practice is sustaining the commitment of partners and collaborative resources in a complex climate of financial competition and survival. The renewed relationship of partners forming the original mission must receive concentrated attention. As professional entities and organizations seek creative strands to attract revenue and services in a time of declining budgets, competition will increase. Ongoing attention must be fostered to validate strong rationale for coexistence and planning efforts in support of the KELI mission.

Maintaining a powerful cadre of mentors in a dramatically changing world is a third practical implication. Defining and embracing the role of technology in the mentor's role and work is essential. Not only must mentors maintain competency in order to communicate effectively with mentees where geographic boundaries exist, they must also understand the vitality of diverse issues presented by technology's impact in the educational setting. Moreover, general knowledge of current field practitioner on-the-job requirements must be maintained by mentors who work from their experience and understanding of the superintendency. Lastly, maintaining quality and formal coaching training must be a program priority to develop and hone mentor skills as the mentor cadre's membership changes over time.

Expansion to first year principal leadership, mentoring, and induction is a natural step in KELI's mission to support leadership in Kansas. This effort is consistent with KELI's five-year plan along with continued development and inclusion of deep learning opportunities for veteran leaders in Kansas. In conclusion, coordination of these efforts aimed at leadership development for the 21st century provides KELI with a strong purpose, viable mission, and sustainable resources. A KELI mentee acclaimed, "Knowing I have a friend and colleague only a call, email, or text away deserves a huge thank you to KELI for fostering this relationship!"

References

Goldberg, Mark F. 2001. Leadership in education: Five commonalities. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 52(10), 757-761.

Hatch, Thomas, and Rachel Roegman. 2012. Out of isolation. *Journal of Staff Development* 33(6), 37-41.

Table 1 | Mentee Demographics

Licensure Status	2011-2012 Cohort n	2012-2013 Cohort n
Initial	13	9
Professional	13	13
Completed Requirements	26	Data available June 2013
Total	26	22

Table 2 | Mentor Demographics

Career Status	2011-2012 Cohort n	2012-2013 Cohort n
Practicing Superintendents	2	0
Retired Superintendents	7	7
Total	9	7

Houston, Paul. 2001. Superintendents for the 21st century: It's not just a job, it's a calling. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(6), 428-433.

Kouzes, James M., and Barry Z. Posner. 1995. *The leadership challenge: How to keep getting extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, James M., and Barry Z. Posner. 2007. *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Moore, Alan D., Robin R. Dexter, William G. Berube, and Craig H. Beck. 2005. Student assessment: What do superintendents need to know? *Planning and Changing*, 36(1), 68-89.

Sparks, Sarah D. 2012. Study dissects superintendent job turnovers. *Education Week*, 32(13), 1-19.

Waters, Timothy, & Robert J. Marzano. 2006. School district leadership that works: The effect of the superintendent leadership on student achievement. Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.



Illuminating the Path: Evidence of Initial Success and Implications for the Future

Dr. Donna Augustine-Shaw

Dr. Donna Augustine-Shaw is Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership at Kansas State University, and has served as a classroom teacher and a building and district level administrator including superintendent of schools. A leader is one who knows the way, goes the way, and shows the way. – John C. Maxwell

Introduction

"Tremendous expectations have been placed on school leaders to cure the ills facing the nation's schools" (Stanford Educational Leadership Institute, 2007, p. 1). The momentous role of leaders in our schools today to impact these circumstances can be overwhelming. Inherent in complex school and district settings is a required response from new superintendents to shape and express core beliefs that define their leadership. Fundamental to these core beliefs is a demonstrated emphasis on quality instruction and the dedication of resources to espouse student learning. As validated by research, quality leadership significantly impacts student achievement (Leithwood, Seashore Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Wallace Foundation, 2013). According to Waters and Marzano (2006), the positive effects of superintendent longevity on academic achievement can be apparent within the first two years of the superintendent's

As district leaders, school superintendents guide and shape district and school outcomes and serve in multifaceted, political environments. It is one thing to know that strong leadership and supportive, aligned conditions matter and another to coordinate wide scale efforts that actually impact leadership development. The Kansas Educational Leadership Institute (KELI), in a unique response to an identified need by state and local professionals, has provided a vital support to educational leaders in Kansas stepping into the superintendent role for the first time. The mission of KELI has focused on providing this support through strong collaboration and a spirit of partnership with professional leadership organizations across the state. Founding partners included the state department of education; state associations for school boards, school administrators, and superintendents; a civic leadership organization; and a state research university. By capitalizing on shared resources, these partners recognized the benefit of collaboration in serving and meeting the needs of Kansas leaders for the 21st century.

The visible and warranted need for a strong system of leadership support for new superintendents, representative of Kansas regulations and needs, served as an impetus for state-level dialogue. Through purposeful discussion and planning at the local district and state level, KELI was formed to serve as the lead entity, endorsed by the state department of education, and recognized as an area professional learning center to guide and steer this significant work. KELI stepped into the forefront by providing a system of support encompassing mentoring/induction, resource provision and utilization, organizational and professional networking, and reflective learning.

Building high-performing districts depends on the interaction of school leaders within the larger context in which they lead (Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2006). Since the grand opening in May 2011, KELI has offered increasing opportunities for supporting growth in leadership. Through purposeful reflection, new superintendents in Kansas are guided by skilled mentors to consider important connections between individual professional growth, their local environment, and guiding leadership standards. The reference to state and national leadership standards has provided an important link for beginning superintendents by helping them understand and apply these standards in their local district context (CCSSO, 2008). Furthermore, KELI programming directed new superintendents to participate in professional meetings and networking and provided an opportunity for deep learning for both new and veteran leaders to increase understanding and application of current issues in the field.

The purpose of this article is to highlight evidence of effectiveness in KELI's first year of operation, determining areas contributing to initial success and applicable changes in moving forward into Year 2. As communication with newly assigned district leaders attending an induction workshop in June 2011 began, new superintendents expressed the need for monthly planning, advice on district-level topics, and encouragement. New superintendents also shared a concern about time for mentoring during the first year. Veteran superintendents attending this workshop indicated a need for relevant and focused professional development designed for leadership in today's schools.

Hence, the program goals outlined in the KELI mentoring and induction program provided connections to promote a more meaningful licensure process in Kansas, a heightened awareness for a clear and featured path of support for new superintendents, and valid professional learning for new and experienced leaders. The services available to first-year superintendents through KELI's innovative and responsive program design provided a positive step in building leadership capacity for Kansas' first-year superintendents.

Indicators of Year 1 Success

The KELI steering committee approved the requirements for the mentoring and induction program in September 2011 and reached consensus on the demonstration of skills and participation in activities important to acquiring the professional district leader endorsement. The list of new superintendents in Kansas school districts formed cohort groups for a given academic year. KELI staff and partners concurrently identified eligible mentors through an initial application process outlining key qualifications. At the conclusion of the academic year, successful completion of the requirements of the KELI mentoring and induction program was documented. Mentors oversaw mentee program completion requirements and signed agreed-upon forms documenting these stipulations were met. The KELI executive director reviewed and approved these records and submitted verification of completion to the state agency. This process served as the basis for superintendent eligibility to move to a professional district leader license or earn professional development credits under state guidelines. In addition, districts with new superintendents participating in the mentoring/induction program were eligible for state reimbursement upon successful program completion.

KELI evaluated the results of its first year of operation via documented evidence of mentoring/induction activities leading to program completion and eligibility for licensure. Additional components of effectiveness relating to mentoring and induction included coaching training, mentee learning reflections, a perception survey administered to mentees and mentors, and feedback obtained from mentors and mentees on the first year of operation. Mentee involvement in professional organization meetings and networking presented confirmation of attendance and growth in these categories. Professional learning activities for new and veteran leaders provided documented evidence of KELI's impact on leadership development. The five-year plan for leadership support in Kansas established by the KELI governance entities highlighted further evidence of effectiveness in the first year of operation through successful completion of outlined goals related to new superintendent mentoring, training, networking, and deep learning opportunities relevant to Kansas leaders.

Mentoring and Induction

The KELI mentoring and induction program outlined the requirements for new district leaders. A responsive cadre of experienced superintendents who mentored beginning practitioners formed the essential base of support. In 2011-2012, KELI's initial year of operation, nine mentors delivered over 700 hours of individualized contact to 26 first-year Kansas superintendents. Mentors documented these contact hours through written logs to account for completion of this program component. At the conclusion of 2011-2012, 13 district leaders met the requirements for moving from the initial to the professional license, celebrating the accomplishment of a goal vital to KELI's charge. The 13 additional district leaders with full licensure earned credits towards professional license renewal. Twenty-five of 26 mentee districts were eligible for reimbursement from the state department of education for the \$500 participation fee. One mentee with a current professional license opted to participate in mentoring only and did not apply for reimbursement.

Mentoring services delivered by skilled Kansas superintendents in monthly face-to-face sessions provided the foundation of support for mentees. In addition to successful experience as a Kansas superintendent, mentors successfully completed training programs offered by KELI, indicated an

ability to travel to mentor district sites and to communicate through technology, and demonstrated skill in building leadership capacity through mentoring/coaching. Geographic location and experience with similar district demographic variables served as the basis for matching mentees and mentors. Veteran superintendents, with small and large district experience, provided an effective approach to sharing knowledge and skills with new superintendents to aid in their transition and growth. Mentor's written accountability logs provided a brief summary of mentoring/induction activities, including on-site visits and the frequency of interactions between mentor and mentee. The majority of mentoring sessions occurred on-site at the local district. The ability for mentors to visit mentees in their local context provided mentors with insight into actual district happenings, critical relationships, and added convenience for new superintendents. The valued role of mentor and advisor was evidenced by one mentee who shared,

"Having a veteran superintendent to bounce ideas [off] was valuable support. When two or three significant issues arose this year, this was the first call I made to talk through my plans. They were wonderful to ask 'what are you thinking' first, before giving suggestions."

On-going communication between mentees and mentors, driven by the needs of mentees, encouraged a responsive two-way communication approach. An important opportunity for mentee and mentor discussion and an information source to aid in planning included a monthly checklist of major activities and tasks deemed important for first-year superintendents. These checklists provided a foundation for communication and planning at each mentoring visit. These checklists, written by practicing superintendents, served as important benchmarks for essential duties, reports, and deadlines during the calendar year. Disparate differences in superintendent responsibilities existed for many leaders assigned to dual positions in small rural Kansas districts. Therefore, monthly

checklists in Year 2 expanded to include specific items relevant to smaller size districts. Mentors listed the monthly checklists as a practice "that worked" in their end of year reflections. Checklists provided timely topics of discussion at mentoring visits and established a common thread of dialogue in the field among mentors and mentees.

Coaching Training.

In addition to the core mentoring/induction framework, experienced Kansas superintendent mentors participated in professional coaching training to enhance onsite mentoring sessions. Certified trainers from a qualified coaching model (Cheliotes & Reilly, 2010) provided initial training in foundational skills and effective coaching practices. Program components included committed listening, paraphrasing, positive intent, and reflective feedback. Specific training topics incorporated new skills in developing a coaching mindset and self-assessing and knowledge of the coaching framework, effective communication strategies, and coaching-mentoring attributes. Mentors established personal target goals and received intentional training on new skill sets. Follow-up coaching training sessions provided customized support for mentors around these identified needs. In the initial year, certified coaching trainers provided 20 hours of accredited training to mentors.

All nine mentors completed a coaching mindset self-assessment in September 2011 and eight mentors completed the self-assessment again in April 2012 (Reiss, 2007). This self-assessment provided mentors an opportunity to reflect on their coaching skills related to 14 attributes conducive to continuous learning and success in the coaching role. Mentors consistently rated themselves high in the areas of trustworthiness and sincerity in both administrations of the self-assessment. Mentors showed growth in the area of knowledge about core coaching competencies and increased their skill in the area of active listening from September to April (see Table 1).

Table 1 | Mentor Coaching Mindset Self-Assessment

Baselle	F-11/C	Continuum Range			Total
Attributes	Fall/Spring	1-4 Low	5-7	8-10 High	n
Knows core teaching competencies	September April		9 2	6	9
Active listener	September April		5 2	4 6	9 8
Trustworthy	September April			9	9
Sincere	September April			9	9

Mentors consistently discussed the challenges of knowing when to *mentor* and when to *coach* and identified the need for continued training to help embed these new skills into their practice. Reiss (2007) defined coaching as moving a person to increased levels of ability, assurance, or judgment. Furthermore, Reiss (2007) shared that coaching builds capacity to guide change in organizations through a supportive environment. Mentors reported the need to intertwine coaching techniques in critical conversations as mentees exhibited readiness for deeper thinking around problem-solving strategies. Mentors shared at their most recent meeting, February 2013, that their mentoring efforts took precedence in the beginning months of the first year, as mentee needs dictated how-to advice related to survival topics in daily practice. Several mentors reported that first year superintendents realized the multifaceted aspect of the position during these first few months as a real eye-opener. A former state superintendent association president and Kansas Superintendent of the Year stated:

"Superintendents are expected to know everything about the districts they lead, yet nowhere do they receive that type of training. KELI offers an opportunity to provide superintendents with a professionally trained mentor as well as professional development opportunities specifically designed for each person's/district's needs." (Mathes, personal communication, March 1, 2013).

The KELI mentoring and induction program anticipated and captured the need for mentoring and coaching mentees in its plan as most first year superintendents do not always realize the systemic impact of their decisions as well as the political intricacy of their new role.

Additional resources were provided to mentors to refine their coaching skills. *Leadership coaching for educators: Bringing out the best in school administrators* by Reiss (2007) provided discussion around coaching techniques in the school setting. In year two, *Opening the door to coaching conversations* by Cheliotes & Reilly (2012) provided the context for study. An intentional focus on acquisition of coaching skills through varied resources remained an important emphasis in the training program requested by and provided to KELI mentors.

Reflection.

Mentees offered reflections regarding their own personal and professional growth during the year. To build knowledge of key state organizations and functions, mentee requirements incorporated attendance at one state board of education meeting and one state superintendent organization meeting. Written reflections, submitted by mentees after these meetings in Year 2, provided important evidence and record of their first year learning experiences.

One of the most revealing reflections occurred in the end of the year general leadership reflection. Mentees provided clear evidence of professional growth in their first year as a Kansas superintendent. One new leader shared, "All of our energy, our passion, is utilized to drive what our vision of the district should be...the true enjoyment in climbing the mountain isn't necessarily the climb, it is the reflection on just how far we have come." Documented responses from new leaders specifically targeted the new superintendent's ability to impact student learning and to move the district's vision forward. Waters & Marzano (2006) identified the establishment of articulated district goals that supports a clear vision for quality instruction as vital to the focused leadership provided by the superintendent.

Survey.

Ruder (2012) administered a perception survey to all KELI mentees and mentors in the spring semester 2012 to gain insight into participant perceptions on the effectiveness of KELI's mentoring and induction program. Mentees and mentors in Cohort 1 (2011-2012), received surveys comprised of a Likert-scale and open-ended questions. The mentee survey contained 11 questions and the mentor survey had 16 questions. All nine mentors responded to the survey, as did all 26 mentees. The viewpoints offered by these respective groups affirmed the positive support provided by KELI's mentoring and induction program. Overall responses indicated the program was successful in helping new superintendents grow professionally.

Mentees reported high satisfaction with on-site mentoring from experienced and trained superintendents and expressed an appreciation for the helpful relationships they had formed with individual mentors. One mentee commented, "Sometimes we are assigned mentors who just go through the

Table 2 | Mentee Perceptions: Face-to-Face Mentoring and Professional Growth

Quartian	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Total
Question	n	n	n
The frequency of face-to-face mentor interaction met my needs.	21	5	26
	(80.8%)	(19.2%)	(100%)
The KELI mentoring program helped me grow professionally.	20	6	26
	(76.9%)	(23.1%)	(100%)

motions; not the case with my [KELI] mentor and I feel this to be an emphasis of the leadership the mentors they themselves are provided" (Ruder, 2012). Mentees also reported strong agreement that the KELI mentoring/induction program assisted their professional growth (see Table 2, p. 30).

Likewise, mentors confirmed the value of face-to-face contact as being both productive and impactful to the beginning superintendent. Fully 100% of mentors agreed that KELI developed professional growth and leadership capacity in mentees (see Table 3, p. 31). One mentor remarked, "I think all of the components have been very helpful – being onsite once a month, receiving monthly checklist information, professional development sessions, cohort networking, and onsite observations – was really well-thought out and worked well for its first year" (Ruder, 2012).

Program Feedback.

The efforts and success of KELI's operations were reviewed after the first year of programming offered to superintendents. The executive director provided an opportunity for mentors to offer feedback around the mentor's scope of work, mentoring and induction program requirements, mentoring procedures, and training support. At the conclusion of Year 1, mentors held meaningful discussion to identify what worked, what did not work, and to recommend changes.

Kansas mentors provided feedback around mentoring and coaching as an integral part of the process. This feedback was gathered in an informal narrative response format. Mentors stated coaching techniques including active listening, positive intent, clarifying questions, paraphrasing, and reflective feedback as effective in their mentee/mentor conversations. Mentors reported a strong emphasis on encouraging mentees to form their own solutions to local issues; thus continuing KELI's focus on building capacity for strong leadership. Coaching practices equipped mentors with skills to more fully realize this goal through the use of questioning techniques that encouraged deeper discussion and reflection. When asked what they would change in their coaching practices, mentors indicated they would clarify the purpose of face-to-face meetings, monitor progress towards goals and action plans more consistently, and continue to ask questions to prompt deeper thinking.

Mentors discussed common issues pertinent to mentee success. Recurring themes deserving priority discussion included transition or redefinition of role to the district chief executive officer, combination assignments as superintendent/principal, community awareness, national and state reform, personnel issues, and time management. Moreover, specialized high need content for beginning superintendents involved budget planning, working with boards of education, and the goal-setting and evaluation process. The impact, or ripple effect, of key decisions made by the superintendent was an essential topic reinforced by mentors. Mentors continued to recognize the need to differentiate support based on variables (district size, previous level of experience in or out of the current district assignment, etc.), as well as a need to respect the demanding schedule of the new superintendent. Mentors reflected on the mentoring strategies they would elect to use again in their interaction with mentees. Mentors consistently reinforced that face-to-face meetings and monthly checklists were valuable and well received.

In communication with mentors and through KELI activities, mentees described benefiting from several key components of the mentoring and induction program. These components included processing with veteran professionals, passionate about the superintendent's role, in face-to-face sessions. Mentees noted the value of these sessions and confirmed that face-to-face meetings were an excellent venue for providing support and encouragement. Evidenced by KELI's purposeful planning, the executive director remarked, "The vision of KELI was to create a program that went beyond theory or sharing war stories, but provided true on-going professional support" (Devin, personal communication, March 1, 2013). Thus, the experienced mentor served as a direct link in guiding the new superintendent through the needs and challenges faced when fielding the first year.

Professional Organization Meetings and Networking

Knight (2011) revealed the importance of reflective practice and authentic dialogue as an integral part of professional learning. In the KELI program, mentees are encouraged to reflect and think critically rather than look for automatic solutions from the mentor. Knight (2011) validated this approach

Table 3 | Mentor Perceptions: Face-to-Face Mentoring and Professional Growth

Question	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Total
questivii	n	n	n
The frequency of face-to-face mentor interaction met the mentee's needs.	7	2	9
	(77.8%)	(22.2%)	(100%)
The KELI mentoring program helped mentees grow professionally.	9	0	9
	(100%)	(0%)	(100%)

to professional learning as a method to deepen the value and acquisition of important skills. Through guidance in program requirements, KELI further promoted mentee growth by participation in professional organization meetings and networking activities. Mentees attended at least four sessions from a list of approved activities that included attendance at professional organization meetings, KELI cohort group sessions, and executive leadership learning seminars as a part of the mentoring/induction program.

Through active participation in professional meetings and networking opportunities, mentoring/induction programs encourage new leaders to look ahead and actively deliberate the use of ideas or future planning needs (Knight, 2011). Documented mentee presence at professional organization meetings, (i.e., new superintendent's workshop, school board association or administrator conference, regional education summit) evidenced completion of this requirement for all Cohort 1 mentees.

The fall and spring cohort sessions provided KELI mentees with opportunities to meet, connect, and learn from other mentees and mentors. Mentees shared experiences relative to first year challenges and collaborated with other professionals in these meaningful sessions. In Year 2, content changes to cohort meetings provided a more responsive approach to practical issues faced by superintendents and exposure to crucial mid-year topics (i.e., budget, reports, and local board issues). Smaller group cohort sessions conducted in Year 2 also provided more intimate discussion and opportunity for collegial support. At the spring 2013 cohort meeting one mentee commented, "Most important were the actual experiences related to the processes described." At this latest cohort session, mentees received practical examples of strategic plans and goal-setting, board self-evaluation and superintendent performance-based evaluation documents, tips and timelines for board organization and upcoming tasks, and budgetbased advice from four practicing Kansas superintendents. An additional mentee offered, "I enjoyed hearing from experienced superintendents." Open discussion at these sessions focused on topics of concern, general updates and guestions, and supplementary resources mentees found helpful.

Cohort 1 mentees completing KELI program requirements attended professional leadership learning seminars. Evidence of attendance at these deep learning opportunities included a professional learning activity agreed upon by the mentee/mentor or attendance at a KELI-hosted seminar for district leaders. Professional growth derived from meaningful topics for today's educational leader and expanding networks for professional relationships continued to be a central goal achieved through mentee participation in these activities.

Professional Learning for New and Veteran Leaders

The professional development component of the KELI program provided a means for deep learning opportunities for *all* Kansas leaders. KELI *Let's Talk* Sessions exemplified the Institute's central mission to provide professional development for all leaders in Kansas. These seminars were open to beginning and veteran school leaders, board members, and other local team members. Content experts opened each

seminar with a topic overview and research-based information. District superintendents or other school leaders then showcased current district practices on selected topics. These seminars provided audience members with a realistic vision of current local practice in action, a focus on the response of the leader, and leadership decisions relative to the topic. The last segment of the seminar devoted time to district team planning and application to local district context. The workshop format often included informal networking or interest-based groups for added discussion and collaboration. Comments from seminar participants on evaluation sheets included:

"The format and presenters were excellent!"
"This is the best learning activity I have been a part of in a long time;" and

"Today was powerful for me and my district."

The first *Let's Talk* seminar hosted by KELI offered in February 2012 addressed legal issues in schools. School law experts addressed daily operational and policy issues identified by current superintendents in the field. A superintendent panel then discussed local ramifications of pending decisions, policies, and local district impact. Evaluation comments noted the value of combining attorney and practicing superintendent perspectives on these common school-based issues.

The second KELI *Let's Talk* seminar held in April 2012 focused on the implications of technology initiatives in the school district setting. A university content expert presented an overview of effective technology use in schools. Four tech-savvy superintendents representing various sized districts in Kansas shared their experiences with technology implementation in the areas of policy, funding, training, and virtual learning environments. Seminar participants noted seminar strengths in the areas of networking, presenter knowledge, and the variety of technology topics.

The third and final *Let's Talk* learning opportunity in May 2012 hosted a strategic seminar emphasizing the leader's role in implementation of the national Common Core standards movement (CCSSO, 2012). The effective staff development model provided expert content delivery followed by presentations from leading-edge districts of varying size. A final break-out opportunity for participants allowed staff members to discuss their next steps in implementation of curricular standards. This seminar provided needed resources related to Common Core standards. Participants noted seminar strengths as hearing from small and large-sized districts, and providing local practitioners with many ideas and valuable networking connections.

During the spring 2012 semester, over 100 building and district leaders, including KELI mentees and mentors, attended 12.5 hours of professional learning offered through KELI (Thompson, 2012). In addition, attendees rated the KELI *Let's Talk* seminars above average to excellent on quality and content in session evaluations (see Table 4, p. 33). The engaging and reflective format of KELI's *Let's Talk* seminars provided a means for professional growth and focused conversation for Kansas leaders tackling current day issues and 21st century challenges.

Table 4 | Participant Evaluation of Let's Talk Professional Learning Seminars

Overstion	Legal Advisors	Social Media	Common Core	
Question	Scale: 5 - Excellent; 3 - Average; 1 - Poor			
The seminar provided opportunities for me to deepen my understanding of the program topic.	4.6	4.5	4.5	
The presenters appropriately addressed the seminar topics	4.8	3.7	4.5	
The format for the seminar enhanced the learning experience for me and created opportunities to share my ideas and experiences with others.	4.5	4.05	4.5	
The overall quality and content of this seminar met my expectations.	4.5	4.4	4.4	

Responding to Year 2

In KELI's second year of operation (2012-2013) its promising practices of mentoring and induction service and professional learning activities centered on leadership moved forward with meaningful changes; reaching 22 first-year Kansas superintendents. All 22 mentees in Cohort 2 are due to complete requirements to move to full licensure or to earn credits towards renewal of their license. Mentor logs will provide documentation of the total number of individualized mentoring service provided to cohort two mentees. Kansas districts will again be eligible for reimbursement of the \$500 participation fee as new superintendents complete KELI program requirements in May.

An additional tier of service provided by KELI in 2012-2013 involved Cohort 1 superintendents transitioning to their second year in the role. Alsbury and Hackmann (2006) reported mentoring programs hold promise for promoting successful integration of new leaders in their local settings as a relatively new approach for quality professional growth for school leaders. Building on the continuation of service to address the needs of executive leaders, KELI invited superintendents completing first year program requirements to participate in a second year of mentoring in a tiered system of support aimed at deeper integration into the superintendent's role. This less intensive program involved access to mentors and professional development. In this model, KELI mentors reached out to mentees formally once each quarter and continued to be available for support when needed. In most cases, the original mentor was assigned to continue work with the mentee during Year 2. During the second year of support, mentors focused on assisting mentees to research and utilize resources to move towards successful and contextualized solutions. The seven superintendents that elected to formally participate in the second year received updated monthly checklists of activities important in the current calendar year and attended KELI cohort sessions and other professional learning activities at a reduced rate.

KELI professional learning events scheduled for spring 2013 encompassed partner collaboration with state agency experts as a result of significant alterations underway in state education related procedures. District leaders set to embrace sweeping changes in key state department initiatives attended informational and participatory What's New sessions on accreditation, accountability, and federal legislative waiver impact. Two state department directors delivered insightful and timely information from pilot projects conducted in Kansas school districts. These pilot projects were used to gather feedback and inform the next steps in accreditation and accountability requirements. Presentations reflected feedback on these What's New requirements and upcoming changes to existing models. The format of these learning events mirrored the organization of 2011-2012 KELI Let's Talk seminars by providing expert presentation on content, examples of districts at the forefront of implementation, and time for local district team discussion. Local Kansas districts, representing a variety of size and demographics, and recommended for progressive innovation in the topic area, provided meaningful application of the content for attending district teams.

Finally, Kansas superintendent mentors explored coaching skills at a deeper level in Year 2. Coaching training in fall 2012 provided by certified instructors focused on mentor reflection around defining coach/mentor roles and skills most useful to the coaching mindset. In this customized training, mentors practiced coaching skills through role-playing and reflective feedback in coaching labs to review and refine essential coaching practices. KELI staff developed and introduced coaching tools for mentors in response to their request for helpful tips in guiding coaching practices and sustaining changes in habits. For instance, a coaching tips sheet showcased key prompts for reinforcing helpful questions and useful techniques at-a-glance. Other tools included a collaborative summary sheet to document mentee/mentor interactions and monthly timeline/protocols to track and plan for important

topics and discussion during the calendar year. In collaboration with their mentors, mentees reflected regularly on their professional growth toward Interstate School Leadership License Consortium (ISLLC) leadership standards in October, January, and May. A formative self-assessment also provided mentors an opportunity to reflect on their individual progress and improvement targets. Continued efforts by mentees and mentors to strengthen KELI's connection to leadership standards and reflective practice, served to deepen the program's impact and value. In addition, mentors provided a critical point of feedback involving the continuation of coaching training for new mentors transitioning into the KELI program as well as continued training to reinforce skills for current mentors.

Modifications in Program Procedures.

Results of the survey and feedback from mentors and mentees led to some changes in the program's second year. A critical role of mentors involved decisive feedback and informed reflection to guide KELI program planning for mentoring/induction and professional learning. These mentors' voices provided insight for program review and evaluation. KELI mentors served as a conduit of communication in advising, reflecting, and networking as a collective group during regularly scheduled meetings. Meeting content included general updates on KELI steering committee and advisory council discussion, advisement and clarification on business items and procedures, and program completion requirements. Mentors held open discussion on progress and delivery of services during meetings. Meeting summaries further recorded an important and historical blueprint of the initial operational guidelines of KELI's mentoring and induction program and captured the critical feedback offered through mentor advisement.

Mentors recommended selected operational adjustments in the mentor scope of work and mentor logs due to improvements in current practice. In addition, mentors suggested a few modifications to mentoring and induction program requirements related to changes in practice in the field. One such change expanded the required reflections for mentees by adding more structure to the reflection process for experiences during the year, in addition to the original requirement for an end of the year general reflection on leadership aspects learned in year one.

Practical issues also dictated change. The number of new superintendents and the geographic location of their districts allowed KELI to avoid using currently practicing superintendents in Kansas as mentors, as had been recommended in the original program design. Differing geographic locations between mentees and mentors continued to present challenges as did responding to new superintendent appointments late in the summer. Other changes centered on procedural aspects such as scheduling, documentation of mentee licenses, program completion verification, regulatory compliance review, as well as training needs to support coaching practices.

In 2012-2013, enhancements implemented by mentors and KELI staff provided additional support and improved focus. Mentors conducted a trial monthly phone call in an attempt to embed and strengthen coaching practices in the mentoring

process. New services included an article of the month for KELI mentees and mentors along with a process to request research on current topics. Mentors utilized various technology-based tools (i.e., blogs) on a limited basis to enhance informal communication. Operational growth occurred by increasing support staff assigned to KELI through an additional university faculty member and a full-time administrative assistant in fall 2012 by committed resources from the university's College of Education. These practices continued value-added support for all KELI participants.

Plan for Long-Term Program Accountability and Evaluation

The development of a long-term evaluation design for KELI is underway. Providing local and state accountability and informing national trends will necessitate a comprehensive plan. The design will ultimately answer the question, "What is the impact of KELI on new superintendents and professional learning for new and veteran leaders in Kansas?"The research base outlined factors important to a state-wide emphasis on leadership development for superintendent mentoring and professional growth (Fullan, 2008; Miller, T., Devin, M., Shoop, R. (2005); NASBE, 2009; Wallace Foundation, n.d.). The state department of education and field practitioners in Kansas had identified the critical need for a model to support the complex and dynamic transition of first year superintendents as well as a quality process to acquire a Kansas professional leadership licensure. These efforts appeared through state-wide coordination and key discussion set to bridge theory and practice.

Document analysis and stakeholder interviews informed the accountability and evaluation design. Key themes reflected initial program strengths, current challenges, and informed initial findings of expected outcomes around KELI's impact on new superintendents. Preliminary evaluation research questions established guidance for assessing long-term desired outcomes that related to program goals. Data from multiple sources will serve to inform and develop a suite of instruments for ongoing evaluation using a time-series design for cohort groups. These instruments (i.e., self-assessment, observation, and survey tools) will be developed to measure progress on expected outcomes and relate outcomes to program components such as mentoring/induction, professional learning, cohort trends, and overall impact. Planned evaluation will address both formative and summative issues. Collected data will be analyzed to inform meaningful program modifications and future design of service and support for new leaders. Enhancing program effectiveness and delivery of service to field practitioners through a comprehensive and informed accountability and evaluation process will provide the application and context to further define leadership needs in Kansas. Future program evaluation strands could include KELI's impact on superintendent performance, role satisfaction, retention, student achievement, leadership preparation, community context, board relations, and organizational change.

Future Direction

An organization's capacity to grow in relevancy and strength is upheld by purposeful identification of current

practitioner needs and transference of critical support in policy and resources to embrace those needs (Orr, King, & LaPointe, 2010). A logical step in KELI's five-year plan expands leadership impact and support at all levels, to include new and veteran superintendents and principals. In response to this plan, a state-wide task force convened in 2012-2013 to examine the needs of a mentoring and induction program for first-year principals in Kansas. The task force membership is comprised of elementary, middle, and high school principals, superintendents, and representation from other Kansas professional organizations. This task force delved into research and best practice (Wallace Foundation, 2012), examined current programs at local and state levels, and surveyed superintendents and principals in Kansas for essential input into current needs and priorities. Data from this process culminated in a reflective and informed discussion by task force members. The KELI Building Leader Mentoring and Induction Task Force is charged with submitting a recommendation to KELI's executive director, spring 2013.

Widening knowledge and visibility of KELI's mentoring and induction program through local, state, and national presentations and publications will cultivate its promising practices and emergent impact on Kansas leaders and others abroad. Concerted partner efforts to expand field awareness and knowledge of KELI services through superintendent searches is a strong example of partner impact and widens KELI's value to Kansas school district leadership. The KELI partners convened in October 2012 and affirmed the original intent of the founding partnerships and KELI's mission. One of the original six partners who was a state resource focusing on development of civic leadership, chose to withdraw from participation as a partner due to time commitments, but continues to support KELI's mission and programs. The commitment and respect of collaboration and partner resources remains essential to KELI's expansion and service. Anticipated and natural involvement of organizations, such as the state association for secondary school principals and state association of elementary school principals will spread professional outreach to building principals as well as district administrators.

Multi-year program and fee structures inclusive of superintendent and principal leadership support are under consideration by KELI's governance structure. KELI's horizon is limitless as numerous types of leadership roles render growing need, definition, and increase capacity for sustainability in future programming. Dedicated resources and committed partnerships remain central to the institute's propensity to build and flourish. This steadfast direction will enable KELI to pursue purposeful growth, maintain a focused lens on identified needs, and an ability to embrace meaningful priorities. At the heart of KELI's work is a responsive approach to an educational landscape that is rapidly changing. Underlining KELI's unique endorsement as an area professional learning center further contributes to its mission to serve and assist Kansas school leaders with a strong, growth-oriented course for license renewal, as well as augment the positive impact of leadership development in Kansas schools.

The contributions of external partner resources, the university's division of continuing education, and college of

education and department assurances have provided a viable source of initial support to further define and accomplish the mission of KELI. KELI's future is further strengthened by a major university-wide initiative in the 2025 College of Education's strategic action plan. The chair of the Department of Educational Leadership, in a year-end KELI report (2012) stated, "There is no model for what KELI started out to do, and KELI – through partnership – has created a highly successful blueprint for leadership development that has significant national implications" (p. 2). As cited by Scott (2011), KELI's opening ceremony keynote speaker and international consultant commented, "KELI provides the roadmap for Kansas to lead the nation in leadership training both in developing new school leaders and in supporting experienced executive leaders" (p. 13). This vision is coming true.

References

Almsbury, Thomas L., and Donald G. Hackmann. 2006. Learning from experience: Initial findings of a mentoring/induction program for novice principals and superintendents. *Planning & Changing*, 37(3), 169-189.

Cheliotes, Linda M. Gross, and Marceta Fleming Reilly. 2010. *Coaching conversations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Cheliotes, Linda M. Gross, and Marceta Fleming Reilly. 2012. *Opening the door to coaching conversations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Council of Chief State School Officers. 2008. Educational leadership policy standards: ISLLC. Washington, D.C.

Council of Chief State School Officers. 2012. Implementing the common core state standards: State spotlights. Available online at www.ccsso.org.

Fullan, Michael. 2008. The fundamentals of whole-system reform: A case study from Canada. *Education Week*. Published online

Knight, Jim. 2011. *Unmistakable impact: A partnership approach for dramatically improving instruction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Leithwood, Kenneth, Karen Seashore Louis, Stephen Anderson, and Kyla Wahlstrom. 2004. How leadership influences student learning. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement. Available online at www.learningfromleadership.umn.edu.

Marzano, Robert J., Timothy Waters, and Brian A. McNulty. 2005. *Schools leadership that works*. Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

Miller, Teresa N., Mary Devin, and Robert J. Shoop. 2005. *Closing the leadership gap*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE). 2009. Building the capacity of state education agencies to support schools. *NASBE Policy Update*, 17 (No. 1).

Orr, Margaret.T., Cheryl King, and Michelle LaPointe. 2010. *Districts developing leaders: Lessons on consumer actions and program approaches from eight urban districts.* Newton, MA: Education Development Center, Inc.

Reiss, Karla. 2007. Leadership coaching for educators: Bringing out the best in school administrators. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Ruder, Chris. 2012. Kansas Educational Leadership Institute Mentor/mentee survey: Internship project. Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University.

Scott, Patrice. 2011. New leadership program aimed at school district executives. *Connections*, 12-13.

Stanford Educational Leadership Institute. 2007. Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Lessons from exemplary leadership development programs. Stanford, CA: Stanford Educational Leadership Institute and The Wallace Foundation.

Thompson, David C. 2012. Division of continuing education online program development grant final report: Kansas Educational Leadership Institute. Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University.

Wallace Foundation. n.d. What states and districts can do – together – to improve school leadership. Available online at www.wallacefoundation.org. (Retrieved November 2010)

Wallace Foundation. 2012. The making of the principal: Five lessons in leadership training. New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation. Available online at www.wallacefoundation.org.

Wallace Foundation. 2013. The school principal as leader: Guiding schools to better teaching and learning. New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation.

Waters, Timothy & Robert J. Marzano. 2006. School district leadership that works: The effect of the superintendent leadership on student achievement. Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.



Collaboration at Its Best: Supporting the Professional Growth of Educational Leaders

Dr. Elizabeth Funk

Dr. Elizabeth Funk has been an educator for the past 25 years, and has experience as a teacher, administrator, and school board member in various states throughout the nation.

We understand that collaboration and teamwork are essential to getting extraordinary things done in today's world. – Kouzes & Posner

Strong leadership has a tremendous impact on organizations. This special edition of *Educational Considerations* highlighted the journey of the Kansas Educational Leadership Institute (KELI), from inception to implementation. Sergiovanni stated, "Those who lead - indeed those who have a responsibility to lead - are those who have the will, expertness, temperament, and the skills to help us achieve our goals in a particular area at a particular time" (2007, p. 112). KELI collaborators recognized the value of developing and implementing an action plan in support of educational leaders throughout Kansas. According to KELI executive director, Dr. Mary Devin, the organization's team members shared a spirit of collaboration unmatched by many other groups.

Jim Collins explained that when organizations establish a new vision and strategy for improvement, it is critical to get "the right people on the bus" and insure they are in the right seats (2001, p. 13). KELI partners were the right people, in the right place, at the right time. They were key decision makers within their own organizations, and they had the ability to formulate a plan and bring it to fruition. Authors Kouzes and Posner (2006) maintained: "Leaders are expected to look into the future, to gaze across the time horizon and communicate to us what they see. It's not about being prescient or clairvoyant. It's about being discerning and perceptive. It's about noticing what's around the corner" (p. 90). KELI partners saw what was around the corner and took action. They knew that strong leadership skills are cultivated through ongoing and structured professional learning opportunities. While they could not predict the future, they agreed that a course of action designed to support educational leaders in Kansas was not only important, but also urgent. The need was identified, and a plan would unfurl.

All the authors in this special themed edition of *Educational Considerations* described the various phases of KELI's collaborative effort to develop a systematic, statewide approach to

mentoring new school leaders. Dr. DeBacker's opening message emphasized the impact of KELI's contributions by stating, "The Kansas Educational Leadership Institute is one that will benefit countless teachers, leaders, and students for many generations." While future program evaluations will be used to confirm and validate the long-term success of KELI, preliminary reviews acknowledge areas where the budding organization has already been successful.

Pre-service preparation programs provide new leaders a foundation on which to stand. However, the most successful leaders will only continue to grow and develop, once they are on the job, if they have ongoing opportunity for professional growth through meaningful interaction with experienced mentors. Mercer and Myers' synopsis of the sequence of events leading up to the birth of KELI unveiled keen insight into the process of uniting key players in a common vision. The authors took readers back several years to when state leaders first recognized the need for a targeted approach to support new district-level leaders across the state. In a timely response to the state's call, concerned partners joined together to formulate a plan to increase leadership capacity in the state of Kansas.

In the second article, "Case study in the power of collaboration: Planning process for the Kansas Educational Leadership Institute," Dr. Devin, along with other key contributors, described the process of bringing the KELI organization to life. From steering committees to subcommittees, the KELI organization began to take shape. As stated by Devin, "The right voices had been invited to this conversation." Six partners successfully collaborated on a project that would eventually spark a statewide shift in the way new district leaders receive support.

In her next article, "From vision to implementation: KELI's first year" Dr. Devin outlined and reiterated the challenges associated with getting an organization of this magnitude and importance on its feet. Despite challenges with initial funding and roadblocks related to time and personnel constraints, the KELI organization continued to blossom because of dedicated individuals loyal to a common vision and a united goal. Michael Fullan said, "People stimulate, inspire, and motivate each other to contribute and implement best ideas, and best ideas mean greater overall coherence" (2001, p. 118). Simply put, partners wanted KELI to succeed. They agreed there was a need and they believed in the value and goals of their organization. Most importantly, team members were committed to creating forward momentum and persevering through the twists and turns of challenges they met along the way.

The fourth article, "The influence of mentoring on developing leaders: Participants share their perspectives" Dr. Augustine-Shaw and Dr. Funk introduced readers to the talented mentors and mentees involved in KELI over the past two years. Authors Kouzes and Posner explained, "Leaders who see their role as serving others leave the most lasting legacies" (2006, p. 10). Just as KELI planners shared a common vision for the organization, the KELI mentors and mentees shared a common commitment to leaving a legacy. Collectively, the planners, mentors, and mentees alike were committed to building district leadership capacity by positively impacting

the professional practice of over two dozen Kansas leaders. Throughout the article, the authors highlighted the experiences and perceptions of first and second year mentor and mentee participants. The themes identified within the qualitative data provided meaningful insight into the impact of KELI activities. This information will prove valuable as the steering and advisory committees continue to improve the program for future participants.

In the last article, "Illuminating the path: Evidence of initial success and implications for the future" Dr. Donna Augustine-Shaw reviewed the initial success of KELI's first year and described the organization's next steps forward. The author explained that, in addition to KELI's successful support initiative in place for novice superintendents, the organization is further responding to current practitioner needs by creating a framework of support, mentoring, and induction for new Kansas principals. Newly appointed task force members, including elementary, middle, and high school principals and administrators, convened in 2012-2013 to review current practices, needs, and priorities for supporting new principals in the state.

The Kansas Educational Leadership Institute may best be described as a successful learning organization. Peter Senge (1990) described learning organizations as organizations that allow and encourage members to think creatively and expansively. Furthermore, Senge maintained that a learning organization continually transforms itself and is committed to facilitating the growth of the members within the organization. As a learning organization, KELI must continue to increase its capacity to develop strong Kansas leaders by responding to the needs of the professionals in the field and adapting the organization to fit those identified needs. The reflective articles in this journal will serve as a helpful tool in planning the Institute's next steps forward. KELI's success can only be determined by the success of the leaders it supports. Therefore, continuous feedback from program planners, advisors, and participants will be crucial to the organization's success.

Public schools are in need of strong, effective leadership. Tony Wagner (2008) expressed concern about America's schools becoming "obsolete" (p. xxi) because they are failing to meet the needs of 21st century learners. Strong, effective district leaders will help schools remain relevant in the lives of the country's greatest resource; its children. Programs such as KELI, will help support superintendents as they lead the organizations designed to prepare students to thrive in a global, multi-cultural society.

While many school districts recognize the value of mentoring programs for educators new to their roles, very few superintendent mentoring programs exist across the country. KELI's model, which was designed to support the professional growth of educational leadership in Kansas schools, can be used as a practical model for other states across the nation. The KELI framework is designed to help leaders continue to learn new skills and develop all aspects of their leadership. Fullan (2001) stated:

"Each and every leader, whether the CEO of a multinational corporation or a school principal, can

become more effective – much more effective — by focusing on a small number of core aspects of leadership and by developing a new mind set about the leader's responsibility to himself or herself and to those with whom he or she works" (p. 2).

The collective efforts of all of the professionals involved in the KELI organization should be commended for their commitment to making a substantial investment in new school leaders.

References

Collins, James C. 2001. *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap – and others don't.* New York: HarperCollins.

Fullan, Michael. 2001. *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, James M., and Barry Z. Posner. 1995. *The leadership challenge: How to keep getting extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, James M., and Barry Z. Posner. 2007. *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, James M., and Barry Z. Posner. 2006. *A leader's legacy*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Senge, Peter M. 1990. *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday/Currency.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. 2007. *Rethinking leadership*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

Wagner, Tony. 2008. The global achievement gap: Why even our best schools don't teach the new survival skills our children need—and what we can do about it. New York: Basic Books.





KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

The Kansas Educational Leadership Institute (KELI) is the missing link in the ongoing development of educational leaders in Kansas. It is an unbelievable testament to the power of partnership, vision, and persistence. It has also provided the structure for sustaining the vision while seeking continuous improvement in professional development for educational leaders.

As this issue of the *Educational Considerations* is focused on KELI, it seems fitting to mention a bit of history. In the late 1990s and early 2000s, the Kansas Department of Education received grants for the ongoing development of educational leaders after they had finished a preparation program. Also, KSDE initiated some professional programs specifically for principals and superintendents. These programs focused on increasing the knowledge base of educational leaders as well as providing opportunities for professional sharing and mentoring. The response to these programmatic efforts was very strong and clearly indicated a need for a strong vision and sustained support system for these efforts. However, a solution to sustaining these efforts was not forthcoming.

Now fast forward a few years to a time when factors within the state came together to create a new and sustainable vision. These factors included the growth and maturity of a shared vision with a host of partners from the profession, educational organizations and the Kansas State Department of Education and the commitment of Kansas State University and especially the College of Education to support the ongoing development of educational leaders through the creation of this institute.

The mission of KELI, the programming already established within the first two years of its operation, and the variety of partners who are involved in directing and supporting its efforts are remarkable. Further, this could not have happened at a better time since a large number of practicing educational leaders will be retiring in the next 10-15 years and the need for mentoring and ongoing professional development will be great.

On behalf of the Board of Regents and higher education system in Kansas, I offer our congratulations, support, and continued best wishes for this outstanding initiative that will change the lives of countless educational leaders and those they serve.

Sincerely,

Andy Tompkins, Ed.D. President and CEO



educational considerations

Issues - 1973-2013

Spring 1973	Inaugural issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	Spring 1981	Special issue devoted to the future of rural schools.	
Fall 1973	General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	Fall 1981	General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	
Spring 1974	Special issue on DIOSDATIMAAOEA: Detailed Identification Of	Winter 1982	Special issue devoted to educational public relations.	
	Specifically Defined Activities To Increase Management Acountability And Organizational Effectiveness Approach. Guest edited by Eddy J. VanMeter, Kansas State University.	Spring 1982	General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	
Fall 1974	General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	Winter 1983	General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	
Winter 1974	Special issue on community education.	Spring 1983	Special issue devoted to instructional technology.	
Spring 1975	General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	Fall 1983	General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	
Fall 1975	General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	Winter/ Spring 1984	Theme issue devoted to current issues in school finance and school law. Guest edited by William Sparkman, Texas Tech University.	
Winter 1976	Special issue on educational facility and capital improvement planning.	Fall 1984	Theme issue devoted to multicultural education. Guest edited by James B. Boyer and Larry B. Harris, Kansas State University.	
Spring 1976	General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	Winter 1985	General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	
Fall 1976	Special issue on career, adult, and lifelong education.	Fall 1985	Special issue devoted to the future nature of the principalship.	
Winter 1977	General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	Winter 1986	General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	
Spring 1977	Special issue on community education.	Spring 1986	Theme issue devoted to rural adults and postsecondary education. Guest edited by Jacqueline Spears, Sue Maes, and Gwen Bailey, Kansas State University.	
Fall 1977	General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	Fall 1986	Special issue devoted to implementing computer-based educational	
Winter 1978	General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	Winter 1987	programs.	
Spring 1978	Special issue on mainstreaming and the exceptional child.		General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	
Fall 1978	General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	Spring/Fall 1987	n eclectic issue devoted to lifelong learning.	
Winter 1979	Special issue on collective bargaining in education.	Winter 1988	Theme issue devoted to multicultural, nonsexist, nonracist education. Guest edited by Anne Butler, Kansas State University.	
Spring 1979	General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	Spring 1988	General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	
Fall 1979	General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	Fall 1988	An eclectic issue devoted to partnerships in public schools.	
Winter 1980	General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	Winter 1989	General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	
Spring 1980	General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	Spring 1989	edited by Anita Pankake, Kansas State University.	
Fall 1980	Special issue devoted to education and older Americans.			
Winter 1981	Special issue devoted to leadership and staff development.	Fall 1989	Theme issue devoted to rural special education. Guest edited by Linda P. Thurston, Kansas State University, and Kathleen Barrett-Jones, South Bend, Indiana.	

Spring 1990	Theme issue devoted to public school funding. Guest edited by David C. Thompson, Codirector of the UCEA Center for Education Finance at	Fall 2002	Theme issue on critical issues in higher education finance and policy. Guest edited by Marilyn A. Hirth, Purdue University.	
Fall 1990	Kansas State University. Theme issue devoted to academic success of African-American students. Guest edited by Robbie Steward, University of Kansas.	Spring 2003	Theme issue on meaningful accountability and educational reform. Guest edited by Cynthia J. Reed, Auburn University, and Van Dempsey, West Virginia University.	
Spring 1991	Theme issue devoted to school improvement. Guest edited by Thomas Wicks and Gerald Bailey, Kansas State University.	Fall 2003	Theme issue on issues impacting higher education at the beginning of the 21st century. Guest edited by Mary P. McKeown-Moak, MGT	
Fall 1991	Theme issue devoted to school choice. Guest edited by Julie Underwood, University of WisconsinMadison.	Spring 2004	Consulting Group, Austin, Texas. General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	
Spring 1992	An eclectic issue devoted to philosophers on the foundations of education.	Fall 2004	Theme issue on issues relating to adequacy in school finance.	
Fall 1992	Eclectic issue of manuscripts devoted to administration.	6 : 200F	Guest edited by Deborah A. Verstegen, University of Virginia.	
Spring 1993	Eclectic issue of manuscripts devoted to administration.	Spring 2005	Theme issue on reform of educational leadership preparation programs. Guest edited by Michelle D. Young, University of Missouri; Meredith Mountford, Florida Atlantic University; and Gary M. Crow, The University of Utah. Theme issue on reform of educational leadership preparation	
Fall 1993	Theme issue devoted to special education funding. Guest edited by Patricia Anthony, University of Massachusetts-Amherst.	Fall 2005		
Spring 1994	Theme issue devoted to analysis of funding education. Guest edited by Craig Wood, Co-director of the UCEA Center for Education Finance		programs. Guest edited by Teresa Northern Miller, Kansas State University.	
Fall 1994	at the University of Florida. Theme issue devoted to analysis of the federal role in education	Spring 2006	Theme issue on reform of educational leadership preparation programs. Guest edited by Teresa Northern Miller, Kansas State University.	
Spring 1995	funding. Guest edited by Deborah Verstegen, University of Virginia. Theme issue devoted to topics affecting women as educational	Fall 2006	Theme issue on the value of exceptional ethnic minority voices. Guest edited by Festus E. Obiakor, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.	
	leaders. Guest edited by Trudy Campbell, Kansas State University.	Spring 2007	Theme issue on educators with disabilities. Guest edited by Clayton E. Keller, Metro Educational Cooperative Service Unit, Minneapolis, Minnesota, and Barbara L. Brock, Creighton University.	
Fall 1995	General issue on education-related topics.			
Spring 1996	Theme issue devoted to topics of technology innovation. Guest edited by Gerald D. Bailey and Tweed Ross, Kansas State University.	Fall 2007	Theme issue on multicultural adult education in Kansas. Guest edited by Jeff Zacharakis, Assistant Professor of Adult Education at Kansas State University; Gabriela Díaz de Sabatés, Director of the PILOTS Program at Kansas State University; and Dianne Glass, State Director of Adult Education.	
Fall 1996	General issue on education-related topics.			
Spring 1997	Theme issue devoted to foundations and philosophy of education.			
Fall 1997	First issue of a companion theme set on the "state of the states" reports on public school funding. Guest edited by R. Craig Wood,	Spring 2008	General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	
C	University of Florida, and David C. Thompson, Kansas State University.	Fall 2008	General issue of submitted manuscripts on education topics.	
Spring 1998	Second issue of a companion theme set on the "state of the states" reports on public school funding . Guest edited by R. Craig Wood, University of Florida, and David C. Thompson, Kansas State University.	Spring 2009	Theme issue on educational leadership voices from the field.	
Fall 1998	General issue on education-related topics.	Fall 2009	Special issue focusing on leadership theory and beyond in various settings and contexts. Guest edited by Irma O'Dell, Senior Associate Director and Associate Professor, and Mary Hale Tolar, Director, School of Leadership Studies at Kansas State University.	
Spring 1999	Theme issue devoted to ESL and Culturally and Linguistically Diverse populations. Guest edited by Kevin Murry and Socorro Herrera, Kansas			
	State University.	Spring 2010	Theme issue on the administrative structure of online education. Guest edited by Tweed W. Ross, Kansas State University.	
Fall 1999	Theme issue devoted to technology. Guest edited by Tweed W. Ross, Kansas State University.	Fall 2010	Theme issue on educational leadership challenges in the 21st century. Guest edited by Randall S. Vesely, Assistant Professor of Educational	
Spring 2000	General issue on education-related topics.		Leadership in the Department of Professional Studies at Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne.	
Fall 2000	Theme issue on 21st century topics in school funding. Guest edited by Faith Crampton, Senior Research Associate, NEA, Washington, D.C.	Spring 2011	Theme issue on the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Standard 4 — Diversity. Guest edited by Jeff	
Spring 2001	General issue on education topics.		Zacharakis, Associate Professor of Adult Education in the Department of Educational Leadership at Kansas State University, and Joelyn K. Foy, doctoral candidate in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at Kansas State University.	
Fall 2001	General issue on education topics.			
Spring 2002	General issue on education topics.	Fall 2011	Special Issue on Class Size and Student Achievement. Guest authored by James L. Phelps, former Special Assistant to Governor William Milliken of Michigan and Deputy Superintendent of the Michigan Department of Education.	

Spring 2012 Special issue of selected of papers from the inaugural National

Education Finance Conference held in 2011. These articles represent a range of fiscal issues critical to the education of all children in the

United States.

Fall 2012 In-depth discussions of two critical issues for educational leaders

and policymakers: Cost-effective factors that have the potential to improve student achievement and effective preparation programs for $\,$

education leaders.

Spring 2013 First issue of selected papers from the 2012 National Education

Finance Conference.

Summer 2013 Second issue of selected papers from the 2012 National Education

Finance Conference.



educational considerations

Educational Considerations is a leading peer-reviewed journal in the field of educational leadership and policy.

Educational Considerations is published twice yearly by the Kansas State University College of Education.

Please send me a one-year subscription.

Order Form

Trease seria file a offer year subscription.	
☐ Paper + Electronic Copy	\$13.00
☐ Electronic Copy only (Save 20%)	\$10.40
Name	
Address	
City.	
City	
State	
Zip	

Make checks payable to *Educational Considerations*.

Mail with order form to:
Editor, Educational Considerations, Bluemont Hall, 1100 Mid-Campus Drive,
Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506

Visit Us Online at www.coe.k-state.edu/EdConsiderations/

