

School Reform Commission

Criteria for next SDP Leader

MODERATOR REPORTS

Young Involved Philadelphians
February 22, 2012

Group 1

Moderators: Ted Enoch and Claire Robertson-Kraft

Moderator's description of the group:

The small group discussion this morning was a fantastic gathering of twenty and thirty something professionals from throughout the Philadelphia region. The group was majority white and female, with a few women of color (Asian American and African American) among the group. This group was intently focused on the qualities the next leader of Philadelphia schools will need to possess, and not as pulled to thinking and talking about the schools themselves as many of the groups in the series were want to do. This group also really engaged with one another, truly listening to one another and continually probing each other's ideas for better and deeper understanding. Some among the group had professional intersections with the school district, while others thought about the schools as parents or prospective parents of Philadelphia public school students. This group really explored the varied attributes described by the search committee, and in the end, really looked at ***(4) A team-builder able to coordinate and motivate a diverse group of managers and educators of different types of schools in different types of settings***, as a means and key leadership attribute that can lead the district. The quality of the conversation and analysis was excellent throughout. This gathering of current and future leaders inspired the moderator and left him with a profound sense of optimism.

Hopes and Fears for next leader of the SDP:

- (Hope) That the next leader will stay long enough to make a true difference and not be a flash in the pan.
- (Hope) That his/her leadership is supported in a sustainable way, both from within and without, and that their leadership and work is supported beyond their tenure...
- (Hope/Fear) That s/he isn't trying a series of the latest gimmicks/fads. Stick to the basics and make education happen...
- (Hope) That education is improved in the city in a way that creates equality in learning for in Philadelphia...

- (Hope) That the next leader is able to build numerous partnerships with other educators and providers...
- (Fear) That s/he treats the district like a big business...
- (Hope) That s/he is a true consensus builder that values education... And that s/he recognizes and addresses that success in education is so often linked to income disparities within the home and community.
- (Fear) That we end up with another “politician” who does not value education.
- (Hope) That we select someone with a strong business mindset who also values education...
- (Fear) That the push for quality will in the end just become a push for charters (which in this participant’s view is an unsustainable macro model)... Both are needed for a healthy, sustainable, balanced system...

Parts of the Framework about which participants are concerned, and why:

Combination of (3) A clear understanding of the way management decisions affect teaching, training, and leadership development among school principals and (4) A team-builder able to coordinate and motivate a diverse group of managers and educators of different types of schools in different types of settings:

- That the next leader will truly be a teacher/education advocate. Someone with a real grasp and understanding of teaching and its demands.
- One who supports the role of teachers and “knows what is going on in the classroom...”
- One who understands the diversity in our classrooms that our teachers are managing...
- Someone who can think “Big Picture”, a visionary AND/BUT one who understands what teachers need in the classroom.
- ***(This came later, after many of the different types of leadership had been identified as necessary after the group had been thinking and discussing together for over an hour, really looking at the Team-Builder approach as a solution):*** This leader must build a strong team around them. Someone who builds a team that is complimentary with their strengths/weaknesses...
- Yes, but so long as this person is an excellent communicator, capable of providing a compelling vision within the school system and without to the greater community, allowing the team to respond to a clear direction.
- A leader who understands that a key to management success is putting the right people/experts in the right position.
- Someone who is familiar with our education system (can acquire this from within or without) and gets the implications of decisions on the system.
- A “cabinet approach” – think the TV show “The West Wing” with passionate experts down the hall from the chief executive who are deeply immersed in the realities of the policies and issues, interacting with the great communicator who is moving the public and system in accord...

- We must recognize that there is a real urgency to get this right and that there is a learning curve that is a big factor that we have to consider...
- No one person can do this alone...
- We need someone who puts the right people in the right places...
- Not someone who micromanages classrooms. Allow for creativity and versatility...

#7 – Ability to rethink the district's service model, moving closer to autonomy for individual schools and decreased centralization

- Someone who can really foster leadership within the district, through multiple levels of staffing...

#2 - Knowledge and capacity to run a large enterprise or organization:

- Yes, we want someone who has a proven capacity to run a billion dollar enterprise.
- A visionary leader, one who sees the big picture.
- One with a real ability to influence.
- One who had political and business savvy...
- Someone who can work with our current (resource deprived and challenged) environment... Someone who can achieve efficiencies with internal resources and handle the size of the current budget and set priorities accordingly...
- Someone who understands/has experience with unions and negotiations. (This is the point when the group began to extol the virtues of being a team-builder, recognizing that a key team member could have this experience while being managed/steered by the chief executive...)

#7 - Ability to rethink the district's service model, moving closer to autonomy for individual schools and decreased centralization:

- This came up as one of the qualities a team-builder will possess...

#6 - A relationship builder who is able to build creative partnerships with numerous external stakeholders to bring resources to individual schools and groups of schools:

- Someone who has a focus on preparing all students for college/and/or next phase in life
- Prepared to compete
- Someone who values this and builds partnerships with higher education, creates college readiness programs and partnerships, one who builds partnerships with the business community, where numerous internship programs take place...

Parts of the Framework about which participants are concerned, and why:

#8 - Ability to influence the public, business community, higher education community, and legislative leaders on the value of public education and the commitments necessary to achieve notable progress:

- This is vague, broad and confusing. Why is it written in such a passive way? Where is

What difference it would make if the successful candidate is/is not from

Philadelphia, and why:

- Again, this group saw “team-builder” as the quality approach that can address this need. The group was more concerned with long-term commitment, sustainability and results...

Other important ideas:

- ***Where are outcomes described and prioritized?***
- We need someone who is focused on and driving outcomes, one who has a real track record with this. (This is missing in today’s system.)
- Someone who is a strong communicator, again, creating a vision and movement towards clear outcomes... (This is also lacking in today’s system) This attribute is key to achieving ***(8) Ability to influence the public, business community, higher education community, and legislative leaders on the value of public education and the commitments necessary to achieve notable progress***

Group 2

Moderators: Harmony Elsley, and Loretta Raider

Moderator's description of the group:

We had a group of 8 people the ages ranged from late twenties to mid thirties. There were 4 women and 4 men, 7 white and 1 African American. The group included YIP leaders, former and current educators, a lawyer, a tech consultant, an educational consultant, an educational products representative and a public servant. Two members are also parents. The members of the group were engaged and readily shared their input and ideas. They listened actively to their peers and built on one another's ideas. The conversation was thoughtful and deep. It was apparent the participants were interested, and concerned citizens and appreciated being actively involved in civic engagement.

Hopes and Fears for next leader of the SDP:

Hopes:

- Taking the high road, seeing the political drivers with students in mind
- Build on community engagement
- Collaborator who will get into the community
- Principally moral
- Helps with the implementation of new tools while providing inspiration and lifting morale
- Someone who can change the perception of the district, who can highlight the good things that are happening
- Embraces innovative programs, leadership and the schools (2)
- Someone who can foster leadership and attract leaders throughout the system

Fears:

- No one person will change the district
- Will want to change everything (2)
- What is behind #7, is it to fill a specific policy issue?
- That the person will be an outsider and not understand Philly
- Need structures to change with the innovation changes
- That the commitment of individuals to a process of involving and engaging stakeholders in civic engagement will not continue

Parts of the Framework that Make sense to participants, and why:

#7 – Ability to rethink the district's service model, moving closer to autonomy for individual schools and decreased centralization

- The group was in agreement on the importance of this criterion as it represents the strategy and the direction of the district. There was discussion regarding the actions that would need to follow for autonomy to be successful.
- Comments included: many principals need direction and professional development; we need clear definitions of autonomy and metrics for accountability; we need to provide the support for leaders to be successful; assessment of the schools and leaders needs to be done first followed by training; consideration must be given to the facts that schools achieve goals through different paths and tools, leadership styles and parent styles differ; allow principals to hire teachers.

#4 – A team-builder able to coordinate and motivate a diverse group of managers and educators of different types of schools in different types of settings

- Team builder was considered a very important competency. The group agreed that “motivate” needs to be defined and that clear metrics should be developed.

#9 – Is committed to actively engaging with students, parents and community stakeholders

- Liked “actively engaging”

Parts of the Framework about which participants are concerned, and why:

#7 – Ability to rethink the district's service model, moving closer to autonomy for individual schools and decreased centralization

- How is success defined, what are the metrics?
-

#1 – A commitment to education and an overall passion to ensure learning for all children

- Several members agreed that this is a throwaway point. The question was raised what does “learning mean”? We need a qualitative approach.

#4 – A team-builder able to coordinate and motivate a diverse group of managers and educators of different types of schools in different types of settings

- There must be a metric related to “motivation”

#9 – Is committed to actively engaging with students, parents and community stakeholders

- Needs to be fleshed out, it was suggested to add “willing to learn” from stakeholders (being a learner as a role model for all)

What difference it would make if the successful candidate is/is not from Philadelphia, and why:

- has to have one hook either be from Philly and understand the city or from another large city experience
- must understand the system and history of the city
- must be humble, respectful and respected and willing to learn and relearn
- must be able to define and track success

- must be from educational background or deeply understand team oriented schools

Other important ideas:

- Leader must be a visionary! The candidate must have a vision for success
- Consider another criterion focusing on qualities of visionary, humility, role model, ability to inspire others, demonstrates respect and is well respected by all stakeholders, and learner
- Consider another criterion highlighting competencies of defining success, measurement and supporting specific needs for improvement
- Too much for one person, can a model be considered of several people/a team?
- We need a CEO, a superintendent who is figurehead and visionary. We also need a COO, a managing director and implementer.
- How candidates are interviewed around the criteria is critical. Behavioral questions need to be developed around each criterion

Group 3

Moderators: Gwynne Smith Scheffer and Marty Molloy

Moderator's description of the group:

- Our group consisted of nine members – three female (one African American), six male (all white)
- Professions/organizations represented include Philadelphia School District Partnership, Charter School Teacher, Attorney, Graduate Student working for Center City District, City of Philadelphia, College Admissions Office, former High School Teacher, education partnership builder
- There was lots of great dialogue and flow in the conversation with participants building off of each other's comments.

Hopes and Fears for next leader of the SDP:

Hopes:

- Inspires confidence across stakeholders/community
- Address disparity between GPA and SAT...strong GPA but weak SARs. Students need stronger mastery of content
- Strong neighborhood school
- Increase good achievement rates through best practices
- Leader can work at the macro level but still know the classroom
- Can build common vision
- Will work with higher education
- Stronger leader to tackle change and take on/build coalitions

Fears:

- No progress – we're doing this again in two years
- Leader cannot connect to Philadelphia
- Leader has inability to manage finances and basic operational needs
- Impatience with implementation
- Fear is that one person can't fit all nine criteria
- Won't take risks and be politically paralyzed
- Philadelphia population unwillingness to change and listen

Parts of the Framework that Make sense to participants, and why:

#8 – Ability to influence the public, business community, higher education community, and legislative leaders on the value of public education and the commitments necessary to achieve notable progress

- Influence the public, business community, higher ed, legislative leaders on value and commitments

- Influence all external stakeholders links the other criteria
 - Impacts resources so it can help lift district out of “crisis mode”
 - Create higher education pipeline
- Partners must be willing to be flexible and work together – give and take in partnerships
- Community accountability is needed but also on the district level
- Return on investment – not down a black hole
- District leader accepting that they don’t have all the ideas
 - Humility of leadership
 - Increased autonomy and participation within and outside
- Leader builds excitement for public education/value of education as a community – there is an image issue
 - Must show notable progress
 - Schools must be willing to take ownership
 - Empower the community to share ownership
 - Share ownership with community
 - Make the case to invest in public education for Philadelphia
- Investing – no transparency of finances – where does all the money go? Community needs to know
 - Do I have the power to bring resources to my local school – this links to #7 autonomy

#4 – A team-builder able to coordinate and motivate a diverse group of managers and educators of different types of schools in different types of settings

- Team builder able to coordinate and motivate a diverse group of managers and educators of different types of schools and in different types of settings
 - Is important – it s the balance to #8 (outer ring to inner ring) on how to collaborate
 - As a district, get its house in order first
 - Must be prepared to work with external stakeholders
 - Communication and SDP employees are the army to execute on progress-success
 - Need the full spectrum at the same time...external and internal
 - Involvement of both internal/external to build buy-in of community and internal people
 - Manage expectations and inspiration
 - Reframe the issues from one of failure to one of success
 - Bringing people together with the diversity of providers reducing the tension of us v. them
 - Diversity – no one can all nine so need someone who can really build complementary schools
 - We’re recruiting a team, not a person
- *#5 –Embraces the idea of a portfolio of schools and advocates for high-quality schools regardless of the provider (district or charter)*

- Embraces the idea of a portfolio of schools and advocates for higher quality
 - Take issue with “district or charter” – it is more broad including magnet, specials
 - 440 is there to support all the different pieces
 - If there is a great school there is inequity of education opportunity to attend that school
 - Must understand the history of how we got to this portfolio differentiation
 - Understanding Philadelphia culture and a city of unique neighborhood assets
 - Very difficult to change the magnet model (CEPS)
 - Need trust building to reconcile awards and lack of “real” success
 - Must understand the inability of neighborhood schools feeling resentful of “other” district schools
 - Fundamental tension between schools that feel left behind
 - There is a tension between portfolio and neighborhood model
 - Do we need comprehensive high schools...they’re not working
 - Get buy in of specialization
 - Build a spectrum of choices for parents because the portfolio is broader than district and charter
 - Choice is an illusion
 - Parents/students have a gap...inequity at the start
 - Community feels impotent and disconnected to charters
 - There is a fundamental dislocation issue with charters
 - Parents and students can’t just concentrate on their neighborhood school
 - Linked to understanding Philadelphia neighborhood structure
 - Students lacking ability to access opportunity outside of their neighborhood
 - Leaders has to understand this is a bigger issue than education, it’s a citywide, multifaceted issue
 - Must know politics (connected to #8)

1 – A commitment to education and an overall passion to ensure learning for all children

- Commitment to education
- Leader must be excited to motivate students, teachers, principals
 - Not a business – not SEPTA/ARAMARK
 - It’s about the kids – warm and fuzzy
 - People are usually one or the other – business v. warm/fuzzy
 - Need someone who has the business skills but demonstrates the commitment to education
 - Appearance

- Willingness to get fired
- Has principals and values
- Is it reality to have someone political/education focus/business savvy?

Tension between #1, #2 and #8

#1 – A commitment to education and an overall passion to ensure learning for all children

#2 – Knowledge and Capacity to run a large enterprise or organization

#8 – Ability to influence the public, business community, higher education community, and legislative leaders on the value of public education and the commitments necessary to achieve notable progress

- Knudsen is a #2 – no support
- Cathy Black is strong manager but ran out of town
- Vallas was a strong business man #2, but clearly cared about children
- It is a balance
- Education is the product
 - Don't need a teacher
 - Everything else supports education
 - Needs to do that
 - Teaching is not a proxy to demonstrate commitment to education
- Don't care if superintendent was a teacher
 - Unless they taught in Philly, they have no idea how bad it is

Parts of the Framework about which participants are concerned, and why:

#8 – Ability to influence the public, business community, higher education community, and legislative leaders on the value of public education and the commitments necessary to achieve notable progress

- Influence the public, business community, higher ed, legislative leaders on value and commitments
 - People don't know how to connect to their school

What difference it would make if the successful candidate is/is not from Philadelphia, and why:

- Person must be willing to say system has failed – not functioning okay
- Complex city with complex system takes time to learn – understand some connection
- Dream – from here, moved away and are coming back with experience
 - knows the history and has a stake
 - not as much of a learning curve

Other important ideas:

Seth Williams decentralized criminal justice system in Philadelphia...it can be done

Group 4

Moderators: Josh Warner, Ian Charlton

Moderator's description of the group:

Group 4 comprised eight individuals, two male and six female. Three were African American and five were Caucasian. The group included lawyers, non-profit advocates, and legislative aides, and all members were passionate about education. Some were from Philly, while others were new to the city. The diverse backgrounds in the group, along with the civic-mindedness of YIPsters in general, led to a very rich discussion that yielded some quality input for the SRC Search Committee.

Hopes and Fears for next leader of the SDP:

Hopes:

- That we can find a person that has all nine of these criteria
- Find an excellent collaborator – a person that is a relationship builder, not an alliance builder
- Someone with experience “fixing a broken ship”
- Leader will have a strong focus on elementary schools
- Leader will come in with an open ear, and with understanding of the diverse landscape (for instance, charter vs. public)
- Leader is excellent at delegating and comes in with a clear plan

Fears:

- That the leader will be expected to produce immediate, major results
- Leader will experience resistance from the get-go
- That we will only be looking for the “anti-Ackerman”
- Leader will have too much to do – the problem is too big and the list of selection criteria is too long
- Leader will have insufficient facility with finances
- Leader will not be acclimated to the Philly school culture, and will have to come in defensively.

Parts of the Framework that Make sense to participants, and why:

#8 – Ability to influence the public, business community, higher education community, and legislative leaders on the value of public education and the commitments necessary to achieve notable progress

- Ability to advocate for the district is critical
- Need to have a plan that would merit additional resources, and the leader will need to “sell the plan” and network
- Must have the ability to communicate with multiple constituencies, and bring different knowledge bases together

- Leader must “open the door” and make the district more receptive
- Should influence the union leadership – both teachers and service workers
- Must have the ability to engage teachers and those “on the front line” of schools and children

#4 – A team-builder able to coordinate and motivate a diverse group of managers and educators of different types of schools in different types of settings

- Must have a keen understanding of what is happening “on the ground,” and the impact that upper-level decisions have, and how they “trickle down” to teachers and classrooms
- Establish a special task force of teachers for direct communication
- Leader must be able to delegate and collaborate (link with criterion #7)

#7 – Ability to rethink the district's service model, moving closer to autonomy for individual schools and decreased centralization

- If the leader is brought on to simply execute the SRC’s vision and mission, then that leader needs to fully believe in and execute that plan (link to #5 as well)

#5 – Embraces the idea of a portfolio of schools and advocates for high-quality schools regardless of the provider (district or charter)

- Leader must be an expert in accountability
- Leader should make full use of partnerships for promoting and ensuring accountability, as there are multiple entities (charters, different programs, etc.) responsible for educating students
- Team building and relationship building are key to this criterion – there is overlap with #4 and #6 – *A relationship builder who is able to build creative partnership with numerous external stakeholders to bring resources to individual schools and groups of schools*

#2 – Knowledge and Capacity to run a large enterprise or organization

- Question: What constitutes evidence of the leader possessing these qualities? How do we prove a “proven track record?”

Parts of the Framework about which participants are concerned, and why:

#2 – Knowledge and Capacity to run a large enterprise or organization

- Knowledge and experience with budgeting for large systems, and “spending for results” should clearly be stated in this criterion
 - Similarly, experience with turning around a large organization should be mentioned
 - Past experience managing an organization in crisis, such that a sense of credibility is brought back to it
- *#7 – Ability to rethink the district's service model, moving closer to autonomy for individual schools and decreased centralization*

- Leader must understand how to build capacity at the local level if decentralization is a reality or is the course
- Be more specific about what “decreased centralization” means. Some operations will become more expensive if they are decentralized
- Decentralizing education decisions is vastly different than decentralizing district-wide programs or services

#9 – Is committed to actively engaging with students, parents and community stakeholders

- Leader must be willing to converse with parents about their responsibilities in the education of their own children. Engaging on the micro-level
- District’s “Parent University” program – bring back

GENERAL CONCERNS WITH THE CRITERIA

- There is tension with the number of criteria and some apparent overlap. There were some suggestions to consolidate the list, but others still that pointed out that the criteria should be kept distinct, as some common skills need to be applied in different ways
- What constitutes legitimacy in the selection and the selection process?
- Superintendents typically have a 3-5 year lifespan. None of the criteria mention longevity.
- No mention of past experience working in a large, urban area. This is important for the “proven track record”
- Leader should focus on instilling these qualities throughout the entire district, such that they don’t just come and go with the arrival/departure of the leader, but rather they are left behind within the district’s culture and workings. Their legacy should be to inculcate these criteria/qualities.
- No mention of the ability to recruit and attract talent – the human capital that will bring about improvements. Talent that will stay in the district. This is missing from the criteria
- Does the order of the criteria reflect the SRC’s order of priorities? If not, how are these criteria prioritized?
- What evidence does the selection committee review?
- Criteria are too specific to be brought about by one person, realistically. They seem more applicable to the executive team the leader will build. Leader should attract talent in these areas, and delegate responsibility while providing good oversight
- Need a leader that is a driven, enthusiastic public servant. Someone who is not overly concerned with compensation. Someone who has “a calling” to improve students and schools.
- How do we judge or allocate what the superintendent will spend their time on?
- Leader must have experience working in this unique demographic (post-industrial, large city, high drop-out rate, etc.)
- The high drop-out rate **MUST** be addressed. Is it a matter of student, teacher, and district morale? Is it a matter of resources?
- No specific mention of partnerships with the many local universities

- Vocational training is an important component of student success. Bring it back.
- “Superstar” leaders often get run out of town
- Can one person do all of this? The criteria are asking for both a visionary type leader and a micro-manager type leader. Attracting talented support staff and then micro-managing them is a recipe for disaster.
- There is tension in the governance model. Is the superintendent the executor of the SRC’s vision and will, or is the SRC the policy support board for the new leader’s plans?

What difference it would make if the successful candidate is/is not from Philadelphia, and why:

YES/NEED TO BE FROM PHILADELPHIA:

- Leader would know the stakeholders
- Leader could start faster
- Trust and credibility would be inherent to involved parties
- Leader would have established ties
- Wouldn’t have to “make a statement” to establish oneself
- If the leader is from Philly, they should have gained experience elsewhere as well
- More of a chance that the leader is invested and already a stakeholder in the wellbeing of the system
- Would get initiatives that are Philly-centric and longer lasting

NO/IT DOESN’T MATTER:

- “Not tainted” from the Philly culture and political environment
- Fresh eyes, fresh start
- Chance that the leader is using this job as a “stop gap” on their way to something bigger/better

Other important ideas:

- Who really is the best person to lead the district? The one with the best ideas or the one with the most connections?
 - It’s the person that is best at moving the district forward
- Please, be likeable!!

Group 5

Moderators: Bryan McHale and Maggie Flanagan

Moderator's description of the group:

12 people including several lawyers and activists. Very concise discussion which built upon itself easily.

Hopes and Fears for next leader of the SDP:

Hopes:

- We get a creative leader who can think outside of the box.
- Someone who can run the District efficiently and recognize which programs work, which don't and why.
 - Learn from the past.
- A leader who is a consensus builder.
- Hope not to be having this same conversation in two years.

Fears:

- A leader who comes in and immediately alienates people.
- The privatization of the School District.
- The next leader will simply get swept up in the institutional momentum of previous failed ideas.
- Do not leave out the students in public schools while talking about charters.

Parts of the Framework that Make sense to participants, and why:

#2 – Knowledge and capacity to run a large enterprise or organization.

- Whoever comes in as the next leader of the District needs to be able to effectively and efficiently execute.

#4 – A team-builder able to coordinate and motivate a diverse group of managers and educators of different types of schools in different settings.

- A team-builder who not just coordinates but unites different stakeholders.
 - Needs to be inspirational and unifying.
 - Accept and implement ideas from the ground up, don't impose them from the top down.

#9 – Is committed to actively engaging with students, parents, and community stakeholders.

- Need to reach out to the community and people outside of the District.
- Include external leaders.
- College/University leaders.
- School District fundamentally impacts the neighborhoods and we need to be able to interact with and address the needs of the community.
- Target people outside of the District for assistance.

#8 – Ability to influence the public, business community, higher education community, and legislative leaders on the value of public education and the commitments necessary to achieve notable progress.

- Civic leaders and government need to play a bigger role.

Parts of the Framework which cause concerns (by criteria #)

#7 – Ability to rethink the district's service model, moving closer to autonomy for individual schools and decreased centralization.

- Worried about how how autonomy and decentralization are not defined.
 - How is accountability addressed?
 - No checks and balances.
 - Strong accountability needs to be in place. Can't be scared to replace leaders in schools.
- How are decentralization and budget cuts working together?
 - Seems likely to be less expensive to invest more resources and support into schools with problems rather than just closing them and handing them off to charters.
- We don't need a new structure. We need the current structure to be open to change.
- Learn from past experiences.
- Nobody follows through in experimenting with new ideas and implementing them when successful.
- There is a lack of professional development to maintain standards District-wide.
- Take different steps to get to autonomy and changing directions in the District.
- What does this mean for students with special needs who aren't in charters?
 - Charters and public schools need to work together to expand programs for students with needs.
- What happens to children who are expelled from charters?

#6 - A relationship builder who is able to build creative partnerships with numerous external stakeholders to bring resources to individual schools and groups of schools.

- This criteria needs to be defined more.
 - What accountabilities?
 - What kind of partnerships?
- District does need outside help for under-resourced schools.
- Need a superintendent who is a strong-relationship builder able to find new money for the schools.

#9 – Is committed to actively engaging with students, parents and community stakeholders.

- Next superintendent should come in with a vision but be able to align that vision with the realities of what is already happening on the ground.
- Need a commitment to communities and neighborhoods.

#2 – Knowledge and capacity to run a large enterprise or organization.

- If “enterprise” is a part of this criteria it should be focused to “public enterprise,” not private corporations.
 - Should come from a large education institution or a public agency.
- Needs to come from an education background.

#1 – A commitment to education and an overall passion to ensure learning for all.

- This criteria should not just be a commitment to education, it should be the ambition to be the best education model in the country.
- People currently send their children to public schools because they can't afford to send them to private school or charters.
- Quality needs to be returned to the public system overall.

What difference it would make if the successful candidate is/is not from Philadelphia, and why:

- It does not matter.
 - There is a fear in limiting the search just to Philadelphia.
 - Wouldn't we know about someone from Philadelphia? Why haven't we found them already?
 - We need someone who understands Philadelphia.
 - Demonstrated willingness to learn about the community.
 - Learn about past problems and failures so as not to repeat them.
 - Know the system, but don't be too comfortable in it.
 - Will someone from another city actually do their homework about Philadelphia?
 - Need someone who won't come in and drive their own agenda.

