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ABSTRACT

The Fellows Academy program began its pilot year during the 2012-13 school year and was planned to continue through the 2013-14 school year. The program was designed to train fellows to eventually become effective principals using the Destination 2020 Improvement plan and other supporting educational research and materials. The program included 57 fellows and 54 mentor principals. Fellows received professional development training at the beginning of the 2012-13 school year (August through October 2012) and participated in a residency with a mentor principal for the remainder of the year (October 2012 through May 2013). Results of a literature review indicated that the program was based on a strong foundation of educational research.

The Fellows Academy, as implemented, was a school leadership training program, not a principal training program. The five goals of the Fellows Academy program were to: 1) develop a pool of effective instructional leaders to assume campus administrative positions by the summer of 2013, 2) improve the quality of instruction by providing effective feedback to teachers while defining quality instruction, 3) create a positive school culture and climate, 4) align professional development with the goals of Destination 2020, and 5) increase effective instruction. The evaluation for the 2012-13 school year focused on program implementation and shorter-term outcomes, and not on longer-term district outcomes. The first program goal of developing a pool of effective instructional leaders to assume campus administrative positions was measurable during the 2012-13 school year. Determining the degree to which the program reached the remainder of the goals fell outside the scope of the 2012-13 evaluation. The 2013-14 evaluation will focus on these goals.

Of the 57 fellows, 56 were considered to have completed the program. Fellows who left the program early for principal or leadership positions were considered to have completed the program even though they did not complete the full year of training and residency. As of July 24, 2013, of the 57 fellows in the program, 86 percent (33% in principal roles and 53% in assistant principal roles) were placed in school leadership positions (19 principal and 30 assistant principal); another 10 percent (6) were in other positions such as coordinators, instructional coaches, or program development specialists. Four percent (2) of fellows left the district.

A main strength of the program was the training provided to fellows on Destination 2020 goals and district Core Beliefs. Surveys results indicated that the residency component of the program was also an area of strength, with the majority of fellows and mentor principals reporting positive relationships with one another (90% and 100%, respectively). Fellows and teachers had similar positive relationships (96% and 89%, respectively).

Some areas of growth for the program were to better organize the training sessions and increase the focus on building instructional feedback skills. One of the most common reasons school leadership staff indicated that fellows were not offered principal roles was that they lacked administrative experience and needed, when appropriate, additional focus on, and practice with, instructional leadership and giving feedback during training sessions and during their residencies. Fellows suggested during focus groups that more training sessions should be facilitated by the executive director rather than by fellows. While the executive director and director were responsible for training on Destination 2020 goals, fellows led training on their topical, Deep Dive projects. Results of focus groups with fellows indicated that training for mentor principals on the expectations of the mentor role was needed (e.g., shadowing principal duties). Before the end of the 2012-13 school year, program staff had begun making improvements to the 2013-14 program design to address the six recommendations for the program.
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Leadership Development/Fellows Academy was created to address the growing needs of the Dallas ISD for improved leadership capacity, more effective instruction and leadership, and improved instructional standards that align with district and school curriculum goals. This program was designed to assist in increasing the instructional leadership capacity of current and future administrators and also develop a pipeline of highly qualified school leaders. The program intended to train effective principals who would then develop effective teachers, leading to increased student achievement throughout the district.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The scope of the evaluation plan, as required by Title II, was to evaluate the Leadership Development/Fellows Academy program based on curricula, processes, and residencies as outlined in program documents. The total amount in Title II funding requested for this program was $1,070,351. The remainder of the Fellows Academy budget came from general operating funds ($6,082,947). Budgetary issues were not evaluated or discussed in this report.

As the Leadership Development/Fellows Academy is a two-year program with short- and long-term outcomes, so too will this evaluation be a cross-sectional and longitudinal study of the effects of the program on district performance. The first year of the evaluation was primarily a formative evaluation focusing on program implementation. The evaluator determined that it was inappropriate to evaluate teacher or student outcomes during the 2012-13 school year as fellows had not been on the campuses long enough to influence these results. Future evaluations will focus on the expected outcomes outlined in the workscope. This evaluation:

1. Reviewed program documentation to determine the planned goals, activities, and expected outcomes of the program.
2. Reviewed relevant literature to determine the association between school leadership and effective instruction.
3. Summarized the program characteristics of the Fellows Academy program as implemented.
4. Described demographic characteristics of the fellows and mentor principals participating in the Fellows Academy program.
5. Examined the potential obstacles and support systems in place that could influence the successful implementation of the Fellows Academy.
6. Described in what ways the program was influencing the adoption of effective instructional practices.

7. Examined the school climate, culture and communication practices in effect on participating campuses.

The evaluation combined qualitative and quantitative research methods. The results of the evaluation were based on review of existing documentation, review of relevant literature, analysis of the Dallas ISD personnel database, results of interviews and surveys with program management staff, fellows, mentor principals, teaching staff, and Dallas ISD school leadership staff.

Section 2.1 provides a thorough review of the Fellows Academy program as outlined in program documentation. This includes all components of the program and reflects both the short- and long-term goals/activities/outcomes of the program.

Section 2.2 is a review of relevant literature focusing on the principal as leader and leadership characteristics that facilitate change and effective instructional leadership.

Section 2.3 describes the first year of the Fellows Academy program as implemented. It focuses specifically on the training and residency components of the program.

Section 2.4 is a description of fellow and mentor principal demographic characteristics.

Section 2.5 is an examination of obstacles and supports program staff experienced while implementing the first year of the Fellows Academy program. The results of this review were identified areas of strength and areas for improvement.

Sections 2.6 and 2.7 are reviews of baseline data collected on how fellows could potentially influence the adoption of effective instructional practices, and school climate, culture and communication on their campuses. Because fellows were not in administrative roles on their campuses during the 2012-13 evaluation, only preliminary data could be collected. The 2013-14 evaluation will focus more specifically on these areas.
MAJOR EVALUATION QUESTIONS

2.1 What were the Fellows Academy program’s goals, activities and outcomes, as described in program documentation?

Methodology

The evaluator reviewed the 2012-13 program workscope along with other program documentation such as the prospectus, action plan, Destination 2020 plan, and Core Belief descriptions. The evaluator used these documents to describe the initial design of the program, including program goals, activities, and expected outcomes. The information provided in this section came directly from those materials.

Results

The Leadership Development/Fellows Academy began during the 2012-13 school year and is planned to continue through the 2013-14 school year. There were 57 fellows selected for the first year of the program through a rigorous performance interview process. The program workscope stated that those fellows who graduated from the Fellows Academy would be eligible to compete for campus administrative or leadership positions at the end of the 2012-13 school year; however, the program adjusted its criteria to meet district demand and fellows were allowed to compete for principal positions during the 2012-13 school year.

During the 2012-13 school year, fellows participated in training, conducted action research projects, engaged in independent learning, participated in a residency experience with a mentor principal, and worked with School Leadership-selected campus administrators to conduct spot observations and build teaching capacity and effective teaching practices.

The Fellows Academy staff worked to inculcate the Dallas ISD Core Beliefs and Destination 2020 goals into the minds and hearts of fellows. These fellows were then expected to assist in instilling these beliefs and goals into campus leadership across the district. The following were the Dallas ISD Core Beliefs associated with Destination 2020:

- Our main purpose is to improve student academic achievement.
- Effective instruction makes the most difference in student academic achievement.
- There is no excuse for poor quality instruction.
• With our help, at-risk students will achieve at the same rate as non at-risk students.

• Staff members must have a commitment to children and a commitment to the pursuit of excellence.

**Needs Statement.** The program workscope summarized the needs for the program. To identify needs, program designers cited the following data sources: human resource “needs,” the district curriculum and audit results and recommendations, and a districtwide and school needs assessment. In addition, the workscope referred to the *State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR)*, *Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)*, and graduation data. The workscope identified six needs:

- Provide enhanced support for the administrators to build their leadership capacity and foster the retention of instructional leaders across the district.

- Provide professional development for administrators to retain effective, highly qualified teachers and teacher leaders.

- Create a pool of effective teachers and principals to increase student achievement based on STAAR/TAKS scores, graduation rates, and human resources reports.

- Increase leadership capacity throughout the district by developing principals who would provide constructive instructional feedback to teachers and who would effectively evaluate teachers while improving quality of instruction.

- Assist schools in the implementation of instructional standards that were aligned with district and school curriculum goals, in order to minimize the achievement gap between student groups.

- Increase the number of Spanish-speaking school leaders by providing language learning opportunities. This will open lines of communication, help channel community support, and ensure that the major educational initiatives work in complimentary ways.

**Program Overview.** The program workscope included a project narrative which was intended to describe the core components of the program:

Effective principals are the key to large-scale reform in education. Throughout the country, districts are moving purposefully to grow the leadership capacity in their schools. With competition for talented principals and assistant principals increasing, Dallas ISD must work deliberately to grow its corps of school leaders.

Due to competition, our district must at once increase the instructional leadership capacity of our current and future principals and assistant principals, as well as develop a pipeline of great school leaders. The Leadership Development/Fellows Academy (LD/FA) will allow the district to quickly and significantly build leadership capacity that will help transform the district.

For the 2012-13 and 2013-14 school years, the Dallas ISD will recruit and train up to 60 school leaders to become highly effective principals. Graduates from the Academy will be
eligible to compete for up to 60 campus administrative positions at the end of the 2012-13 school year.

The core beliefs of the Dallas ISD are: 1) our main purpose is to improve student academic achievement; 2) effective instruction makes the most difference in student academic performance; 3) there is no excuse for poor quality instruction; 4) with our help, at-risk students will achieve at the same rate as non-at-risk students; 5) and staff members must have a commitment to children and a commitment to the pursuit of excellence. Acting on these, we have created a Fellows Academy to increase effective instructional leadership capacity while supporting the current school leaders in their work to become excellent instructional leaders.

Program Goals and Objectives. There were five project goals or objectives outlined in the program workscope. These goals/objectives were to:

1. Develop a pool of effective instructional leaders to assume campus administrative positions by the summer of 2013.
2. Improve the quality of instruction by providing effective feedback to teachers while defining quality instruction.
3. Create a positive school culture and climate.
4. Align professional development with the goals of Destination 2020.
5. Increase effective instruction.

These goals and objectives were aligned with three planned activities. These activities were:

1. Recruiting, hiring and retention of highly qualified teachers, assistant principals and pupil services personnel.
2. Improving the quality of the teacher workforce to meet the requirements of P.L. 107-110, section 1119.
3. Improving the quality of paraprofessional workforce to meet the paraprofessional qualifications under P.L. 107-110, section 1119.

Program Activities and Strategies. In order to meet objective 1, the program workscope stated that staff would develop fellows to become effective instructional leaders by conducting professional development on quality instruction and leadership. Participants included up to 60 fellows and 400 campus administrators.

The activity/strategy associated with objective 2 was to gather data through spot observations; assist principals with the development of instructional leadership capacity on their campuses; create a culture of learning among faculty and staff; and facilitate action research projects. These activities would affect up to 60 fellows, 400 campus administrators, and 8,000 teachers. Program staff reported that they
did not have access to this many campus staff during the 2012-13 school year. The program workscope was adjusted for the 2013-14 school year to reflect this change in scope.

Objective 3 included activities such as supporting principals in their efforts to improve the quality of instruction and creating a culture of learning among faculty and staff. The activity also would include up to 60 fellows, 400 campus administrators, and 8,000 teachers. The population size was adjusted downward for the 2013-14 school year.

In order to meet objective 4, the program would complete reorganization of human capital in the Professional Development department to become Leadership Development by August 31, 2012; 100 percent of professional development requests of Leadership Development would be aligned with the district plan by June 2013; and 100 percent of principals could utilize their campus leadership capacity for professional development with the departments’ support. The participant population was the same for this objective and activities: up to 60 fellows, 400 campus administrators, and 8,000 teachers. The population size in the 2013-14 workscope was adjusted downward.

Objective 5 had one activity associated with it, which was to work with assistant superintendents and executive directors to assign fellows to identified schools. The participants included in this activity were: up to 60 fellows, 400 campus administrators, 8,000 teachers, 20 executive directors, and five assistant superintendents. The program adjusted the population size downward for the 2013-14 school year.

**Expected Outcomes.** There were five expected outcomes described in the program workscope:

1. Through the implementation of aligned instructional strategies, the district will increase student achievement, increase graduation rates, decrease dropouts, and ensure that students are college and career ready.

2. Fellows will be the guide and liaison in supporting principals with embedded instructional professional development and instructional feedback on their campuses. This will improve quality of instruction by 20 percent of the staff, improve school climate as aligned with Dallas ISD Core Beliefs as indicated in the Climate Survey on the mid-year and end-of-year review for 2012-13. Student achievement will increase during the 2013-14 school year as fellows are placed in their leadership roles.

3. The program will employ highly qualified individuals to fill positions in Leadership Development and the Fellows Academy through a rigorous performance interview process. At the completion of the program, 100 percent of fellows will graduate and be placed, through interviews, in school leadership positions. The program will review employment data at the end of the 2013-14 school year including fellows’ successful completion of the two-year post placement commitment.
4. Support principals with professional development aligned to the district and school action plan in the areas of teacher development, improvement of instruction, and evaluation of teachers. This will slow teacher attrition and retain high performing teachers. This will be exhibited through instructional feedback data aligned with professional development while acquiring teacher improved instruction. The direct measurement of this expected outcome will come through increased student achievement as referenced above.

5. Minimize the achievement gap between student groups in the 2013-14 school year.

Destination 2020 Goals. In September 2012, the district released a final draft of the Destination 2020 Improvement Plan. In the 2012-13 school year, the Destination 2020 Key Actions were to:

1. Ensure staff members understand the direction of the district and core beliefs.
2. Improve the quality of instruction.
3. Develop principals into effective instructional leaders.
4. Tie teacher and principal evaluations to student achievement data.
5. Create a professional and high-functioning central office team.
6. Restructure the Department of School Leadership.
7. Create a career-ready certificate.
8. Create two Strategic Feeder Groups.

For the next three years, the district planned to focus its efforts in the following areas: effective teachers, effective principals, professional and high-functioning central office, leadership density (increasing the number of leaders on each campus who will focus on instructional capacity), and engaging parents and the community.

There were 10 operational goals which the district identified it will pursue in order of priority by 2020:

1. Teachers: Ensure highly effective teachers for all students.
2. Principals: Ensure a highly effective leader for every school.
3. Safe and Secure Schools: Ensure a safe, secure and welcoming environment for all students, parents, staff, and the community.
4. Parental Involvement: Develop shared responsibility between parents/guardians and schools that foster academic success and self-management of learning.
5. Rigor: Implement rigorous curriculum and engaging educational practices and experiences.
6. Culture: Create and sustain a positive and compassionate "common culture" throughout the district that leads toward accomplishing our vision and mission.
7. Human Resources: Hire, retain, and develop highly effective employees for every position.

8. Data and Innovation: Make managerial decisions based on appropriate, reliable, and valid data and best practices, and to develop and continually improve new, innovative ways of schooling to meet the needs of students in the 21st century.

9. Central Office: Organize central services to encourage and enhance a positive culture throughout the district, support the campuses and positive culture on each campus by removing barriers that prevent achieving our goals.

10. Facilities: Systemically upgrade and maintain our facilities to provide every student an efficient learning environment.

The Destination 2020 Improvement Plan also stated that, by September 2020, the district expected:

- 90 percent of our students to graduate on time.
- 40 percent of our students attain a 21 or higher composite score on the ACT exam or SAT of 990 on Reading/Math.
- 75 percent of our students to be proficient on the Year 2020 workplace readiness assessments. Year 2020 workplace readiness assessments will be designed by the business and non-profit communities and will include critical thinking, communications, teamwork, information literacy, technology skills, and work ethic.
- 80 percent of our students to enter college, the military, or a “career-ready job” straight from high school.

The evaluation for the 2012-13 school year focused on program implementation (a formative evaluation) and shorter-term outcomes, and not on longer-term program outcomes. The first goal on developing a pool of instructional leaders was aimed at short-term outcomes that were measurable during the 2012-13 school year. Determining the degree to which the program reached the remainder of the goals fell outside the scope of the 2012-13 evaluation. The 2013-14 evaluation will focus on these goals. This report will, however, document the work done during the 2012-13 school year as it relates to the remaining goals.

2.2 According to relevant literature, what is the relationship between school leadership and effective instruction?

Methodology

The sample consisted of recent and relevant literature in the areas of effective instruction and school leadership. Articles were reviewed, searching for common themes and relevant findings.
Results

The Principal as Leader. When discussing the issue of what makes a principal an effective leader, there are many areas to consider. Good principals shape the vision of the campus; create a climate that is hospitable to learning; cultivate leadership in others; and manage people, data and processes to improve the school overall. In addition to this work, the principal is also responsible for improving instruction (The Wallace Foundation, 2012). Effective principals focus specifically on quality of instruction to improve student achievement on their campuses. They do this by setting high expectations, creating communities of learning, and building connections between themselves, teachers and the classroom. Professional learning is also an important part of becoming an effective principal – emphasizing research-based strategies to improve instruction, working both with teams and individual teachers (The Wallace Foundation, 2012). The Wallace Foundation report (2012) cites a Minnesota-Toronto study of principals. Survey results showed that keeping track of teachers’ professional development needs, monitoring teachers' work in the classroom, shifting from formal yearly evaluations to ongoing and informal interactions with teachers, and using other instructional leaders on the campus such as department chairs or teaching experts were all indicators of high-performing leaders. Results of the Minnesota-Toronto study indicated that school and classroom conditions, teachers’ instruction and their professional community, and student/family background conditions were directly responsible for student learning (Wahlstrom, Louis, Leithwood, and Anderson, 2010).

Leadership Characteristics that Facilitate Change. A 1992 report on leadership characteristics and school change (Mendez-Morse), stated that effective leaders focus both on tasks and human resources. These leaders valued the contributions, talents, and efforts of others in the organization. These findings indicated that principals must not only be skilled at managing their campuses, but must have mastered the soft skills necessary to motivate staff. Communication and listening skills are what allow effective principals to communicate their vision for the campus and goals for campus climate, and to build capacity in their staff.

The results of a study of essential supports for school improvement also indicated that leadership was the first essential support mechanism (Sebring, Allensworth, Bryk, Easton, and Luppescu, 2006). Findings suggest that effective leadership must focus on instruction and strategic orientation, leading to
strengthened parent-community ties, professional capacity of the staff, a student-centered learning climate, and ambitious instruction. When all of these factors come together, results indicated that improvements in student learning would follow.

Teachers’ Perspectives on Effective Instructional Leadership. When discussing how principals can promote teaching and learning in schools, a study of teachers’ perspectives indicated that processes such as inquiry, reflection, exploration and experimentation were most valuable (Blase and Blase, 1999). Teachers reported that effective principals talked with them to encourage reflection. These conversations included making suggestions, giving feedback, modeling, using inquiry, soliciting advice and opinions, and giving praise. Principals made purposeful and appropriate suggestions to teachers in a nonthreatening way. These suggestions were characterized by: listening, sharing their experiences, using examples and demonstrations, giving teachers choice, contradicting outdated and destructive policies, encouraging risk taking, offering professional literature, recognizing teachers’ strengths, and maintaining a focus on improving instruction. The feedback principals provided was specific, expressed interest, provided praise, established a problem-solving orientation, allowed teachers to share concerns about students, and clearly indicated the availability for continued discussion. Teachers stated that effective principals would be able to model not only effective teaching techniques but positive interactions with students. These principals also showed interest in the experience of teachers about effective instruction. Valuing teacher feedback led to improved teacher motivation, self-esteem, efficacy, sense of security, and reflective behavior. When giving praise, principals focused on specific and concrete behaviors.

Teachers agreed that principals who promoted professional growth were more effective (Blase and Blase, 1999). They provided professional development opportunities, supported collaboration efforts among educators, developed coaching relationships among educators, encouraged and supported redesign of programs, applied adult principles of learning to all phases of staff development, and implemented action research to inform instructional decision making. The findings of this study supported those of more recent studies indicating that a multifaceted approach was needed in order for principals to be effective at improving instruction.
2.3 What were the characteristics of the Fellows Academy program as implemented?

Methodology

The sample consisted of documents, observations and information from in-person meetings with program management. The characteristics of the program were described using data and observations provided by program management and Evaluation and Assessment.

Results

Program Components. It is important to note, at the beginning of this report, that the Fellows Academy was designed to be a school leadership training program, not a principal training program. This distinct difference will be reflected throughout this report. Though initial program documentation and language did not adequately address this programmatic difference, program implementation did. It became clear through review of program documentation, conversations with program management staff, and information gathered from fellows, mentor principals, and teachers that this was a leadership training program in its pilot year. Because of this, program management staff members made changes to the program plan as they progressed through the year and adjusted practices along the way.

The purpose of the Fellows Academy was to train educational leaders. Program documentation stated that the program was uniquely positioned to develop instructional leaders who, upon securing a leadership position, could then prepare students for college and careers. The Fellows Academy was reportedly aligned with the Texas Principal Competencies (Principal Certification Exam scoring criteria) and trained fellows on leadership skills that were necessary to succeed in the current educational environment. Student achievement, quality instruction, and philosophy and culture formed the foundation of all learning within the Fellows Academy. The Fellows Academy had two components: a training component and a mentor principal residency component. Training included professional development sessions, on-site observations and department rotations. Training also included a language component where fellows spent a minimum of one hour per day each week working on a Rosetta Stone program to learn Spanish. If the fellows were already proficient in Spanish, they could choose to focus on another language during this time.

The job description of the Fellows Academy fellow positions stated that fellows would earn an annual salary of $60,000. Fellows who worked for the Dallas ISD prior to joining the Fellows Academy,
and who earned more than the stated salary, were allowed to maintain their previous salary levels. Six fellows met these criteria. Their salaries ranged from $68,000 to $85,000.

The fellows’ job description included a list of areas in which fellows would receive training: providing instructional feedback, conducting teacher evaluations, recruiting teachers, ensuring systematic workflow, developing leadership density, and making data-driven decisions. The job description also stated that fellows would conduct school walk-throughs, participate in district data and system reviews, visit effective schools in other districts, conduct action-research projects, complete a Spanish language course, engage in independent study, help monitor school progress, and participate in a residency with a mentor principal program. Due to changes in the program plans based on district need, fellows were permitted to apply for school leadership positions that became available during the 2012-13 school year.

Selection Criteria. Eligible candidates for fellows could be teachers, assistant or associate principals or principals, either employed by the Dallas ISD or other educational institutions. Candidates who had demonstrated success in improving the quality of instruction, raising student achievement, and developing a positive school culture and climate received deeper consideration. Preferred qualifications were at least three years of classroom teaching experience, at least two years of administration experience, and a Master’s degree.

The fellow selection process included a performance-based interview, writing component, and comprehensive reference check. The interview revolved around five performance areas: leadership, the instructional program, staff development, effective management, and professional responsibilities. Candidates completed Core Belief exercises, described initiatives they had implemented or lead, watched video clips of instruction and provided instructional feedback, described how they could determine whether their feedback was effective, discussed how to build leadership capacity in schools, listed the criteria important for hiring staff, and wrote a strategic plan for establishing relationships with parents and stakeholders or wrote a letter to staff introducing themselves and setting the tone for the upcoming school year. The results of the interviews were evaluated using an evaluation rubric and a point system that identified candidates responses as unsatisfactory, progressing (I or II), proficient (I or II) or exemplary.

Training. The fellows training occurred from August 20, 2012, through October 26, 2012. During training, fellows participated in professional development sessions, on-site observations and department
rotations, and individualized language training on Rosetta Stone. Over a five week period, fellows participated in rotations in the following central offices: finance, communications, evaluation, assessment, operations, alternative certification, special education, and curriculum and instruction. In addition, fellows spent one morning shadowing the superintendent, Mike Miles, and visiting several campuses as a part of their training. As of the end of the first semester, not all fellows had completed this portion of their rotations due to scheduling conflicts. By the end of the 2012-13 school year, the program had completed this portion of the training by scheduling departmental staff to attend Fellows Academy training days.

The professional development training sessions revolved around the superintendent’s summer principal training, held from July 23-27, 2012. This training focused on good instruction, curriculum alignment, demonstrations of learning, multiple response strategies, instructional feedback, conducting spot observations, the key principles of effective organizations, systems thinking and action planning, principal evaluation procedures, and the Destination 2020 Core Beliefs. The Fellows Academy program used the training materials created for the July principal training sessions to design their training. All training sessions included a core belief exercise. Fellows conducted walk-throughs of schools to evaluate instruction, and participated in data reviews, mid-year reviews, and system reviews. Fellows also conducted action-research projects, engaged in independent study, helped to monitor the progress of assigned schools, and analyzed district data.

Fellows conducted “Deep Dive” action-research projects as a part of the professional development sessions. Fellows chose a topic based on relevant educational issues, researched the topic, and presented their findings to the group. These projects were focused on raising student achievement, improving quality of instruction, and creating a positive school climate and culture. Fellows conducted spot observations in classrooms during the on-site observations. These observations were used purely as training opportunities and were not used in teacher evaluations. More information on on-site observations will be provided in future reports.

On October 29, 2012, the fellows began a regular Monday training schedule. The fellows would spend Monday of each week in professional development sessions, and Tuesday through Thursday on campuses for their residencies. The Monday trainings were based on the principal staff development training Superintendent Miles provided to principals on a monthly basis. The Superintendent shared
materials from his training so that the Fellows Academy staff could align their training with what principals were receiving.

Program management staff reported that the Fellows Academy program used the Destination 2020 Improvement plan and the Principal Certification Exam competencies as a guide for training. Program management staff reported that they did not have any program documentation showing how these materials were used in day-to-day training, specifically. The principal certification preparation materials included three domains: school community leadership, instructional leadership, and administrative leadership. Each domain had between two and four competencies.

School Community Leadership Domain:

- The principal knows how to shape campus culture by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.
- The principal knows how to communicate and collaborate with all members of the school community, respond to diverse interests and needs, and mobilize resources to promote student success.
- The principal knows how to act with integrity, fairness and in an ethical and legal manner.

Instructional Leadership Domain:

- The principal knows how to facilitate the design and implementation of curricula and strategic plans that enhance teaching and learning; ensure alignment of curriculum, instruction, resources, and assessment; and promote the use of varied assessments to measure student performance.
- The principal knows how to advocate, nurture, and sustain an instructional program and a campus culture that are conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.
- The principal knows how to implement a staff evaluation and development system to improve the performance of all staff members, select and implement appropriate models for supervision and staff development, and apply the legal requirements for personnel management.
- The principal knows how to apply organizational, decision-making, and problem-solving skills to ensure an effective learning environment.

Administrative Leadership Domain:

- The principal knows how to apply principles of effective leadership and management in relation to campus budgeting, personnel, resource utilization, financial management, and technology use.
- The principal knows how to apply principles of leadership and management to the campus physical plant and support systems to ensure a safe and effective learning environment.
The Fellows Academy program staff was developing a more formal training curriculum for the 2013-14 school year as of the date of this report’s release. This curriculum will include a day-to-day lesson plan with daily agendas and lesson objectives. Program management staff also indicated that as the Superintendent’s principal training curriculum evolved, so too would the Fellows Academy training curriculum.

Residency. The executive directors and assistant superintendents for the Dallas ISD selected the mentor principals, and the executive director and director of the Fellows Academy determined which fellows would be placed at each campus. Not all mentor principals selected were “experienced” principals. At least three of the principals were either in their first, second, or third year of a principalship.

The residency component of the Fellows Academy program began on October 30, 2012. The executive director of the program sent a letter to all mentor principals on October 15, 2012 describing the program and the expectations for the residency phase. The letter indicated that fellows were to spend 75 percent of their time working on instructional observations, development and feedback; 20 percent of their time on operational issues and duties; and 5 percent on shadowing the mentor principal or a principal in another building. Mentor principals were informed that they would have opportunities to engage in professional learning experiences that would focus on strengthening the mentoring relationship, their ability to develop leadership capacity through coaching, assessing the fellows’ areas of growth, and creating standards-based learning opportunities aligned to the fellows’ strengths while monitoring their progress. Uncertainty about how to best fit the Fellows Academy program into the larger district context prevented the program from providing these professional learning experiences during the 2012-13 school year. The program had already begun addressing this issue for the 2013-14 school year.

The Fellows Academy program staff and fellows organized a reception to introduce the fellows to their mentor principals. The reception was held on October 22, 2012, from 4:30 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. Assistant superintendents, executive directors, and other Dallas ISD administration staff were invited to attend. The reception included a welcome from the program executive director, remarks by the superintendent, core belief exercises and ice breakers lead by program fellows, a description of the program’s purpose and the residency component of the program by the executive director and director of the Fellows Academy, remarks on principal selection by the chief of school leadership, and closing
remarks from the chief academic officer. There was also time allotted for fellows and their mentor principals to discuss the upcoming residency, requirements, and expectations. Program management staff intended the reception to provide important program information to mentor principals and serve as a positive move toward calming potential anxieties among campus staff and improving cooperation between the program and district stakeholders. Program management staff reported that the program had suffered from negative responses initially, but that the program had worked diligently to address the negativity.

Fellows worked on the mentor principals’ campuses Tuesday through Friday of each week. Fellows were expected to work eight-hour days and coordinate and document those hours with their mentor principal; however, three fellows were also employed by the Leadership Development/Fellows Academy and spent less time on campuses than did fellows solely participating in the Fellows Academy program. Fellows could attend morning and after school Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings, professional development, parent/teacher conferences and/or schoolwide events at the request of the mentor principal. Mentor principals were asked to provide the fellows with an orientation to the building and an appropriate location where fellows could work or store their belongings for the duration of the school year. Fellows were expected to attend data meetings with the principal. At the end of the school year, all fellows would conduct an exit interview with their mentor principal. The program stated that fellows were not to serve as substitute teachers, athletic coaches, or be on any duty rotation schedule.

Program documentation outlined the role of the mentor principal and fellow during the residency. Mentor principals were to serve as a role model and mentor ensuring that a supportive learning environment was provided. They were also expected to provide experiences to fellows that exposed them to a variety of in-depth instructional and administrative responsibilities. Suggestions included: teacher instructional coaching, staff recruitment, attend data discussions with principal, attend principal meetings with principal, interviewing process, plan/procedure for at-risk students, management and prioritizing of parental concerns, management of the campus budget, maintaining campus security, scheduling and creating master schedules, delegating responsibilities, communication (students, parents, and staff),
conflict resolution (staff and parents), discipline and handling referrals, system observation, scheduling and conducting staff meetings, and maintaining a positive climate in the school, and building staff morale.

The role of the fellow was to assume responsibilities developed collaboratively with the principal. The objective was to expose fellows to the practices and thought processes of a principal. Fellows would assume responsibility for conducting all activities while aligning with the Core Beliefs. Suggestions for fellow activities included:

- Assisting the principal with spot observations
- Assisting the administrative team in calibrating instructional tools
- Participating in systems observations and providing feedback
- Completing targeted monitoring of Learning Objectives (LOs) and Demonstrations of Learning (DOLs)
- Collaborating with and supporting established campus teams
- Supporting professional development sessions aligned with campus data
- Providing individualized coaching to teachers in groups or one-on-one
- Conducting campus needs assessments
- Assisting in the creation or update of school action plans
- Assisting in preparation of the mid-year review
- Conducting and organizing PLCs
- Working with Central Office to resolve building concerns
- Accessing instructional support with standards and content specialists
- Coordinating assessments
- Monitoring Special Education (SPED) accountability and Texas Education Agency (TEA) compliance

The main goal, or objective, of the residency was for fellows to use change theory and data-based decision-making to design and implement a schoolwide initiative, called a “Change Project”. The Change Project was related to the school community leadership domain of the principal certification exam and focused on the second competency: that principals should know how to communicate and collaborate with all members of the school community, respond to diverse interests and needs, and
mobilize resources to promote student success. The project was required to relate to some aspect of student achievement, quality of instruction or philosophy/culture. Fellows were to use data to support the need for their initiative, and fellows were responsible for the development and implementation of the initiative for the duration of the 2012-13 school year. Fellows were required to track improvements in their ability to implement the initiative, with honest assessments of strengths and growth areas as the year progressed. Fellows were expected to produce a summative PowerPoint presentation of findings at the end of the year. There was movement in residency campus placement throughout the year and eleven fellows started their principal or assistant principal positions before the end of the 2012-13 school year. Because of these transitions not all fellows were able to complete their commitments to campuses and fulfill the obligations of the Fellows Academy program. If the program goal was for fellows to earn campus principal or other leadership positions, then starting positions during the program year would not be an issue. But, the program goals also consist of training a certain type of leader which would theoretically require the full completion of the program. If this was the case, fellows should be required to complete the full year of training and residency. As of the release of this report, the program had not determined the best way to deal with this issue.

The Fellows Academy program staff was working towards clarifying the mentor principal role during the 2012-13 school year and has developed documentation to outline roles and responsibilities for mentor principals during the 2013-14 school year. In addition, program staff members planned to include mentor principal training during the 2013-14 school year.

**Fellows Performance Evaluation Criteria.** Program staff evaluated the fellows’ performance using a performance rubric. Program staff used an Excel spreadsheet to track attendance, hours spent on language lessons, Core Belief exercise proficiency and sense-making proficiency, number of spot observations and feedback proficiency, staff development presentation proficiency, scheduling and budget alignment proficiency, professionalism and relations proficiency, mid-year review dates, end-of-year review dates, and progress monitoring dates. Program staff also tracked topics, dates and ratings for Core Belief exercises and professional development presentations. The performance rubric outlined the five areas of focus for the program: leadership, the instructional program, staff development, effective management, and professional responsibilities. Fellows were evaluated using performance
criteria described in each focus area and possible sources or evidence of performance. Fellows' work in each area was rated as unsatisfactory, progressing, proficient, or exemplary.

The performance rubric was under development during the 2012-13 school year. The Fellows Academy program had six standards set for graduation from the Academy:

- Completion of school residency assignment
- Rating of at least 2 on Fellows Academy rubric (i.e., progressing or proficient) based on progress monitoring by Academy administration and mentor principal appraisals
- Ability to perform professional development either at campus or at Academy
- Conversational proficiency in Spanish speaking ability through use of Rosetta Stone
- Completion of Change Project
- Completion of Master’s degree and certifications (i.e., principal and Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS)/ Instructional Leadership Development (ILD)

Fellows Academy program management staff reported that they did not strictly apply the graduation criteria to fellows for the 2012-13 school year. Of the 57 fellows, 56 were considered to have completed (i.e., graduated from) the program. Fellows who left the program early for principal or leadership positions were considered to have completed the program even though they did not complete the full year of training and residency.

Evaluation of Graduation Criteria and Evaluation Rubric

The evaluator reviewed the graduation criteria and evaluation rubric and determined that there were five areas in which the fellows’ performance evaluations needed to be refined. The evaluator discussed these issues with Fellows Academy management staff, and revisions were taking place as of the release of this report.

1) Completion of a school residency assignment should be clarified. Completion should be defined. How would the fellows be measured if they began a principal or assistant principal job during the course of their residency assignment? How would the program take into account the varying experiences of fellows working with mentor principals of differing levels and expertise?

2) Mentor principal appraisals at both the mid-year and end-of-year evaluations showed little variation. All mentor principals gave high ratings at both appraisal periods, leaving little room
for feedback on areas of needed growth. It was possible that the program brought in fellows with high levels of expertise, but if the role of mentor principal was to develop the fellow, then it would follow that there would have been areas of growth identified during appraisals. The 2012-13 cohort of fellows “graduated” on May 20, 2013, before the end-of-year mentor principal appraisals were complete. The program should evaluate all graduation criteria before fellows are given their certificate of completion. In addition, more rigorous evaluation of training and the residency performance is needed during the 2013-14 school year.

3) A rubric for professional development should be created. The program never fully defined what counted as professional development and was not able to monitor all professional development activities, leaving the scoring on the rubric fairly subjective.

4) A rubric for Spanish proficiency should be created. Fellows Academy program staff used a formula to determine “proficiency” in Spanish using what levels the fellows had reached, the amount of progress the fellows had made over time, and what scores they had received on Rosetta Stone tests. In determining a more balanced way to grade fellows on the Rosetta Stone program, program staff decided that looking at the number of hours spent on the program was insufficient. The Rosetta Stone program itself was leveled, gave progress for each level and also rated proficiency for each level. Based on these metrics, Academy staff created a weighted system which determined how many possible points each Fellow could earn (up to 3) for completion of the Rosetta Stone program. The breakdown was as such: level weight: 40%, progress weight: 40%, score weight: 20%. The evaluator could not determine whether this method accurately measured a fellow’s ability to actually use the Spanish language in the workplace.

5) A rubric for evaluation of the Change Project should be created. Not all fellows were able to complete a Change Project during the 2012-13 school year; however, the rubric did not seem to take this into account.

The Fellows Academy program staff will continue during the 2013-14 school year to make revisions to the performance rubric and increase the rigor of their evaluation criteria.
2.4 What were the demographic characteristics of the fellows and mentor principals participating in the Fellows Academy program?

Methodology

The sample consisted of fellows and mentor principals participating in the Fellows Academy program. Program management staff provided background information and identification numbers on fellows and mentor principals. Fellows’ resumes were also reviewed. Program information was linked to the Dallas ISD personnel data file created on April 18, 2013.

Results

Fellows Demographics. The majority of fellows were African American (63%) and female (68%) (Figures 1 and 2).
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Figure 1. Fellow Population Described by Ethnicity
Just over half of the fellows were classified as internal hires (about 53%) (Figure 3). Dallas ISD years of service ranged from zero, for new hires, to 26 years, for more tenured fellows. The average number of years of service in the Dallas ISD was just under eight and a half years. Fourteen of the 27 external hires had previously worked for the Dallas ISD. The other 13 had no years of service with the district.
Figure 4 shows the percentage of fellows by highest degree attained. The majority of fellows had a master’s degree (83%). At the time of this report’s release, four fellows were enrolled in master degree programs, and five were enrolled in doctoral programs. The personnel database did not include this information.
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**Figure 4. Fellow Population Described by Highest Degree Attained**

Fellows had between zero and five teaching or administrative certifications, with the majority holding either one (26%) or two (35%) (Table 1). At the time of this report’s release there were three fellows with no certifications reported in the Dallas ISD personnel database. It was possible the personnel data file was not up to date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Certifications</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If they had not already, fellows were to obtain their principal certifications while participating in the Fellows Academy program. Of the 57 fellows, 98 percent had completed their principal certifications as of the release of this report. Only one fellow had not completed this certification.

Three of the fellows were concurrently participating in the Fellows Academy program and employed as full-time employees of the district. Two fellows were coordinators, and one was a manager for the Leadership Development/Fellows Academy department. In addition, three of the fellows were participating in the Southern Methodist University (SMU) Educational Leadership Master’s program. This two-year program also included a residency and mentoring component similar to the Dallas ISD program. The issues of fellows being concurrently enrolled in the Fellows Academy and either employed or participating in a similar program of study should be examined.

**Mentor Principal Demographics.** The 57 fellows were placed with 54 mentor principals. The majority of mentor principals were African American (35%) or Hispanic (35%), and female (69%) (Figures 5 and 6).
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*Figure 5. Mentor Principal Population Described by Ethnicity*
The majority of mentor principals had a master's degree (93%). The mentor principals had between zero and 37 years of service in the Dallas ISD, with an average of about 16 years of service. The hire dates available in the Dallas ISD personnel database suggested that at least one principal was brought into the district for the 2012-13 school year. While the evaluator was able to determine the number of years of state and local service to education, the evaluator was unable to determine the number of years spent teaching and working as administrators.
Mentor principals held between two and eight teaching or administrative certifications, with the majority holding between two and four (a total of about 87%) (Table 2).

Table 2
Mentor Principal Population:
Number of Certifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Certifications</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just over 50 percent of fellows were placed with mentor principals on elementary school campuses (52%) (Figure 8). The remaining fellows were split evenly between middle school and high school campuses. Executive directors and assistant superintendents were responsible for selecting mentor principals and determining on what campuses the fellows were to complete their residencies.

Figure 8. Mentor Principal Population Described by Campus Level
Table 3 lists the campuses on which fellows were placed. Two mentor principals had two fellows placed on their campuses (Cabell and Edward H. Cary Elementary Schools), and one had three fellows (T.W. Browne Middle School). Not all fellows were assigned to the same mentor principal or campus throughout the 2012-13 school year. In some instances, fellows were assigned to more than one mentor principal or campus. Between the first and second semester, nine campuses (four elementary, four middle schools, and one high school) were dropped as residency sites: H.I. Holland ES at Lisbon, Preston Hollow ES, Celestrino Mauricio Soto Jr. ES, Edward Titche ES, Balch Springs MS, Fred F. Florence MS, Francisco “Pancho” Medrano MS, L.V. Stockard MS, and W.T. White HS. Seven campuses were added between the first and second semesters: Barbara Jordan ES, Robert E. Lee ES, Martin Weiss ES, Ann Richards MS, Boude Storey MS, Thomas Jefferson HS, and Patton Academic Center HS.
Table 3  
Fellow and Mentor Principals: Campus Placements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary Schools</th>
<th>Middle Schools</th>
<th>High Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Browne**</td>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadia Park</td>
<td>Cary***</td>
<td>Adamson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushman</td>
<td>Dallas Environmental Science Academy</td>
<td>Carter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabell *</td>
<td>Edison Learning Center</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caillet</td>
<td>Garcia</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callejo</td>
<td>Greiner</td>
<td>Obama Male Leadership Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>Patton Academic Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa View</td>
<td>Hood</td>
<td>Rangel Young Women’s Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Samuell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochran</td>
<td>Quintanilla</td>
<td>Seagoville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeGolyer</td>
<td>Richards</td>
<td>Skyline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>Storey</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert E. Lee</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pershing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seagoville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolbert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Truett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Twain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Withers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Two fellows were placed at Cabell ES.
** Three fellows were placed at T.W. Browne MS.
*** Two fellows were placed at Edward H. Cary MS.
2.5 What were the potential obstacles and support systems in place that could influence the successful implementation of the Fellows Academy?

Methodology

Data for this section were collected using focus groups and surveys with fellows, mentor principals, and teachers. The evaluator designed an online survey to solicit information about program characteristics and participant perceptions. On Wednesday, May 15, 2013, the Fellows Academy executive director sent the online survey to fellows, mentor principals, and teachers who had worked with fellows during the 2012-13 school year. The survey was sent directly to fellows and mentor principals, and mentor principals were asked to forward the survey link to teachers who had had direct contact with fellows. The response rate for fellows was 81 percent (46 out of 57 responding) and 63 percent for mentor principals (34 out of 54 responding). The evaluator and executive director did not have access to the number of teachers working with fellows; thus, a response rate could not be calculated for teachers.

One hundred teachers responded to the survey. A limitation of the teacher survey was that the evaluator designed it to be anonymous, meaning no identifying information such as name or campus was requested. Because of this, the evaluator was unable to determine how many teachers per fellow were responding and was unable to determine how many teachers per campuses had responded to the survey. This limitation was acceptable given the belief that teachers would be more willing to respond if their responses were anonymous. Fellow, mentor principal, and teacher survey protocols can be found in Appendices A, B, and C, respectively.

On Monday, May 13th, 2013, the evaluator conducted four topical focus groups with Fellows Academy fellows. Each focus group had between four and seven fellows participating and focused on a different aspect of the Fellows Academy program (Residency, Obstacles and Supports, Effective Instruction, and Climate/Culture/Communication). Focus group questions can be found in Appendix D. The Residency and Obstacles and Supports focus group results will be discussed in this section. Results of the Effective Instruction focus group will be discussed in section 2.5. The results of the Climate/Culture/Communication focus group will be discussed in section 2.6. The residency focus group examined the mentor-mentee relationship fellows had with principals. Focus group questions solicited information about fellows’ main duties during their residency, whether they were able to work with teachers, the Change Projects fellows were to implement on their campuses, what professional
development they were able to provide on their campuses, and what characteristics a good mentor principal should have. The Obstacles and Supports focus group gathered information about the obstacles fellows faced during the program, what support systems were in place to help them succeed, and what obstacles they faced during the principal selection process.

Fellows Academy program staff selected fellows for the focus groups based on availability and their experiences, both in the Academy and their residencies. In terms of experiences, fellows had different opportunities to experience various aspects of the principalship throughout the Academy. Depending on those opportunities and their outcomes, both positive and negative, fellows were selected to participate in one of the four focus groups. Experience opportunities used to shape the decision included, but were not limited to: residency environment, providing professional development, coaching, instructional feedback and support. In the future, focus group participants may be selected based on random sampling, ensuring an unbiased selection process. However, based on focus group discussions, the evaluator determined that focus group participants represented a range of program experiences and perceptions.

The evaluator reviewed the procedures for the 2012-13 principal selection process. Between July 17 and July 25, 2013, the evaluator conducted phone interviews with six school leadership staff members (executive directors and assistant superintendents) involved in this process. The interview questions solicited information about what role the school leadership staff members had in the principal selection process, what they were looking for in a principal hire, how much contact they had had with fellows during the 2012-13 school year prior to the principal selection process, how fellows compared with non-fellows during the hiring process, whether fellows seemed prepared and knowledgeable about leadership in the district, what feedback they would have given to fellows about their performance during the interview process, what reasons non-fellows were hired over fellows, whether or not the Fellows Academy was a good leadership pipeline for the district, and whether more communication with Fellows Academy staff would have been useful before or during the principal selection process.

Results

The results of the focus groups and online surveys suggested that the Fellows Academy program was facing some implementation issues due to unforeseen difficulties with district staff cooperation and
an emphasis on longer-term outcomes rather than on the desired short-term outcomes of the program. If one were to view the first year of the Fellows Academy as a pilot year, there were, and continue to be, many lessons to learn about districtwide program design and implementation. Some of these include the difficulties in aligning program goals and expected outcomes with resources, activities and procedures; communicating with stakeholders; and reacting to changes in the program context. Fellows overwhelmingly reported that clearer expectations with regard to program design and a training and residency component that had increased rigor would greatly enhance the success of the Fellows Academy program.

As a result of these findings, the program was already adjusting its 2013-14 workscope and corresponding program documents to more clearly define the program. In addition, program staff members were examining the residency and mentor principal components of the program to determine how they could provide the best training to fellows with the most fidelity to program design.

Results of the focus groups also suggested that the small staff of the Fellows Academy was an obstacle. There was an executive director and director employed by the district, along with three additional support staff. The support staff members were also fellows in the Academy, creating a split focus for their efforts. The program would benefit greatly from additional full-time staff so that more focus could be put on the fellows’ development during training sessions and during their residency experience.

**Training Component.** Fellow survey questions solicited information about the quality of training during the Fellows Academy. Fellows were asked to reflect on what aspects of training most assisted them during their residency assignments. Fellows reported that the focus on Core Beliefs, Destination 2020 goals, departmental rotations, Spot Observation calibration and learning how to write effective Learning Objectives (LOs) and Demonstrations of Learning (DOLs) were the most beneficial parts when it came to their residency experience. Though there were many strengths identified, fellows also indicated that there were areas where training could have been improved. They reported that there was poor communication and a lack of transparency between program management staff and fellows. Training needed to be better organized and was often not well planned. Some fellows were concerned that trainings were often facilitated by fellows, and the executive director and director did not conduct the training sessions. Program management staff reported that the executive director and director conducted
training sessions on Destination 2020 while fellows lead training sessions on their Deep Dive, action research projects. A few fellows indicated that they had difficulty adapting what they learned in training to the campus culture when they started their residency, meaning that what they learned in the training room, did not necessarily translate to actual practice.

When fellows were asked what additional training would be beneficial in preparing them for a principal role, more operational training was the most common theme identified. Fellows requested training on budget, master scheduling, action planning, data analysis, Oracle, My Data Portal, Chancery, testing components and schedules, dealing with student discipline, interviewing skills, and more practice with Spanish language skills. Fellows also requested more training on how the Admission, Review Dismissal (ARD) process worked. Fellows again asked that the training be developed and conducted by the Fellows Academy executive director and director, rather than by other fellows. Several fellows indicated that they needed no additional training and were ready to take on a principal role.

When fellows reported on what components of training were most beneficial to their learning, the most common responses were small groups, outside experts, individual projects, role play, and department rotations.

Results of the surveys suggested that a major strength of the Fellows Academy program was training fellows on Destination 2020 goals and Core Beliefs; however, a focus on operational procedures and skills was needed. This issue reflects the distinction between the Fellows Academy being a leadership training program and not a principal training program, specifically. The program would benefit from increased rigor in the areas fellows will have to focus once they begin principal positions. Another major strength of the program was the network of fellows and administrative staff that was created through the training process. Fellows were able to meet campus and district leaders and develop relationships they can rely once they move into their leadership roles.

**Residency Component.** Results of the focus groups and online surveys indicated that the residency and mentor principal components of the Fellows Academy program served as both an obstacle and an area of strength for the program. When an appropriate pairing between mentor principal and fellow was made, the fellow and mentor principal greatly benefited from the experience. Results suggested that to create a positive learning environment for fellows, mentor principals should want to be
mentors; they should meet some criteria for being a mentor principal; the expectations of the mentor principal role should be clearly communicated to them; and there should be consideration given to the mentor-mentee pairing. The Fellows Academy executive director and director should have the ability to communicate with mentor principals about the expectations of the program and provide important program information and feedback to aid mentor principals. In addition, the process of selecting campuses for the residency should be more clearly defined to improve the experience of fellows. Campuses should be selected that provide the best possible training for fellows; however, campus needs should also be considered.

Fellows also indicated that their own attitudes when entering their campuses served as a barrier in some cases. The fellows admitted that they needed to be more humble upon arriving at the campus and be clearer that they were there to learn and grow as leaders and potential administrators. Some fellows indicated that they were too harsh with teachers and did not approach them in a constructive manner. The fellows reported that they changed their behavior as the year progressed and that their relationships with mentor principals and teachers improved as a result. Fellows reported that there was some tension within the Fellows Academy cohort of fellows and that it took some time to learn how to work with all of the talented and ambitious individuals participating in the program. The fellows indicated that the program was aware of these issues and would be addressing these potential concerns at the beginning of training for the 2013-14 cohort of fellows.

The fellows indicated that they all performed different duties as part of their residency assignment. While some were responsible for assistant principal duties like discipline, others were able to shadow their mentor principals and learn the principal role. Some fellows were assigned to oversee specific grade levels while others were over particular subjects. Most of the fellows’ Change Projects had to do with quality of instruction. A few of the fellows participating in the focus groups reported that they focused on other issues such as campus climate, or even more specifically, attendance and tardiness issues. Fellows indicated that when they were transferred from one campus to another or accepted a principal position, their Change Projects often ended at the original campus. Other fellows said that other campus staff members were able to take over and sustain the programs. One fellow indicated completing a project before leaving the campus.
Results of the online surveys are found in figures 9 through 13 and tables 4 through 6. Figure 9 displays the average number of years of service in teaching and administrative position for both Dallas ISD and in total for fellows, mentor principals, and teachers. Mentor principals had more years of teaching then did the fellows. Teachers also had a higher average number of years of teaching than did fellows. Mentor principals had around 10 years of administrative experience on average, while fellows had between three and four years.

![Figure 9](image)

**Figure 9.** Average years of teaching/administrative service in DISD/total

Table 4 displays responses to general questions on the Fellow survey. Half of the fellows were placed on elementary campuses for their residency. The remaining 50 percent were almost evenly split between middle and high schools, with slightly more fellows placed on middle school campuses (28%). The majority of fellows were placed on one campus (72%) and with one mentor principal (70%) during the 2012-13 school year; however, there was some movement of fellows between campuses and mentor principals with some fellows being assigned to two (26%) or three (2%) campuses and two (26%) or three (2%) mentor principals.

It is important to note that only 20 percent of fellows reported that they were fluent or functional in Spanish. One of the criteria for graduating from the Fellows Academy program was that the fellow be “proficient” in Spanish. Because the question wording included functional or fluent and not proficient, the
evaluator is unable to determine whether fellows met the graduation requirement; however, it is a safe
assumption that if fellows did not report that they were at least functional in Spanish, that their foreign
language skills were in need of improvement in order to be able to communicate with students and
parents on campuses. A definition of functional, fluent and/or proficient should be developed for use in
evaluating the program in the future.

Table 4
Fellow Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What level is your residency current campus?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On how many campuses were you placed during your residency for the 2012-13 school year?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To how many mentor principals have you been assigned during the 2012-13 school year?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you currently functional/fluent in Spanish?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 displays responses to general questions on the mentor principal survey. The majority of
mentor principals met with their fellows on a daily basis (82%). The remaining mentor principals met on at
least a weekly basis. Though it was not a requirement of the program, about 68 percent of mentor
principals reported that fellows shared training materials with them. This is a good practice and increases
the benefits of being a mentor principal. Most mentor principals had contact with Academy staff less than
once a month (62%) or had no contact (24%); however, 50 percent of mentor principals reported that
feedback from Fellows Academy staff would have been beneficial. Another 47 percent of mentor
principals said that contact with Fellows Academy staff would ‘maybe’ be beneficial.
Table 5
Mentor Principal Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often did you meet with your fellow(s)?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did your fellow(s) share any of their training materials with you?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often did you have contact with Fellows Academy staff?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a month</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not have contact with Fellows Academy staff</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As a mentor principal, would you have benefited from Fellows Academy program staff feedback?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                                                                                     | 34 | 100.0|

Figure 10 shows the fellow and mentor principal ratings of the quality of their relationship with one another. Ratings were similar between groups. The majority of fellows and mentor principals reported that their relationships were Mostly Positive (83% and 85%, respectively). While no mentor principals rated their relationship with fellows as Neutral, Slightly Negative, or Mostly Negative, a small number of fellows did report that their relationships with their mentor principals were neutral (9%) or slightly negative (2%). No fellows reported that their relationships with their mentor principals were Mostly Negative. When fellows explained their answer to the closed-ended question, the majority reported that mentor principals were excellent role models, that they were open to new ideas and provided fellows with opportunities to learn the principal role; however, a less common theme was that fellows had issues with their mentor principals. They reported that mentor principals were sometimes defensive and not open to new ideas, provided no direct mentoring, did not include fellows in meetings or campus leadership activities, that no trust or rapport had been established, that mentor principals did not appreciate having a fellow on their campus, and that the mentor principals potentially believed that the fellows were there to take the principals’ jobs. A common comment among mentor principals was that fellows were professional, hard
working, knowledgeable and willing to learn; however, a less common comment was that fellows were not

team players.

Figure 10. Fellows and Mentor Principals Relationship Ratings

Figures 11 and 12 refer to fellow and mentor principal satisfaction with the Fellows Academy

program. The majority of fellows and mentor principals reported that the program had met their

expectations (80% and 79%, respectively). In addition, most fellows reported that they would recommend

the Fellows Academy program to a friend (76%) and mentor principals reported that they would want to

be a mentor principal again in the future (71%).

Survey results indicated that fellows expected to receive rigorous training on becoming an
effective instructional leader. The expectations of some fellows were that they were guaranteed principal
positions once they were admitted to the Fellows Academy program. Fellows who indicated that the

program did not meet their expectations, reported that they spent too much time training each other and

that this style of training did not reach the level of rigor they were expecting. Some fellows reported that

the program was negatively received across the district and that this prevented them from receiving the

most benefit possible from training. Fellows were concerned that the principal selection process was

unclear and some fellows reported that they were disappointed that they had not received principal

assignments. Mentor principals who reported that the program had not met their expectations indicated

that they wanted training on the Fellows Academy program and their role as mentor principals.
The majority of teachers reported that they met with the Fellows Academy fellow on their campus on a weekly basis (42%). Another 22 percent reported that they met on a daily basis. Twelve teachers reported that they did not meet with the fellows on their campuses. These responses were retained for analysis because their comments lent some perspective on the campus environments. Even though teachers did not meet with a fellow, they still had perceptions of the value of the fellows on their campuses.
Table 6
Teacher Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often did you meet with the Fellows Academy fellow on your campus?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a month</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not meet with the fellow on my campus</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results displayed in Figure 13 indicate that fellows and teachers found their relationships with one another to be Mostly Positive (87% and 82%, respectively). Two teachers indicated that they had no relationship with the fellow. Teachers reported that the fellows assisted them with learning how to write effective Learning Objectives (LOs) and Demonstrations of Learning (DOLs). They also helped teachers learn how to better use Multiple Response Strategies (MRSs). Some teachers were unsure of what the role of the fellow on the campus was.

![Figure 13: Fellows and Teacher Relationship Ratings](image)

**Fellows Evaluation Rubric.** Fellows responding to the online survey reported that they were evaluated using 3Rs, the Fellows Academy Rubric, mentor principal mid- and end-of-year appraisals, self
reflection/evaluation, and observations by the Fellows Academy executive director and director. While the majority of fellows indicated that the methods by which they were evaluated were effective, some fellows reported that the Fellows Academy executive director and director did not observe the fellows enough to accurately evaluate them. In addition, some fellows suggested that mentor principals needed more training on program expectations and that more communication between mentor principals and Fellows Academy management staff was needed in order to evaluate the fellows effectively.

Principal Hiring Process. The Dallas ISD received 1,152 applications for principal positions during the 2012-13 school year. Of those, 415 were invited to participate in the 2013-14 principal selection process. Phase one of the principal selection process included an assessment center where candidates were asked to watch a video of a teacher giving a lesson and then role-play the feedback they would give to that teacher with an assessment center interviewer. Candidates were also asked to participate in a data exercise where they reviewed the data for a school and produced an action plan based on that data. Candidates were given one of three ratings at the end of the assessment center: Proceed to Principal Pool, Recommend for Assistant Principal, or Do Not Recommend at This Time. Of the 57 Fellows, 50 attended assessment centers. Of the 50 Fellows who attended; the initial outcomes were:

- 15 Fellows (30%) were recommended to Proceed to Principal Pool.
- 26 Fellows (52%) were recommended to continue in the AP selection process.
- 9 Fellows (18%) were not recommended to continue in either the AP or Principal selection process.

Of the 289 non-Fellows who attended assessment centers:

- 104 non-Fellows (36%) were recommended to continue in the Principal selection process.
- 72 non-Fellows (25%) were recommended to continue in the AP selection process.
- 113 non-Fellows (39%) were not recommended to continue in either the AP or Principal selection process.

Of the fellows attending the assessment center, 82 percent were recommended to proceed either to the Principal Pool or AP selection process, compared to the 61 percent of non-fellows who participated
in the assessment center. Once candidates were assigned to the Proceed to Principal Pool category they were assigned to one of five teams (Phase 2 Principal Selection Process). The team used the Principal Competencies and the Principal Interview Summary Sheet. There were 10 principal competencies: equity and results for all students, instructional leadership, driving for results, impact & influence, achievement, initiative & perseverance, effective problem solving, planning ahead, team leadership, and strategic thinking. If the result of the team interview was for a candidate to advance to final round, then candidates were on a list that the assistant superintendents (with ED input) and the chief of school leadership matched to school profiles based on campus administrator and staff input. Appendix E at the end of this report shows the position and campus to which fellows were assigned as of July 24, 2013.

This was the first year to use the three-part process for selecting principals, using a districtwide rubric for evaluating principal candidates, rather than looking for principal candidates for specific campuses. The process required some revisions once it had begun. Further calibration was needed for rating candidates participating in the assessment center. Because of this, school leadership staff went back and reviewed all candidates (fellows and non-fellows) who received a Recommend for Assistant Principal or Do Not Recommend at This Time rating. These candidates were evaluated again taking into account other data sources such as letters of recommendation, references, and documentation of proven success in the field. In some cases, candidates in these two categories were invited to participate in Phase II of the process with an interview team. Results of the Phase II interview process were not available at the time of these report’s release. These counts will be provided as the data becomes available.

The school leadership staff interviewed for this report participated in the first and second phases of the principal selection process. When asked what they were looking for in a principal hire, they all reported that they were looking for a candidate with strong instructional leadership skills and a proven ability to coach staff. All interview participants had some contact with fellows during the 2012-13 school year, but reported that that contact was limited. Interview participants varied in their perceptions of fellows based on this contact. They reported that some fellows showed great leadership potential while others needed more development. Results of the interviews indicated that executive directors and assistant superintendents did believe that the Fellows Academy was a good leadership pipeline for the district but
that more emphasis and rigor should be added to training and the residencies to ensure that fellows had adequate practice and exposure to instructional leadership practices. Interview participants did indicate that they would have benefitted from more information about the program from the beginning of the year. They wanted to participate more in the development of fellows and wanted to communicate with Fellows Academy management staff about fellows’ performance on their campuses.

School leadership staff reported on why non-fellows were hired over fellows. They indicated that the main reason was experience in administrative positions. Fellows came into the hiring process often with little administrative experience and were not able to give concrete examples of proven successes on campuses. In addition, results indicated that fellows did not perform well on the role play exercises that took place during phase I of the interview selection process. School leadership staff reported that they expected the fellows to be better prepared to give instructional feedback to teachers as a result of their training in the Fellows Academy and that in the future the program should focus on this area more. In some cases, fellows appeared to know the language of instructional coaching but did not appear to have a deeper understanding of the concept. School leadership staff reported that fellows did have a strong understanding of Destination 2020 goals and Core Beliefs indicating that one of their areas of strength was that they understood the mission, vision and goals for the district. With regards to feedback, interview participants indicated that they needed to be more prepared to give instructional feedback to teachers and needed to work on their public speaking and interviewing skills. In addition, fellows should be better able to develop entry plans and action plans for transitioning into their leadership positions.

Focus group results suggest that fellows were unclear about the hiring process. They indicated that they did not understand the purpose behind each step and that there seemed to be no formal process for selecting principal hires. Some fellows did report that they thought they would be assigned to a principal position because they were in the Fellows Academy. This misunderstanding should be addressed. Fellows entering the Fellows Academy were not guaranteed principal positions and needed to compete for assignments along with all other qualified candidates. The Fellows Academy program staff members were aware of this issue and were working to clarify program expectations for the 2013-14 school year.
Figure 14 shows the percentage of fellows assigned to each type of position. The largest group of fellows was assigned to assistant principal positions after participating in the Fellows Academy program (53%). Another 33 percent were assigned to principal positions. There were three fellows who were hired as coordinators within the Fellows Academy program (5%). Two fellows left the district (4%). Three fellows were hired into other positions such as program development specialists or academic facilitators (5%).
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**Figure 14. Percentage of Fellows by Position Offer**

Figure 15 shows the number of fellows who were in a particular position before they entered the Fellows Academy program and the number of fellows in those positions after they exited the program as of July 24, 2013. The number of principals increased by 17 and the number of assistant principals increased by 18. The number of teachers and those in other positions (e.g., coordinators, professional development specialists, instructional specialists, or counselors) decreased from 25 to zero for teacher positions and 17 to 6 for other positions. The number and percentage of fellows in each group at entry
and exit from the Fellows Academy program are displayed in Table 7. The largest movement was from teacher to assistant principal, representing 26 percent of the fellow population. The second largest group was fellows in other positions moving to principal roles (14%). The majority of fellows entering the Fellows Academy program were teachers or in other roles (42% and 33%, respectively) while the majority of fellows exiting the program were assistant principals (53%) or principals (33%).

![Figure 15. Number of Fellows in Positions by Level, Before and After Program](image)

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry Position Before Academy</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Assistant Principal</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Left District</th>
<th>Entry Position Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>4% (2)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>4% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>7% (4)</td>
<td>12% (7)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
<td>21% (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>9% (5)</td>
<td>26% (15)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>5% (3)</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
<td>42% (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14% (8)</td>
<td>14% (8)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>5% (3)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>33% (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Position Total</td>
<td>33% (19)</td>
<td>53% (30)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>11% (6)</td>
<td>4% (2)</td>
<td>100% (57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages may not add to 100 percent due to rounding.
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2.6 In what ways was the Fellows Academy program influencing the adoption of effective instructional practices on participating campuses?

Methodology

The sample consisted of fellows participating in the Fellows Academy program. The evaluator was collecting baseline data in an effort to understand the role fellows played in the adoption of effective instructional practices during their training and residency year. Future evaluations focusing on program outcomes will focus more specifically in this area. On Monday, May 13th, 2013, the evaluator conducted four topical focus groups with Fellows Academy fellows. Each focus group had between four and seven fellows participating and focused on a different aspect of the Fellows Academy program (residency, obstacles and supports, effective instruction, and climate/culture/communication). Focus group questions can be found in Appendix D. The focus group on effective instructional practices examined the impact fellows were having on their residency campuses. The focus group questions solicited information about the amount of contact fellows had with teachers, what kind of work fellows did with teachers, how their work influenced the adoption of effective instructional practices, and what professional development the fellows provided to campus staff.

On Wednesday, May 15, 2013, the evaluator administered an online survey for teachers soliciting information about program characteristics and participant perceptions. Teachers responded to a question on the survey soliciting information about instructional feedback.

Results

One of the major strengths of the Fellows Academy program was its ability to train fellows on the Destination 2020 goals, district Core Beliefs, and the three main goals of a principalship (quality of instruction, raising student achievement, and creating a positive school culture and climate). One area of confusion was the dual role some fellows played on the residency campus. They were first and foremost on the campus to learn and be trained in the principal role; however, they were also expected to provide professional development to staff. This created conflict in some cases and could have impacted the quality of the learning experience for fellows. The program management is currently reviewing practices to determine the best balance of expectations. The program not only expected the fellows to benefit from their mentor principals, but also that the fellows would add value to the campus and make sustaining
contributions to its success. This would create a mutually beneficial relationship for fellows and mentor principals and would ensure the success of the program over the long term.

The teacher online survey solicited information about how well the fellows provided instructional feedback to teachers. The teachers who responded to the survey indicated that the fellows conducted Spot Observations and then provided timely, specific, and useful feedback. While most feedback was positive, a few teachers reported that the fellows did not seem to know the course content and so could not provide useful feedback. Some teachers reported that they did not get much instructional support from fellows and that instead, the fellows provided assistance with discipline.

At this stage of the evaluation, the evaluator was unable to determine the extent to which fellows were influencing the adoption of effective instructional practices. This is a component of the program that should be studied further once the fellows are in principal or other administrative roles.

2.7 What school climate, culture and communication practices were in effect on participating campuses?

Methodology

The sample consisted of fellows participating in the Fellows Academy program. The evaluator was collecting baseline data to determine how fellows potentially impacted campus climate, culture and communication during their training and residency year. Future evaluations focusing on program outcomes will focus more specifically in this area. On Monday, May 13th, 2013, the evaluator conducted four topical focus groups with Fellows Academy fellows. Each focus group had between four and seven fellows participating and focused on a different aspect of the Fellows Academy program (residency, obstacles and supports, effective instruction, and climate/culture/communication). Focus group questions can be found in Appendix D. The focus group on climate, culture and communication focused on how the fellows were working with their mentor principals and staff and the impact of climate and culture on that relationship. The focus group questions solicited information about the campus climate when fellows arrived and how it may or may not have changed over time, how communication worked on the campus, and how fellows were received on their campuses and across the district.

Results

Results of the focus groups suggested that fellows had to deal with many misconceptions about the Fellows Academy program at the campus level; however, fellows reported that over time and with
clarification they were able to establish good working relationships with campus staff. Fellows reported that they had varying levels of communication with their mentor principals, with some fellows communicating on a daily basis and others reporting more limited contact. Most of the fellows in the focus group suggested that they were able to impact the culture on their campuses by working with teachers on effective instruction. They were also able to assist staff by addressing any misunderstandings about the Destination 2020 goals and the corresponding policies and procedures regarding quality of instruction. Fellows suggested that their main responsibilities on their residency campuses were to focus on quality of instruction. Some fellows were also given opportunities to shadow their mentor principals and were exposed to assistant/associate principal responsibilities. Not all fellows were given this opportunity. There were also differing levels of teacher interaction, with some fellows being allowed to work with teachers one-on-one, some working with teachers under the supervision of mentor principals, and some fellows not given the opportunity to work with teachers at all.

The Fellows Academy program staff members are aware of issues regarding how the Academy was received by campus staff and are working with district leadership staff to improve how the program is introduced to campuses and perceptions of the program. The executive director of the Fellows Academy began to report to the Chief of School Leadership as of the release of this report. This move will most likely improve the amount of communication happening between Fellows Academy program staff, assistant superintendents, executive directors, principals and other campus staff. The program may be able to better serve the needs of campuses under this new reporting structure.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this evaluation was to evaluate the Leadership Development/Fellows Academy program based on curricula, processes, and residencies as outlined in program documents. This evaluation reflected the program in that the first year of this evaluation focused on program implementation of the fellows’ training and residency year, while the second year will focus on teacher and student outcomes once fellows have had time to make an impact on their campuses.

Relevant Literature. The review of relevant literature in the area of school leadership and effective instruction supported the framework for the Fellows Academy program. The program’s focus on student achievement, quality instruction, and philosophy and culture was based on a strong foundation of
educational research. The methods on which fellows were trained in order to reach these goals appeared to align with accepted knowledge and practices.

**Program Characteristics.** The Fellows Academy program was made up of two components: training sessions and a residency experience. Training was made up of in-class sessions, on-site observations and district department rotations. The residency experience was comprised of a mentor-mentee relationship between the campus principal and fellow and implementation of a schoolwide initiative focused on some aspect of student achievement, quality instruction, or philosophy and culture.

Not all fellows were experiencing the program in the same way. Three fellows were employed with the district in full-time positions as well as being enrolled in the program. Four fellows were enrolled in the program and were also participating in a university principal training program. In addition, fellows were allowed to compete for 2012-13 principal positions, and 11 fellows had been offered assistant principal or principal positions before the end of the school year. It is possible that these differences in fellows' experiences in the program could affect their outcomes.

The results of data collection for this report suggested that the Fellows Academy program was facing some early implementation issues due to unforeseen difficulties with district staff cooperation and program emphasis on longer-term outcomes (i.e., once fellows were in leadership positions) rather than on the desired short-term outcomes of the program (i.e., the leadership skills fellows were to gain from their training and residency experiences). When looking at the Fellows Academy program as if it were in the development stages, there were, and continue to be, many lessons to learn about districtwide program design and implementation. Some of these include the difficulties in aligning program goals and expected outcomes with resources, activities and procedures; communicating with stakeholders; and responding to changes in the program context.

The Fellows Academy program was a leadership training program and not a principal training program. The results of documentation review, meetings with program management staff, focus groups with fellows, and online surveys for fellows, mentor principals and teachers, clearly showed that this was a leadership training program in its pilot year. As a result, program management staff made changes to the program plan as they progressed through the year and identified areas of improvement as the year went on.
Fellow and Mentor Principal Demographics. The majority of fellows were African American (63%), female (68%), were internal hires (53%), held Master’s degrees (83%), and held either one or two certifications (32% and 26%, respectively). The majority of mentor principals were African American or Hispanic (35% in each group), female (69%), held a Master’s degree (93%), held between two and four certifications (a total of about 87%), and were serving on elementary school campuses (52%). Demographic data suggested that mentor principals had more years of service with the district than did fellows; however, the results would be significantly improved with the inclusion of data regarding total years of teaching and administrative service within the district, the state, and the country. This data was not available in the personnel files at the time of this report’s release. This data would provide additional information about the levels of experience of fellows and that of their mentor principals.

Obstacles and Supports. The program faced some barriers to implementation across the district and was continuing to form as a program during the 2012-13 school year. Program staff members are working towards better fidelity of program implementation for the 2013-14 school year. A main strength of the program was the training provided to fellows on Destination 2020 goals and district Core Beliefs. But, in some cases the training component of the Fellows Academy program served as an obstacle to implementation. Fellows reported that while the focus on Core Beliefs, Destination 2020 goals, departmental rotations, Spot Observation calibration and learning how to write effective Learning Objectives (LOs) and Demonstrations of Learning (DOLs) were strengths of the program, there was poor communication and a lack of transparency between program management staff and fellows. Fellows expected to receive rigorous training on becoming an effective instructional leader. Training needed to be better organized, was often not well planned out, and trainings were often facilitated by fellows rather than by the executive director and director. In some cases, fellows expected that they would be guaranteed principal positions once they were admitted to the Fellows Academy program. Some fellows reported that the program was negatively received across the district and that this prevented them from receiving the most benefit possible from training.

Results of the focus groups and online surveys indicated that the residency and mentor principal components of the Fellows Academy program served as both an obstacle and an area of strength for the program. Stronger relationships between mentor principals and fellows would benefit not only the
program, but the district as a whole. More effort should be made to select the most appropriate mentor principals and campuses for the residency experience. This includes giving the program the ability to communicate with mentor principals about the expectations of the program and provide important program information. Experiences of fellows on their residency campuses varied, with some fellows receiving more training on the principal role than others. Fellows also indicated that their attitudes towards campus administrator and staff served as an obstacle in some cases. The fellows were on campuses to learn and grow as leaders and potential administrators and their behavior and demeanor should reflect that. The fellows reported that they changed their behavior as the year progressed and that their relationships with mentor principals and teachers improved as a result.

The Fellows Academy program had a foreign language component and required all of its fellows to learn the Spanish language if they were not already proficient; however, only 20 percent of fellows responding to the online survey reported that they were fluent or functional in Spanish. One of the criteria for graduating from the Fellows Academy program was that the fellow be proficient in Spanish.

Principal Selection Process. Phase one of the district principal selection process included an assessment center where candidates participated in a role play exercise where they gave instructional feedback to a teacher after watching a video of a teacher giving a lesson. They also participated in a data exercise where they reviewed the data for a school and produced an action plan based on that data. Candidates were given one of three ratings at the end of the assessment center: Proceed to principal pool, Recommend for Assistant Principal, or Do not Recommend at This Time. Of the 50 fellows who participated in the assessment center, 30 percent of fellows were recommended to continue to the principal selection process, 52 percent were recommended to continue to the assistant principal selection process, and 18 percent were not recommended to continue to either selection process. Of those candidates who had not participated in the Fellows Academy program, 37 percent were approved for the principal pool, 24 percent for assistant principal, and 39 percent were not recommended to continue.

The second phase of the principal selection process involved team interviews with school leadership staff (i.e., executive directors and assistant superintendents). Interviews focused on ten principal competencies: equity and results for all students, instructional leadership, driving for results, impact & influence, achievement, initiative & perseverance, effective problem solving, planning ahead,
team leadership, and strategic thinking. If the candidate was recommended to advance to final round, the assistant superintendents (with ED input) and the chief of school leadership matched candidates to school profiles based on campus administrator and staff input.

This was the first year to use the three-part process for selecting principals using a districtwide rubric for evaluating principal candidates, rather than looking for principal candidates for specific campuses. The process required some revisions once it had begun. Candidates who were not recommended or who were recommended for the assistant principal pool were re-evaluated using additional data sources such as letters of recommendation, references, and documentation of experience and were potentially invited to continue on to Phase II. Results of the Phase II interview process were not available at the time of these report’s release. These counts will be provided as the data becomes available.

School leadership staff who participated in the first and second phases of the principal selection process were interviewed (executive directors and assistant superintendents). They reported that they were looking for candidates with strong instructional leadership skills and a proven ability to coach staff. The school leadership staff had had some contact with fellows during the 2012-13 school year and reported that based on their experience with fellows they believed some fellows showed great leadership potential while others needed more development. School leadership staff reported that the Fellows Academy program was a good leadership pipeline for the district but that more emphasis and rigor should be added to training and the residencies to ensure that fellows had adequate practice and exposure to instructional leadership practices. They requested more information about the program and wanted to participate more in the development of fellows and wanted to communicate with Fellows Academy management staff about fellows’ performance on their campuses.

School leadership staff reported on why non-fellows were hired over fellows into principal positions. Experience was the main factor in why non-fellows were hired over fellows. Fellows did not have the same level of experience resulting in them not being able to give concrete examples of proven success on campuses. In addition, results indicated that fellows did not perform well on the instructional feedback, role play exercises that took place during phase I of the interview selection process. The expectation of school leadership staff was that fellows would be more prepared in this area as a result of
their training. School leadership staff reported that fellows did have a strong understanding of Destination 2020 goals and Core Beliefs indicating that one of their areas of strength was that they understood the mission, vision and goals for the district.

**Effective Instructional Practices.** Fellows sometimes served dual roles on their residency campuses. They were on the campus to learn and be trained in the principal role; however, they were also expected to provide professional development to staff. This could have potentially impacted the quality of the fellow's learning experience. The program is currently reviewing their practices to determine the best balance of expectations. It was important that fellows benefit from their mentor principals, but also add value to the campus, thus creating a mutually beneficial relationship for fellows and mentor principals, ensuring the success of the program over the long term.

Teachers who responded to the survey indicated that the fellows conducted Spot Observations and then provided timely, specific and useful feedback; however, a few teachers reported that the fellows did not seem to know the course content and so, could not provide useful feedback. Rather than providing training on effective instructional practices, some teachers reported that fellows provided assistance with discipline instead.

At this stage of the evaluation, the evaluator was unable to determine the extent to which fellows were influencing the adoption of effective instructional practices. This is a component of the program that should be studied further once the fellows are in principal or other administrative roles.

**Climate, Culture and Communication.** Fellows dealt with many misconceptions about the Fellows Academy program at the campus level; however, fellows reported that over time and with clarification they were able to establish good working relationships with campus staff. Fellows were able to impact the culture on their campuses by working with teachers on effective instruction and clarifying any staff misunderstandings about the Destination 2020 goals and the corresponding policies and procedures regarding quality of instruction.

The Fellows Academy program staff members are working to improve how the program is perceived by the district. The executive director of the Fellows Academy began to report to the Chief of School Leadership as of the release of this report. This move will most likely improve the amount of communication happening between Fellows Academy program staff, assistant superintendents, executive
directors, principals and other campus staff. The program may be able to better serve the needs of campuses under this new reporting structure.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are recommendations based on the findings of the 2012-13 evaluation with a program staff response to each:

1. Rewrite program workscope and supporting program documents to more clearly describe the goals, activities, and short-term expected outcomes of the training and residency components of the Fellows Academy program as it exists currently. Long-term goals related to improved instruction and academic outcomes should be identified as such. This recommendation will improve implementation fidelity, increase clarity of program design for stakeholders, and lead to appropriate procedures being developed in the future. For example, increased clarity in program design would result in clear and specific criteria for the residency/mentor principal experience.

Program Staff Response: A detailed prospectus has been developed to provide clarity in program design and daily lesson plans will be created to document the daily learning curriculum for future use. All resources and materials will be attached. The prospectus contains the following:

- Overview
- Curriculum
  - Professional Development
  - Training
  - Residency
  - Supplemental Activities
  - Program Completion Requirements
  - Academic Calendar
- Applying to the Program
  - Application Requirements
  - Admissions Process
  - How to Apply
  - Frequently Asked Questions

A Residency Program packet has been created to provide clear and specific criteria for the Residency/Mentor Principal experience. The packet contains the following:

- Overview
- Goals
- Structure
- Residency Expectations
- Individualized Residency Plan/Compact
- Fellows Performance Rubric
- Residency Project Rubric
- Key Criteria and Principles for Mentorship
- Mentor Principal Job Description
- Mentor Principal Training
• Mentor Principal Contract

2. Reconsider allowing fellows to apply for principal positions during the school year in which the program is running. The program should determine what this change in policy would mean for implementation of the program and how program activities might need to change as a result. Potential questions might relate to the criteria for successful completion of the program and how this change in procedure would impact the Change Project fellows were implementing during their residency year.

Program Staff Response: The Fellows’ program curriculum has been reorganized to “front load” learning for all fellows in order to ensure adequate preparation for those who might receive principalships or assistant principalships prior to completing the Academy.

3. Consider not allowing fellows to be employed in full-time positions with the district while enrolled in the Fellows Academy program. In addition, the program should begin evaluating the effects of bringing in fellows who had already participated in a principal training program. Examining these areas may lead to valuable information about selection criteria for the program and could lead to increased fidelity in program implementation.

Program Staff Response: None of the 2013-2014 fellows are in other full-time positions with the district. The Academy recognizes the varying levels of expertise within the 2013-2014 cohort of fellows and believes this serves to strengthen the program. As a result, training, professional development and the residency will be differentiated to meet the needs of the fellows.

4. Electronically track the number of years fellows and mentor principals have been working in teaching and administrative positions. This will improve the program’s ability to report on the experience of its fellows and mentor principals and potentially determine which characteristics may or may not be most appropriate for inclusion in the program.

Program Staff Response: The Academy operates on the premise that strong instructional leaders can and must be developed to meet the needs of Dallas ISD based on characteristics of effective leaders, such as the ability to increase student achievement, improve the quality of instruction, establish and maintain a positive culture and philosophy. While years of experience may have some impact on leader effectiveness, it is not the single most critical component to the development of an instructional leader.

5. Increase the rigor of training by including more operational responsibilities required for the principal role and increase the amount of direct practice to which fellows are exposed so that they are better able to articulate what they have learned once they move into their residency
assignments and leadership positions. In addition, a strong focus should be placed on achieving proficiency in the Spanish language.

Program Staff Response: The Fellows Program curriculum has been front loaded with systems thinking, quality of instruction, data-driven instruction, culture and philosophy so that Fellows are better able to articulate and utilize what they have learned once they begin the Residency. While some operation responsibilities are addressed prior to the Residency, the intent is that a deeper understanding of day-to-day operations is gained within school learning during the Residency.

The Academy is incorporating the use of Spanish progress monitoring assessments to assist in determining “proficiency”. All fellows will be assessed at the beginning of the program to determine initial fluency. Fellows scoring less than 80% proficiency on this assessment will participate in the Rosetta Stone program. Progress monitoring throughout the program will continue to occur.

6. Improve the rigor of the residency by providing thorough training to mentor principals about their roles and responsibilities, ensuring that fellows receive the same opportunities and experiences across mentor principals to the furthest extent possible.

Program Staff Response: The Residency Program packet will be used to train mentor principals prior to the beginning of the residency. The Mentor Principal training will include:

- Review and understand Mentor Principal job description
- Review and understand the Fellows Performance Rubric
- Review and understand the Individualized Residency Plan
- Prepare for the IRP co-planning conference
- Understand their role in co-planning and supporting the Fellows’ Residency Project
- Understand the critical aspects of learning and reflecting in partnership with the Fellow
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APPENDIX A

2012-13 Fellows Academy Survey: Version for Fellows

The following online survey solicits information about your experience in the Fellows Academy program. There are demographic questions, questions about your specific experience with the program such as the residency and training components, and general questions about program policies/procedures and your expectations regarding the program.

The survey should take about 30 minutes to complete. Please answer each question as accurately and fully as possible. The Fellows Academy program staff are working to make improvements to the program and your responses to this survey will be very helpful in that effort. Please provide as much information as you are able. Your responses will be kept confidential and no individual data will be released to the Fellows Academy program or Dallas ISD staff. Evaluation and Assessment department staff will analyze all participant’s responses and present results in the aggregate. Please complete this survey no later than Friday, May 24th.

If you have any questions or concerns about the survey, you may contact:
Nora E. Douglas, PhD
Evaluation Specialist
Evaluation and Assessment
(972) 925-6408
nodouglas@dallasisd.org

Thank you so much for your time and participation!

DEMOGRAPHICS:

1. How many TOTAL years of teaching experience do you have?
2. How many years of teaching experience with Dallas ISD?
3. How many TOTAL years of administrative service do you have?
4. How many years of administrative service with Dallas ISD?
5. Did you apply for a summer school principal position?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
6. Were you encouraged by Fellows Academy program staff to apply for summer school principal positions?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
7. What other roles have you served during your time with the Fellows Academy program other than attending training and participating in your residency (e.g., 2013-14 fellow cohort interview process, meeting preparation, test monitoring, HCM Interviewing)

RESIDENCY:

8. On how many campuses were you placed during your residency for the 2012-13 school year?
a. If more than one, please explain why there was a change of campus.

9. What level is your current campus?
   - Elementary School
   - Middle School
   - High School

10. To how many mentor principals have you been assigned during the 2012-13 school year?
   a. If more than one, please explain why there was a change of mentor principal.

11. Please describe your relationship with your current mentor principal?
    - Mostly Positive
    - Slightly Positive
    - Neutral
    - Slightly Negative
    - Mostly Negative
   a. Please explain your answer to the question above.

12. Please describe your relationship with other campus administrators.
    - Mostly Positive
    - Slightly Positive
    - Neutral
    - Slightly Negative
    - Mostly Negative
    - I do not work with any other campus administrators
   a. Please explain your answer to the question above.

13. Please describe your relationship with campus teachers?
    - Mostly Positive
    - Slightly Positive
    - Neutral
    - Slightly Negative
    - Mostly Negative
    - I do not work with any teachers
   a. Please explain your answer to the question above.

TRAINING:

14. What aspects of your Buckner building (Monday and beginning-of-year) training directly assisted you during your residency? Please give specific examples.

15. What additional training do you need to prepare you for a principal role? An AP role? Other district leadership roles?
16. If you are currently working full time for the district in a permanent position and are no longer attending the Monday training sessions, what additional areas of training would have been useful?

17. What components of training were most effective (e.g., small groups, role play, individual projects, etc.)?

18. What language are you learning using Rosetta Stone?

19. Are you currently functional/fluent in Spanish?
   - Yes
   - No

GENERAL:

20. What were your expectations of the program prior to beginning training?

21. Has the program met your expectations?
   - Yes
   - No
   a. If no, why not?

22. Overall, what have been the most valuable aspects of the Fellows Academy program in your preparation for a leadership role?

23. In what ways can the Fellows Academy improve the delivery of its program?

24. In what ways could your experience as a fellow have been improved?

25. Would you recommend this program to a friend or colleague?
   - Yes
   - Maybe
   - No

26. Please describe your contact with Fellows Academy staff. How often do Fellows Academy staff visit you on your campus or meet with you?

27. Please share any District experience you have had as a fellow that you would recommend be continued or might need further review. (Residency, hire into leadership position, split funding, etc.)

EVALUATION:

28. How was your work evaluated throughout the year?

29. Was this evaluation sufficient?

30. In what ways could this process be improved?
APPENDIX B

2012-13 Fellows Academy Survey: Version for Mentor Principals

The following online survey solicits information about your experience as a mentor principal in the Fellows Academy program. There are demographic questions, questions about your specific experience with the program such as the residency and training components, and general questions about program policies/procedures and your expectations regarding the program.

The survey should take about 20 minutes to complete. Please answer each question as accurately and fully as possible. The Fellows Academy program staff are working to make improvements to the program and your responses to this survey will be very helpful in that effort. Please provide as much information as you are able.

Your responses will be kept confidential and no individual data will be released to the Fellows Academy program or Dallas ISD staff. Evaluation and Assessment department staff will analyze all participant’s responses and present results in the aggregate. Please complete this survey no later than Friday, May 24th.

If you have any questions or concerns about the survey, you may contact:

Nora E. Douglas, PhD
Evaluation Specialist
Evaluation and Assessment
(972) 925-6408
nodouglas@dallasisd.org

Thank you so much for your time and participation!

DEMOGRAPHICS:

1. How many years of teaching experience with Dallas ISD?
2. How many TOTAL years of teaching experience do you have?
3. How many years of administrative service with Dallas ISD?
4. How many TOTAL years of administrative service do you have?

RESIDENCY:

5. How did you become a mentor principal?
6. How many fellows did you mentor this year?
7. Please describe your relationship with your fellow(s)?
   ○ Mostly Positive
   ○ Slightly Positive
   ○ Neutral
   ○ Slightly Negative
   ○ Mostly Negative
8. Please explain your answer to the question above.

9. How often did you meet with your fellow(s)?
   - Daily
   - Weekly
   - Monthly
   - Less than once a month

10. How well did your fellow(s) communicate with you?

TRAINING:

11. What training did you receive for your role as a Mentor Principal?

12. What training would have been beneficial?

13. Did your fellow(s) share any of their training materials with you?
   - Yes
   - No

GENERAL:

14. What were your expectations of the Fellows Academy program prior to beginning as a mentor principal?

15. Has the program met your expectations?
   - Yes
   - No

16. If the program did not meet your expectations, please explain why.

17. In what ways could your experience as a mentor principal have been improved?

18. Overall, what have been the most valuable aspects of having a fellow on your campus?

19. In what ways can the Fellows Academy improve the delivery of its program?

20. Please explain how your fellow impacted student achievement, effective instruction and philosophy and culture on your campus.

21. Would you want to be a mentor principal in the future?
   - Yes
   - Maybe
   - No
EVALUATION:

22. How often did you have contact with Fellows Academy staff?
   - Daily
   - Weekly
   - Monthly
   - Less than once a month
   - I did not have contact with Fellows Academy staff

23. As a mentor principal, would you have benefited from Fellows Academy program staff feedback?
   - Yes
   - Maybe
   - No
APPENDIX C

2012-13 Fellows Academy Survey: Version for Teachers

The following online survey solicits information about your experience working with fellows from the Fellows Academy program on your campus. There are a few demographic questions and questions about your specific experience with the Fellows Academy fellow.

The survey should take about 10 minutes to complete. Please answer each question as accurately and fully as possible. The Fellows Academy program staff are working to make improvements to the program and your responses to this survey will be very helpful in that effort. Please provide as much information as you are able.

Your responses will be kept confidential and no individual data will be released to the Fellows Academy program or Dallas ISD staff. Evaluation and Assessment department staff will analyze all participant’s responses and present results in the aggregate. Please complete this survey no later than Friday, May 24th.

If you have any questions or concerns about the survey, you may contact:

Nora E. Douglas, PhD
Evaluation Specialist
Evaluation and Assessment
(972) 925-6408
nodouglas@dallasisd.org

Thank you so much for your time and participation!

1. How many years of teaching experience with Dallas ISD?
2. How many TOTAL years of teaching experience do you have?
3. What subject do you teach?
4. What grade level do you teach?
5. Please describe your relationship with the Fellows Academy fellow on your campus?
   - Mostly Positive
   - Slightly Positive
   - Neutral
   - Slightly Negative
   - Mostly Negative
   - No relationship
6. Please explain your answer to the question above.
7. How often did you meet with the Fellows Academy fellow on your campus?
   - Daily
   - Weekly
   - Monthly
   - Less than once a month
   - I did not meet with the fellow on my campus

8. How well did the fellow provide you with instructional feedback?

9. How effective was the instructional feedback provided by the fellow?

10. In what ways could your experience with the fellow have been improved?

11. Overall, what have been the most valuable aspects of working with a Fellows Academy fellow?
APPENDIX D

2012-13 Fellow Focus Group Questions

Focus Group #1: RESIDENCY

1. Briefly describe your main duties during your residency year.
2. During your residency, did you do direct work with teaching staff? If so, how many teachers?
3. Briefly describe your ‘change project’. What is the status of the initiative as of today? How has the initiative continued after completing the requirements of the Fellows Academy? Will it become a part of the culture on your school campus?
4. What professional development training have you provided to campus staff?
5. Would you recommend your mentor principal to receive a fellow next year? Why or why not?
6. What characteristics would a good mentor principal exhibit?

Focus Group #2: OBSTACLES/SUPPORTS

1. What obstacles have you faced as a fellow?
2. What support systems are in place to help you succeed as a fellow?
3. What obstacles have you faced in the hiring process?

Focus Group #3: INSTRUCTION

1. To what degree were you able to work with teachers during your residency?
2. What was the process of working with teachers on your campus like?
3. Please give some specific examples of how your work during the residency has influenced the adoption of effective instructional practices.
4. What professional development did you do with principals during your residency with regards to effective instruction? (What were the topics? How was it received? What was the process for scheduling and developing topics?)

Focus Group #4: CLIMATE, CULTURE and COMMUNICATION

1. What is the school climate/culture of your residency campus? Due to your influence, how has that environment changed throughout the 2012-13 school year?
2. Please describe in as much detail as possible how communication works on your campus (e.g., How often do you meet with your mentor principal? Is communication formal or informal? What is the tone of communication? Is there transparency? Is there constructive feedback?).
3. How were you received as a Fellows Academy fellow on your campus? Across the district?
## APPENDIX E

### 2013-14 Fellow Assignments: Current as of July 24, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fellow Name</th>
<th>Position Acquired</th>
<th>Assigned School</th>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander, Clement J.</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>T.W. Browne</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>7/15/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Allena</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Ronald McNair</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>7/15/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Tremayna</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Pleasant Grove</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>7/15/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bujanda, Martha</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Tom Gooch</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1/22/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis, Charmaine</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>7/15/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzalez, Socorro A.</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Spence</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>7/15/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill, Michele</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Stonewall Jackson</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>7/15/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Rodney</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Bushman</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1/28/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks, Dinah</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Zumwalt</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>7/15/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinez, Josefinia</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Eby Halliday</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>5/10/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mays, Tara L.</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>DeGoyler</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>7/15/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McFarland, Cynthia</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Rowe</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>7/15/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niewinski, Nicole</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Marsh</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>7/15/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodriguez, Roxanne</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Lipscomb</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>7/15/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saiyed, Ali</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Robert E. Lee</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1/28/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singleton, Julie</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>H.I. Holland at Lisbon</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>5/20/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Dennis</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Kennedy Curry</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>7/15/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, Tracie</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Seagoville</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>7/15/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Sheryl</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Gilbert Cuellar</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>7/15/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donaldson, Ronald</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Robert T. Hill</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>7/31/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott, Jacqueline</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Adamson</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis, Chloe</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>H. Grady Spruce</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>7/31/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis, Tina</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>North Dallas</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>7/31/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett, Kiersten</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>L.G. Pinkston</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>7/31/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamboa, Joshua E.</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Quintanilla</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>7/31/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollingsworth, Ronald</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Marsh</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt, Ashley</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>O.M. Roberts</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>7/31/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James, Leon</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Rusk</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenerson, Andre’</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Billy Dade</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>7/31/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson-Ford, Robin</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>7/31/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane, Tomekia</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>John Leslie Patton</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4/30/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang, Sherry M.</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>C.F. Carr</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>7/31/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopez, Jose A.</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Martha Turner Reilly</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2/15/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McArthur, Malcolm</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Dallas Environmental Science Academy</td>
<td>7/31/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, Lakisha</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickett, LaTrisha</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>James Madison</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>7/31/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potts, Marsha</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Lorenzo DeZavala</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>7/31/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralston, Pamela</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rider, Ariss</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Hector Garcia</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>7/31/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rothermund, Misty</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Barbara Jordan</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1/30/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw, Bryant</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Edward H. Cary</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>7/31/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheppard, Valerie</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Robert L. Thornton</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>7/31/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Henry</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>L.W. Kahn</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>7/31/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrell, Anthony</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>O.W. Holmes</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>7/31/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waters, Dionel</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Kimball</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2/25/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatton, Verbeana</td>
<td>Program Development Specialist</td>
<td>Edward Cary</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>1/28/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowry, Coleen</td>
<td>Instructional Coach</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberson, Dawn</td>
<td>Academic Facilitator</td>
<td>Division TBD by School Leadership</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauntz, Renee</td>
<td>Coordinator - Fellows Academy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8/21/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kastelein, Jennifer</td>
<td>Coordinator - Fellows Academy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7/15/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt, Dawn</td>
<td>Coordinator - Fellows Academy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, Lesley</td>
<td>Left the District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook, Tenganyike</td>
<td>Left the District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

Fellows Academy, Principal Selection Process: 
Executive Director and Assistant Superintendent Interview Protocol

1. What was your role with regards to the principal selection process?
2. Did you make recommendations for hire? Did you make final decisions with regards to hiring?
3. What were you looking for in a principal hire?
4. How much did you work with the fellows outside of the selection process?
5. How did the fellows compare with non-fellows during the hiring process?
6. Did fellows seem prepared and knowledgeable about leadership in the district?
7. What feedback would you have given to fellows with regards to their performance in the interview process?
8. What were the main reasons why non-fellows were recommended for hire over fellows?
9. Where there any clear indicators of differences in abilities between fellows and non-fellows with regards to campus leadership?
10. How could the principal hiring process be improved?
11. Do you consider the Fellows Academy a good leadership pipeline for the district?
12. Would more communication with Leadership Academy staff have been useful during the principal selection process?
13. Is there anything I didn’t ask about that you would like to add?