

Proposal to the Wachovia Foundation for Outcome Grant for the Teachers and Teaching Initiative – Years 1-3

I. Program Progress:

The Leadership Preparation Performance Coaching (LPPC) program will provide training and support for coaches who support teachers during preparation and transition to leadership in Georgia. Recently we completed the research phase of the program working with a design team, comprised of a broad group of stakeholders in preparation program coaching and experts in coaching and performance improvement. We also completed our site visits, interviews and reading regarding a wide range of performance development strategies used by organizations with similar challenges. We aligned our work with two Georgia TTI-funded projects to prevent duplication and create efficiencies. We shared our best-practices based model with Southern Regional Educational Board (SREB), the GA Department of Education (GADOE), and the Georgia Staff Development Council for inclusion in their programs, and we are working with them to ensure that each program leverages the outputs of the others. For example, leadership coaches in our program will complete the training developed by SREB as a prerequisite for our program. We also sponsored a bill in the Georgia legislature, which passed, to create a Master Teacher Designation and an Academic (Teacher) Coach initiative which will pair developing teachers with exemplary teachers as coaches. (The teaching coaching program sponsored by TTI can now be used to develop these coaches, creating a high degree of alignment between our policy advocacy work and their project goals.) Outputs include:

- Research review on coaching in education
- Best-practices based model for coaching.
- Documented priority performances in which teachers must reach proficiency prior to assuming a formal school leadership role indicating those which must be practiced in the actual work environment leading other teachers
- Performance-factors assessment to determine the barriers and enhancers to teachers' practicing priority performances and to effective coaching
- Detailed Leadership Preparation Performance Coaching (LPPC) workflow
- LPPC model
- Training process initial design
- Training module, job and tool templates and samples

To identify best practices and solutions we looked to organizations outside education with similar needs for performer time to competency and proficiency. The research yielded a proven model for training coaches that is performance-based with solid standards for program design and delivery, which we are adapting. Reviews of electronic tools for coaching, including an electronic performance support system for mentors in colleges in the United Kingdom, produced a plan for development of a web-based system for structuring and guiding the task performance of LPPCs. Our goal now is to deliver the support system concurrently with the coach training, so we can reduce the training time, provide directed support to the coaches on the job, and overcome the challenges of disbursing information to coaches who work in many geographic areas of the state.

This creates a plan change from our proposal last year in order to delay rollout of the training until early 2006 to allow for concurrent support system deployment, and for the coaching module developed by SREB to be adapted and embedded in the LPPC training materials. We have had no other significant funding changes, personnel changes or issues which would redirect this project.

II. Organizational Capacity:

Georgia's Leadership Institute for School Improvement is a private-public partnership between the Georgia Partnership for Excellence in Education and the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia. Our program is devoted to equipping and supporting educational leaders in K-12 public schools in Georgia to drive change for student success. As we pilot and incubate new practices for developing leaders and improving the conditions of practice for teachers and their leaders, we work to influence the policies in the state, universities and in school districts that must change so that Georgia can attract, prepare, develop and retain high quality teachers and leaders.

The Georgia Partnership for Excellence in Education, a 501 (c)(3) non profit organization, is the fiscal agent for private funds for the Leadership Preparation Performance Coaching program and administrator of this grant. The State of Georgia provides \$837,000 per year through the Board of Regents to support operating costs of the Institute and has pledged \$450,000 in additional funds for FY06. Staffing and operating expenses to support this program will be provided by the State of Georgia via the Board of Regents.

The Institute is led by Deb Page, a former teacher and former Senior VP of Instruction and Business Development for Citibank, N.A. The Institute staff is comprised of operational support staff, contractors, and on-loan exemplary leaders from Georgia school districts.

Our current programs, in addition to the LPPC program, include: 1) Leadership Base Camp and Summit, a leadership development program which uses research-based best practices and proven business methods for improvement to retrain educational leaders and teacher leaders to lead the “New Work of Leadership of School Improvement”; 2) Learning Pathways, a series of expanded training and support services to support continued learning of education leaders following initial training; 3) Rising Stars, a pilot preparatory program for teachers who aspire to become leaders in their schools, which is reinventing the way Georgia’s colleges, universities and school districts select and develop new leaders; 4) Learning Communities, session for educational leaders to share promising practices, teach best practices, support each other during practice adoption and network with experts from business, education and higher education; 5) 21st Century Technology Leadership, a pilot for testing and replicating best practices in leading use of instructional technology 6) Performance Leadership training and consulting for developing strong performance management, measurement, monitoring and communications skills using business practices.

Key Accomplishments Since 2001:

- GLISI has provided in-depth training to 1,070 leaders in 76 of 181 school districts and introduced over 5,400 educational leaders and teachers to the “New Work of Leadership of School Improvement”.
- GLISI schools show greater gains on state test results across all subjects and grades than do demographically similar schools; On average, they made gains approximately twice as large as demographically similar schools.
- 69% of participating schools in the core leadership program, with one year of student test data, met the measurable goals that they set for improvement within one year.
- Program completers rated the effectiveness of the Institute's programs in preparing them to lead effective school change 3.5 or better on a 1-4 scale.
- 96% of superintendents agree that their district's relationship with the Institute has accelerated their attainment of desired district improvement results.
- 92% of principals agree the GLISI core leadership development program taught them what they needed to impact student achievement; 84% agreed that the process has been effective in engaging faculty and staff in improvement.
- 93% of principals agree that the GLISI core leadership development program prepared them to lead effective school change; 88% report their school cultures changed to support improvement after participation in GLISI; 99% of those attributed that change in school culture to working with GLISI
- 100% of school districts which participated in initial training have requested to send additional teams.
- The Institute has raised 1.5 private dollars per dollar of state investment.
- GLISI facilitated development of a pilot “collaborative” of school districts, colleges and universities, and Regional Educational Support Agency Boards of Control to launch an alternative, performance-based leader preparation program for teachers. The pilot is expanding to four new “collaboratives”.
- GLISI launched learning communities for superintendents and principals which have linked over 100 districts in implementing Balanced Scorecards, implementing academic performance standards, improving SAT Performance, leveraging instructional technology, and engaging the community.

GLISI has developed the support of a wide range of key stakeholders. Governor Sonny Perdue made a special state budget request to increase state funding for the Institute by \$450,000 and made a request to the

foundation that funds our leadership programs to match the increase. Currently we are applying for a federal grant to support our work in leader preparation in high needs areas. No changes in leadership or decrease in funding streams are currently anticipated. GLISI is actively working to maintain and increase private and state investment.

III. Community:

This project will initially serve teachers aspiring to leadership roles in 60+ Georgia demographically diverse and geographically dispersed districts, including urban Atlanta, rural Georgia, Atlanta-metropolitan, and suburban systems with both large and small schools. Sixty-eight percent of the students in the schools to be served by teacher leaders are from low-income families, as indicated by participation in free-and-reduced lunch programs. This program will engage all the public colleges and universities which prepare leaders and the 16 Regional Educational Service Agencies over the next three years. LPPCs will be selected by districts from within, from the ranks of retired leaders, and from service agencies to support teachers aspiring to leadership at any level.

IV. Project Summary:

This grant request is to support Year One of our *Leadership Preparation Performance Coach Program* which will support districts, universities and service agencies in providing teachers practice in priority leadership tasks and coaching them to demonstrate proficiency before they assume leadership roles. The process trains coaches to assess practice against criteria and provide feedback to teachers during preparation and induction (transition) to leadership roles to decrease their time to competency. The program is designed to provide coaching to support preparation programs in developing teachers who can “hit the ground running” to positively impact student achievement and organizational effectiveness. The process is designed to use best practices we identified from business and education to overcome key barriers to effective leader preparation identified during our research phase. Coaches will be selected and trained, and support tools will be deployed, during Year One.

Need addressed: More than 40 percent of principals and an even higher percentage of superintendents will retire over the next decade, creating an urgent need for new leaders who can improve schools. Educational reform has raised the stakes for school performance causing the work of school leadership to change dramatically in the last few years. These changes do not allow time for teachers to learn effective leadership skills on the job; therefore, this proactive program is needed to develop proficiency during leadership preparation and induction. A 2005 study by Columbia University, “Educating School Leaders” cited many of the same barriers and issues with educational leader preparation which our interviews, focus groups and study of recent research into school leader effectiveness revealed. The barriers we found which this program will address include:

- Current preparation programs do not provide practice in relevant school leadership tasks. As a result, when teachers assume leadership roles they must learn to lead on the job, in a high stakes environment.
- Programs tend to be conceptual in nature, rather than designed to prepare teachers with demonstrated proficiency to lead other teachers to improve achievement. Teachers who transitioned to leadership reported that their preparation internships most often provided knowledge and some experiences “shadowing” leaders, but did not consistently build the skills and proficiency levels needed to lead effectively.
- Universities may be able to meet broad standards for leadership preparation programs, but they are unable to provide clinical practice since they are outside the public school systems. They are often frustrated by the lack of cooperation by schools in providing effective leadership internships or coaching teachers through preparation and induction.
- Too often university faculty has little or no experience in the current “real work” of leading schools; therefore, they cannot coach students effectively. Some schools lack incumbent leaders qualified to coach teachers to lead.

- School districts are not satisfied with the level of proficiency or types of competencies of preparation program completers, and view their available pipeline of leaders as inadequate or unsuitable.
- Current leadership programs which do not require performance demonstration are viewed as easy paths to increased compensation for teachers and are frequently chosen by teachers over programs which would increase their content or instructional mastery; however, the vast majority of teachers in Georgia who complete the programs and receive salary increases do not move into leadership, are not willing to assume leadership roles, or are viewed as unsuitable leadership candidates by their school and district leaders.

This program will adapt best practices we collected from other states which have begun to address the barriers above as well as proven practices from businesses with similar challenges in reducing time to competency while increasing proficiency. This program will support our aligned efforts with the Professional Standards Commission to create endorsements for coaches, more steps on the career ladder for teachers and leaders and encourage teacher-leadership through performance-based endorsements obtained through practice, assessment and coaching by LPPCs. We will align this project with a parallel Institute initiative, *Rising Stars*, a pilot performance-based preparation program funded by the Wallace Foundation and the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia for teacher leaders and aspiring principals which we are expanding to serve the entire state over the next three years. *Rising Stars* builds “collaboratives” of school districts, universities and service agencies to provide relevant curriculum and internships. LPPCs will support teachers in these “collaboratives.” These aligned initiatives will ensure Georgia teachers receive the type of preparation, practice and support they need to be willing and able to lead their schools.

Target populations: This project will develop incumbent leaders, university faculty with authentic leadership experiences, school district staff, Regional Educational Support Agency staff, and independent contractors to coach teachers in leadership preparation and induction (transition to leadership) first in all pilot sites and later in all districts in the state.

Fit With TTI’s Goals: This project will improve education in Georgia by systemically improving the quality of leadership by/of teachers in our schools through implementing a best-practice based leadership coaching process aligned with parallel initiatives for improving teacher coaching and leader preparation.

Relationship to Student Achievement: A large and growing body of research points to effective school leadership as a key driver of student achievement. Good school leaders cast a vision for success for all students, and they support, engage and challenge teachers to teach all children to achieve at high levels. Research also points to the need for distributed, or shared, leadership in schools to ensure that those closest to the students, teachers, are engaged in analyzing data, planning and testing improvements, making decisions and influencing parent and stakeholder support. This project will institutionalize a leadership coaching process in the state of Georgia which will ensure that teachers receive the guidance, practice and feedback they need to become effective leaders of improvement of student achievement.

Year One Goals:

To address the barriers and tap best practices found in our research phase we adapted our project plan to (1) develop an electronic performance support system for coaches and (2) to pace our rollout to match the expansion of the *Rising Stars* Program to establish several additional pilot “collaboratives” of school districts, universities, and Regional Educational Service Agencies who will work with us to address the challenges and gaps in preparation programs and internships. We delayed development of training until Year One so all factors impacting the rollout could be assessed and plans could be finalized for working around barriers. We rescheduled LPPC training with SREB’s training as a prerequisite. Year One Goals include:

Goal 1: Communicate and review LPPC standards and selection criteria with pilot “collaboratives”.

Goal 2: Partner with the Georgia Department of Education and Southern Regional Educational Board to align activities to ensure a common language for educational coaching in our state, and to differentiate the

work of LPPC's from that of Academic Coaches and GADOE Leadership Facilitators. (Academic Coaches are Master Teachers who coach peer teachers in a specific subject area; Leadership Facilitators work with school leaders in schools failing to make Adequate Yearly Progress which are rated "Needs Improvement".)

Goal 3: Complete design and development of instructional modules and performance assessments for coaches using the templates and content developed in the Research and Development phase.

Goal 4: Design and develop the pilot version of a simple electronic performance support system for LPPCs and release the beta (test) version concurrently with coach training.

Goal 5: Train trainers to redeliver SREB's *Coaching for School Improvement* training to LPPCs; Partner with GADOE and SREB on selecting and training trainers.

Goal 6: Leverage our Rising Stars program to work with universities and districts in pilot alternative preparation "collaboratives" to select coaches, assign supervisors for LPPC's.

Goal 7: Deliver SREB's *Coaching for School Improvement* training to LPPC trainees, collaborating with DOE and SREB to offer concurrently for Academic Coaches and DOE Leadership Facilitators.

Goal 8: Conduct orientation for LPPC supervisors and pilot LPPC training for supervisors

Goal 9): Deliver training program for LPPCs and deploy electronic performance support system

Goal 10): Work with the colleges and universities, Regional Educational Service Agencies and districts engaged in the "collaboratives" and the Board of Regents to implement the coaching program. (Year 1, 2 and 3)

In years Two and Three we will build more "collaboratives" and address these goals:

Goal 11: Train additional coaches to meet needs of additional "collaboratives" established after Year 1 pilots (Year 2 and 3)

Goal 12: Study the effectiveness of those trained and coached and determine success cases for further research and validation of effectiveness of the training and coaching practices. (Year 2, 3 and beyond)

Goal 13: Coordinate with Georgia's Professional Standards Commission to revise career paths to include tiers for leadership coaches, performance-based endorsements for leadership coaches, and multiple leadership endorsements to encourage teacher-leadership.(Year 2 and 3)

Goal 14: Build greater functionality and complete deployment of the electronic performance support system (Year 2 and 3)

Goal 15: Evaluate time to competency and the impact on student achievement of cohorts of leaders coached via this program against peers without this support. (Year 2, 3 and ongoing)

Staffing and Management: This project will be lead by Dr. Gale Hulme, Program Director, under the supervision of Deb Page, Institute Executive Director. Dr. Hulme will coordinate the planning and analysis phase through delivery and evaluation. She will ensure alignment of this project with the parallel alternative leadership preparation pilot, "Rising Stars", with Dr. JoAnn Brown, Rising Stars Program Coordinator. Pam Henderson, Operations Manager, will serve as project manager and will manage the budget and contracts under Dr. Hulme's direction. Dr. Tom McKlin will coordinate the research and evaluation processes. Contractors will be used to develop instructional materials and assessments. Dr. Hulme and Ann Duffy, Policy Director, will coordinate efforts with all partners in the project. Bios for all team members are attached. Contractors will be retained to assist with training and support system development.

V. Implementation Plan:

We have extended the training development process, based on the needs identified during our research and the expanded scope of the training and support. We developed the timeline to allow paper-based training materials and job aids to be adapted into the electronic support tool, with a goal of concurrent deployment of the training and support tools. Year one focuses on developing the LPPC training program and the first phase of the support system, selecting LPPCs and Master LPPCs, and training both groups. The training and support activities continue in the third and fourth year, with an added focus on evaluation and revision.

Complete standards and LPPC and Master LPPC criteria
Vet LPPC criteria with "collaboratives"

April 30, 2005
April – May 2005

Design and develop coaching modules, paper-based tools and job aids	Present – August 2005
Design Electronic Performance Support System (design only)	May -- September 2005
Recruit and select Master LPPCs	June – August 2005
Recruit LPPC trainees	June -- October 2005
Conduct iterative testing with Collaboratives	May – December 2005
Design and Develop Performance-Based Training Session for LPPCs	June – August 2005
Revise SREB Coaching Module for Use in LPPC training	Sept. - October 2005
Revise standards and criteria, if required	Aug. – November 2005
Pilot LPPC training and train coach supervisors (Master LPPCs)	Dec. – March 2006
Revise training and materials, as needed	Nov. – January 2006
Print, bind and ship training materials	February 2006
Develop Electronic Support System Test Version	Sept. 2005 – February 2006
Conduct LPPC training and release test support system	March – Dec 2006
Develop LPPC Support Structure	Nov. 2006 – July 2008
Work with Master LPPCs and Collaboratives to Monitor LPPC Performance	May 2006 – ongoing
Identify needs for retraining, barrier removal, tools and support	May 2006 – December 2006
Expand Electronic Performance Support System to meet needs	May 2006 – July 2008
Evaluate results and determine success cases for further research and validation	Sept 2006 -- July 2008
Coordinate Georgia’s Professional Standards Commission to revise career paths	May 2006 – July 2008
Select, train and support additional LPPCs to provide statewide support	Mar. 2007 – July 2008
Evaluate LPPC performance	Mar. 2007 – ongoing
Confirm LPPC designations	Mar. 2007 -- ongoing

VI. Results/Objectives:

This project is a continuance of our work funded by the T&TI beginning in July of 2004 for which the primary goals were researching needs and best practices, developing a coaching model and designing training. The goals for years One, Two and Three are outlined in the *Project Summary*.

July, 2004 – Present Outputs: The work to date has produced the following: Project plans, coaching task analysis reports, best practices-based coaching model, performance coaching model, detailed LPPC work flow, templates for training modules with assessments, job aids and support tools; sample training modules, job aids, and support tools; coaching and performance consulting literature reviews; research and review summaries; budgets; initial training process model; electronic performance support tool high-level function requirements; sample electronic support tool interface metaphor; timelines; performance factors analysis summary; roles analysis summaries with role definitions; focus group summaries; site visit reports; and a collection of sample coach training and support best practices. Over 35 stakeholders and subject matter experts collaborated in five design team sessions, conducted research, reviewed models and collected best practices to contribute to the design of the LPPC model and training and support plan. (See I. Program Progress)

Year One Outputs: Project plans; budgets; coach standards (performance criteria) and selection criteria; partnering agreements; contracts; instructional materials; assessments, job aids and support tools, training sessions for Master LPPCs; electronic support system design document and development plan; training for 10 Master LPPC’s and 100 LPPCs; electronic performance support system test version; Performance Factors Assessment and evaluation tools.

Year One Outcomes: The following outcomes will be accomplished and evaluated using the tools noted:

Outcome 1: LPPCs trained by the program will rate the training “Satisfactory” or better in preparing them to perform their jobs. To be evaluated by training course evaluations. (*Tool: Training Course Evaluation forms and Co-Developer Feedback forms.*)

Outcome 2: LPPCs trained by the program will increase awareness and efficacy in performance coaching. To be evaluated by training course evaluations (*Tool: Evaluation rating forms and Co-developer Feedback forms.*)

Outcome 3: LPPCs trained by the program will demonstrate proficiency in priority coaching tasks prior to being assigned as coaches. Each LPPC trainee will be evaluated by observations and assessments by Master LPPCs during LPPC training. (*Tool: Training Module Skills Check and Final Assessment ratings.*)

Outcome 4: Pilot “Collaboratives” and Participants in preparation programs will rate the performance of the LPPCs on the job as “Satisfactory” or better. Each LPPC will be evaluated by ratings from the university, school district and performer against specific performance criteria. (*Tool: LPPC Evaluation Form*)

Outcome 5: LPPCs will rate the current support system version as “Satisfactory” or better. Impact will be evaluated by LPPC system review ratings. (*Tool: LPPC Support System Rating Form and Co-developer Feedback Form*)

Outcome 6: “Collaboratives” will rate the LPPC pilot process as “Satisfactory” or better. Impact will be evaluated by Collaborative LPPC Ratings (*Tool: LPPC Pilot Process Feedback form.*)

Year Two Outputs: Training for additional LPPCs and Master LPPCs to meet the needs of “collaboratives” statewide and for school systems with induction/transition programs; Version 1.1 of the LPPC Electronic Support System; Evaluation of Year 1 LPPCs; Revision of LPPC training, tools and job aids; revision of LPPC coaching model and workflow (if required); development and delivery of LPPC retraining and follow-up training; Performance Factors Analysis and Report; Agreements on endorsements and certifications with the Georgia Professional Standards Commission; LPPC Program evaluation.

Year Two Outcomes: The following outcomes will be accomplished and evaluated using the tools noted:
Note: Some evaluations and research will be done concurrently with evaluation of the *Rising Stars* pilot.

Outcomes 1 – 6 will continue with the addition of more LPPCs and collaboratives

Outcome 7: The Georgia Professional Standards Commission will approve a LPPC endorsement and draft legislation recommendations for Leadership Coaches to be added to the career path. Progress will be evaluated by presence or absence of endorsement and recommendations draft.

Outcome 8: Pilot program participants (tracked as a group) will reach competency faster than teachers prepared for leadership without LPPC coaching (tracked as a group). Reduction in time to competency will be evaluated by competency ratings from school districts of teachers participating in the LPPC-supported “collaboratives” and in traditional programs. (*Tool: District Progress Tracker Rating Forms.*)

Year Three Outputs: During Year Three outputs will be approximately the same as Year 2 to allow for expansion of “collaboratives” statewide, replacement of LPPCs as needed, updates and revisions to the training and support system, and on-going evaluation.

Year Three Outcomes: The following outcomes will be accomplished and evaluated using the tools noted:
Note: Some evaluations and research will be done concurrently with evaluation of the *Rising Stars* pilot.

Outcome 9: Improvement of the pipeline of new leaders will provide participating districts with proficient leaders who are willing to assume leadership roles. Pipeline improvement will be evaluated by participating school system surveys and studies of the numbers of teachers who transition to leadership with LPPC support vs. an equal number of teachers prepared without LPPC support. (*Tool: Leadership Pipeline Surveys w/ Transition Count Forms*)

Outcome 10: Leaders trained by “collaboratives” and supported by LPPCs demonstrate evidence of positive impact on student achievement and organizational effectiveness as evidenced by leading and lagging indicators. Impact will be evaluated by analysis of student achievement results in schools lead by leaders prepared by the collaboratives and coached by LPPCs. Note: Will require sufficient leader time in job to demonstrate impact on student achievement and organizational effectiveness. (*To be determined by analysis of student achievement data from state tests, school report cards, Similar Schools Comparison website data and other available measures of achievement and effectiveness.*)

To date this project has established the needs to be met by LPPCs working with “collaboratives”, developed the LPPC coaching model and determined both the work to be done by the coaches and the process for training and supporting LPPCs. Continuation will result in the outcomes listed above, plus

establishment of a state career ladder which includes coaches and LPPC endorsements by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission. (See Research and Evaluation Logic Model)

- **VII. Evaluation Plan:** Dr. Tom McKlin, the Institute’s Research and Evaluation Coordinator, will lead the research and evaluation effort. A portion of the grant, \$25,000 per year, will be devoted to evaluation efforts and recommendations for continuous improvement based on analysis of evaluation. Information from each phase of evaluation will inform changes and improvements in the model, training and support system. Each outcome listed in VI. Results/Objectives includes the specific evaluation method with tools. The Research and Evaluation Logic Model (attached) captures the targets, research questions, evaluation methods, short-term outcomes and long-term impacts. We intend to engage university researchers in addressing the research questions. All other evaluation will be completed by our staff and contractors. The focus of evaluation of year one work will primarily be on the effectiveness of the training and levels of LPPC efficacy and proficiency in priority coaching tasks. Beginning in year two, evaluation will focus on LPPC performance and collaboratives’ satisfaction as well as LPPC satisfaction with the support system.

VIII. Collaboration:

Letters of partnership for this project are attached. The following will partner with the Institute on this project to create and institutionalize a systemic coaching approach in Georgia: *Board of Regents* -- Set standards for performance-based programs which require “collaboratives”; *Professional Standards Commission* -- Develop teacher career paths and coaching certifications; *SREB* – Provide Coaching School Improvement training module and initial trainer instruction content; *GADOE* – Use any materials from our research or development for adaptation with Academic Coaches and Leadership Facilitators; National Staff Development Council – Adapt outputs from our research or development into national models; Universities – Participate in “collaboratives” and connect program managers to LPPCs; School Systems – Participate in “collaboratives” as they are established; Regional Educational Support Agencies – Manage the LPPC process

IX. Conclusion:

The extension of this grant into the next three years will allow us to develop a concentrated and sustainable solution to a deeply embedded systemic problem and address it by adapting approaches which have been used successfully outside education. The alignment of this work with the other T&TI-funded efforts as well as other Institute initiatives, such as the Rising Stars “collaborative”-building program will ensure we make a system impact. We are certain other challenges will arise as we implement the program. By working in alignment with these other initiatives we increase our capacity to overcome barriers, create effective solutions, and drive change for student and leader success.