**Gallaudet University**

**Stage 1: New Program: Preliminary Proposal**

The New Program Preliminary Proposal is submitted via the Office of Academic Quality to the **New Program Review Committee** (NPRC) consisting of the following members: the Chief Enrollment and Marketing Officer, Provost, University Budget Director, Senate representative, and the appropriate Dean(s).

1. **Suggested Name of Program**: Educational Leadership Certificate Program
2. **Suggested Program Administrative Home** (Department and/or College)

Department of Education/School of Education, Business and Human Services

1. **Program Type**
   1. Undergraduate major
   2. Undergraduate distinct minor
   3. Graduate Master’s degree
   4. Graduate certificate
   5. Graduate/Research Doctoral degree (PhD)
2. **Mode of Delivery**
   1. On-campus only
   2. Distance Education
      1. Hybrid (some on-campus; 50% or more through distance education)
      2. Fully distance education (typically on-line)
         1. Synchronous
         2. Asynchronous
3. **Intended Audience**
   1. Students holding a baccalaureate degree
   2. Students seeking a master’s degree
   3. Students currently enrolled in an approved graduate program at Gallaudet
   4. Students who are seeking PST credit
   5. Students not enrolled in a graduate program and not intending to enroll in graduate degree program
   6. **Other, please describe:**

Individuals seeking an educational leadership certificate are those possessing a Master's degree or higher in education and who desire to become licensed school leaders. Teachers who wish to improve their leadership abilities may also be included. Each year a new cohort of students will be recruited and admitted.

1. **Degree/Product**
   1. Student receives an undergraduate degree
   2. Student receives graduate degree
   3. Student receives a certificate or other product: Student would receive a certificate of completion from Gallaudet and a recommendation for licensure in Educational Administration from the DC Office of the State Superintendent in Education (pending review by DC OSSE). Because of reciprocity agreements the student may also be eligible to receive licensure from other state-specific agencies granting licensure to practice in Educational Leadership or School Administration.

**Rationale for Program:**

An understanding of successful school leadership practices and the growing shortage of educational leadership in Deaf Education is important for making a case for establishing the Educational Leadership Certificated program at Gallaudet. The rationale will begin with a brief literature review followed by three sections: Filling a Gap; Federal Law; and Research into the Relationship between Deaf Culture, Classroom Culture, School Culture, and Leadership.

Burns (1979) emphasized that leaders are not leaders if they do not have followers and that it is important to consider the roles and relationships of both leaders and followers in order to understand leadership. Burns defines leadership as “leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations - the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations of both the leaders and followers” (p.19). Gardner (1990) defines leadership as the “process of persuasion or example by which an individual or leadership team induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and or his followers” (p.1). Burns (1979) and Gardner (1990) point out that leaders obtain their power from their followers and serve them as agents or sometimes surrogates. But leadership is not simply the exercise of power. A plethora of theories about leadership exists that explains leadership as inherent personal qualities, situational or environmental circumstance, or cultural behavioral patterns that surround the situation in which a person (or persons) leads.

A collaborative school leadership setting is defined as the existence of multiple members working together within the school (Valentine, 2006). Current successful collaborative school leadership practice shifts the focus from the formal leader (i.e., school principal) to informal leaders, a network of leaders, followers, and their school leadership situations that give form to leadership practice (Spillane & Diamond, 2007; Spillane, Halverson & Diamond, 2001; 2004). It is the activity of the school organization that is an appropriate unit of analysis for studying leadership practice (Spillane, Halverson & Diamond, 2001; 2004). Teacher-leaders arise and are identified by the situation, problem presented, or by their expertise/knowledge (Spillane & Diamond, 2007). Multiple leaders within a school potentially have cognitive properties that are greater than the sum of their individual parts (Gronn, 2002; Spillane & Diamond, 2007). This concept of multiple leaders working together within a school organization, collaborating and sharing multiple expertise and knowledge signifies that multiple “brains” working together are better than one. This synergy is one identifier of collaborative school leadership.

Part of a school leader’s role is encouraging the expanded leadership skills of all of the teachers in the school and creating a trusting, respectful climate in the school (Valentine, 2006). Over time, leadership changes dramatically in collaborative schools. Although collaborative leadership appears very difficult at the outset, many schools are making significant changes that result in improved academic performance for students as well as increased trust, collegiality, and sense of efficacy for the faculty (Hoy & Miskel, 2009, Valentine, 2006).

**Filling A Gap**

Currently, there is no research or published data specifically targeting schools for the Deaf and school leadership or leadership preparation. However, preliminary findings in an unpublished research study of five schools for the deaf (O’Brien, 2012) show that less than half of current school administrators are certified. When asked why these administrators are not certified many reasons were given such as: (1) no time to attend classes during the school year; (2) access to local university programs is problematic; (3) currently searching for an online program that would provide access, and (4) self-satisfaction with their own performance and no felt need to be licensed. Interview questions about current administrative practices revealed that most were unaware of the benefits of collaborative leadership in increased trust, collegiality, and sense of efficacy for the faculty and academic improvement for students. Some top administrators felt that top-down administration was the best approach. For other administrators it is not clear what their leadership approach is, but they were observed being more reactive than proactive in decision-making.

Further, according to preliminary findings in an unpublished research study (O’Brien, 2012), when administrators were asked if they felt there was a principal shortage many top level administrators stated that there are few people prepared to become school principals in schools for the deaf. One administrator, frustrated with the current principal, stated that the current principal was hired even though the hiree did not have the skills to lead the school. This principal was hired because there was no better candidate found in a two-year search. Another administrator stated that teachers who are also certified school leaders do not want to become administrators. Yet another administrator stated that he needed to grow his own administrators or recruit them from another school. Most of the current school leaders interviewed by O’Brien began their administrative careers as uncertified leaders (and some remain uncertified) and relied on more experienced administrators for assistance.

Published research claims on the need for new school leaders are mixed. For example, one recent source, Pijanowski, Hewitt, and Brady (2009) reported that the school principal applicant pool reported by superintendents is underestimated. Their study indicates that candidate qualifications, persistence, and choices of candidates and superintendents all contribute to the perception of a shortage. In this study the data do not demonstrate that the shortages are in fact not real.  When applicants apply for multiple positions they may well be counted in several pools.  Further, when candidates do not accept offers, either for salary or for other reasons, the pool is not large enough to fill the position and the “perception” is real. Another reason that Pijanowski et al. reported that there is no shortage of school leaders is the number of teachers who are certified as school leaders. While there are many teachers who are also certified school administrators, they pointed out that many do not have a desire to become school leaders.

Other sources claim a shortage of qualified candidates or difficulty in finding ‘*highly qualified*’ candidates. Owings, Kaplan, and Chappell (2011) state that there is a shortage of capable principals who are prepared to successfully lead schools in an era of outcome-based accountability. Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, and Meyerson (2005) reported that the need to fill school leadership positions with highly qualified applicants is much greater than previously reported. Petersen (2002) found that not only is there a shortage of highly qualified school leaders, but also in some areas of the U.S. it has been estimated that an alarming number of principals (60%) will retire, resign or leave their positions over the next five years. The U.S is not the only country facing this dilemma. Thomas (2007) found that in Australia 70% of the principals and 40% of the teachers were likely to retire by 2012. Whittaker (2001) reported that interviewed superintendents “indicated a moderate to extreme shortage of principal candidates, with the problem more severe at the high school level” (p. 90).

The need for the Educational Leadership Certificate Program is justified by the work of Humphries, Kushalnagar, Mathur, Napoli, Padden, Rathman, and Smith (2012) who recommend four steps to ensure that deaf children acquire language because many programs either discourage or ignore the need for early introduction to sign language or the use of sign language. One of their recommendations is that deaf children should be exposed to sign language so that they do not pass through the period in which the brain appears genetically programmed to acquire language, without acquiring language. This would not preclude cochlear implants or other treatments but may help reduce the numbers of deaf students who are linguistically deprived because they were not taught sign language. The proposed program aims to produce school leaders who are cognizant and knowledgeable of culturally relevant leadership, deaf-centric pedagogy and practice, and school culture. The type of certificated educational leader described above would better serve deaf students in any educational system (O’Brien, 2011).

A question to ponder when considering administrator licensure is why administrators without an educational leadership license are hired in schools for the deaf and why states allow schools for the deaf to continue this practice in an era of accountability. According to the Wallace Foundation, (2011), “improving school leadership ranks high on the list of priorities for school reform” (p. 3). In a six-year longitudinal study, Lewis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, and Anderson (2010) found that school leadership is second only to teaching to foster school improvement and increased academic achievement. School leadership matters. Of concern in schools for the deaf is the number of schools for the deaf failing to pass Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) under the No Child Left Behind Law (Cawthorn, 2011). For example, none of the 20 states reporting AYP proficiency scores for the 2009-2010 school year met AYP; however, two schools are considered to have met their state’s safe harbor criteria (Cawthorn, 2011). Safe harbor means that either a confidence interval is used by the state and the school’s score fell within the stated range, or it indicates that the school has improved its AYP score by a specified percentage but did not meet the targeted benchmark (Cawthorn, 2011).

Most researchers in the field of educational leadership indicate the need for highly qualified school leaders. By inference, if the pool for school principal candidates is inadequate, then educating candidates who are enabled to bring culturally relevant, skilled leadership to bear in educating the deaf is important to Gallaudet University. The reasons that this is important to Gallaudet include the need to increase the academic achievement of students in the PK-12 setting and to prepare more young deaf students for higher education. Another improvement the program would foster is the enhancement of the education, the retention, and the success of current (those that are not certified) and future school leaders. This program will increase the number of highly qualified certified school leaders working in deaf education programs. Given the impact that school leaders can have on school climate and educational outcomes, graduates of this program will be able to effect positive change within their schools and programs. Thus, educational outcomes for the education of deaf children will be enhanced.

**Federal Law**

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 has initiated an era of accountability in which public schools must demonstrate that their student population performs proficiently on state standardized testing (Kirsh, Braun, & Yamamota, 2007). As school districts progress toward NCLB standards, the United States Department of Education (USDOE) monitors them annually. The USDOE defines acceptable progress as Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). However, to date, most schools for the deaf have not passed AYP and of even greater concern is that these schools are not being held accountable at the present time (Cawthorn, 2011). To date, very little or incomplete data are collected on deaf education AYP outcomes (Cawthorn, 2007; Kluwin & Morris, 2006); further, standardized tests or state assessments that specifically show the progress of deaf children in public school or schools for the deaf are lacking (Cawthorn, 2007; 2011). A major goal of the certificate program will be to focus on school improvement design methods in order to assist schools in attaining higher academic standards and better data collection. The program will also focus on federal education policy and its effects on the schools.

**Research into the Relationship between Deaf Culture, Classroom Culture, School Culture, and Leadership**

Schools that serve deaf students (including multicultural deaf students) have unique needs when considering the requirements for earning a certificate in school leadership. Cultural and linguistic knowledge and school leadership and school culture knowledge must be coupled together when considering school improvement for schools for the deaf. While school leaders do not have a direct impact on academic achievement, they do impact the teaching staff and school climate, which in turn affects student learning and achievement (Leithwood, Lewis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). Further, school leaders influence the culture of the school (Ladson-Billings, 1994; 1995) by their actions, interactions, knowledge, behavior, and attitude (Gay, 2000). Effective school leaders now must have the knowledge and skills with which to facilitate learning in various cultures. The program would offer coursework to give graduates culturally relevant knowledge and encourage culturally relevant actions, interactions, behavior, and attitudes in their professional conduct. Students would be encouraged to utilize this knowledge in their interactions with teachers, parents, students and community.

**Conclusion**

Students enrolled in the proposed Educational Leadership Certificate Program will gain new insights and knowledge through on-campus classes and distance learning experiences. Students completing this program and gaining recommendation for school leadership licensure will be able to enter schools in an administrative capacity and begin effecting change. Given the significant impact that a school leader can have on the school environment and educational outcomes, graduates of the program will have the knowledge and preparation needed for advocating and implementing changes aimed at promoting higher academic achievement and improved school culture.

The Educational Leadership Certificate Program will help Gallaudet meet the Gallaudet Strategic Plan (GSP) Goal E, the Gallaudet University research agenda regarding visual language and language learning as students begin analyzing their work. Students will produce an analytical report on their practicum experience. The program is intended to be supported, in part, by external grants (Strategies E.1.3 & E.2.3) for staffing and development. Further, parts of the learning objectives for the program are consistent with the re-establishment of the center for assessment (and demographic studies –Strategy E.2.6 *and E.3.4*). The proposed program will also increase student enrollment (Goal A). And, as students complete their certificates, natural alliances and partnerships will form at various levels and in various agencies (Strategy E.3.1, 2).

An important goal of the Educational Leadership Certificate Program, with a cohort structure, will provide more opportunities for collaboration and dialog among students, which should foster collaboration between the students. Currently schools for the deaf operate independently of each other and have little opportunity for collaboration (unpublished observation, O’Brien, 2012). The certificate program will provide an opportunity to foster communication, collaboration, and problem solving among future school leaders with the understanding that there is greater strength in working together.

The success of the Educational Leadership Certificate Program will contribute significantly to making Gallaudet the epicenter of research, development, and outreach leading to advancing both practice and knowledge for deaf and hard of hearing persons and for all humanity (Goal E). In essence, this certificate program will make an impact on the education of deaf children and will be on the forefront of educational leadership and school improvement.

1. **Goals of the Program:**

Gallaudet’s Mission: Gallaudet University, federally chartered in 1864, is a bilingual, diverse, multicultural institution of higher education that ensures the intellectual and professional advancement of deaf and hard of hearing individuals through American Sign Language and English. Gallaudet maintains a proud tradition of research and scholarly activity and prepares its graduates for career opportunities in a highly competitive, technological, and rapidly changing world.

The program goals have been aligned with the mission of Gallaudet University and standards set by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC). Most states (42 at present) use the ISLLC standards when considering school leadership licensure.

The program will be designed as a two-year cohort program. Students will begin the program in the summer on Gallaudet University campus. After successfully completing the initial summer coursework students will complete online course work in the fall and spring semesters. Students will return to Gallaudet University for a second summer of coursework and would complete another full year as described above. A certificate would be awarded after the student has successfully completed 27 credit hours and an acceptable portfolio.

The Program will enroll 10 students per academic calendar year.

At least 75% of the cohort will complete their program within three (3) years.

At least 90% of the graduates will pass their state licensure exam.

The program will enroll students that represent a wide range of national and multicultural identities.

Numerical or percentage goals will be established for recruitment of students into the program.

Using a survey methodology, the program will be evaluated by students and teaching faculty.

Satisfaction and perceived quality will be assessed by Likert Scaled items on an instrument yet to be designed.

Students will evaluate each course taught in the program at the end of each semester.

Faculty will be evaluated based upon standards (and instrument) to be decided by committee.

Each course taught would have an assignment that will be aligned with the ISLLC standards.

A committee will decide whether a separate testing (on the GU campus) would be appropriate for assessing graduate knowledge of ISLLC standards.

The students will demonstrate knowledge of the ISLLC standards.

The committee and instructors will design a rubric to measure knowledge of the ISLLC standards in coursework assignments, presentations, and portfolio.

Students will apply the ISLLC standards to coursework assignments, presentations, and portfolio.

The committee and instructors will design a rubric to measure the application of the ISLLC standards in coursework assignments, presentations, and portfolio.

The long-range goals of the new program will be to prepare graduate candidates to:

1. Provide the kind of leadership that will serve as a catalyst for the improvements in the education of deaf and hard of hearing persons in any program worldwide. The students will get the needed preparation to become of the kind of school leaders who are knowledgeable of program criteria that support the cultural and linguistic diversity of the students (particularly with an emphasis on bilingualism and critical pedagogy).

A committee will determine appropriate program knowledge and criteria that support the cultural and linguistic diversity of the students in the program.

1. Pass specific state, national and other school administrator licensure, such as standards set by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), which will enable the graduates to attain leadership roles within their schools.

At least 90% of graduates will pass the appropriate exams for their state administrator license.

1. Some fraction of the cohort will become student members of University Council for Education Administration (UCEA) and later professional members.

Numerical goal to be determined by committee

The long-range outcomes of the new educational leadership certificate cohort program will be to develop certificated school leaders who will be knowledgeable in:

1. Deaf culture- School leaders who are knowledgeable of Deaf culture should find that their deaf-centric pedagogy and practice knowledge, academic expectations, and understanding of student identity are enhanced.
2. American Sign Language (ASL)- Leaders who are knowledgeable of bilingual classrooms (ASL and English) should find that their knowledge of pedagogy and ASL are enhanced.

Graduates will prove qualifications in ASL by passing Gallaudet University’s American Sign Language Proficiency Interview (ASLPI). The test score will become part of the Portfolio record.

1. School culture and how it influences teacher and staff efficacy and school improvement.

Assessment will involve a paper or a presentation given by the student to the cohort. The paper or presentation will demonstrate knowledge of the relationship of school culture and teacher and staff efficacy. The Educational Leadership Committee will develop a writing rubric or presentation rubric for evaluation. The work (presentation or paper) and the evaluation will become part of the Portfolio.

1. Data-Driven Leadership which involves making leadership decisions by paying attention to the results of state assessment, classroom assessment, standardized assessment, and student learning and achievement and using them for developing school improvement plans.

Assessment will involve a paper that evaluates knowledge of data driven leadership. The Educational Leadership Committee will develop a writing rubric or presentation rubric for evaluation. The paper and the evaluation will become part of the portfolio.

1. School Leadership as it influences the school culture and the success of its mission.

Assessment will involve a paper that evaluates knowledge of school leadership and school culture. The Educational Leadership Committee will develop a writing rubric or presentation rubric for evaluation. The paper and the evaluation will become part of the portfolio.

1. School Improvement as it is indicated and even influenced by assessment tools, by teaching strategies and implementation of a clear vision within a school community.

Assessment will involve a paper that evaluates knowledge of school improvement. The Educational Leadership Committee will develop a writing rubric or presentation rubric for evaluation. The paper and the evaluation will become part of the portfolio.

1. School Policy as it affects teacher efficacy, academic achievement, the operation of schools, and school culture, especially that which concerns deaf and hard of hearing students.

Assessment will involve a paper that evaluates knowledge of school policy. The Educational Leadership Committee will develop a writing rubric or presentation rubric for evaluation. The paper and the evaluation will become part of the portfolio.

1. Federal Education and Special Education Policy as it affects teacher efficacy, academic achievement and the operation of schools, including those that enroll deaf and hard of hearing students.

Assessment will involve a paper that evaluates knowledge of basic federal education and special education policy. The Educational Leadership Committee will develop a writing rubric or presentation rubric for evaluation. The paper and the evaluation will become part of the portfolio.
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