



**NATIONAL POLICY BOARD FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION**

Meeting Minutes

**November 3, 2011**

CCSSO Faculty Room

1:00 p.m.- 4:00 p.m.

**I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Jim Cibulka, chairperson, calls the meeting to order.

Present were: Janice Poda (CCSSO), Mary Harrill-McClellan (AACTE), MaryAnn Jobe (AASA), Gayle Owens, (ASCD), Gail Connelly (NAESP), Dick Flanary (NASSP), Jim Cibulka (NCATE), James Berry (NCPEA), Michelle Young (UCEA), Pam Tucker (UCEA), Honor Fede (NPBEA):

Visitors: Rene Islas, Director of Center for Results, Learning Forward and Joe Thierstein, OER

**II. REVIEW OF THE AGENDA**

Chairperson Cibulka reviews the agenda and asks for any additional items.

**MOTION:** Michelle Young proposed and Gail Connelly seconded a motion to approve the agenda. The agenda was approved unanimously.

**III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTION:** Gail Connelly proposed and Margie Crutchfield seconded a motion to approve the minutes. The minutes were approved unanimously.

**IV. OPEN SOURCE MOVEMENT AND ITS POTENTIAL IMPACT ON K-12 EDUCATION**

Jim Berry introduced Joel Theirstein from OER who presented information on the open source movement and discussed the potential impact the movement is having on curriculum content in K-12 education. Dr. Theirstein gave a background on the open source movement in the United States. There are a lot of funding opportunities for the open movement to make curriculum and K-12 content free to the public. With the use of technology this has become easier to access. He gave the board background information on what “open source” means with regard to legal documents and technology use. One of the biggest problems with open domain documents has been accessing the documents through specific technologies. Another problem has been that “open” in the United States does not necessarily mean the same thing in other countries. In the legal constructs there

was a need for a legal construct for international use – many countries limited open access. So now there are legal constructs for copy-right domain. He explained the different types of government’s “open” licensure definitions and agreements for copy-right domains.

Joel discussed the advantages of the open source movement. In the K-12 arena, traditional textbook companies provide books and curriculum that is generic and not tailored to specific districts or local K-12 school situations. The beauty of the open document movement is that with the right licensure agreements, districts and/or teachers can modify on-line curriculum content to provide examples or bring in information specific to their district, school, or learners. Content can be modified to address specific learning needs of students without infringing on specific copy-right issues. Districts and teachers would not have get book publishers permission to modify the content because the content is in an open access environment. It gives teachers a lot of creativity to modify the curriculum to meet classroom needs.

However, he indicated that states and districts will still need some type of endorsement at the state or district level to maintain a vetting process. Many state systems are putting in state standard vetting systems to ensure that the content will still meet state standards under the licensure requirements. Another advantage is that the content can be printed out at a cheaper price than the existing structure. The content can be updated every year to be current. Everybody has access to the content either online or downloaded and printed out or via phones.

OER is working to lower the cost of textbook production and with this medium there is a lot of savings (about \$50 million dollars to publish a textbook). This doesn’t include the distribution cost of textbooks. The federal project is more about improving the quality of textbook materials and this medium can be used by districts to save money and use their textbook budget money to build simulations and new innovative content to meet specific learning needs.

Jim Berry talked about NCPEA’s Connexions which is an environment for collaboratively developing, freely sharing, and rapidly publishing scholarly content on the NCPEA web. NCPEA’s Content Commons contains educational materials for everyone — from children to college students to professionals — organized in small modules that are easily connected into larger collections or courses. All content is free to use and reuse under the Creative Commons "attribution" license.

Jim Berry explained that he will be asking his board (NCPEA) for support of an open-source project. He thought it would be good to disseminate this information to the NPBEA board for consideration. It is an area that has federal backing and support. He suggested that the NPBEA consider embracing the development of a joint K-12 open source project with NCPEA. We then might try for federal funding of the joint project.

The board asked Jim to provide more specific clarification on the design of the project for NPBEA consideration at the next meeting. We need to understand more about what this would mean for K-12 principal development and preparation. What is the professional development piece of this project? This has implications for how we prepare teachers and leaders. The Board asked Jim Berry to provide an update or briefing paper at the spring meeting to the NPBEA board that includes implications the open source movement has for K-12 teacher and principal preparation and implications for principals and districts.

**V. RECENT FEEDBACK FROM CCSSO ON QUALITY LEADERSHIP PREPARATION**

Janice Poda gave a presentation on CCSSO state reports that are now coming out on results from the use of federal (RTT) stimulus money. States used the RTT money to create strategic plans for increasing teacher and leader effectiveness. Overall many states are finding a huge disconnect between different state systems (example: professional learning system is different from their evaluation system which is different from the state's preparation program system). States are realizing that none of their systems are structured into a coherent platform making it hard to compare effectiveness data. The adoption of the CCSS standards has been another seat changer and a lot is going on in the states to get ready for the assessments that will go into place in FY2014-15. More recently, the ESEA flexibility request that went out in September, 11 states are applying in November. Section 3 asks states to report on their teacher and leader evaluation systems as well as their support systems. Finding so far, show that state plans have almost nothing on leadership evaluation or professional development support structures. CCSSO is telling the states to go back to the drawing board to get plans to talk about leadership evaluation and support. We hope to see a movement on this issue. The Senate Bill – Harkin bill – if this bill passes they will probably have a conference committee that will come up with legislation that both houses will pass. This is a really fast moving environment with Congress – seat change in policies.

More states have passed legislation on teacher and leader effectiveness in the last two years than has been passed in the last 20 years. So this is a hot issue right now in Congress. What does that mean? CCSSO's incoming president has a platform for improving teacher and leader preparation. Preparation is a hotly debated topic right now in CCSSO. The one concern that comes up a lot is an issue of what assessments should be used for eligibility and licensure into the leadership field. Are they what they should be? Should we have a test or some kind of performance assessment?

States are thinking of using performance assessments in lieu of or in addition to state licensure tests. Another issue of frustration for CCSSO is about having to retrain new graduates in the skills or knowledge they need in the classroom or

school. Sometimes it may mean more specific training on reading or there are concerns that teachers don't understand how to take a standard and turn it into a lesson or they don't know how to take data assessment to change their instruction.

Janice showed a graphic for how CCSSO thinks about teacher and leadership preparation. Everyone should be continuously improving not just those in need of improvement. She showed another graphic on CCSSO Education Workforce – Educator Effectiveness. CCSSO has a strong goal of making students “college and career ready.” CCSSO considers the CCSS standards to define what students should know and be able to do. How teachers and principals accomplish this in terms of facilitating instruction is through the ISLLC and INTASC standards. One thing we are working on is mapping the CCSS standards back to the INTASC standards and specific instructional techniques for implementing the CCSS standards. CCSS states what students need to know and be able to do – INTASC and ISLLC should help teachers and leaders with the “how” of accomplishing the implementation of CCSS standards. Our research is telling us that teachers and leaders are not being adequately prepared for today's learning environment. Research shows that students are increasing learning “anywhere - anytime” – kids learn more outside of the classroom through technology than they do in the classroom. What does that mean for teaching and leading and more specifically the INTASC and ISLLC standards?

Our board is also concerned that teachers may not have the depth of content knowledge or the pedagogical skills to take students to higher levels of learning, especially project-based activities. When students are working on projects – teachers have to know a lot more about the content knowledge in order to be able to assist students with questions. The CCSS standards have implications across all content areas and the other 21<sup>st</sup> century skills that kids need to learn in terms of team work, collaboration, problem-solving, etc. we need to work on with teachers.

The assessment literacy – the new assessment will have a much stronger diagnostic component so teachers will need to be able to take the data and change the instruction for individual and groups of students – personalization of learning will be more important. Janice shared that we have changed the INTASC standards so that they are now about what the learner needs to know and be able to do not the teacher. Standards should talk about what the learner needs – personalize more the training. So I think that is a different way of thinking. The facilitation of learning is different now – from being a deliverer of content “sage on stage” to more of a “guide on the side” approach – being a facilitator of the student's learning. How do you prepare teachers and leaders on this new approach?

Here is what we think leaders need to know:

1. Leaders needs to know a lot more about the CCSS standards and how to teacher across the curriculum areas and those skills so they can coach

teachers on how to improve their practice. They ought to be given the instruction for preparation before the teachers. It isn't happening in the states to date. Dick agreed that principals are clueless, but the states are not providing any information or resources. Principals are scared to death – there is no discussion at the state level on how to prepare teachers and alignment of the curriculum or what resources are available. Janice agreed that superintendents are saying that the states are not saying anything. We were surprised because that is not what the states are saying. It is very fractured in the states.

2. Leaders needs to know how to coach this new vision of what teaching should look like. Principals need to be able to know how to help teachers on the common core and what it means to be “college and career ready”. Do we have consensus on what college and career ready means? – Janice says no. It may be defined by the set cut-scores for admission into college. There is still more work that needs to be done to define this term. Elementary principals needs to know what we mean about “college and career ready” too.
3. Evaluation and the training are needed for evaluators of teachers. There is an important step missing in the preparation of evaluators so that they know what is expected of them. Teacher evaluation results have the potential of becoming a high-stakes issue with high stakes decisions. Principals will need to report and release their decisions and data about the level of effectiveness of teachers – show who is effective or not. So they need to be able to make smart and accurate decisions. This will take training. Even if you have nobody who fails they may say that the data is skewed. There is general consensus out in the field that principals make poor evaluators. So if principals can't pass the evaluator tests they may have difficulty staying a principal. This needs a lot of work, the importance of conducting high-quality evaluations.
4. Principals need to have a thorough knowledge of teacher evaluation systems and how to assess teachers accurately and consistently. They have to be able to know and provide accurate and consistent evaluations and give appropriate feedback to teachers. Principals are not prepared adequately on how to provide teachers with honest and helpful feedback, giving guidance and support to help them along the continuum/rubric.
5. Principals really need to know a lot more about embedding professional development for teachers in the school day and reorganizing their schedule and developing leadership teams. Specifically, they need to be more conversant about coaching professional learning in schools. We have found that even in basic skills like building a schedule, some principals are clueless. We have had to work with principals on how to build a schedule. Also preparing the school infrastructure for collaborative learning,

problem-solving, and computer based assessments. Principals need to think about their computer needs to be ready for the assessments (CCSS) in FY14-15. They need to think through these needs ahead of time now so that they are prepared for the CCSS assessments.

So what are states doing to address these issues and prepare teachers and leaders? States are looking at performance-based assessments for licensure instead of tests or in addition to tests. Taking program approval policies and making changes to preparation. States are also looking at aligning SPA standards to CCSS standards. Even though those five states that are not CCSS standards would say that their standards are aligned to CCSS and are preparing students to be college and career ready. States are also looking at the criteria for recommending leader candidates for licensure and the tiered licensure requirements. States are considering being much more prescriptive for candidates – have to show much more to be recommended for licensure. This is a hot topic for chief states school officers.

Jim Cibulka asked Janice about whether we have a problem with the ISLLC standards and she said that these things have happened since the standards were written. There are probably things that we need to reexamine the standards. With all the changes that have occurred since 2008, we need to reexamine them and suggests the NPBEA look forward it.

Gail asked Janice how we can possibly implement this level of change and shift with no additional professional development resources going to sitting principals. How do you build support structures into state systems and continue to help principals adapt to ever increasing levels of expectation? States need to think more about support structures and resources for continuous capacity building of sitting principals. We are expecting higher and higher levels of accountability without providing the training and development for leaders to be more capable. NAESP and NASSP have noticed that states are shutting down professional development options and yet still have higher and higher job performance demands. If we can't get the capacity of sitting principals to where we need them to be, then setting new standards for new principals coming into the field won't matter. Dick mentioned that the turn-around principals are telling them that state departments of education can be a detriment to principal development. Have we done an asset survey on states to see which states are providing supports (leadership academies, etc)? Research shows that only five states provide professional supports currently. It's appalling. Dick agrees that we need to look at the ISLLC standards again. UCEA thinks that the ISLLC standards are strong, but we lack resources to support the development of principal capacity. UCEA surveyed principal preparation programs around the country (150) and found that 80% had realigned their programs in the last three years to the ISLLC standards. Only about 300 programs have undergone an accreditation review – we are not sure of the exact number of institutional programs out there but think it is growing.

The board discussed member's growing concern over the lack of support and professional development resources that are offered to sitting principals to help prepare them for these changes in the educational landscape. It seems that state supports are either not there or are there very little – we need to address the professional development issue.

Jim Cibulka suggested we look at taking a two-prong approach, develop professional development supports as well as revisit the ISLLC preparation standards. Janice suggested that the board also consider defining different roles for other school leaders – teacher leaders or other non-certified areas. We are probably building our evaluation systems on an old paradigm about one leader rather than a team approach – innovative system thinking.

Jim Berry spoke to the group about an NCPEA book that is coming out that discusses Janice's last issue on rethinking the future of leadership preparation and what leadership structures might look like in the future. The book focuses in part on the notion of "pedagogically-centered leadership" where teaching and leading are combined. It asks for a re-centering of leadership preparation to address changing leadership structures. We need to look forward at the impact of technology – education delivery is being impacted and will continue to change. These changes affect leaders and leadership preparation. The book is going to come out in March with ideas that are not main-stream. We would welcome a conversation with NPBEA. We ask members to read the book. We would like the NPBEA to write something about the book preferably asking professors to consider the book's concepts about big picture ideas for leadership preparation and positioning ourselves for future leadership concepts. Jim Cibulka suggested that the board look at the draft and write him with comments to put into an NPBEA email to NCPEA.

Janice shared that the Wallace Foundation has told CCSSO they are not interested in refunding a revision to the ISLLC standards at this time. Jim Cibulka suggested he could informally look into other possible funding sources for revising the ISLLC standards – there was general agreement to that suggestion.

## **VI. CAREER LEADERSHIP PROGRESSION POLICY WHITE PAPER**

In September 2011 meeting, we had visitors to the meeting – college deans and university chairs – who expressed their concerns over the quality of leadership preparation at colleges and universities. That group expressed interest and was asked to put together a research report about the quality of leadership preparation programs and put together a set of program quality features or standards for improving leadership preparation programs at colleges and universities.

At the last meeting in May, that group presented their research findings on quality program features and linked the report to certain types of leverages in state policy. It was agreed upon at the last meeting that because the NPBEA board has a

broader focus than just leadership preparation programs, this research should be put into a larger context of a career leadership progression platform policy paper. Preparation would be one part of a leader's career pathway progression.

Since the last meeting, a subcommittee of the NPBEA thought through this charge that includes research and frames possible parts for a leadership pipeline career pathway. This group passed out a draft white paper for consideration by the board and asked for next steps. Pam Tucker outlined the presentation's developmental progression for what a leader might go through after they are trained. Current issues happening in schools today with regard to CCSS standard implementation and cyber-bullying might fit into this pathway with regard to professional development support for sitting principals. A professional career pathway would incorporate a pre-service structure with parts and an in-service structure with parts. So the presentation outlines pre-service activities and professional development activities. Each of our organizations already has activities that fit along this progression pathway. However, it is only when our associations all work together that we can make a professional pipeline career pathway work at a national level for school and district leaders.

Pam Tucker reviewed a draft of the research proposal with its six categories and recommendations along the progression timeline: recruitment, selection, preparation programs then recruitment, selection, induction when in the field. She indicated that before the paper is finalized, they wish to get input from the board. NPBEA members did not have a lot of time to review the draft document or offer feedback. The NPBEA board did not feel comfortable supporting the recommendations at this time. They asked Michelle's group to finalize the pipeline paper with today's feedback and send it to them electronically. Each association will need to take the paper and go back to their boards for approval.

The final "Pipeline" white paper will be sent out with a set of recommendations to NPBEA members for review prior to our next meeting. The board will review the recommendations and consider whether to support the white paper's recommendations at the next NPBEA meeting in June, 2012.

## **VII. DEVELOPING PRINCIPAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES – NAESP/NASSP**

Dick Flanary provided information on a collaborative NAESP/NASSP project to research the state of principal evaluation systems across the country and to develop guidelines for principal evaluation that captures the voice of principals. The two associations have selected principals across the country from elementary, middle, and high schools to come together with researchers from Johns Hopkins University and the American Institutes of Research to look at research and develop key competencies for evaluating principal effectiveness. The project is scheduled to conclude next year. Dick asked the board to stay tuned to future progress reports about the work and hopes to bring the guidelines to the board for board member feedback and input.

### **VIII. ELCC STANDARDS UPDATE**

Dick Flanary, chair of the ELCC, reported that NCATE's SASB has just recently met and approved the 2011 ELCC Program Standards for Building Level and District Level. It has taken three years of ongoing development, but we finally have two sets of national standards that are aligned to the 2008 ISLLC standards. Dick commended the professors from UCEA and NCPEA who worked so diligently over several years to develop an extensive research base for our field – specifically research that supports each standard and element. The two sets of standards are being edited and published now and will be posted electronically on the NCATE and NPBEA websites. The new standards will go into effect for all institutions submitting program reports to NCATE in spring 2013. Prior to that point, institutions will be able to use either the 2002 or new 2011 ELCC program standards.

### **IX. NPBEA BUSINESS –**

Gail Connelly presented to the board copies of the FY2011 Financial Audit and Taxes and asked for the following motion:

**MOTION:** Gail Connelly proposed and Margie Crutchfield seconded a motion to accept the 2011 NPBEA Audit and 2011 Taxes. The motion was approved unanimously.

### **X. ADJOURNMENT**