
Introduction

This introduction first appeared in the *Journal of Educational Administration* in 2015. It is used with the permission of Emerald Group Publishing Limited. Additional members of the writing team were Jacquelyn Wilson, Co-Chair, Erin Anderson, Beverly Hutton, Mark Smylie, Susan Printy, and Jonathan Supovitz.

In this introduction, we explore the foundations of the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL). We begin by uncovering the purpose dimensions of the Standards, what they are designed to influence. We undertake this initial assignment through a brief historical discussion, by highlighting core design principles, and with an analysis of the importance of the Standards. In the balance of the introduction, we examine the two intellectual pillars on which the Standards rest: academic press and caring support.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

The vision for national standards for school leaders took shape inside the National Policy Board for Education Administration (NPBEA) and bears the fingerprints of its executive director in the mid-1990s, Scott Thomson. The NPBEA was formed in response to recommendations contained in the 1987 report of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA)-sponsored National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (NCEEA) (Griffiths, Stout, & Forsyth, 1988; Thomson, 1999). It is a hallmark document in the history of school leadership that provided bridging from the forty-year post-WWII era to new conceptions about what educational administration might become (Forsyth, 1999). It was the NPBEA that secured the funding to develop national standards for school leaders, although in 1994 in an effort to prevent duplication, the grant application to the Pew Trusts for creation of “common and higher standards . . . was amended to designate the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) as assuming primary responsibility for this work” (Thomson, 1999, p. 107). Over eighteen months, the newly formed Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium, which encompassed twenty-four states and members from the associations in the NPBEA, crafted the

2 Professional Standards for Educational Leaders

first set of national standards for school administrators (Forsyth, 1999) that came to be known as the ISLLC Standards for School Leaders (Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium, 1996).

As we report below, the ISLLC Standards quickly began to influence the profession of school administration in both direct and indirect ways. Some of this influence can be traced to the timing of their development. During the decade from 1985 to 1995, there was growing acceptance that the field was in need of major overhaul (Griffiths, 1988). Central here was the belief that the profession required a stronger and more unified center of gravity, and that the profession was more than a conglomerate of varied holding companies (Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Bennion, 1987; Murphy, 1999a). The national standards also drew strength from a growing concern with the quality of leadership preparation throughout the nation, angst carefully delineated in a wide range of critical reviews of the profession beginning with Bridges (1977) and Erickson (1977, 1979) and running through the years of the NCEEA and its aftermath (Murphy, 1990b, 1992a; National Commission for the Principals, 1990, 1993). Interest was also galvanized by the fact that the Standards captured a vision of school administration that was beginning to take hold across the four spheres of the profession—research, development, policy, and practice. Using a macrolevel prism and employing the language of Boyan (1963), the profession was moving from its long history of administration as a subfield of management to administration as a subfield of education. Using a more fine-grained lens, a shift from leading organizations to leading learning was unfolding (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). The long period of neglect of the technical core of education (Bates, 1984; Callahan, 1962; Evans, 1991; Greenfield, 1988; Murphy, 1992a) was coming to a close, and the newly crafted Standards captured changing formulations of the profession (Murphy, 2005b).

As expected, the release of the Standards in 1996 and their expanding importance in the profession catalyzed a good deal of scholarly critique. Almost all of the concerns fell into two categories. Some analysts addressed shortcomings in the content of the Standards. These, in turn, focused on both omission of content (e.g., insufficient attention to matters of social justice) (see, for example, Davis, Leon, & Fultz, 2013; Hess, 2003; Leithwood & Steinbach, 2005; Young & Liable, 2000), and the incorporation of questionable content (e.g., the inclusion of nonempirical material) (see, for example, English, 2000; Hess, 2003; Leithwood & Steinbach, 2005). Other scholars were concerned that the Standards could be (would be) misused.

For an incongruous set of reasons that can best be described as political in nature, the struggle to democratize the Standards and extend ownership on the one hand, and to solidify control on the other, the 1996 Standards were revised in 2008. The initial process of developing the ISLLC Standards was transparent, but relatively low-keyed and largely contained within the development team of state and association participants. By 2008, the climate surrounding the Standards had changed considerably. The Standards

had become a very important part of the profession, to a much greater extent than even the developers imagined. Consequently, nearly everyone who had a stake in the profession desired a stronger and more direct voice in recrafting the Standards. At the same time, the official guardians of the Standards, especially CCSSO, demanded a more visible role than they had in 1996. In the process, the 2008 Standards became both more widely owned and more tightly controlled. On the substantive side of the revision ledger, there was little appetite for major changes. The dominant stance was that the Standards were just beginning to become infused throughout the profession (e.g., in preparation programs, in principal evaluation systems). Any recasting that significantly altered the Standards was viewed as problematic, carrying with it the probability that progress since 1996 would be rolled back. Concomitantly, there was general agreement that the expansion of the knowledge base in school leadership in the decade in question did not warrant a need for major alterations. The decision was made to keep the original six standards. Revisions would occur through additional and stronger crystallization of the subdomains that defined each of the standards. These “functions” replaced the long lists of knowledge, skills, and dispositions that defined the 1996 Standards (ISLLC, 1996). As such, they brought greater meaning to the Standards while honoring the principle that the Standards were directional in nature, not immediately measurable (Murphy, 2005b). In 2013, CCSSO decided that it was time to revise the Standards for a second time. The seven-member team responsible for rewriting the Standards arrived at three important decisions at the start of their work. First, they decided that the foundation on which the Standards stood, leadership for learning, was solid; that is, it provided the correct architecture for understanding and defining school administration. Second, they concluded that some of the scaffolding, leadership of the core technology, leadership of the school culture, and leadership of diverse communities required significantly more attention. Third, the team agreed that the bands that held the platform together (community, social justice, and school improvement) (Murphy, 1999a) needed to be strengthened and made more visible. We examine these substantive issues below. Before we do so, however, we explore some of the core design principles of the Standards.

DESIGN PRINCIPLES

There are a number of essential understandings about the Standards that merit attention, often because they have been misunderstood. Much of this confusion can be traced to insufficient explanations by the developers of the Standards. Some can be explained by insufficient attention on the part of reviewers (Murphy, 2005b).

The Standards are based only on empirical evidence. The reality is that the Standards were never designed to be constructed using only empirical

research findings. To be sure, a large portion of the Standards rest on the best available empirical evidence. This is appropriate. At the same time, the creation of the Standards was predicated on the conclusion that other materials need to be employed in the building process (Murphy, 1992a). The Standards acknowledge and honor the reality that educational administration is and should be a profession of values, of ethics, and of professional norms (Beck & Murphy, 1994; Foster, 1988; Greenfield, 1988). For example, there is no empirical ground for the claim that leaders should be stewards of public resources. Nor is there any empirical evidence that school administrators should disproportionately allocate human and social capital to care for marginalized children and their families. Yet it would be an impoverished profession if we failed to underscore such norms and values. The Standards also include craft knowledge of colleagues in the practice of administration, what scholars often refer to as the wisdom of practice (Murphy, 2005b).

The Standards are primarily for preparation programs. The Standards were never intended to be limited to (or primarily focused on) the preparation of school administrators. This misunderstanding grew from a number of converging dynamics. To begin with, the NPBEA in the mid-1990s decided to feature preparation as the most viable approach to improve the profession (Thomson, 1999). Second, the ISLLC leadership team design strategy to bring the Standards to life called for a first move into program accreditation, i.e., the creation of ELCC (Educational Leadership Constituent Council) Standards. The next move targeted state laws and regulations in the area of licensure of program graduates, including the development with ETS of the School Leader Licensure Examination. All of these forces combined to create a tight bond between the ISLLC Standards and preparation programs (Murphy, 1999b).

At the same time, the leadership team understood that these first two strategies would prove insufficient to the task of widespread infusion of the Standards. The team design called for strong connections to be formed between the Standards and the full array of “leverage points” that could influence the definition and practice of school administration (e.g., preparation, professional development, leader evaluation) (Murphy & Shipman, 2003; Murphy, Yff, & Shipman, 2000).

The Standards are measurable. The Standards are directionable, they push and pull the profession in well-specified pathways (e.g., ethical behavior, vision development work). By design, they rest at a level above measurement. They provide a framework that underscores issues meriting operationalization. To move the Standards onto measurement terrain, three additional issues must be addressed. To begin with, the appropriate leverage point needs to be made explicit. Are the Standards being applied to principal evaluation? To professional development? To program accreditation? Administrative roles also need to be specified. There likely will be, for instance, different quality points for principals and superintendents

within a specific leverage point (e.g., licensure). Third, indicators need to be created. What, for example, would we need to see to determine if a principal were creating meaningful parental engagement?

IMPORTANCE

An essential question is why the profession writ large and professors in particular should attend to national standards for school leaders (Young, 2014). At one level, the answer is that the PSELs represent consensual agreement across all the professional associations about the grounding for school administration. At a more concrete level, investment is important because the Standards exert considerable influence on the shape and texture of the profession of school administration. For example, we know that the PSELs are welded into the framework of school leadership at the state level. Indeed, forty-five states have laws and regulations that infuse the Standards into core understandings and actions in the domain of school administration (McCarthy, Shelton, & Murphy, 2014). More concretely, via the Educational Leadership Coordinating Council, the PSELs have become the foundation for preparation programs across the nation.

INTELLECTUAL FOUNDATIONS

The Standards are scaffolded on the two pillars of academic press and caring support. In this section, we unpack these core constructs. In the process, we reveal a good deal about three crosscutting themes that bind the PSELs together: culture, school improvement, and justice.

ACADEMIC PRESS: LEADING LEARNING

If there is anything approaching a law in education, it is that teacher quality is the most critical factor in explaining student learning (Hughes, 2003; Lewis, 2008). That is, “the achievement of school children depends substantially on the teachers they are assigned” (Wayne & Youngs, 2003, p. 89), more so than the school that they attend (Hattie, 2009). Who teachers are and the values, knowledge, and skills that they bring to teaching are critical to school and student success. Equally important, what they do matters a good deal (Darling-Hammond & Post, 2000; Hattie, 2009).

Scholars over the decades have labored to determine the size of teacher effects on student learning. Bryk, Sebring, Allensworth, Luppescu, and Easton (2010) found that students with more effective teachers learn more than twice as much as students assigned to less effective teachers. Weak teachers in schools with a poor work orientation represent a

particularly troubling condition for student learning. Smerdon, Borman, and Hannaway (2009) found that more effective teachers produce about 1.5 years in student achievement while less effective teachers add only 0.5 years growth. Nye, Konstantopoulos, and Hedges (2004) conclude that

the difference in achievement gains between having a 25th percentile teacher (a not so effective teacher) and a 75th percentile teacher (an effective teacher) is over one third standard deviation (0.35) in reading and almost half a standard deviation (0.48) in mathematics. (p. 253)

Equally important, researchers consistently find that the effects of having a series of weak or strong teachers are cumulative. They also document that the effects of ineffective teachers linger on and that it is difficult to recover from having weak teachers, especially in consecutive years (Hattie, 2009; Smerdon et al., 2009). Thus we close with the law we introduced above. Instruction trumps programs, student grouping patterns, choice arrangements, and all other school factors (Supovitz & Turner, 2000; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). We also close with the central message of the Standards: "An examination of instruction must be at the heart of the question of leadership" (Louis, Dretzke, & Wahlstrom, 2010, p. 321).

If indeed teachers and teaching is a critical theme in the school improvement narrative, we should not be surprised that in good schools the administrators are leaders of the learning process (Hallinger, 1992, 2003; Robinson, 2008; Siu, 2008). Robinson, Lloyd, and Rowe (2008, p. 668) document this finding in their study, concluding "that a school's leadership is likely to have more positive impacts on student achievement and well-being if it is able to focus on the quality of learning, teaching, and teacher learning." We also discover from the research that instructionally focused leadership fosters loyalty and satisfaction among teachers (Blase & Kirby, 2009); an increase in professional capacity (Geijsel, Slegers, Leithwood, & Jantzi, 2003); and more collaboration among staff (Blase & Blase, 2000). The mediating variable is, of course, more effective teaching practices. What this means is that the principal touches student performance indirectly by influencing teacher's instructional strategies (Hallinger & Heck, 1996, 1998; Heck & Hallinger, 2014; Supovitz, Sirinides, & May, 2010). On one hand, they do this by modeling instructional practices or providing feedback on lessons. They also shape instruction in classrooms indirectly by molding the settings and environments in which teachers work (Hayes, Christie, Mills, & Lingard, 2004), e.g., their relationships and opportunities to work with their colleagues and by forging a positive climate in which to teach (May & Supovitz, 2011; Supovitz et al., 2010).

The essential ground to learning-centered leadership is a deep connection to the core technology. Learning becomes one of the two cardinal

dimensions in the work of leaders. Structures, operations, procedures, and practices are more consciously and adeptly constructed on and linked to learning (Barnett, McCormick, & Conners, 2001; Dinham, 2005; Stein & Coburn, 2008). A long line of empirical inquiry reveals that this centrality is defined in four spheres: commitment to, knowledge of, involvement with, and responsibility for learning and teaching (see Beck, Murphy, & Associates, 1997; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Murphy, *in press*; Murphy, Elliott, Goldring, & Porter, 2007, for reviews).

We know from the research that learning-centered leaders are more interested in the core business of schooling, what Sweeney (1982, p. 347) early on labeled “concern for instruction and achievement.” They are less likely to move away from or abandon their identities as teachers (Bryk et al., 2010). For example, Louis and team (2010), Nelson and Sassi (2005), Robinson (2007), and Southworth (2002) all found that instructional leaders have considerable understanding of curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment.

Researchers have also documented that effective principals translate this interest in, commitment to, and knowledge of learning and teaching into more “personal involvement in planning, coordinating, and evaluating teaching” (Robinson, 2007, p. 13). Overall, they are engaged in issues of teaching and learning (Walker & Slear, 2011). They are also more involved in “teachers’ advice networks” (Robinson et al., 2008) and learning communities and in building instructional capacity in schools (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Murphy, 2016). Principals make themselves available to work on these matters (Cotton, 2003; Hallinger, 1992). They are in classrooms frequently and are adept at enriching the instructional program by providing detailed feedback (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008), and they model instructional expectations (Walker & Slear, 2011). In short, researchers consistently conclude that principals spend considerable time engaged with learning and teaching and are “less distracted by the day-to-day demands of their jobs” (McDougall, Saunders, & Goldenberg, 2007). Effective principals “spend more time than their counterparts in low-performing schools in working with teachers to coordinate the school’s instructional program, solve instructional problems collaboratively, [and] help teachers secure resources” (Hallinger & Heck, 1998, p. 176).

Finally, scholars over the last thirty-five years have found that effective principals are more likely than their less effective colleagues to take responsibility for instruction (Robinson et al., 2008; Wellisch, MacQueen, Carriere, & Duck, 1978). They do not deflect blame onto others or justify failure. Indeed, as Sweeney (1982, p. 348) concluded in one of the first reviews of effective schools, “schools where teachers attributed more responsibility to the principal in a greater number of areas were significantly more likely to be successful.”

CARING SUPPORT

At the heart of the PSELs is the empirical conclusion that schools that serve children and young people well are defined by two anchoring pillars, strong academic press and caring support. Aness (2000, p. 595) refers to this as “a combination of nurture and rigor or affiliation and intellectual development” and Bryk and team (2010, p. 74) characterize it as “a press toward academic achievement . . . coupled with personal support from teachers.” In the last section, we examined the research on academic press. Here we analyze what is known about caring community, highlighting community for students. We begin with the conclusion that focusing primarily on the academic dimension of school improvement is insufficient (Bryk et al., 2010; Newmann, Rutter, & Smith, 1989; Shannon & Bylsma, 2002), especially for students placed in peril by poverty (Becker & Luthar, 2002; Murphy, 2010; Noddings, 1992; Rumberger, 2011). Academic press alone “does not attend sufficiently to the quality of social relations required for effective teaching and learning” (Goddard, Salloum, & Berebitsky, 2009, p. 293). That is, schools with strong press can still prove inadequate if they provide little attention to the social and relationship dimensions of education (Crosnoe, 2011; Felner, Seitsinger, Brand, Burns, & Bolton, 2007; Murphy & Torre, 2014; Quint, 2006).

At the same time, we know that nearly exclusive attention to culture is problematic as well, that it is a “necessary but not sufficient factor in promoting worthwhile forms of student achievement” (Newmann et al., 1989, p. 225). A number of landmark studies have revealed how over-emphasis on culture can lead to a lowering of academic expectations (Cusick, 1983; Powell, Farrar, & Cohen, 1985; Sedlak, Wheeler, Pullin, & Cusick, 1986). Too great an emphasis on providing nurture and support can constrain educators from promoting serious academic engagement (Farrell, 1990). The concern is that students may “be exposed to socially therapeutic rather than intellectually demanding values and activities, and that their schools’ efforts to build supportive and cohesive communities may actually help divert attention from academic goals” (Shouse, 1996, p. 52). Communal support for students, separate from focus on achievement, creates distinct complications for students (Newmann & Wehlage, 1994). When this occurs, “there [does] not seem to be any subject matter other than . . . cordial relations” (Cusick, 1983, p. 53), and caring separated from challenge contributes to student disengagement (Page, 1991). Research confirms that community is best conceptualized as in the service of learning (Aness, 2003; Antrop-González & De Jesús, 2006; Shouse, 1996). The evidence is also clear that press and support work best when they are viewed as an amalgam (Murphy, 2013) or conceptualized as two strands of DNA that wrap around each other (Dinham, 2005; Kruse, Seashore Louis, & Bryk, 1995; Strahan, 2003). “Rigor and care must be braided together” (Fine, cited in Antrop-González, 2006, p. 274) to work best.

According to Sweetland and Hoy (2000, p. 705), culture is a “concept used to capture the basic and enduring quality of organizational life.” It encompasses the values and norms that define a school (Dumay, 2009; Franklin & Streeter, 1995; Rossmiller, 1992). It is “those facets of organization that reflect underlying assumptions guiding decisions, behavior, and beliefs within organizations” (Scribner, Cockrell, Cockrell, & Valentine, 1999, p. 155). It can be thought of as the personality of the school (Hoy, Hannum, & Tschannen-Moran, 1998).

In the PSELs, school culture is defined in terms of community, a construct that is defined in a variety of overlapping ways (Beck & Foster, 1999). Battistich, Solomon, Kim, Watson, and Schaps (1995, p. 628) use community to capture “the psychological aspects of social settings that satisfy group members’ needs for belonging and meaning.” It consists of ingredients such as membership, support, care, integration, and influence (Baker, Terry, Bridger, & Winsor, 1997; Murphy & Torre, 2014; Osterman, 2000). Community stands in juxtaposition to institutionalism and hierarchy as an organizational frame of reference (Beck & Foster, 1999; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2001; Murphy, 1991; Scribner et al., 1999).

Communally organized schools are marked by three *core components*: (1) a set of shared and commonly understood organizational values and beliefs about institutional purpose, what students should learn, how adults and students should behave, and students’ potential as learners and citizens; (2) a common agenda of activities that defines school membership, fosters meaningful social interaction among members, and links them to school traditions; and (3) the distinctive pattern of social relations embodying an ethic of caring visible in both collegial and student-teacher relationships. (Shouse, 1996, p. 51)

Here, we illustrate the concept of community as it applies to students, what is characterized in the PSELs as communities of pastoral care. The explanatory narrative begins with this essential reality: “It is students themselves, in the end, not teachers, who decide what students will learn” (Hattie, 2009, p. 241) and students do not volunteer effort when they are detached from school (Crosnoe, 2011; Murphy & Torre, 2014; Newmann, 1981; Weis, 1990). Schooling for students is profoundly voluntary. Children have to “go to school.” The decision to “do schooling” is substantially their own. This means, of course, that they are key decision makers in the learning production. The major purpose of supportive learning community is to positively influence students’ willingness to learn what the school believes they require to be successful in life, to cause students to embrace academic challenges, and to help them reach those ends (Baker et al., 1997; Joselowsky, 2007; Newmann, 1992).

Educators in general and leaders in particular have three options at this point: ignore this reality, fight to change it, or use it as a platform for action. The first and second options have been the tools of choice for education historically. This is hardly surprising given the institutional nature of schooling and the managerial logic of school leadership (Callahan, 1962; Cuban, 1988). The problem is, however, that these choices have not been especially effective (Boyer, 1983; Crosnoe, 2011; Cuban, 1988; Eckert, 1989; Farrell, 1990; Goodlad, 1984; Newmann, 1981; Noddings, 1992; Patterson, Beltyukova, Berman, & Francis, 2007; Sizer, 1984; Weis, 1990), especially for students placed in peril by society and schooling (Alexander, Entwisle, & Horsey, 1997). Supportive learning community for students as defined in the PSELs moves the profession to option three: weaving the wisdom, needs, concerns, interests, and worries of students deeply into the “doing of schooling” without sacrificing academic press. Or more globally, it requires educators to acknowledge that achieving valued outcomes for students “involves, as a first step, recognizing that school culture is the setting in which [students] are being educated” (Crosnoe, 2011, p. 40). For example, research confirms that social concerns form the caldron of interest for students in schools (Crosnoe, 2011; Newmann, Wehlage, & Lamburn, 1992). It also shows us that to reach working-class youngsters, we need to address social connections beyond the schoolhouse (Eckert, 1989; Farrell, 1990; Stinchcombe, 1964). The charge for school leaders according to the PSELs is to work these and related realities productively in the service of helping students master essential academic goals.

On the research front, a deep line of empirical findings concludes that school communities in which many young persons find themselves, especially older students and youngsters in peril (Adams, 2010; Baker et al., 1997; Murphy, 2016; Quint, 2006), do not exert the positive influence and support necessary for them to commit to “do schooling” (Balfanz, Herzog, & MacIver, 2007; Croninger & Lee, 2001; Newmann et al., 1992). While this is not the place to examine this line of analysis in detail, we need to point out that student disengagement, often passive, sometimes active, is common in schools (Conchas, 2001; Murphy & Torre, 2014; Patterson et al., 2007; Quint, 2006). This is hardly surprising given that one of the pillars of institutions and bureaucracy is impersonality (Weber, 1978). As Aness (2003, p. 83) reminds us, because of this “schools are conventionally organized as though relationships are not only unimportant and irrelevant, but an obstacle to efficient operation” (see also Noddings, 1992).

Analysts have uncovered a good deal of knowledge about what supportive communities of pastoral care for students look like and how they function. The PSELs are anchored on that research. Supportive learning community is defined by essential norms (care, support, safety, and membership). These norms combine to produce intermediate outcomes, such as student learning dispositions and psychological states which, in turn, lead to academic engagement. All of this powers student learning (Murphy & Torre, 2014).

Communities of pastoral care emphasize two strategies, one working to overcome liabilities and the other to build up assets. To begin with then, communities of pastoral care “foster productive learning by removing developmentally hazardous conditions” (Felner et al., 2007, p. 210). They suppress factors that undermine hopes for success, such as the formation of dysfunctional and oppositional peer cultures. Personalization damps down aspects of schooling that push students away from engaging the work of “doing school” well. A supportive learning community provides a “protective power” (Garmezy, 1991, p. 427) while attacking social problems that place students in peril (Christle, Jolivette, & Nelson, 2005; Crosnoe, 2011; Murphy, 2010; Murphy & Tobin, 2011b). It helps create a “social environment that neutralizes or buffers home stresses” (Alexander & Entwisle, 1996, p. 77) and community problems and individual characteristics that foster social marginalization and academic disengagement (Demaray & Malecki, 2002a; Garmezy, 1991). Concomitantly, scholars document that caring and supportive learning environments create assets, social and human capital, to draw youngsters into the hard work that is required to be successful in school (Ancess, 2003; Dinham, Cairney, Craigie, & Wilson, 1995; Goddard, 2003; Supovitz, 2002, 2008). They transform schools into places “where the social and pastoral environment nurture[s] a desire to learn in students” (Blair, 2002, p. 184). Assets, such as care and warmth, are stockpiled to assist in helping students reach ambitious learning targets (Demaray & Malecki, 2002a, 2002b; Quint, 2006; Roth & Brooks-Gunn, 2003; Yu, Leithwood, & Jantzi, 2002).

CONCLUSION

The ongoing work to update the PSELs has been subject to a number of powerful forces and dynamics. One of the most important was the history of the creation (1996) and the initial revision (2008) of the Standards. Organizational and political sediment demanding attention had built up over 20 years. Second, the reality that the Standards had become a high impact platform was inescapable. They had and most likely would continue to cascade over professional organizations, states, and districts in highly influential ways. They had signaled that important changes in the work of academics, practitioners, policy makers, and program developers were unavoidable. Most significantly, the knowledge base on which the Standards were scaffolded, academic press and caring support, demanded an enlarged treatment of what leaders should be doing to create schools where inside an environment of care, all youngsters reach ambitious targets of academic learning.