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Summary of Research – Why Distributed Leadership

Then
- Effect of leadership on school improvement
- Lone instructional leader
- Talents of teachers untapped
- Unsustainable
- Demands of change
- Need more leadership capacity
- CPRE saw patterns of distributed leadership in reforming initiatives

Now
- High achievement schools attribute success to distributed leadership
- Leadership has more influence when distributed
- Greater teacher participation
- More effective retention and succession
- Important organizational and change outcomes
- Distributed leadership positively impacts student achievement
- More sustainable means of building a learning focused climate

Why Distributed Leadership: Now

Our analysis provides an empirical test of the notion that leadership variables are positively related to student learning. It also suggests that both shared and instructionally focused leadership are complementary approaches for improving schools.

What is Distributed Leadership? Successful vs. Effective Leaders

- **ATTEMPTED LEADERSHIP** is any effort the administrator makes to influence superiors, associates, or subordinates.

- **SUCCESSFUL LEADERSHIP** is the ability to get others to behave as the administrator intended. The job gets done and the administrator’s needs are satisfied, but those of the other people are ignored.

- **EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP** is the situation where people perform in accordance with the administrator’s intention and find this a path to the satisfaction of their needs.

*Bernard Bass*
What is Distributed Leadership?
Successful vs. Effective Leaders

Definition of Distributed Leadership

“[Leadership refers to] those activities that are either understood by, or designed by, organizational members to influence the motivation, knowledge, affect, and practice of other organizational members in the service of the organization's core work.”

Spillane (2006)
Distributed Leadership Module
Definition of Distributed Leadership

The Leadership Practice Aspect

Leaders
Administrators, Specialists, Teachers

Leadership Practice
is in the interaction

Situations
Tools, Routines, Structures

Followers
Teachers, Administrators, Specialists

Operationalizing a Distributed Perspective
Any attempt to operationalize a distributed perspective on leadership must accomplish three things.

**First**, it should create opportunities for teachers and others in the school to engage in leadership work...and relies in no small part on those in formal leadership positions creating structures, supports and opportunities for such leadership to emerge (Harris, 2008). Leithwood et al. (2006) found that such "planful alignment" of distributed leadership was associated with positive organizational change.

**Second**, it must focus specifically on influence strategies. Individuals who are involved in such reforms should understand that part of their job is to cultivate influence—both their own and that of others—and that they in turn are likely to be influenced in the process.

**Third**, it should focus on improving teaching and learning. While this might seem obvious, it is also complicated.
The Distributed Leadership (DL) Project was originally funded by a $5 million grant from the Annenberg Foundation to the Penn Center for Educational Leadership (PCEL) in 2005.

Developed to operationalize a distributed perspective on leadership within a robust intervention in 16 Philadelphia schools.

Designed to create more leadership capacity in support of school improvement.

One of the first efforts in the nation to deliberately take on the challenge of designing, operationalizing, and implementing DL to build distributed leadership capacity to improve the quality of instruction.
Distributed Leadership Replication

After the DL Program’s record of success in the 16 Philadelphia schools, confirmed by a mixed-method cluster randomized control trial, the program was requested for a $3.2 million, 4-year replication in 19 Archdiocese of Philadelphia schools in 2010.

The context for both projects was the City of Philadelphia, which was identified by the United States Census Bureau as having the largest deep poverty population of the 10 largest U.S. cities. Nearly 200,000 people in Philadelphia live in deep poverty, defined as income that is under half the federal poverty level – less than $8,000 for a family of 2 and less than $10,000 for a family of 3 (Philadelphia Inquirer, March 20, 2013).

Distributed Leadership to Scale

The success of the Archdiocese project (in some ways even more successful than the first) led the system leaders to a recent request that we develop a plan for replication across the entire system (140 additional elementary schools and 13 additional high schools). This confirmed one of our beliefs that distributed leadership could be operationalized successfully in randomly-selected, urban schools, including high schools.
Philadelphia Distributed Leadership Initiative: Logic Model
Revised 8/31/09

Contextual Factors

Community Characteristics

District Characteristics

School Characteristics

Family Characteristics

Student Characteristics

Distributed School Leadership Program

Teacher Leadership in Instructional Improvement
Organizational Leadership: Mission, Vision, Goals, Culture
Improved Instructional Leadership
Professional Learning Communities
Data Analysis/Use
Collaborative Learning and Planning
Teacher-teacher and Teacher-principal leadership teams
Guiding Professional Development in Buildings

DL Team Outcomes
Development of DL teams and team routines
Teacher leaders foster professional inquiry
Instructional strategies shared

School Culture and Instructional Improvement
Targeting/ assessing individual students' progress
Improved planning and selection of curriculum and materials
Improved instructional leadership strategies across subjects
Instructional leadership strategies to assist low performing students
Improved classroom conditions/ management

School Leadership Capacity
Established norms of trust & collegiality among adults in the school
Improved instructional coaching of peers in school
Strengthened professional learning communities
Improved instructional leadership capacity
Evidence-based leadership on curricular/ instructional targets

Student Engagement
Attendance
Attention in class
Homework completion

Student Outcomes
Improved student achievement:
• Grades
• Test scores
• Discipline
• Grade promotion
• School persistence and promotion to high school

Philadelphia Distributed Leadership Initiative: School-level Theory of Change
Revised 8/31/09

(1) Teams are carefully selected (recruitment), trained (professional development), and supported (coaching)
(2) Teams develop a strong, collaborative practice focused on instructional improvement
(2a) Norms of trust, innovation and collaboration develop among team members
(3) Team members are empowered and have the skills to work collaboratively with other teachers outside of the team
(4) Team members effectively engage school sub-groups (e.g., grade groups, Professional/Small Learning Communities)
(4a) Serve as catalysts for broader change in school
(5) Team members share/broker expertise in specific instructional practices
(5a) Team members foster professional inquiry in to practice and support instructional improvement
(6) Collaboration around instructional improvement expands and improves school-wide
(6a) Norms of trust, innovation and collaboration develop school-wide
(7) Instruction improves school-wide
(8) Student learning improves school-wide
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Project Design, Structure, and Logic

- The overarching goal of the DL Projects was to build instructional leadership capacity in schools for the purpose of improving student learning.
- To accomplish this, the DL Project first creates leadership teams that are instructionally focused, collaborative, and strategic.

Note: Distributed leadership views leadership as an emergent property of schools; building instructional leadership capacity is therefore a school-wide endeavor.
Toward Effective Implementation

Since distributed leadership was relatively new in its implementation in schools, a specific research-based training and development plan did not exist that addressed our needs in the original project. Consistent with the project’s Program Logic and Theory of Change (DeFlaminis, 2009 and 2011), effective implementation of the project requires that DL teams:

(a) have strong conceptual grounding in Spillane’s (2006) theory of distributed leadership (he teaches the first 2-day module)
(b) develop highly collaborative team functioning;
(c) understand how to facilitate change and influence others;
(d) be comfortable and develop skills in using data to both plan and monitor their work, and;
(e) focus relentlessly on instructional issues and work to positively influence the instructional practices of faculty members while engaging them in leadership work.

Toward Effective Implementation

Effective implementation of the Distributed Leadership project requires that teams have a strong conceptual grounding in distributed leadership. The program incorporates the belief that administrators and teachers must be empowered with specific skills and capacities to lead effectively. In order to prepare teams to carry out the leadership work in the schools, the Distributed Leadership project provides each team member and leadership coach with 77 hours of leadership development using the training modules developed originally for the Annenberg project in collaboration with James Spillane.
Project Design, Structure, and Logic

In addition to direct professional development, teams and team members receive approximately 10 hours per week (less after year 1) of on-site coaching to support their work. Hackman (2009) indicates that leadership coaching is a critical strategy for creating and sustaining effective teams. Distributed leadership coaches are trained with the teams and attend DL team meetings and work individually with team members as needed.

Project Design, Structure, and Logic

School participation in the DL Project is determined by:

- Application
- A 2/3 vote of the building
- A lottery (i.e., random assignment), in accordance with the research design (a randomized control design).

Once a school has been selected, teachers within the school must apply and be interviewed for the distributed leadership team. Applications are selected by the principals in consultation with the project director and assistant director.
Project Design, Structure, and Logic

- Teachers and principals are compensated at a rate of $3,000 for year one and $2,200 for each following year.
- Teams are expected to attend 1 week of summer training, 2 Saturday training sessions and devote 2-4 hours per week to project activities.
- Most teams provide far more than expected.

As the teams progress through professional development, each team member is expected to create an action plan that clearly states his/her goals, strategies for reaching them, and how progress will be measured. The action plans ensure a focus on instructional improvement while allowing each school to chart its own course. To support this process, the Project provides each school with 20-40 additional hours of professional development to be used at their discretion.
Other Requisites for Success

- A DL focus on instructional improvement requires that the district have a well-developed educational plan - including robust curricula, an instructional plan, and authentic literacy and formative assessments - to have the greatest achievement effects.

- Effective implementation requires a high level of implementation fidelity. Our evaluators (Supovitz and Weinbaum, 2008) and others have explained that program complexity, intensity, structure, content, procedures, and training are each factors that have been found to influence the level of implementation fidelity observed.

Project Findings
Project Findings

- The first DL Project has been evaluated by a research team led by Rebecca Maynard of the Graduate School of Education at the University of Pennsylvania and Jonathan Supovitz of the Consortium for Policy Research in Education.
- The research team utilized a mixed method cluster randomized design:
  - Held a lottery each year to randomly select a total of 16 schools to join multiple cohorts of the Project (four schools in 2006-07, four additional schools in 2007-08; eight schools in 2008-09).
  - Schools which applied for the project but were not selected in the lottery served as control schools (n=27).

Cole (2008)

Overall Project Findings

- The DL Project successfully identified and developed leadership teams that were significantly higher functioning than were leadership teams in comparison schools.
- Principals and team leaders forged new working relationships that productively expanded the leadership capacity in the participating schools.
- Teachers developed leadership capacity and took on leadership roles on their teams and with their colleagues.
- Team members worked strategically to change instruction through a variety of approaches and targeting a variety of areas that they determined to be their school’s greatest needs.

Overall Project Findings

- Case studies showed several examples of leadership team members exerting influence with other teachers and positively influencing instruction.
- There was substantial evidence of positive impacts on the instructional practices of teachers who were the targets of team member action plans.
- There were no detectable widespread gains in measured student outcomes. This is likely due to the diverse nature of the leadership team efforts, which were deliberately based on their assessments of school need, and therefore not primarily focused on tested subjects.


Project Findings

The evaluation of the Archdiocese Project was not a randomized trial due to financial constraints. Several areas are highlighted in the following slides to provide some perspective on that successful project.
DL Built Confidence and Efficacy

In the Archdiocese, we found the same confidence and a greater sense of efficacy in their perceptions of self as leaders as a result of participating in the DL project.

One principal wrote in his monthly report:

*It has been a fairly full and somewhat hectic month. Once again the DL team has been able to maintain focus and move our academic initiatives forward. Our team continues to thrive; it is truly the perfect mix of talent and dedication. So the great experiment is working well beyond my original expectations. Picking the right people and not people of necessarily like thought in the past, even former frequent adversaries. We have grown individually and as a dynamic team and our school has reaped the rewards. You can quote me on this fact.*

(Principal’s Report, December 2012)

DL Encouraged Energetic Leadership

We found that teachers provided the best professional development to their peers, not necessarily because the content differed, but because their peers found the professional dialogue more engaging and “more meaningful than top-down, mandated offerings that were not often meaningful but were required” (DeFlaminis, 2011, p. 27). One factor that could not be taught was teacher willingness. Across schools, the most effective implementations were found in schools where the teacher leadership base was energetic, willing, and intrinsically motivated.
Trust and Shared Decision-making

One of our doctoral students (Abdul-Jabbar, 2013) studied trust as a critical issue in our schools. He found that professional regard (respect) was stimulated most when teachers and administrators were promoted as equals. Both teachers and administrators were identified as integral and highly valued in the change process. Having teachers take the helm in leading action plans, heading faculty meetings and professional development trainings, and conducting surveys and other data collection and analysis projects in their schools produced a noticeable shift towards active teacher participation, teacher involvement and engagement that did not go unacknowledged.

Trust and Shared Decision-making

Also, DL group norms of shared decision-making and decisions by consensus were essential. These norms were found across the majority of campuses and helped to mitigate power imbalances and support teacher empowerment.

Abdul-Jabbar (2013) concluded that “trust was a critical component in advancing and speeding up a leadership team’s progress in a school improvement project.”
Another doctoral student (Yoak, 2013) found that the program stimulated changes in leaders’ thinking about leadership. The content and experience of the program was found to challenge past ways of thinking and doing, which surfaced beliefs many participants never even knew they had. In promoting practitioner reflection and a burgeoning awareness of the who, what, and how of leadership, the DL Program revealed that learners of leadership progressed through fairly distinct phases of development. See below:

a. Unexamined assumptions about leadership  
   b. Surfacing mental models for leadership  
   c. Thinking around leadership theory and practice becomes more explicit and concrete
DL Changes Leaders’ Thinking

Yoak (2013) concludes:

*Initially, program participants came into the program with largely unexamined assumptions about leadership. Over time, participants were able to articulate their personal models for leadership: what they believed constituted the practice of leadership and who they felt were positive exemplars of leadership. By the program’s end, participants were increasingly able to portray leadership explicitly and concretely making robust connections between theory, research and practice.*

DL Teams Accelerate Change

We have abundant evidence of projects completed in our schools – often faster than usual. Perhaps the excitement and the primary value of the DL project lies in the ability to build teams, leadership capacity, and address more quickly and completely schoolwide projects that have not been completed with existing structures and leadership. John Kotter has proposed in the Harvard Business Review (November 2012) and in a new book that many innovative companies are creating a second “operating system” to address the challenges produced by mounting complexity and rapid change. This second system is devoted to the design and implementation of strategy that uses an agile, network-like structure and a very different set of processes. This data-based system continually assesses and reacts with greater agility, speed, and creativity than the existing one.
The Dual Operating System: Key Characteristics


DL Teams Accelerate Change

To some extent our DL teams function much like those second systems in Kotter’s business examples. Wharton’s Michael Useem has said to superintendents (Study Council Meeting, April 25, 2012) that “research reveals that the quality of top management teams better predict company performance than the CEO alone.” In a world that is changing more quickly than we can, we need leadership capacity and teams that can accelerate attention to our priorities. This may be this project’s greatest strength and lasting contribution.
Questions, Issues, Discussion

Contact

John A. DeFlaminis, Ph.D.
Penn Center for Educational Leadership
Graduate School of Education
University of Pennsylvania
3440 Market Street, Suite 500
Philadelphia, PA 19104
(215) 573-5511
jadeflam@gse.upenn.edu
Appendix A
Distributed Leadership Theory of Action (Revised)

School and District Characteristics

Legend

Leadership Team Members
Grade/subject/other Team groups
Individual Teachers
Classes of Students

Appendix B
Annenberg Distributed Leadership in Philadelphia Schools Project
Curriculum Modules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Time (hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The Distributed Perspective</td>
<td>James Spillane with Camille Rutherford, Treaver Doherty, The School of Education and Social Policy Northwestern University</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Developing Professional Learning Communities</td>
<td>Ann Delehant</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mission and Direction: Shared Vision, Values and Commitments</td>
<td>J. DeFlaminis, M. Hornyak, J. Vissa</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>D. Smith, E. Msulwa (Teleos)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Building District Leadership Teams</td>
<td>Charles Dwyer</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teamwork and Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>Charles Dwyer</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Building Bridges and Connections</td>
<td>Harris Sokoloff</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Evidence-Based Leadership Using Data to Guide School Improvement</td>
<td>Jon Supovitz</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Leadership for Literacy Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>Patricia Baszter</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Motivation: The Key to Effective Leadership</td>
<td>John DeFlaminis</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fostering Leadership in Mathematics</td>
<td>Jeanne Vissi</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Collaborative Learning Cultures</td>
<td>Debbie Bambino</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Developing Evidence-Based and Shared Decision-Making</td>
<td>J. DeFlaminis, J. Supovitz</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Peer Coaching</td>
<td>Ann Delehant</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Number of Module Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B

### Annenberg Distributed Leadership in Philadelphia Schools Project

#### Curriculum Modules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Time (hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 0   | The Distributed Perspective  
Learn about the Distributed Perspective of Leadership which includes leadership practice as the central and anchoring concern, leadership practice as generated in the interactions of leaders, followers and their situations and how the aspects of the situation both contribute to defining leadership practice and are defined through leadership practice.  
James Spillane with Camilla Rutherford, Trevor Doherty, The School of Education and Social Policy, Northwestern University | 14.0          |

#### Modules Developed by the Distributed Leadership Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Time (hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | Developing Professional Learning Communities  
Learn about effective learning communities including how to link the work of professional learning communities with student achievement, building community and trust, protocols for looking at student work, the elements of a good rubric and practice writing a rubric.  
Ann Delehant | 14.0          |
| 2   | Mission and Direction: Shared Vision, Values and Commitments  
Learn how to delineate the role that leaders play in developing visions and goals and sustaining them for their schools. Learn how to consider stakeholder roles from a cultural perspective when defining mission and vision.  
J. DeFlaminio, M. Hornyak, J. Vissu | 3.5          |
| 3   | Emotional Intelligence  
Learn how to work well with others, have self-confidence, bounce back from difficulties, empathize with how others are feeling and to control your emotions.  
D. Smith, E. Mwelwa (Tefos) | 3.5          |
| 4   | Building District Leadership Teams  
Learn about teambuilding which connects people to engage in patterns of behavior and produces performance that results in desired outcomes.  
Charles Dryser | 3.5          |
| 5   | Teamwork and Conflict Resolution  
Learn the types of conflict and approaches to managing conflict in an effort to obtain cooperation in attaining goals.  
Charles Dryser | 3.5          |
| 6   | Building Bridges and Connections  
Learn a multi-faceted understanding of concepts and practices for engaging different stakeholders in improving student learning. This module focuses on different engagement practices and how to apply them inside, as well as outside, your school.  
Harris Sokoloff | 3.5          |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Time (hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7   | Evidence-Based Leadership Using Data to Guide School Improvement  
Learn how to effectively use data to inform decision-making, provide effective feedback, and review the use of data modeling tools. You will identify ways to make innovative use of student performance data at your school.  
Jon Supovitz | 7.0          |
| 8   | Leadership for Literacy Teaching and Learning  
Learn how to define literacy within the context of your work, review best practices for school-wide literacy practices, explore research-based literacy strategies and draft an action plan for literacy leadership.  
Patricia Baxter | 3.5          |
| 9   | Motivation: The Key to Effective Leadership  
Understand motivation and how it is evolved as a process over time; develop an understanding of the elements of motivation and how each can be managed in a school setting, and the connections between the elements of motivation, motivating colleagues and functioning as a distributed leadership team  
John DeFlaminios | 3.5          |
| 10  | Fostering Leadership in Mathematics  
Learn how to identify directions for mathematics learning to propose for your school, consider best practices in mathematics education and understand changes in mathematics education.  
Jeanne Vissu | 3.5          |
| 11  | Collaborative Learning Cultures  
Learn about collaboration including the current status of collaboration in your school, possible resistors, structures and tools that can be used to sustain collaboration and how to develop a theory of action that builds the collaborative capacity of your team and staff as a whole.  
Debbie Bambito | 3.5          |
| 12  | Developing Evidence-Based and Shared Decision-Making  
Learn about and understand the mental models that impact our thinking and the role of data in decision-making; use data to improve the quality and acceptance of your team's decision and explore models that can help the distributed leadership team to understand when and how to involve others in shared decision-making.  
J. DeFlaminio, J. Supovitz | 3.5          |
| 13  | Peer Coaching  
Learn about peer coaching, which has been identified as one of the most effective practices to ensure transfer of training (to 80% learning). Learn effective strategies and techniques for working with colleagues in a peer coaching context.  
Ann Delehant | 3.5          |

Total Number of Module Hours: 77.0
Appendix C

Moving to a Distributed Leadership Structure: A Framework

*Developed by:*
John A. DeFlaminis, Ph.D.
Executive Director
Penn Center for Educational Leadership
University of Pennsylvania

---

Level 1: Traditional Chain of Command

Positions leader above and separate from the work team

**The Leader**
- Locus of leader command between the team and higher management
- Has sole authority for decision-making
- Set apart by role, title, and position
- Directs the organization’s members in influencing the core work

**Team Members**
- Follow directions
- Work for the leader more so than with each other
- Have limited access to higher management. Provides information to leader as requested
- Limited communication with the leader (mostly around work)
- No direction of organization’s members in influencing the core work
Level 2: Leader is Central
Positions leader from above to the center of the work group (especially for communications) but distinction still exists between what leader and work team does.

- Leader locus central to team communication and decision-making
- Directs most activities
- Accessible to all team members
- Directs the organization members in influencing the core work
- Rely on leader for information and direction
- Provide information to leader for decision-making as needed
- Individual leadership may be exercised on non-leader led issues
- Directed by leader on key decisions
- May affect direction of organization members in influencing the core work.

Level 3: Some Shared Decision-Making & Authority
Positions leader central to the team but leader begins to shift decision-making authority. Team members share responsibilities belonging to leader who encourages communication, collaboration, and teamwork among team members.

- Shares decision-making authority in selected areas
- Encourages independence/leadership in selected areas
- Promotes teamwork, collaboration and communication among team members
- Develops team and team members for increased responsibility
- Shares direction of organization members in influencing the core work
- Involved in decision-making in selected areas
- Scope of responsibility expands for some team members
- Developing teamwork and collaborative/communication skills
- Growing collaborative team and spirit. May not include entire team
- Share some direction of organization members in influencing the core work.
Level 4: Extensive Shared Decision-Making & Authority
Leader and team develop confidence in shared decision-making and authority. Team members share more responsibilities belonging to leader who encourages even greater communication, collaboration, and teamwork.

The Leader
- Shares decision-making authority in more areas and across more team members
- Encourages independent leadership in more areas and across more team members
- Promotes teamwork, collaboration, and communication among team members
- Develops interdependent team and team members for increased responsibility
- Shares direction of organization members in influencing the core work.

Team Members
- Involvement in decision-making in more areas and across more team members
- Scope of responsibility expands for most team members
- Strong teamwork and collaborative communication skills
- Strong, interdependent and collaborative team and spirit
- Share more direction of organization members in influencing the core work.

Level 5: Distributed Leadership
The leader is no longer central to the team and greater interdependence develops and exists between the team members and the leader. The leader has distributed some responsibilities and decisions and the team’s authority has increased.

The Leader
- Has shifted from sole doer to supporter, coach, and facilitator in distributed areas
- Works with team to expand authority to higher level responsibilities
- Coordinates the team efforts
- Allows others to direct organization members in influencing distributed areas of the core work

Team Members
- Assume distributed duties/areas with little assistance from the leader
- Work closely with school staffs and, in many cases, other team members
- Assume distributed responsibilities formerly held by the leader and have decision-making authority in those areas
- Direct organization members in influencing distributed areas of the core work.
Level 6: Highly Distributed Leadership
Team members are self-directed and the leader’s role has shifted to other issues, while still providing direction and acting as a resource when needed. Group members are available for more responsibility.

- **The Leader**
  - Supports, coaches and counsels (as needed) the self-directed teams as they take on increasingly challenging responsibilities
  - Free to focus on new issues outside the teams
  - Identifies new responsibilities for team
  - Distributed responsibilities to others to direct organization members in influencing distributed areas of the core work.
  - May begin another distributed leadership team in new area.

- **Team Members**
  - Self-directed and confident in distributed leadership areas. Makes decisions in those areas
  - Take full ownership of most aspects of delegated areas
  - May be able to assume more new responsibilities. Highly evolved networks develop.
  - Direct organization members in influencing distributed areas of the core work.

Appendix D: About PCEL

The Distributed Leadership (DL) Project was developed by John DeFlaminis at the Penn Center for Educational Leadership (PCEL), located at the Graduate School of Education at the University of Pennsylvania. The mission of the PCEL is to advance leadership principles, practices and knowledge so that educators develop their capacity to reflect on practice, guide effective change, and lead programmatic excellence. PCEL provides both ongoing programs of professional development and topical sessions to schools, districts and agencies through strong, longstanding partnerships with the School District of Pennsylvania, and over 100 districts in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and Delaware. PCEL also coordinates national and international programs with governmental and university partners across the United States, and in China, Thailand, Ireland, Great Britain, Dubai, and New Zealand.