Great teaching lasts long after the bell rings
Member Owned, Member Directed...
...Insurance & Risk Management Services

SERVING WASHINGTON SCHOOLS FOR
over 25 years

Contact your agent or call us direct at:
800.407.2027 | www.siaw.us | www.usipwa.us

Administered by: CANFIELD
FEATURE SECTION

WEC 2013 Conference
Dive deeper into the school leadership concepts introduced by the keynote speakers at the 2013 Washington Educators’ Conference in Seattle.

8 Teacher Supervision That Improves Student Learning
Laura Lipton & Bruce Wellman

16 5 Big Ideas
From Common Core Standards to Curriculum
Jay McTighe & Grant Wiggins

FEATURED CONTENT

26 Ann Buswell Named 2014 State Assistant Principal of the Year
Linda Farmer, APR

36 AWSP Component Board Rosters

IN EVERY ISSUE

6 News Briefs

28 Learning Centers | Martin E. Fortin, Jr.

30 Diversity | Niki Arnold-Smith & Karen Remy-Anderson

32 Student Leadership | Susan Fortin & Vincent Perez

34 Honor Roll | Mary Alice Heuschel, Ph.D.

COLUMNS

5 The Editor’s Desk | Linda Farmer, APR

7 From the AWSP President | Karen Owen

38 From the AWSP Executive Director | Gary Kipp

ON THE COVER

PR for Principals
Great Teaching Lasts Long After the Bell Rings | Dan Voelpel
Learn how powerful personal stories can make a difference in your district.

Cover photo: Eric Boles, former NFL player and motivational speaker, embraces his most memorable teacher, Rosa Cartledge, during the studio taping session for the “Great Teaching” PSA series created by Tacoma Public Schools.

Photo by Casey Madison/Tacoma Public Schools
Mark your calendar now for this key event where you’ll learn about Skyward software and services that can help you manage finances, track student progress and data, streamline human resource processing, payroll and reporting in your district. Registration and housing open October 2013. Early Bird pricing ends January 17.

HOSTED BY

WSIPC

DON’T MISS WASWUG 2014 MARCH 9-11 • BELLEVUE, WASHINGTON

Does your front office operate more like an emergency triage unit than a center for higher learning?

Learn How to Work Less, Produce More, and Still Get the Job Done in a Sensible School Week with Malachi Pancoast, President, The Breakthrough Coach. It’s one of the most practical – and liberating – programs you will ever attend.

UPCOMING PROGRAMS IN YOUR AREA:
• March 18 & 19, 2014 - Portland, OR
• March 20 & 21, 2014 - Tumwater, WA

To register, visit http://www.the-breakthrough-coach.com/pages/calendar.php
always knew there was a connection between reading and writing. When I’m deep into a good book, one with powerful verbs and descriptive phrases, my writing seems to flow easier, faster.

The opposite also has been true. I journaled fiendishly growing up. Page after page, on every subject under the sun (okay, a lot of it may have about adolescent boys). The more I wrote, the more I wanted to read. I soaked up words, thoughts and ideas and looked for ways to express them through writing.

I was going to be a writer. My parents wrung their hands, the phrase “You want fries with that?” looming over my limited job opportunities. I’m feeling my own twinges of parental worry as I watch my daughter, now a first grader, dive headfirst into reading and writing.

Last week, though, I ran across a study that shows that one of the best ways children can learn and retain new material is by writing about it (Karpicke & Blunt, 2011). Noted author Pam Allyn cites the study in her book, “Your Child’s Writing Life.” Her premise is that writing fosters a child’s emotional growth, helps develop critical thinking skills and leads to guaranteed improvement in academic achievement.

A regular routine of reading and writing leads to better test taking and grades? Teachers and principals know this. It’s not just one study, it’s a whole body of work.

Teachers and principals do struggle with competing needs for instructional time, however. That’s why it’s imperative that parents encourage their kids to engage in writing, drawing and storytelling exercises in their free time.

I’m feeling my own twinges of parental worry as I watch my daughter, now a first grader, dive headfirst into reading and writing.

A regular routine of reading and writing leads to better test taking and grades? Teachers and principals know this. It’s not just one study, it’s a whole body of work.

I’ll be picking up more crayons and paper on the way home tonight.
Maxwell Wins 2013 Torch of Leadership

Marcie Maxwell won AWSP’s 2013 Torch of Leadership Award for her commitment to K-12 education during the 2013 legislative session. At the time of the award, Maxwell represented the 41st district. She is now Gov. Jay Inslee’s education policy advisor. Established in 2009, the award honors public officials who support the principalship.

How Can AWSP Better Support Assistant Principals?

The Assistant Principals Leadership Conference (APLC) has been a staple in the AWSP professional development lineup. In recent years, however, attendance has waned to less than a quarter of the 900+ assistant principals in the state. It’s time to make a change: what should we do instead of APLC? How can we support assistant principals in the important work they do? Contact Scott Seaman at scott@awsp.org or 800.562.6100, with your ideas.

AWSP 2013 President’s Award Goes to Jim Howard

Jim Howard, Ph.D., is the 2013 recipient of the AWSP President’s Award. Howard, the program administrator for the WSU-Spokane Administrator Preparation Program, has been influential at the state level with principal preparation programs. The AWSP President’s Award honors those outside the association who support the principalship.

AWSP Leadership Framework Team Honored

AWSP bestowed its 2013 Special Recognition Award on a group of practicing principals, university researchers and industry experts who created Version 2.0 of the AWSP Leadership Framework. The Framework has been adopted by nearly all the state’s 295 school districts to use with the required principal evaluation system.

Recipients:
- Gene Sharratt, Ph.D.
- Glenn Malone, Ed.D.
- Sally Lancaster, Ed.D.
- Larry Lashway
- Chad Lochmiller, Ph.D.
- Kristen Schroeder
- Nancy Strobel
- Ailene Baxter, Ed.D.
- Brian Lowney

Resources Galore for AWSP Leadership Framework

Need resources to help with the AWSP Leadership Framework? Visit www.awsp.org and click on the blue Framework tab to access more than 600 surveys, case studies, books, DVDs, interviews, best practices and other resources tied to the eight principal evaluation criteria. A group of practicing principals, scholars and researchers compiled and vetted the contents.

Eight New Laws That Affect Principals

More than 40 bills became law in 2013 that change the way schools operate. A few that directly change the way a principal leads a building this year include:
- AP Computer Science
- Epinephrine Autoinjectors
- School Safety-Related Drills

Find a one-page summary of eight new laws in the Advocacy section of the AWSP website.
Comprehensive Engagement

Is there any other mode for a principal today to operate in?

As I consider the concept of engagement, I see it through multiple perspectives. Five distinct perspectives, to be exact: professional, staff, student, family and community and personal. When these areas converge, they create the authentic and holistic engagement necessary to be effective as an educational leader.

Professional Engagement
This is the degree that I involve myself in our profession. I am honored and proud to serve this year as president of your state association. I have served on the leadership board at the middle level, been elected middle level principal of the state and allowed to remain on the board. As I neared the end of my term, I chose to serve on the AWSP executive board. Why? My professional engagement is a strong one that serves to energize and strengthen my abilities as a person and school principal. I would encourage each of you to make the effort to get involved at the local level. The rewards far exceed the time!

Staff Engagement
Another level of engagement where I find myself totally committed is my staff. As a principal in the same building for the past 10 years, I am rededicating myself this year to enhancing and growing the relationships within my school. I have begun the year by sharing this focus then meeting with each staff member individually. After just a few meetings I am reminded of the high level of commitment, professionalism, and skill of the individuals I work with.

Student Engagement
This is where we spend much of our thinking and observation time. My goals include assuring that every student is connected with at least one adult and to the community of our middle school. The programs in place to ensure this engagement include a comprehensive advisory, a host of student recognitions, (one of my favorites is the teacher choice recognition), student leadership, which includes nearly 10 percent of our students, and before- and after-school activities. Lastly the program that ties all the students together is our consistent, sound and intentional approach to PBIS (Positive Behavior Interventions Support). Our Totem Traits are taught, posted and reinforced everywhere!

Family and Community Engagement
This continues to be a goal area for me this year. We don’t have a PTA or Booster group, however, for the first time in some years I have high interest. Our main focus will simply be to increase the connections between school and home. We also intend to start a WATCH D.O.G.S. program.

Personal Engagement
This last level of engagement is my foundation and includes my faith, my family and my personal commitment. I work intentionally to keep this level of engagement in balance. I am committing to daily goal setting, or the “daily wins” as a speaker from the WASA/AWSP Summer Conference spoke about. The wins include both my professional and personal life.

Being an effective and balanced principal requires continual attention to each of the levels and perspectives of engagement that make up our daily lives both at work and home.
The focus of the supervisory process is shifting: from fulfilling contractual obligations to promoting opportunities for growth; from using data to prove to using data to improve, from evaluation as an event to evaluation as a process, and from teachers asking “what are my scores?” to asking “what are my goals?”

Much of the impetus for these initiatives stems from a fundamental premise: Teacher effectiveness links directly to student learning and skillful supervision links directly to teacher effectiveness. In well-implemented evaluation systems, the difference between highly rated teachers and those scoring at the lower ends of performance scales can be an entire year’s worth of additional learning for students.

Such evaluation systems include: clearly articulated and well-understood standards and related performance scales, high-levels of supervisor observation and analysis skills, and both formative and summative conferences aimed at teacher development, not remediation.

Recent studies suggest that even when the first two factors are in place, confidence and competence in learning-focused supervisory conferences make a fundamental difference in teacher growth.

Thus, for supervisors, the ability to structure and facilitate powerful learning-focused conversations lies at the heart of both one-to-one and collective work with teachers. Standards provide the what to talk about; learning-focused supervision offers the how.

Learning-focused supervision is a growth-oriented process that embeds four essential qualities. This approach to building professional expertise is developmental, standards-driven, data-based and customized.
Principal Peter Donaldson observes a class at Mount Erie Elementary (Anacortes SD).
Developmental

Learning is a developmental process, for children and adults alike. In teaching, as in all fields, there is a definable novice to expert journey. Rubrics describing performance levels illuminate this pathway. As student demographics shift, as technology infuses classrooms and expectations for higher levels of understanding drive changes in assessment systems, all teachers will be on a developmental trajectory no matter how many years of experience they have. Learning-focused supervisors take a growth-oriented approach—shaping their interactions based on both a teacher’s present practices and shared expectations for future practices.

Standards-driven

Standards frame shared expectations and establish and clarify measures of excellence for teacher and student performance. Applied effectively, they become rallying points for important conversations about teaching and learning and they set aspirations for goal setting and continuous growth. In learning-focused cultures, standards not only shape expectations—they raise them. Deeply researched and validated teaching standards with their associated rubrics now define and describe good teaching. Excellence is a measurable destination, not a vague aspiration or locally developed checklist.

Data-based

Productive supervisory interactions are grounded in a variety of data that capture the effects and outcomes of a teacher’s practice. Literal notes, student work products and other forms of objective data focus supervisory conversations on tangible evidence that become a catalyst for exploration and analysis. Without accurate information, conversations drift in a sea of inference and distraction. Clear data establish the foundation for calibrating performance against standards, stimulating goal setting and the clarification of desirable actions and measurable results.

Customized

Growth-promoting supervisors customize their work with teachers. The classroom practices of two teachers with similar overall ratings might be vastly different. By clarifying and contextualizing specific elements and discrete components within standards, learning-focused supervisors and teachers can explore fine-grained variation in skills. During planning and reflecting conversations, skillful supervisors clarify expectations using examples based on the teaching assignment, grade level or content area. These supervisors flexibly apply templates and tools to personalize their approach and build professional expertise for individual teachers.

A Continuum of Learning-focused Interaction

Learning-focused supervision is a partnership in which evaluator and teacher construct new understandings based on contextualized data, relevant research and explicit standards reflecting principals of effective practice. These constructs support goal setting, problem solving and action planning.

To keep supervisory conversations learning-focused, skillful supervisors shift between four stances: calibrating, consulting, collaborating, and coaching to develop teachers’ capacities to reflect upon data, to generate ideas and options, and to increase personal and professional awareness and skills. Each stance serves a specific function and all are effective tools for rich conversations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor/Specialist</th>
<th>Information, analysis, goals</th>
<th>Information, analysis, goals</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guiding question</strong></td>
<td>What are the gaps/growth areas indicated for this teacher based on present performance levels and the standards?</td>
<td>What information, ideas and technical resources will be most useful to this teacher at this time?</td>
<td>What are some ways to balance my contributions with this teacher's experiences and expertise?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Function</strong></td>
<td><strong>Articulating standards</strong> • Using data to identify gaps between expected standards and present results • Defining problems • Prescribing results</td>
<td><strong>Clarifying standards</strong> • Using data to analyze gaps between expected standards and present results • Offering information and ideas • Providing problem analysis and perspectives • Naming principles of practice.</td>
<td><strong>Jointly clarifying standards</strong> • Using data to co-analyze gaps between expected standards and present results • Co-generating information and ideas • Co-analyzing problems • Expanding perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role in planning for action</strong></td>
<td><strong>Determining teacher actions/goals</strong> • Naming success criteria • Establishing timelines</td>
<td><strong>Proposing teacher actions/goals</strong> • Defining success criteria • Confirming timelines</td>
<td><strong>Co-constructing teacher actions/goals</strong> • Co-developing success criteria • Agreeing on timelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cues</strong></td>
<td><strong>Credible voice</strong> • Using neutral language, as in “These data …” “This example …”</td>
<td><strong>Credible voice</strong> • Using neutral language or personal pronouns, as in, “I think that …” “It is important to …” “Here is one way to think about that”</td>
<td><strong>Approachable voice</strong> • Collective pronouns, as in “Let’s think about …” “How might we …”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cautions</strong></td>
<td>Take care not to let personal preferences become prescriptions. Judgments must be supported by clear, external criteria. • Use literal observation notes, classroom artifacts and assessment data to avoid subjectivity or bias.</td>
<td>Monitor and manage the impulse to help or rescue. Stay learning-focused and don’t let personal passion overcome patience with the developmental process. • Be aware that overuse of the consulting stance may build dependency on the supervisor for problem solving.</td>
<td>Resist the impulse to dominate the conversation and provide the bulk of the analysis and thinking. • Monitor for balance in idea production. Don’t allow personal enthusiasm or preferences to override the intention to co-create ideas and options. • Reduce potential frustration by posing developmentally appropriate questions. Questions should stretch not strain thinking. • Be sure that questions allow for multiple responses and do not signal that there is a preferred answer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continued on page 12*
As the table on page 11 illustrates, each stance is defined by who is the primary source of determining the data-based, standards-driven level of performance, who provides technical information, problem definition and gap analysis, and who identifies and establishes growth goals and action plans.

Application of the Continuum is not static. Skilled supervisors fluently and flexibly navigate across all four stances. Just as in teaching, it is important to know and be able to select from a variety of strategies that are appropriate to the learner’s needs. In this way, the Continuum helps keep learning-focused supervision both developmental and customized. The ultimate aim of these stances and their cumulative effect is to support continuous learning for teachers and to enhance their capacity to reflect upon and learn from their own practice and to contribute to productive collegial relationships.

**Calibrating Stance**

Guiding question for the supervisor: “What are the gaps/growth areas indicated for this teacher based on present performance levels and the standards?”

In the calibrating stance, the supervisor clarifies performance standards and expectations, identifies gaps, and names and monitors improvement goals and success indicators. For the supervisor, this stance is used to connect observational and other data to a performance level with confidence, clarity and credibility.

Because it is most desirable for the teacher to make these assessments, using the calibrating stance is limited to occasions when a directive approach is called for – generally for very low-performing or unsatisfactory teachers or sometimes for “complacent” teachers who need motivation.

It is important to note that the act of calibration, or assessing the level of practice based on a standard must occur in every evaluative conversation. This determination requires clear standards, a rubric delineating levels of performance based on those standards and literal data to determine the “fit.”

In the calibrating stance, the supervisor determines and communicates the level of performance to the teacher. Based on a variety of data sources the supervisor establishes a level of performance and organizes the data and the conversation to inform and discuss this rating with the teacher, clearly explaining the thinking behind the assessment as it relates to all of the information available.

In the most extreme cases, the calibrating stance becomes the dominant stance in the conversation, with the greater percentage of time spent there. Some triggers for this choice include teaching behaviors that create an unsafe or harmful environment physically or emotionally, teacher responses that are inappropriate, classroom management that is non-existent, student performance that is consistently below expectations and instructional planning and delivery that is ineffective.

**Supervisory Functions**

In the calibrating stance, the supervisor defines and reinforces teaching standards and expectations. The verb to calibrate means an active process of matching an object or performance to an agreed upon value. Simplistically, that value might be a shoe size or the diameter of a section of tubing. In contemporary educational discourse such values are expressed as standards.

To operate with integrity within a calibrating stance the conversation must be driven by data. These data are used to identify gaps between expected standards and the present results, and/or to reinforce and illuminate effective practices. Clearly articulating the standards and accessing available resource materials, learning-focused supervisors define and illuminate successes and challenges. They customize the conversation by presenting models and examples of the standards in action that are content and grade level specific and explicitly name expectations. In planning for action, skillful supervisors take a developmental approach in determining achievable goals, success criteria and timelines for completion.
Consulting Stance
Guiding question for the supervisor: “What information, ideas and technical resources will be most useful to this teacher at this time?”

Based on the teacher’s initial responses, or at some other point during the conversation, the supervisor recognizes gaps in content knowledge, student knowledge, or instructional repertoire. In some cases the teacher’s problem frame is narrow, or potentially inaccurate or the range of strategies is small. In others, there is limited understanding of factors that might be causing an issue. As a result, the supervisor determines that a shift to the consulting stance would be effective.

Supervisory Functions
In the consulting stance, a supervisor offers perspectives on present concerns, by naming possible causes and possible approaches to improve performance. Beyond this gap analysis, a thoughtful supervisor also shares essential information about learning and learners and curriculum and content as they relate to existing issues, principles of practice, connections to expected performance standards and relevant craft knowledge.

By offering, “Here’s what you should pay attention to” and “Here’s why that matters” and “Here are some options”, learning-focused supervisors make their thinking transparent. Here again, an approach that is customized and developmentally appropriate drives many of the supervisor’s choices. For example, in planning for action, skillful supervisors propose a menu of teacher goals to promote student achievement and professional growth, and provide opportunities for the teacher to choose and prioritize. Defining indicators of success and confirming timelines for completion are essential parts of the planning process. As teachers internalize principles of learning and teaching, these understandings become resources for more generating their own approaches and solutions.

Collaborating Stance
Guiding question for the supervisor: “What are some ways to balance my contributions with this teacher’s experiences and expertise?”

The collaborative stance creates a shared platform for the co-construction of knowledge. In this stance, both participants generate ideas, offer solutions, analyze problems. In many cases the learning-focused supervisor shifts to a collaborative stance to increase the teacher’s confidence in his or her own ability to analyze data, frame problems and develop strategies. Much like the gradual release concept in classroom practice, this developmental orientation contributes to greater ownership of the strategies and actions generated.

In this stance, the supervisor provides support for idea generation balanced with respect for the teacher’s ability to generate ideas and solutions. A rich, inquiry-driven collaboration creates permission for both parties to add ideas and perspectives without anyone dominating the conversation.

Supervisory Functions
From the collaborative stance, the supervisor and teacher jointly clarify standards to ensure shared understanding. Together, they analyze data.

Continued on page 14
to identify a level of performance, identifying gaps between standard-driven expectations and current practice. In partnership, they generate potential causal theories, establish goals for growth, develop plans and produce strategies for action. Shared perspectives lead to greater insights for both teacher and supervisor.

Each stance is in large part defined by which participant in the conversation is producing the information and/or analysis at a given moment. The collaborative stance has the widest range of participation. In this stance, both parties are contributing. In some cases, the supervisor leans more towards consulting by suggesting criteria or offering a principle of practice upon which to base ideas. In others, the supervisor might lead with a completely open-ended inquiry, and the collaboration has more of a coaching quality.

Coaching Stance
Guiding question for the supervisor: “What mental and emotional resources might be most useful for this teacher at this time?”

The coaching stance assumes that the teacher has the resources necessary to engage in data-centered reflection on practice and modify and manage personal learning. Operating from this stance, the supervisor respectfully invites the teacher to draw upon his or her experience and lead in the construction of new ideas, problem frames, growth oriented goals and action plans.

The coaching stance communicates high expectations and high regard for teachers’ capacities. For this reason, one key principal of practice is to enter the conversation from a coaching stance with an initial inquiry and close the conversation in that stance, as well, to identify new learning and clarify next steps.

Supervisory exchanges must offer opportunities to think, reflect and problem-solve within the flow of the real work of learning to teach.

Supervisory Functions
In the coaching stance, the supervisor references teaching and learning standards and a variety of data as focal points for the conversation. The supervisor inquires into the teacher’s thinking about each of these resources to identify levels of performance. In this stance, the teacher is the primary source of problem frames, gap analysis, potential solutions and strategies. Through an inquiry process, the supervisor’s role is to enhance teacher’s capacities for planning, reflecting, problem solving and decision-making.

The coaching stance is one of inquiry. This means that there are multiple appropriate responses, and that the supervisor has not predetermined a correct answer.

The value of these questions is that they influence the teacher’s underlying thought processes. By inquiring, pausing, and probing for details as data are explored, the supervisor supports both idea production and the exploration of the “whys” and “hows” of choices, possibilities, and connections.

This nonjudgmental approach applied over time, enlarges the frame, developing the teacher’s ever-increasing capacity for expert thinking and practice. The ultimate aim of the coaching stance is to develop a teacher’s internal resources for self-coaching so that
with time and practice, an increasingly sophisticated inner voice guides professional self-talk. In planning for action, supervisor questions guide the teacher’s exploration of goals, success criteria and reasonable timelines for action.

Creating a Learning Culture
A developmental and customized approach requires that supervisors consider which data are collected and shared, which aspects of specific standards drive the learning and how frequently they engage with their teachers. In addition, flexible supervisors navigate strategically across the continuum, choosing the most appropriate stances for promoting a teacher’s growth. This flexibility is another aspect of customization in learning-focused conversations. The ability to continually anticipate, monitor and flex stance across the Continuum of Interaction is a vital component in developing and maintaining learning-focused supervisory relationships.

If the goal is to increase teachers’ capacities for self-direction, supervisory exchanges must offer opportunities to think, reflect and problem-solve within the flow of the real work of learning to teach.

Given the changing context that surrounds schools, it is essential that the first line support system for teachers is one that nurtures their growth and development as individual practitioners and as collaborative colleagues.

The test of supervisors’ effectiveness is the degree of influence that their behavior has on teachers’ commitment to their own growth: their knowledge and skill, improvements in classroom practice and the level of engagement and success for students. As the actions of individual teachers combine with the actions of their colleagues, a school’s learning culture emerges.

Shaping this learning culture is the prime work of instructional leaders. Learning-focused supervision is an effective and necessary vehicle for doing so.

Laura Lipton and Bruce Wellman are co-Directors of MiraVia, LLC, a publishing and human resource development firm in Charlotte, VT. Their writing, research and seminars focus on effective and innovative educational practices and on building professional and organizational capacities for enhanced learning. Lipton and Wellman are international consultants, engaging with schools, school districts and community agencies, designing and conducting workshops on organizational and group development, learning-focused supervision and strategies to build professional expertise. To learn more, visit www.miravia.com.

Look to Horace Mann for knowledge
When it comes to retirement and insurance planning, could you use help? Count on your local Horace Mann representative to patiently answer your questions and help you understand what is needed.

Wonder if that’s what Sir Francis Bacon had in mind centuries ago when he coined the phrase “Knowledge is power?”

For more information, contact your local representative or visit horacemann.com.
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In this article, we explore five big ideas about the Common Core State Standards and their translation into a curriculum. As with most big ideas, these Standards are in some ways obvious but may also be counter-intuitive and prone to misunderstanding. We highlight potential misconceptions in working with the Standards, and offer recommendations for designing a coherent curriculum and assessment system for realizing their promise.
The Common Core Standards have new emphases and require a careful reading.

In our travels around the country since the Common Core Standards were released, we sometimes hear comments such as, “Oh, here we go again,” “Same old wine in a new bottle;” or “We already do all of this.” Such reactions are not surprising given the fact that we have been here before. A focus on Standards is not new. However, it is a misconception to assume that these Standards merely require minor tweaks to our curriculum and instructional practices. In fact, the authors of the Mathematics Standards anticipated this reaction and caution against it: “These Standards are not intended to be new names for old ways of doing business.” Merely trying to retrofit the Standards to typical teaching and testing practices will undermine the effort.

A related misconception in working with the Common Core is evident when teachers turn immediately to the grade level Standards listed for their grade or course to plan their teaching. Such an action is reasonable; after all, isn’t that what they are supposed to teach? While understandable, we advise against zeroing in on the grade-level Standards before a careful examination of the goals and structure of the overall documents.

To invoke a construction analogy: Think of the grade level standards as building materials. As a construction supervisor, we wouldn’t simply drop off materials and tools at a worksite and have the workers “go at it.” Instead, we would begin with a blueprint—an overall vision of the desired building to guide its construction. Without an overall end in mind, teachers can create wonderful individual rooms that won’t necessarily fit together within and across floors or achieve the intended results.

The Common Core Standards have been developed with long-term outcomes in mind (e.g., College and Career Anchor Standards in English Language Arts), and their components are intended to work together (e.g., Content and Practice Standards in mathematics). This point is highlighted in a recently released publication, Publishers’ Criteria for the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (July 2012):

“‘The Standards’ refers to all elements of the design—the wording of domain headings, cluster headings, and individual statements; the text of the grade level introductions and high school category descriptions; the placement of the standards for mathematical practice at each grade level. The pieces are designed to fit together, and the standards document fits them together, presenting a coherent whole where the connections within grades and the flows of ideas across grades...”

It is imperative that educators understand the intent and structure of the Standards in order to work with them most effectively. Accordingly, we recommend that schools set the expectation and schedule the time for staff to read and discuss the Standards, beginning with the “front matter,” not the grade-level Standards. We also recommend that staff reading and discussion be guided by an essential question: What are the new distinctions in these Standards and what do they mean for our practice? Since the Standards are complex texts and demand a “close” reading, we recommend that staff carefully examine the table of contents and the organizational structure; the headers (e.g., Design Considerations; What is Not Covered, etc.), the components (e.g., Anchor Standards and Foundational Skills for ELA; Standards for Mathematical Practice), and the Appendices (ELA).

Following a thorough reading of these introductory sections, discuss the changing instructional emphases called for by the Standards and their implications. For example, the ELA Standards demand a greater balance between reading informational and literary texts, and stress the use of text-based evidence to support argumentation in writing and speaking. The Mathematics Standards accentuate the focus on a smaller set of conceptually larger ideas that spiral across the grades (as opposed to simply “covering” numerous skills) with an emphasis on meaningful application using the Practices. We cannot overemphasize the value of taking the time to collaboratively examine the Standards in this way. Failure to understand the Standards and adjust practices accordingly will likely result in “same old, same old” teaching with only superficial connections to the grade level Standards. In that case, their promise to enhance student performance will not be realized.

Continued on page 18
Standards are not curriculum

A Standard is an outcome, not a claim about how to achieve an outcome (i.e. a curriculum). Thus, the Introduction to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for Mathematics states: “These Standards do not dictate curriculum or teaching methods.” A similar reminder is found in the ELA Standards: “The Standards define what all students are expected to know and be able to do, not how teachers should teach. For instance, the use of play with young children is not specified by the Standards, but it is welcome as a valuable activity in its own right and as a way to help students meet the expectations in this document... The Standards must therefore be complemented by a well-developed, content-rich curriculum consistent with the expectations laid out in this document.”

Indeed, these statements highlight the intent of any set of Standards; i.e., they focus on outcomes, not curriculum or instruction. The implication is clear—educators must translate the Standards into an engaging and effective curriculum. So, what is the proper relationship between the Standards and curriculum? Consider another analogy with home building and renovation: The standards are like the building code. Architects and builders must attend to them but they are not the purpose of the design. The house to be built or renovated is designed to meet the needs of the client in a functional and pleasing manner—while also meeting the building code along the way.

Similarly, while curriculum and instruction must address established Standards, we always want to keep the long-term educational ends in mind—the development of important capabilities in the learner as a result of engaging and effective work. In other words, a curriculum works with the Standards to frame optimal learning experiences. To shift analogies, the Standards are more like the ingredients in a recipe than the final meal; they are more like the rules of the game rather than a strategy for succeeding at the game.

So then, what is a curriculum? In research for our initial book, **Understanding by Design®** (Wiggins and McTighe, 1998), we uncovered 83 different definitions or connotations for the word, curriculum, in the educational literature! Such a variety of meanings confer an unhelpful ambiguity on the challenge of moving from Standards to curriculum. Worse, most definitions focus on inputs, not outputs—what will be “covered” rather than a plan for what learners should be able to accomplish with learned content. This is a core misunderstanding in our field. Marching through a list of topics or skills cannot be a “guaranteed and viable” way to ever yield the sophisticated outcomes that the Standards envision.

The ELA Standards underscore this idea clearly by framing everything around “anchor standards,” all of which highlight complex abilities and performances that students should master for college and workplace readiness. The Mathematics Standards’ emphasis on the need to weave the Content and Practice Standards together in a curriculum makes the same point.
As suggested above, the first step in translating the Common Core Standards into engaging and outcome-focused curriculum involves a careful reading of the documents in order to insure clarity about the end results and an understanding of how the pieces fit together. This idea is not new. Over the years, we have suggested various ways of unpacking standards in conjunction with our work with the Understanding by Design framework®. (See, for example, Wiggins and McTighe 2011, 2012).

When working with the Common Core, we recommend that educators “unpack” them into four broad categories—1) Long-term Transfer Goals, 2) Overarching Understandings, 3) Overarching Essential Questions, and 4) a set of recurring Cornerstone Tasks.

The first category, Transfer Goals, identifies the effective uses of content understanding, knowledge, and skill that we seek to use in the long run; i.e., what we want students to be able to do when they confront new challenges—both in and outside of school. They reflect the ultimate goals, the reason we teach specific knowledge and skills. Unlike earlier generations of standards where transfer goals were implicit at best, the Common Core Standards have made them more overt. Indeed, the College and Career Anchor Standards in ELA specify long-term transfer goals, while the Mathematics Standards strongly suggest a goal such as, Students will be able to use the mathematics they know to solve “messy,” never-seen-before problems using effective mathematical reasoning.

The second and third unpacking categories—overarching Understandings and Essential Questions—are like two sides of a coin. The Understandings state what skilled performers will need in order to effectively transfer their learning to new situations, while explorations of the Essential Questions engage learners in making meaning and deepening their understandings.

The term overarching conveys the idea that these understandings and questions are not limited to a single grade or topic. On the contrary, it is expected that they be addressed across the grades with application to varied topics, problems, texts and contexts.

The fourth category, Cornerstone Tasks, are curriculum-embedded tasks that are intended to engage students in applying their knowledge and skills in an authentic and relevant context. Like a cornerstone anchors a building, these tasks are meant to anchor the curriculum around the most important performances that we want learners to be able to do (on their own) with acquired content knowledge and skills. Since these tasks are set in realistic contexts, they offer the natural vehicle for integrating the so-called 21st century skills (e.g., creativity, technology use, teamwork) with subject area content knowledge and skills. They honor the intent of the Standards, within and across subject areas, instead of emphasizing only the content measured more narrowly on external accountability tests.

These rich tasks can be used as meaningful learning experiences as well as for formative and summative purposes.

Cornerstone tasks are designed to recur across the grades, progressing from simpler to more sophisticated; from those that are heavily scaffolded toward ones requiring autonomous performance. Accordingly, they enable both educators and learners to track performance and document the fact that students are getting progressively better at using content knowledge and skills in worthy performances. Like the game in athletics or the play in theater, teachers teach toward these tasks without apology.

The four categories that we recommend are initially unpacked at the “macro,” or program, level to establish the equivalent of a curriculum blueprint. More specific course and grade level curriculum maps are then derived backward from them, just as rooms in a building are constructed using the architect’s blueprint as a guide. Practically speaking, this macro level work is best undertaken at the state, regional or district levels by teams of content experts and experienced teachers. Currently two states, Massachusetts

Big idea #3

Standards need to be “unpacked”
and Pennsylvania, have assembled teams of content experts to unpack their Common Core state standards in this very manner, and the Next Generation Arts Standards, presently in development, are using this same construct to frame the Standards from the start!

While we strongly advocate this type of unpacking and have witnessed its benefits, we have also seen the process become way too narrow and granular when applied at the “micro” level. Thus, we concur with the important cautionary note offered by the Kansas Department of Education about a misapplication of Standards unpacking:

“Unpacking’ often results in a checklist of discrete skills and a fostering of skill-and-drill instruction that can fragment and isolate student learning in such a way that conceptual understanding, higher order thinking, cohesion, and synergy are made more difficult. Too often, the process of ‘unpacking” is engaged in an attempt to isolate the specific foundational or prerequisite skills necessary to be successful with the ideas conveyed by the overall standard and is a common precursor to test preparation and reductive teaching. Although this process may be important work in some instances and can certainly be enlightening, it also poses substantial problems if those completing the work never take the time to examine the synergy that can be created when those foundational or prerequisite skills are reassembled into a cohesive whole. Metaphorically speaking, ‘unpacking’ often leads educators to concentrate on the trees at the expense of the forest.”

The key to avoiding an overly-discrete and fragmented curriculum is to design backward from complex performances that require content. A return to the linguistic roots of “curriculum” reveals the wisdom in this outcome focused view. The Latin meaning of the term is a “course to be run.” This original connotation helpfully suggests that we should think of a curriculum as the pathway toward a destination. As mentioned above, our conception is that curriculum should be framed and developed in terms of worthy outputs; i.e., desired performances by the learner, not simply as a listing of content inputs.

This is not a new idea. Ralph Tyler made this very point more than 60 years ago (Tyler, 1949). He proposed a curriculum development method involving a matrix of content and process components that would guide teachers in meshing these two elements into effective performance-based learning. As Tyler points out, the “purpose of a statement of objectives is to indicate the kinds of changes in the student to be brought about... Hence it is clear that a statement of objectives in terms of content headings... is not a satisfactory basis for guiding the further development of the curriculum.” Indeed, the Mathematics Standards recommend just such an approach:

“The Standards for Mathematical Practice describe ways in which developing student practitioners of the discipline of mathematics increasingly ought to engage with the subject matter as they grow in mathematical maturity and expertise throughout the elementary, middle and high school years. Designers of curricula, assessments, and professional development should all attend to the need to connect the mathematical practices to mathematical content in mathematics instruction.”

Thus, the first question for curriculum development must be goal focused: Having learned key content, what will students be able to do with it?
Our long-standing contention applies unequivocally to the Common Core Standards as well as to other Standards: The ultimate aim of a curriculum is independent transfer; i.e., for students to be able to employ their learning, autonomously and thoughtfully, to varied complex situations, inside and outside of school. Lacking the capacity to independently apply their learning, a student will be neither college nor workplace ready.

The ELA Standards make this point plainly in their characterization of the capacities of the literate individual:

“`They demonstrate independence. Students can, without significant scaffolding, comprehend and evaluate complex texts across a range of types and disciplines, and they can construct effective arguments and convey intricate or multifaceted information... Students adapt their communication in relation to audience, task, purpose, and discipline. Likewise, students are able independently to discern a speaker’s key points, request clarification, and ask relevant questions... Without prompting, they demonstrate command of standard English and acquire and use a wide-ranging vocabulary. More broadly, they become self-directed learners, effectively seeking out and using resources to assist them, including teachers, peers, and print and digital reference materials.”`

These points underscore a potential misunderstanding resulting from a superficial reading of the Standards documents (especially in Mathematics). One could simply parcel out lists of discrete grade-level standards and topics along a calendar while completely ignoring the long-term goal of transfer. A curriculum envisioned and enacted as a set of maps of content and skill coverage will simply not, by itself, develop a student’s increasingly autonomous capacity to use learned content effectively to address complex tasks and problems. Such traditional scope-and-sequencing of curriculum reinforces a “coverage” mentality and reveals a misconception; i.e., that teaching bits of content in a logical and specified order will somehow add up to the desired achievements called for in the Standards.

A related misconception is evident when teachers assume that the Standards prescribe the instructional sequence and pacing. Not so! To assume that the layout of the documents imply an instructional chronology is as flawed as thinking that since a dictionary is helpfully organized from A to Z, that vocabulary should therefore be taught in alphabetical order.

While the grade-level Standards are certainly not arbitrary and reflect natural long-term “learning progressions,” a rigid sequence within each grade level was never intended. The authors of the Common Core Mathematics Standards explicitly call attention to this misconception and warn against it:

“`For example, just because topic A appears before topic B in the standards for a given grade, it does not necessarily mean that topic A must be taught before topic B. A teacher might prefer to teach topic B before topic A, or might choose to highlight connections by teaching topic A and topic B at the same time. Or, a teacher might prefer to teach a topic of his/her own choosing that leads, as a byproduct, to students reaching the standards for topics A and B.”`

The implications of these points are critical not only for curriculum mapping but for the very nature of instructional practice. Consider this advice from a nonacademic source – the United States Soccer Coaches Federation. In *Best Practices for Coaching Soccer in The U.S.*, the Federation recommends a change in the soccer “curriculum” of practice:

*Continued on page 22*
“When conducting training sessions, there needs to be a greater reliance on game oriented training that is player-centered and enables players to explore and arrive at solutions while they play. This is in contrast to the ‘coach centered’ training that has been the mainstay of coaching methodology over the years. ‘Game centered training’ implies that the primary training environment is the game as opposed to training players in ‘drill’ type environments. This is not to say that there is not a time for a more ‘direct’ approach to coaching. At times, players need more guidance and direction as they are developing. However, if the goal is to develop creative players who have the abilities to solve problems, and interpret game situations by themselves, a ‘guided discovery’ approach needs to be employed.” (pp.62-64)

We propose that this recommendation applies equally to teachers of academics as to coaches of soccer. In other words, if we want students to be able to apply their learning via autonomous performance, we need to design our curriculum backward from that goal. Metaphorically speaking, then, educators need to ask, what is the “game” we expect students to be able to play with skill and flexibility? In other words, we need clarity and consensus about the point of content learning— independent transfer. Then, we can build the curriculum pathway backward with those worthy performances in mind.

To design a school curriculum backward from the goal of autonomous transfer requires a deliberate and transparent plan for helping the student rely less and less on teacher handholding and scaffolds. After all, transfer is about independent performance in context. You can only be said to have fully understood and applied your learning if you can do it without someone telling you what to do. In the real world, no teacher is there to direct and remind you about which lesson to plug in here or what strategy fits there; transfer is about intelligently and effectively drawing from your repertoire, independently, to handle new situations on your own. Accordingly, we should see an increase, by design, in problem- and project-based learning, small-group inquiries, Socratic Seminars, and independent studies as learners progress through the curriculum across the grades.

Our point here is straightforward: if a curriculum simply marches through lists of content knowledge and skills without attending to the concomitant goal of cultivating independent performance, high-schoolers will remain as dependent on teacher directions and step-by-step guidance as 4th graders currently are. The resulting graduates will be unprepared for the demands of college and the workplace.

A prevalent misconception about standards in general is that they simply specify learning goals to be achieved. A more complete and accurate conception, in line with the colloquial meaning of the term, recognizes that standards also refer to the desired qualities of student work and the degree of rigor that must be assessed and achieved.

Think about what we mean when we talk about “high standards” in athletics, music or business: we refer to the quality of outcomes, not the inputs. We ask if work is up to standard, not whether we “covered” such standards as teachers. In this sense, the standards are at their core a set of criteria for building and testing local assessment. They tell where we must look and what we must look for to determine if student work is up to standard. Such information is crucial to guide local assessments and insure that these are validly anchored against national standards.

Ironically (and unfortunately), this important point is not made in the main body of the ELA Common Core Standards but in Appendices B and C. These Appendices are arguably the most important sections of the ELA Standards because there the authors describe the degree of text difficulty that students must be able to handle, the features that need to be evident in student writing, and the kinds of performance tasks that will provide the needed evidence. Accompanying samples of scored work illustrate the
qualities of performance that must be attained to meet the Standards.

This performance-based conception of Standards lies at the heart of what is needed to translate the Common Core into a robust curriculum and assessment system. The curriculum and related instruction must be designed backward from an analysis of standards-based assessments; i.e., worthy performance tasks anchored by rigorous rubrics and annotated work samples. We predict that the alternative – a curriculum mapped in a typical scope and sequence based on grade-level content specifications—will encourage a curriculum of disconnected “coverage” and make it more likely that people will simply retrofit the new language to the old way of doing business.

In sum, moving from Standards to curriculum requires careful reading and thoughtful interpretation to avoid the predictable misunderstandings noted above, while building the curriculum backward from worthy tasks offers the pathway to the performances envisioned by the Common Core.

Thus, our proposal reflects the essence of backward design: Conceptualize and construct the curriculum back from sophisticated “cornerstone” tasks, reflecting the performances that the Common Core Standards demand of graduates. Indeed, the whole point of Anchor Standards in ELA and the Practices in Mathematics is to establish the genres of performance (e.g., argumentation in writing and speaking, and solving problems set in real-world contexts) that must recur across the grades in order to develop the capacities needed for success in higher education and the workplace.

Our recommendation to construct curriculum around assessments may lead to a related misunderstanding: i.e., that we need to assess each grade-level Standard in isolation, one by one. We think that this view is due in part to the layout of grade-level Standards and to the look and feel of traditional standardized tests, in which very discrete objectives are the subject of most test items. This confuses means and ends; it conflates the “drill” with the “game.” The authors of the Common Core ELA Standards wisely anticipated this misconception and they caution against it: “While the Standards delineate specific expectations in reading, writing, speaking, listening, and language, each standard need not be a separate focus for instruction and assessment. Often, several standards can be addressed by a single rich task.”

In sum, moving from Standards to curriculum requires careful reading and thoughtful interpretation to avoid the predictable misunderstandings noted above, while building the curriculum backward from worthy tasks offers the pathway to the performances envisioned by the Common Core.

Editor’s Note: This article first appeared in the Spring 2013 Wisconsin ASCD “Highlighter” magazine. It is reprinted here with permission.

Jay McTighe is an educational writer and consultant. www.jaymctighe.com
Grant Wiggins is an educational writer and consultant and President of Authentic Education. www.authenticeducation.org
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Great teaching
lasts long after the bell rings

By Dan Voelpel
Public Information Director
Tacoma Public Schools

Can the power of personal stories—intimate stories of teachers who inspired their students—heal emotional wounds from a teachers’ strike and garner community support for public schools? Tacoma Public Schools sure hoped so.

During the fall of 2011, Tacoma teachers went on strike. The high-profile labor dispute—the first strike in Tacoma since the 1970s—heightened the usual tension between administration and labor. And it split the Tacoma community—some who angrily blamed the teachers for walking out on their students after school started and some who blamed the district administration.
After the strike ended and through the ensuing year, the Tacoma Education Association and the Tacoma Public Schools administration changed leadership—a new union president and a new superintendent. Both sides wanted a fresh start.

At the same time, Tacoma Public Schools knew it was coming up on a watershed moment in the 2012-2013 school year. The district had not passed a voter-approved construction bond issue since 2001. Two attempts to pass bond issues failed miserably in 2006 (just 57 percent support) and 2009 (a woeful 48 percent support). Coming off of a divisive labor dispute, everyone knew winning the necessary 60-percent voter support of a massive $500 million bond issue would be an uphill battle—especially since the previous all-time record for voter support was just 62 percent in 1984.

Making a pitch to the community

Beyond just helping the Tacoma community feel good about buildings, we needed the people of Tacoma to feel good about the district in general—and our teachers, specifically. We needed to put the labor strife to rest. In addition, the secondary aim was demonstrating to our teachers that the district truly believes in them and the important work they do every day with our students. Even though the administration reiterated this message sincerely time and again during labor negotiations, it doubted that its teachers believed it.

During the summer of 2012, the Public Information Office devised an approach: What if we invited graduates of Tacoma Public Schools to tell short stories about teachers who inspired them to pursue a passion, helped them succeed academically or otherwise steered them toward a vocation?

We reached out to the Tacoma Education Association leadership to see if they wanted to partner on the project. They did.

We then put out the word via our social media networks that we were hunting for the stories of graduates. We also knew we wanted to kick off the video Public Service Announcement series with a high-profile graduate, which would ensure greater public visibility for the effort—so we reached out to the agent for Vicci Martinez, a Stadium High School graduate and musician who made the finals of the hit TV show “The Voice.” Martinez agreed to participate.

We set up a two-day, multiple-camera studio shoot at the KBTC studios of Bates Technical College. Our two district videographers shot the footage and edited the graduate stories into a series of 10 60-second videos. In some cases, we arranged to secretly bring in the teachers highlighted in the graduates’ stories and include them in the videos, which created touching moments.

We also knew we needed to wrap the Public Service Announcements in a cohesive, feel-good message. Our team brainstormed ideas together and exchanged late-night taglines. We settled on the message: “Great teaching lasts long after the bell rings.”

In the months before the bond issue election, we began to release the videos one per week—highlighted one at a time on our home page.

Going viral

We generated media coverage. Both Pierce County TV and TV Tacoma, which operate their own government TV channels, agreed to air our spots. We aired them on our own KTPS TV cable channel throughout Tacoma. We cut two of the public service announcement videos to 30 seconds, which allowed local cable television providers—Comcast and Click Network—to work the videos into their regular PSA cycle between commercial TV programs. We posted the videos on our YouTube channel and on our school district Facebook page.

We arranged to participate in Comcast’s “Newsmakers” video TV show—a four-minute episode that Comcast airs periodically on its regional network—to describe and show off our Public Service Announcement series.

Through our YouTube channel alone, the videos have received an average of more than 700 recorded views. On Facebook, the videos generated a tremendous amount of positive community comments and helped shed a warm light on our district and our teachers.

Ultimately, Tacoma’s capital bond issue passed on Feb. 12 with an unprecedented level of support—a 70.71 percent “Yes” vote.

Editor’s note: The Tacoma Public Information Office garnered top awards for communications effectiveness with its “Great Teaching” PSA series from the Washington School Public Relations Association and the National School Public Relations Association.

The videos may be viewed at: youtube.com/user/ktpsvideo
They are grouped under the “My Teacher Stories” header.
Ann Buswell

Is a key driver of success at Bellingham’s
Whatcom Middle School

By Linda Farmer, APR
Managing Editor

No one likes to play the heavy. Carrying out unpleasant tasks (such as disciplining middle-schoolers) could drain the joy and warmth right out of an administrator. Not Ann Buswell. As a long-time assistant principal at Whatcom Middle School, she consistently displays passion, energy and excitement when it comes to her students. Her methods have paid off: disciplinary referrals and failing grades are at their lowest level in the past 10 years.

Buswell is the Washington State 2014 Assistant Principal of the Year. The award is bestowed by the Association of Washington Middle Level Principals (AWMLP), a governing board of the Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP). The honor alternates yearly between a middle level principal and a high school principal. This year it’s the middle level’s turn.

Being an assistant principal is more than handling discipline, of course. Buswell’s principal, Jeff Coulter, credits her with “helping to lead the transformation of Whatcom as a typical junior high to a vibrant middle school known for its exceptional instructional practices and positive school culture.”

Buswell was chosen Assistant Principal of the Year for her role in Whatcom’s instructional and structural metamorphosis during the past 10 years. Instructionally, Buswell helped make the switch from content area teachers working independently to teaching teams that share the same group of students along with dedicated collaboration time. The reorganization took place in the 2003-2004 school year and has since created a culture of professional exploration and collaboration, not to mention a new climate of trust.

Structurally, Buswell’s “composed and selfless response” to the fire that devastated Whatcom’s building in 2009 allowed the school to rebuild—both physically and emotionally—with teamed learning in mind. Buswell’s interest in national best practices surrounding middle schools fueled unique instructional spaces in the building that fit the school’s new learning philosophy.

“Kids learn and change when working with Ann on discipline issues,” said Don Rash, AWSP’s director of middle level programs. “But her impact is larger than that. Whatcom wouldn’t be where it is today without Ann’s strong leadership.”

Buswell has served as assistant principal at Whatcom Middle School since 1997. Previously she taught at Shuksan Middle School as a sixth grade core teacher from 1990-1997. She earned a bachelor’s in English from the University of Northern Iowa, and both a teaching certificate and a master’s in school administration from Western Washington University.

Washington state Gov. Jay Inslee will honor Buswell for her Assistant Principal of the Year award at the Washington Educators’ Conference in Seattle in October 2013. She also will be recognized in spring 2014 in Washington D.C. as part of the pool of candidates for the National Assistant Principal of the Year Award.

See a list of past winners and learn more about the award at www.awsp.org under the About tab.
Our principals’ association has a long and proud history of leading learning in a retreat setting. The retreat setting is powerful. It gives participants time and opportunity to reflect, to wonder, to ask, to question, and to answer in a safe learning environment.

Science Field School

Staff wondered if the retreat model could be applied to traditional academic coursework. The answer was a resounding “yes.” In 2011, we partnered with the White Pass School District to offer a one-semester credit field-based science class using the natural setting at Chewelah Peak Learning Center. By pairing natural resource professionals with certified science teachers, we developed a quality course of study for high school students that maintained their interest even during 14-hour days.

Health & Fitness Course

Given our success, we sought and received accreditation through the Northwest Accreditation Commission as a supplemental program through 2017. Last summer, we rolled out the next offering—a Health and Fitness course at the Cispus Learning Center. Also worth one semester credit, this course focused on backpacking and hiking, an activity you can carry with you for life.

Meanwhile, Washington Student Leadership Director Susan Fortin had hired Vincent Perez to lead a new student leadership initiative for our state’s underserved Latino youth. During the course of his work, Vince connected with Helen Malagon, Lupe Ledesma and Sylvia Reyna of the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction’s (OSPI) Migrant and Bilingual Education program. It turned out they were looking for a way to provide credit courses to at-risk migrant youth. This was the beginning of a new and unique partnership between OSPI and AWSP.

Dare to Dream Academies

After months of hard work, AWSP, OSPI and four universities (Central, Washington State, Eastern and the University of Washington) announced the Dare to Dream Academies. In June 2013, high school migrant students went to the university of their choice for a week-long intensive course in either science, math or leadership, each worth one semester’s credit.

The students had a complete college experience. In addition to 14-hour intensive days in class or labs, students lived in the dorms, ate college food and laughter are shared, there is a witness to one another’s learning and growth.

By Martin E. Fortin, Jr.
Director of Learning Centers
had access to college-student mentors and professional staff who helped them with academics, assisted them in planning for a course of study or a job after high school, and other life issues.

Each day certified teachers from our accredited program observed the lessons and documented the content using tools from Common Core sources. Each night they read the notes and journals from the students’ academic day. They made comments, and then consulted with the lecturers to help ensure the learning atmosphere was positive and productive.

Retreat setting again proves successful

The retreat setting—this time on a college campus—proved successful again. Three hundred and thirty one students representing 64 different schools successfully completed a course of study. Informal polling on the first day found that more than half of the participants were discouraged learners who had very little expectation to graduate from high school. Gradually they discovered that they were capable of handling tough academic subject matter and that they could be successful students. Most went home believing that they are capable learners and had a new outlook for their high school career. Indeed, many verbalized the goal to someday return to the very same campus as university students.

This is just the beginning of a long partnership that will help all students discover the pathway to academic success. Learn more about the Dare to Dream Academies and the other credit bearing coursework for high school students in Washington state by contacting Marty Fortin, fortin@awsp.org or 360.497.7131.

How will you lead?

Do you want to be a catalyst for transformative change?
A leader who guides the talents of employees and managers?
Someone who builds strong community through ethical service?

Seattle University will prepare you for this kind of leadership.
No matter where you sit.
Closing the Gap

Two members of the AWSP Diversity Task Force attended the Closing the Opportunity Gap conference in June 2013 at the University of Washington Tacoma, Center for Strong Schools. They sent these reports:

By Niki Arnold-Smith
Principal, Eastgate Elementary, Kennewick School District

This conference featured speakers who offered ways to fairly and safely include students of color in as many educational opportunities as possible. The classes focused on discipline and ways to handle and prevent discipline concerns so that students were excluded from school as little as possible.

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) 101, by Dr. Lori Lynass showed us how monitoring and tracking behavioral data could help with the prevention or recurrence of these concerns by restructuring school plans as needed. PBIS is a pro-active, systems level approach to promote success of all students. It defines social expectations across all settings and engages family and community in the school.

At another session, a representative from the League of Education Voters Foundation showed how their goal is to close the achievement gap by keeping more students in school through the reduction (or elimination) of suspensions and expulsions at all grade levels. Their data showed that in 2011, white students in Washington graduated from high school at a rate roughly 15 percent higher than students of color. Their proposal is to collect student level data and ensure that it is publicly accessible; to end indefinite expulsions; and, to propose policies and procedures through the state legislature to keep students in school.

John Lenssen spoke about culturally responsive practices in school behavior programs and how this relates to PBIS. This session supported the positive discipline outlined in my first session and tied in Geneva Gay’s Culturally Responsive Teaching. It explained how culturally responsiveness could help to prevent school exclusion for many students.

I had the opportunity to attend a final session on Sustained Positive Interactions with Youth with Behavioral challenges. This was presented by Dr. Gregory Benner, executive director of the Center for Strong Schools at UW Tacoma. The session emphasized that we should set clear and positive expectations for our students throughout the school and model what these expectations would look like. For example, show the student exactly what walking in the hallway should look like. The emphasis was also on catching the students doing the right things and focusing on these behaviors. As stated, “when we focus on misbehavior, we typically get more of it.”

Gregory Benner, Ph.D., Executive Director and founder of the Center for Strong Schools at UW Tacoma, was a speaker at the Closing the Gap Conference held there in June 2013.
A highlight of the conference for me was a workshop titled, “Brotherhood: Enhancing Male Students of Color.” During this session I learned about three programs designed to teach young men of color the goal setting and leadership skills necessary to excel academically and personally. These programs featured partnerships between Tacoma Public Schools, the City of Tacoma, Tacoma Urban League, the YMCA, and Highline Community College.

The first program was initiated by the City of Tacoma and the Tacoma Urban League in partnership with Tacoma middle schools. The Male Involvement Program, offered to students during the school day, provides mentorship from males of color to middle school aged males of color.

Through the use of relevant curriculum, group discussion, and practical application opportunities students learn problem-solving skills, conflict resolution skills, and how to engage in positive peer interactions. Students are taught about respectful communication and appropriate ways of behaving. They learn about being men of moral character and ultimately, what it means to be a man of responsibility.

The second program, the YMCA’s Brotherhood program, which runs through the school year and continues into the summer, is a mentoring program based on 3-Cs: Consistency, a Caring Adult and Compassion. Through the use of group activities, guest speakers, and a structured curriculum the program develops leaders by teaching students about leaving a positive legacy, promoting a sense of belonging, and creating a vision for their future.

Rashad Norris, Director of Outreach at Highline Community College shared information about the annual Black and Brown Summit hosted by the community college. The summit brings together keynote speakers and multiple breakout sessions to include topics on post-secondary education opportunities, race and sports, and male privilege with a focus on the privileges and relationships among race and masculinity. The intended audience for this summit is young men of color with the purpose of empowering and motivating them to excel academically and personally.

I highly recommend that school administrators attend this conference, if offered again in the upcoming year. It offers us the opportunity to consider alternate reactions to student misbehavior. The conference also allowed me to reflect on the consequences of suspension and expulsion and how much these could impact students and families.
A nee-dotal stories of school and student success fill our professional tanks at AWSP’s Washington Student Leadership office.

Examples include:

• The La Cima (The Summit) summer camp experience that resulted in an averted suicide for an undocumented student and a new college trajectory for a student who had previously never seen herself as “a leader.”

• At a ¡La Chispa! (The Spark!) workshop a middle school student received counsel from a high school role model on avoiding gang involvement.

There are hundreds of amazing stories like these in Washington schools. More likely thousands. The challenge is to take the stories and go a step further to look at the role of principal leaders and student leaders and their collective impact on school improvement.

Here’s the question we sought to answer: “Can school involvement in an AWSP student leadership program be translated to measurable results that become evidence of school success in any of the AWSP Leadership Framework criteria?” The registration flyer or field trip roster for students to attend a leadership training is simply an artifact. The evidence is seen when you can specifically answer the questions, “What is the impact of participation? What difference has it made in our school?”

Three principals who used our Latino Student Leadership services (artifacts) now have evidence that can be squarely linked to the criteria in the AWSP Leadership Framework. The table on the next page shows what that looks like.

Providing opportunities for students to engage in meaningful leadership experiences has always been a benefit to schools. Students learn new ideas for improved school climate and new ways to create a sense of family within the school. Students learn organizational skills that help them turn ideas into action. And, students have always used evaluation to improve on projects in the future.

I challenge you to have your students take their leadership work one step further. Have them evaluate their projects and participation (artifacts) and see what results have occurred. These results are the evidence that can be linked to the AWSP Leadership Framework.

Taking that extra step shows that principal leaders and student leaders can work together for the success of all students.

Providing opportunities for students to engage in meaningful leadership experiences has always been a benefit to schools. Students learn new ideas for improved school climate and new ways to create a sense of family within the school. Students learn organizational skills that help them turn ideas into action. And, students have always used evaluation to improve on projects in the future.

I challenge you to have your students take their leadership work one step further. Have them evaluate their projects and participation (artifacts) and see what results have occurred. These results are the evidence that can be linked to the AWSP Leadership Framework.

Taking that extra step shows that principal leaders and student leaders can work together for the success of all students.

Franklin Pierce High School Principal Jennifer Shaw helps a student with a presentation he will give later in the evening to a parents’ meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley High School</td>
<td>Closing the Gap</td>
<td>Annually sends students to La Cima Leadership Camp.</td>
<td>Following camp, the LaCima delegates had administrative support to form a MECHA club. TPEP evidence compiled by Principal Hittle compared GPAs and number of Fs for 8 MECHA members. For the group, GPAs increased (+.17) and Fs decreased from 7 to 3 (-4) in a two-semester comparison during the time these students were actively involved in MECHA leadership activities. Visibility and success of MECHA club, led to the creation of Students of Color club, which has allowed other ethnic groups a place to validate their identity and culture in a school that is 85% White.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley SD</td>
<td>Creating a Culture</td>
<td>Hosted and provided high school Latino leaders as role models for the middle level ¡La Chispa! Leadership conference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Hittle, Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I believe these students have gained a sense of belonging and pride in being at CV.”</td>
<td>Principal Mike Hittle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Pierce High School</td>
<td>Engaging the Community</td>
<td>Hosted a Latino student leadership day in a dual-language format that included feeder middle school and freshman delegates supported by Latino role models in grades 11-12. The event included a dinner and program for parents and families.</td>
<td>As a result of concerns expressed by parents, a new position was created for Spanish speaking parents to communicate with teachers and school officials. In 2012, 10 parents attended the dinner/program as part of the Latino student leadership event. Parent participation increased to 32 in 2013. (+12) In 2010, 60% of Hispanic students who started as seniors graduated. In 2013 that rate jumped to 90%. Shaw commented, “Although many initiatives have contributed to this increase the intentional leadership training of our Latino students has resulted in their increased engagement in school. Our Latino students are becoming more involved in ASB, Link Crew and other clubs.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Pierce SD</td>
<td>Creating a Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Shaw, Principal</td>
<td>Closing the Gap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Having Dan work with our Latino students and parents is creating meaningful change in our building.”</td>
<td>Principal Jennifer Shaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Baker Middle School</td>
<td>Engaging the Community</td>
<td>Upon accepting the principalship at Mt. Baker in August 2011, Brown met with 15 Latino parents at their request. They expressed concerns regarding school connection to Latino students and their families. Brown hosted a ¡La Chispa! leadership workshop for 100 Latino students at Mt. Baker.</td>
<td>Students’ sense of connection through that one-day program led to the development of an after-school ¡La Chispa! club. 20-25 students consistently attended optional weekly meetings where they participated in activities focused on personal leadership and academic identity. The original group of 15 concerned Latino parents are all currently involved as school volunteers, have joined the PTA and are advocating at feeder elementary schools for student placement at Mt. Baker. In September 2011, less than 1% of Latino students were involved in a club or activity. Today, 50% of Latino students are involved in a club or activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn SD</td>
<td>Creating a Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Brown, Principal</td>
<td>Closing the Gap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“La Chispa inspired 25 usually reserved Latino students to perform a cultural dance in front of the entire student body last year. It was awesome!”</td>
<td>Principal Greg Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Life as a school superintendent is quite hectic. How does your new hectic compare to the old hectic in Renton?

The definition of hectic is “constantly busy and hurried.” This is often characterized by continual activity and the lack of any time to rest or relax. The pace of a school superintendent is definitely “constantly busy and is usually characterized by continual activity.” An important responsibility as a superintendent is to balance work responsibilities and personal time so you do have time to rest and relax. That has become especially important as Chief of Staff. The scope of work is dramatically increased. My new hectic is comparable, just multiplied by a factor of 10. In the Chief of Staff role, the pace is intense; the issues requiring my attention are significant and often complex. The focus required to minimize the “hectic” and bring structure, assurance and confidence to the office is essential.

Are there any lessons you learned as a school administrator that have come in handy in your new job?

Definitely. Lessons in leadership absolutely apply. We know how important it is to communicate a vision, set expectations, identify measurable goals and establish teamwork internally and externally to be successful. Similarly, the lessons learned in developing a strong strategic planning framework to use in our schools as a tool for working together collectively have been put to good use in establishing a continuous improvement model for the state. The recent launch of Results Washington (www.results.wa.gov) reflects this type of collaborative framework. It identifies Governor Inslee’s vision for our state and the mission for his administration based on his mission of “Building a Working Washington, the Washington Way.”

What are the Governor’s priorities for education?

The Governor expects every child to receive a world-class education that prepares him or her for a healthy and productive life, including success in a job or career, in the community and as a lifelong learner. He has broken his education goals into two topics: access and success. Both include priorities for early learning, K-12 and post-secondary programs. The Governor expects all Washingtonians to have access to education opportunities that prepare them to transition from high quality early learning experiences to elementary, middle and high school to post-secondary, career and lifelong learning opportunities. Washington’s education system must provide innovative, high-quality skills and tools for every student to attain 21st century skills to succeed in school, a job, career and in the community. Learn more at www.results.wa.gov.

What can principals do to help education initiatives move forward this legislative session?

Principals, and all education leaders, can and should take an active role in communicating with elected officials. Locally, all districts have Representatives and Senators that represent the school and/or district. Each of those legislators should know who you are. Invite them to your school so they can see what is happening in their local classrooms and better understand the challenges and opportunities in the education system. Make sure they can reach you to ask your opinion on education issues as they contemplate policy and budget decisions. Do not wait for them to contact you regarding education policy under consideration. You are the experts and should provide legislators with your
professional opinion and perspective. Understanding how busy principals are, AWSP offers excellent summaries, analysis of education policies and initiatives and information about how to reach legislators in Olympia. If you are a principal and have never been in touch with a Senator or Representative, I encourage you to start by making contact with AWSP for advice and information about the laws around use of personal time and equipment. All principals should engage in the legislative process. Let your voice be heard.

What do you see as the biggest challenge for principals in the coming years?

In addition to the vast array of challenges in all schools to address the diverse learning needs of students, and the adults responsible for their education, the changing landscape of “reform and accountability” is one of the biggest challenges. Implementing Common Core and the important work of understanding the Smarter Balanced Assessment system, staying current with the progress of Next Generation Science standards and that assessment, and the TPEP implementation are all huge initiatives that must be done well in our state.

There are three important components that are critical in this work:
1. Advocating for appropriate funding for training and implementation.
2. Being accountable for the appropriate use of funding (including assuring the use of research-proven approaches to professional development and student support to increase achievement) and accurate reporting of results so we can increase the confidence of the public and elected officials.
3. Implementation of each component with fidelity.

Educators understand the importance of multiple measures, the likely changes in overall state assessment results when new assessments are implemented, and the (sometimes unique) challenges locally to a community of learners. We must, collectively, increase our efforts and effectiveness of communicating and explaining results with integrity, not excuses. Educators are working harder than ever – it’s time we get the message across that we are meeting diverse learning needs in classrooms every day with creativity, innovation and effectiveness. We are increasing expectations of performance – for ourselves and our students, and we are willing to be accountable at every level in the system.

Do you have a motto or personal philosophy?

When you limit your expectations, you limit your potential. Be open to opportunities, be willing to risk and contemplate sacrifice today for a better tomorrow.

What books/magazines are on your nightstand/e-reader?

I have to honestly answer that my evening reading includes state agency director briefings, audit reports and legislative policy proposals/agency request legislation. While that likely doesn’t sound super exciting to many, it is packed with new ideas, challenging problems to solve and abundant learning opportunities.

What is one piece of advice you’d like to leave with Washington principals?

Consider the following course of action:
• Pay attention to what is happening locally, state and nationally
• Explore your potential as a leader... risk
• Broaden your scope... expand your “ken”
• Go the extra mile... it’s never crowded
• Contribute in every way you can... get involved!

What would you do with 100 EXTRA SCHOOL DAYS each year?

Imagine what you would do if you had 100 extra days a year. At Champions, we give you that time in our before- and after-school program to meet your academic goals.

Discover the possibilities at www.discoverchampions.com
Elementary

Elementary School Principals Association of Washington (ESPAW)

OFFICERS

President
Bruce Cannard, Principal
Edison Elementary, Kennewick SD

President-elect
Ron Sisson, Principal
Lakes Elementary, North Thurston PS

Past President
Rex Larson, Principal
Gause Elementary, Washougal SD

Treasurer
Richard Mellish, Principal
West Mercer Elementary, Mercer Island SD

First Vice President
Scott Friedman, Principal
Nine Mile Falls Elementary, Nine Mile Falls SD

Second Vice President
Kenneth Evans, Principal
Northeast Tacoma Elementary, Tacoma PS

NAESP Representative
Dwight Cooper, Principal
Reardan Elementary, Reardan-Edwall SD

Three-Year Representative to AWSP
Laura J. Bolt, Principal
Hathaway Elementary, Washougal SD

BOARD MEMBERS

Capital Regional Director
Brock Williams, Principal
Parkside Elementary, Tenino SD

Columbia Basin Regional Director
Ryan Pike, Principal
Lakeview Terrace Elementary, Moses Lake SD

Columbia River Regional Director
Karen Douglass, Principal
Stevenson Elementary, Stevenson-Carson SD

East King Regional Director
Wayne Hamasaki, Principal
Sunset Elementary, Issaquah SD

Harbor Regional Director
Noreen Sampson, Principal
Robert Gray Elementary, Aberdeen SD

Lake Wallula Regional Director
Lori Butler, Principal
Ridge View Elementary, Kennewick SD

North Central Regional Director
J. Heather Ireland, Principal
Manson Elementary, Manson SD

Northeast Regional Director
Robyn Davis, Principal
Pasadena Park Elementary, West Valley SD #363

Northwest Regional Director
Claudine Berry, Principal
Conway Elementary/middle, Conway SD

Palouse Regional Director
Don Lee, Principal
Grantham Elementary, Clarkston SD

Peninsula Regional Director
Jeff McCormick, Principal
Woodlands Elementary, Central Kitsap SD

Pierce Regional Director
Eric Molver, Principal
Mountain View Elementary, Puyallup SD

South Central Regional Director
Heidi Sutton, Principal
Apple Valley Elementary, West Valley SD #208

Snohomish Regional Director
David Jones, Principal
Cedar Wood Elementary, Everett PS

South King Regional Director
Bonnie Wong, Principal
Meadow Ridge Elementary, Kent SD

Spokane Regional Director
Lisa Pacheco, Principal
Ridgeview Elementary, Spokane PS

Tacoma Regional Director
Jennifer Cooper, Principal
Grant Elementary, Tacoma PS

NAESP Federal Relations Liaison
Brian D. Pickard, Principal
South Colby Elementary, South Kitsap SD

OSP Liaison
Robert Butts, Assistant Superintendent for Early Learning

VACANT POSITIONS
Seattle Regional Director
Diversity Task Force Representative

AWSP STAFF

Paula Quinn, Director of Elementary Programs & Professional Development

Cris Sippel, Elementary Programs Coordinator, Diversity Services & Initiatives Assistant and Professional Services Support

Middle Level

Association of Washington Middle Level Principals (AWMLP)

OFFICERS

President
Carole Meyer, Principal
Salk Middle, Spokane PS

President-elect
Steve Rabb, Principal
Enumclaw Middle, Enumclaw SD

Past President
Whitney Meissner, Ed.D, Principal
Chimacum High & Chimacum Pi Program, Chimacum SD

Vice President
Gordon Grassi, Principal
North Pines Middle, Central Valley SD

NASSP Coordinator
Marilyn Boerke, Principal
Liberty Middle, Camas SD

Three-Year Representative to AWSP
Jeff Gutfield, Principal
Bethel Middle, Bethel SD

Regional Director Representative
Colleen Nelson, Principal
Northwood Middle, Kent SD

BOARD MEMBERS

Black Hills Regional Director
Linda O’Shaughnessy, Principal
George Washington Bush Middle, Tumwater SD

Greater Yakima Regional Director
Cynthia Holloway, Assistant Principal
Wilson Middle, Yakima PS

Inland Empire Regional Director
Erika Ann Burden, Principal
Westwood Middle, Cheney PS

Kingco North Regional Director
Josh Sanchez, Principal
Northshore Junior High, Northshore SD

North Central Regional Director
Brett Baum, Principal
Okanogan Middle, Okanogan SD

East Pierce County Regional Director
Steven Fulkerson, Co-Principal
Lakeridge Middle, Sumner SD

West Pierce County Regional Director
Michael Benoit, Principal
Harbor Ridge Middle, Peninsula SD

Northwest Regional Director
Derek Forbes, AP/Athletic Director
Mount Baker Jr/Sr High, Mount Baker SD

Olympic Regional Director
Andrew Cain, Principal
Cedar Heights Junior High, South Kitsap SD

Seattle Regional Director
Cindy Watters, Principal
Hamilton International Middle, Seattle PS

Sno-Isle Regional Director
Sheila Gerrish, Ed.D., Principal
Cedarcrest Middle, Marysville SD

South King County Regional Director
Jerry Warren, Principal
Illahee Middle, Federal Way PS

St. Helens Regional Director
Sandi Christensen, Principal
Canyon Creek Middle, Washougal SD

Three Rivers Regional Director
Mira Gobel, Principal
Pioneer Middle, Walla Walla PS

Chair, Student Leadership Committee
Charles Lisk, Principal
Stevens Middle, Port Angeles SD

WIAA Representative
JoAnn Carbonetti, Principal
Park Place Middle, Monroe SD

2013 Middle Level Principal of the Year
Heather Renner, Principal
Morris Ford Middle, Franklin Pierce SD

2012 Middle Level Principal of the Year
Kenneth Renner-Singer, Principal
Osborn Elementary and Beaver Valley School, Cascade SD

Diversity Task Force Representative
Cameron Grow, Principal
Lincoln Middle, Pullman SD
OSPI Liaison
Mike Hubert, Director, Guidance & Counseling Secondary Education and School Improvement

VACANT POSITIONS
Kingco South Regional Director

AWSP STAFF
Don Rash, Director of Middle Level, Certification, Principal Support Programs
Annalee Braley, Membership Services Support/Middle Level Programs Coordinator

High School
Washington Association of Secondary School Principals (WASSP)

OFFICERS
President
Ken Schutz, K-12 Principal Odessa High, Odessa SD
President-elect
Brian Vance, Principal Roosevelt High, Seattle PS
Past President
To Be Determined
2nd Vice President
Aaron Fletcher, Principal Liberty High, Liberty SD
3-Yr Rep to AWSP
Jennifer Shaw, Principal Franklin Pierce High, Franklin Pierce SD
NASSP Coordinator
Vicki Puckett, Principal Mercer Island High, Mercer Island SD
Budget Chair
Kymery Tyelyn-Carlson, Principal Skyview High, Vancouver PS
At-Large Representative
Karen Remy-Anderson, Principal River Ridge High, North Thurston PS

LEAGUE REPRESENTATIVES
WESCO 3A/4A
Christine Gruver, Principal Stanwood High, Stanwood-Camano SD
NW Conf 1A/2A/3A
Steve King, Principal Mount Baker Jr/Sr High, Mount Baker SD
Cascade Conf 1A/2A
Dale Leach, Principal Lakewood High, Lakewood SD
NW 1A/2B
Kyle Freeman, Principal Orcas Island Middle & High, Orcas Island SD
KingCo 4A
Kurt Criscione, Principal Woodinville High, Northshore SD
KingCo 3A
Christina Thomas, Principal Lake Washington High, Lake Washington SD

Metro 3A
Ruth Medsker, Principal West Seattle High, Seattle PS
South Puget Sound 4A
Richard Zimmerman, Principal Auburn High, Auburn SD
South Puget Sound 2A/3A
James Hester, Principal Washington High, Franklin Pierce SD
Narrows 3A/4A
Steve Rood, Principal North Thurston High, North Thurston PS
Seamount 2A/3A
Giovanna San Martin, Assistant Principal Renton High, Renton SD
Olympic 1A/2A/3A
Christy Cole, Principal Kingston High, North Kitsap SD
Nisqually 1A
Ashley Barker, Principal Eatonville High, Eatonville SD
Greater St. Helens 2A
Richard Reeves, Principal RA Long High, Longview SD
Greater St. Helens 4A/3A
Kymery Tyelyn-Carlson, Principal Skyview High, Vancouver PS
Evergreen 2A
Bob Walters, Principal W F West High, Chehalis SD
Evergreen 1A
Matthew Ishler, Principal Rochester High, Rochester SD
Trico 1A
Michael Hamilton, Principal Kalama Middle/Senior High, Kalama SD
Pacific 2B
Brian Hunter, Principal Ocoda Junior/Senior High, Ocoda SD
Central 2B
Brian Maley, Principal Winlock Middle/High, Winlock SD
Mid Columbia 3A/4A
William Oppliger, Principal West Valley High, West Valley SD #208
South Central Ath. Conf. 1A
Michael Torres, Principal Zillah High, Zillah SD
Columbia Basin (Big 9) 3A/4A
Katherine Sidwell, Assistant Principal Moses Lake High, Moses Lake SD
Caribou Trail 1A
Barry DePaoli, Principal Chelan High, Lake Chelan SD
Great Northern 2A
Eric Anderson, Principal Clarkston High, Clarkston SD
Northeast 1A
John McSmith, Principal Medical Lake High, Medical Lake SD
Bi-County 2B
Aaron Fletcher, Principal Liberty High, Liberty SD
Northeast Panorama 1B
Donald Baribault, K-12 Principal Northport High, Northport SD
Greater Spokane 3A/4A
Eric Sylling, Principal Shadle Park High, Spokane PS
Southeast 1B/2B
Bervil (Buck) Marsh, Principal Colfax High, Colfax SD

CHAIRS | LIAISONS
Alternative High Schools
Thu Ament, Principal Oakland High, Tacoma PS
High School/College Relations
Richard Zimmerman, Principal Auburn High, Auburn SD
2013 HS Principal of the Year
Brent Kline, Principal Mariner High, Mukilteo SD
2014 Assistant Principal of the Year
To Be Determined
Skill & Technical Centers
Kristan Blum, Executive Director New Market Skills Center, Tumwater SD

Smaller Secondary Schools
Jeffrey Hardesty, Principal Tonasket High, Tonasket SD
Student Leadership
Greg Barker, Assistant Principal Snohomish High, Snohomish SD
WIAA Representative
Chris Woods, Principal Capital High, Olympia SD

VACANT POSITIONS
Emerald City 1A
SeaTac 2B
North Olympic 1B
Coastal 1B
Columbia Valley 1B
Central Washington 1B/2B
Greater Columbia Gorge 1B
Private School Liaison

AWSP STAFF
Scott Seaman, Director of Principal Support and High School Programs
Linda Thomas, Legislation, Intern, HS Programs and Conference Exhibitor Coordinator
The Power of Habit

Paying attention to our own routines and patterns will shape the work of our staff

I had lunch recently with one of my mentors and a dear friend, John Pehrson. John is a former Boeing executive and served three years on the board of AWSP’s foundation.

John is an octogenarian. For John, that is a combination of octane and genius. I admire his analytical mind and the seemingly endless energy he has to devote to important civic issues. He just finished working with other Seattle community leaders analyzing and commenting on Seattle School District’s strategic plan. He is also a leader in other Seattle initiatives.

After lunch, John gave me a book he had just read. Written by New York Times business reporter Charles Duhigg, it’s called “The Power of Habit: Why we do what we do in life and business.”

There is much for principals to learn in this book. It includes great examples of the power of creating change, both personally and organizationally, by generating the right habits. Think Michael Phelps, Howard Schultz and Martin Luther King.

John talked about Duhigg’s analysis of how Paul O’Neil transformed Alcoa in a most unexpected way by creating the habit in each employee of putting safety first. He relentlessly made this habit pervasive throughout the company. And, with that habit in place, he used it to focus on other initiatives.

Our talk turned to habits being established in schools today that have the power to transform education. A significant habit for principals is to make sure that teachers are watching each other teach, then to ensure that they’re having professional conversations about teaching strategies and the results. Creating the habit of conversations about teaching is similar to O’Neil’s efforts to make conversations about safety front and center at Alcoa.

There has been much written about the power of reflection in producing growth in personal and organizational effectiveness. Many of those who contributed to the new teacher and principal evaluation expectations in Washington believed this and tried to create a system that would make it more likely.

Unfortunately, a side effect of one of the new regulations is that principals’ calendars are so crammed full of time spent complying with the regulation, that there is little time available to work on nurturing habits of teachers in the school to observe each other and reflect together. With principals having nearly the same requirements for evaluating teachers on focused evaluations as they do for teachers on comprehensive evaluations, the time needed for the evaluation process has more than doubled for many.

If we are serious about reforming (a word I have great reservations about using) education, we will do it by creating universal and effective habits for the educators in the system. Leading the establishment of those habits has never been more critical and possibly never been more difficult. Time is at a premium for all of us. It is important, however, that we spend the time to create habits for ourselves that result in impactful habits of our staff. Duhigg’s book is a great place to start.

Gary Kipp has served as AWSP’s executive director since 2003. He has more than 40 years experience as a teacher, assistant principal, principal and assistant superintendent.

By Gary Kipp
AWSP Executive Director
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