NATIONAL POLICY BOARD FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
Meeting Minutes
September 14, 2010
CCSSO Multi-Media Room
8:00 – 1:00

I. **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Gene Wilhoit, chairperson, called the meeting to order.

Present were: Gene Wilhoit (CCSSO), Lois Adams–Rodgers (CCSSO), Peter McWalters (CCSSO), Agnes Crawford (ASCD), Jim Berry (NCPEA), Jim Cibulka (NCATE), Gerry Tirozzi (NASSP), Dick Flanary (NASSP), Honor Fede (ELCC), Fred Brown (NAESP), Michele Young (UCEA), Alan Soho (president UCEA), Casey Cobb (University of Connecticut), Susan Twombly (University of Kansas), David Monk (Pennsylvania State University), Nancy Brickhouse (University of Delaware), Margaret Grogan, (Claremont Graduate University), Rosetta Sandidge (University of Kentucky), Joe Aguerreberre (NBPTS)

II. **REVIEW OF AGENDA**
Chairperson Wilhoit reviewed the agenda and asked for any additional items.

III. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A. The Agenda was approved as presented.

B. The minutes from May were approved as presented.

C. Financial report:
   1. Michele Young, passed out audit and budget to members, along with expenses and income. Michele noted that for the last few years AACTE has not paid dues nor has the group received dues paid. Attempts to reconcile have not been responded to, thus the 3 budget options presented are structured around not receiving future dues from AACTE.
   2. Gene moved to approved the audit. The audit was approved.

D. Approval of revised budget
   1. Discussion over the 3 budget options ensued. Agnes pointed out that it is very helpful to have the same person responsible for records and minutes over the years in light of the 3 budget options.
   Michele motioned to Pass budget A
   The motion was passed and Budget option A was approved.

E. Chair designation

Gene's term is up, nominations are open for a new Chair. Jim Berry mentioned that having someone in Washington with the contacts is useful.

Jim Cibulka offered to take the chair, NCATE has not previously chaired.

IV. Leveraging Change: Model University Leadership (Michele Young and University Deans)

Michele gave a brief introduction on the group joining the meeting today: As part of a Wallace sponsored project for UCEA, Wallace has been doing a lot of work in leadership development and the link between student learning and leadership development. Teaming with universities they have gone about studying how to implement and sustain meaningful change through leadership. In previous meetings NPBEA asked how they could reach out to universities on this issue, thus Michele thought this group would fit well to discuss this issue. The Deans have joined the group today to share their perspectives on this issue.

Pam Tucker stated that she is currently facing TEAC accreditation. She has been under intense scrutiny over what their program is doing. The universities that UCEA represent are very focused on the concerns over quality. They (UCEA) work very hard to develop quality programs and are often cast in the same light as programs not as focused on quality. Pam has seen a huge amount of attention focused on leadership preparation, what good leaders are doing and how this translates into what they can do for students. They would like to reach out and work with other groups concerned over quality.

David Monk commented that he also thinks it is important to keep the economic issues in mind. Universities are taking a hard look at their programs, their content and how they are run. There is an interest in identifying the high priority programs. It's a important time to push new messages into the higher ed sector.

General Comment - "Part of the challenge at research universities is that new 'for profit' schools have more cutting edge accessibility and affordability for new students."

Michele Young stated that the assumption is that the marketplace chooses quality, which many of 'us' are skeptical about. Many times (the deans) find programs that are substandard, which have no problems placing their graduates. A different method is needed to find what programs are and aren't quality.

General Comment - Right now there is an instrument (survey tool) that has been field tested, called the 'School Leadership and Practice' instrument, co-developed by UCEA and AARA. It allows you to compare graduates from one cohort or program delivery to the next. It lets you examine delivery methods, topics covered and many other details across your institution and others. 92 institutions (UCEA) are using this currently.

Pam Tucker – I think this survey speaks to the heart of the problem: We all want quality, but what does it look like? Accreditation sources are a huge quality indicator. Standards are quite different in some states.

Gene asked 'how difficult would it be for this group of innovative research universities to come up with a set of quality indicators?'

The response from the Deans was positive in that they could come up with quality indicators.

Michele Young agreed that the university community with partners would be able to suggest common indicators for high quality preparation.

Dick Flanary mentioned that "As we look at the landscape of what is going on right now, the feds are exerting great pressure on the principal-ship. School districts are struggling finding quality principal candidates. There is great opportunity here for the group to come up with a solution by bringing all the work and research out there together."

General comments:
 - We have all this disparate efforts going on within our own profession. There is no question the market doesn't work. (Concerns over lack of staffing quality principal ship candidates) There is an urgency here to find a solution. As a profession we should say, 'this is what we think this looks like'.

-You have people in the roles of principal-ships who are struggling. There is an immense need to support existing principals, not just preparation programs.

-The Iterative analysis needs to move to the school.

-Movement towards distributing leadership formally would invite more people into the field.

Jim Berry added that "There is a belief that the markets will improve principal-ship preparation programs. Our org feels that maybe we need to push back and disapprove of this ideology. I think this really bodes well for NPBEA, to put out a paper or monograph or proposal to give guidance to preparation programs out there. Putting something out there as a guiding document for any program doing leadership preparation would be helpful."

Gene - "I think Josh Naer, would be quick to say that there is no way that program can solve the problems that exist currently in this country. He has broadcast very widely with what he has learned, doing so with observations from his graduates. If we have high quality programs out there that are producing results, we have to put that on the table. Show them 'better results' as it is driven to student outcomes. The solution rests in high quality programs delivered by high quality institutions, but in order to get there we have to provide evidence of that."

Jim Cibelka – "What I think is really absent in our field, is a unified voice around quality assurance. Currently there is state level discussion on this which has caused a wide variation in program quality. This is caused by people at the university level being siloed. We haven't spoken with one voice about quality in the profession. I think working together we could really turn this around and make accreditation a very powerful tool for reform. The need for it is undeniable. We will see more and more deregulation if we don't push this. We also have some unhappy alliances between higher ed and the market place."

Jim berry – "The authority in Michigan has been given to the university based associations. I believe that within 3 years in Michigan, the principal association, superintendents association, and the ASCD have been granted authority to accredit principals in the state. Michigan currently has 18 universities approved for principal accreditation. It is possible that MI will have up to 25 purveyors with this system in place."

Michele Young – "We've had such a competitive model in our field. The university of Connecticut model is an excellent example of how the field can work effectively together. At some point we need

to figure out how we raise the field above competing with each other and to cooperate to move forward."

Gene - "In an environment without standards – proliferation will occur. In the model we are using now, different pathways are encouraged, however without a discussion about quality, standards will drop. We have an environment emerging that would be open to a serious conversation on standards quality, however policy makers do not have the expertise to determine what those quality standards are."

Peter McWalters – "At least in the field the one thing that is easiest to defer to is the knowledge research base. There is an issue of how to go from the research/knowledge to practice. It is up the industry to bridge the gap between preparation to the work. To take on effective leadership, you have to take on the context of the working conditions. That can only be done somewhere between the states authority and the districts actual role."

Gene posed the question to the Deans – "How comfortable are you with the ISLLC Standards? What is our definition of leadership? Before we talk about the programs we should see if there is consensus on whether or not we are on the right track."

Michele – "Given the current structure of leadership in schools, the ISLLC standards reflect the current body of work. If we are to think beyond what currently exists in schools and districts, there is a place within our field for a very important conversation on what leadership should be and what that means when we envisioning new standards. Currently however, the ISLLC standards are fairly well supported and embraced by the for profit community."

Jim Berry – Before the ISLLC standards came out, their was no rallying point for quality, despite push back against the standards, it gave people a voice on quality.   For me, it's a process where if we rally round what is quality and how we evaluate, assess and refine that over time.

Gene 'If the ISLLC standards are reflective, then the question is 'how do we define high quality practice based on these standards based in this context'.

Comment from a Dean – "There is a difference between the person coming out of a program and a person qualified to do all the duties in the field. Where is the step to walk between the two? What is the knowledge base and its practical application in order to produce student achievement."

MaryAnne Jobe – "There are some schools that use performance standards based on the ISLLC Standards in preparation programs. They are used as an evaluatory process at the end of preparation programs. Montgomery county schools are a good example of this in action."

Dick Flanary – "The work being done with advanced certification – If you look at the numbers there will never be a huge surplus of principals looking for advanced certification. Having a set of standards that define accomplished practice has a huge potential impact on the field. Districts are struggling with this issue. We have a research project with high poverty low resourced environments, that have displayed significant a achievement gains in the past 8 years, the principals would say that their turnaround happened with no additional support from the state and limited support from the district."

Peter McWalters – "If ISLLC is a decent description of how we envision schools today; programs that have model lighthouse going on, are also active research products. Some of those schools turned around with a principal using 'tough love' and others turned around using a more collaborative

approach. We need to know if there is a place for both and where."

General Comment - "Another piece of the struggle, is – you have all the right things in your 'program' but may still not get your results. Knowing how to teach but not knowing how to follow up with students can distort your results."

Gene – "Some of this can be resolved by addressing the issue of quality and defining it. Throughout this conversation we have noted some of the real challenges of implementation. Variability of program quality and the perverse attraction to get individuals into the field without adequate preparation. In two states I observed publicly supported university programs who produced large numbers with adjunct faculty, that were more attractive then the high quality research based programs competing with it. We have to have a political advocate since some people are being prepared in inadequate programs and end up literally hurting children."

General comment – "A lot of people do accreditation programs mainly for the pay increase with no intention of becoming a school leader or administrator."

Michele – "Programs *should* remove people not interested in becoming principals, however programs are under pressure to maintain numbers to prevent programs or staff from being cut."

General Comment – A good question to ask accreditation programs 'Would they want this person to be a principal for your child?'

Michele – "Deans need to be able to better filter quality candidates through these programs."

General Comment - "Turn of the century medical schools limited enrollment. Diagnostic tools became a focus for the medical profession at the turn of the century. Could we do something comparable in the education field with universities?"

Gene – "We could learn a lot from the medical practice. I have a pitch I like to make to legislatures in regards to leadership positions: 'This is the best strategic investment one can make to improve the system' (referring to leadership quality).   You cannot deal with thousands of teachers 1 to 1, but you can do this with leaders.   Over time this can make a big difference without impacting the budget much at all.' We can develop a strategy here to deliver quality, yet we've not made that case.   Legislators will buy this."

Jim C. - "When we consider who we need to bring into the conversation, state higher ed regulators would be important. As far as Institutional pressures go, there we have to reach out to the presidents. There are professional associations who have presidents as their audience, we should consider that inviting them to part of this discussion may be useful. If we don't have them in a conversation, then we don't have the proper implementation strategy."

Gene asked the group what role could NPBEA play in bringing different groups and associations to gather around the table and talk about the practice and issues over leadership. He continued to say that "We alone cannot solve all of this. We need the best minds from higher education engaged in this work. What I have heard is generally there is a comfort level in that what we find in the ISLLC standards is closer to what we want in practice, with the caveat that we need some further definition of what practice might look like and high quality implementation. This is not far from what we are doing with InTASC teacher and leader standards.

If we could come up with some generalized statement about the challenge that lies ahead of us, I think we can come back at the next meeting and begin to wrestle with how to put some pieces in place. Even prior to getting that agenda laid out, we could see what kind of interest there is among institutions of higher education coming forward with some set of elements that define high quality practice. Coming forward with some set of elements that define high quality practice, we as a body would be receptive in receiving these ideas and carrying them forward. This puts us on a path for some work over the next couple years….Understand what I said, in that context."

Gene asked if there were any objections to moving forward with this?

Consensus was reached to move forward.

CCSSO will take on the task of a first framing for this. Michelle will take this back to the universities and help formulate a time frame.

Gene mentioned that this will end up with a policy statement coming out of this organization at some point. Michele also pointed out that the sense of urgency on this issue will also be taken into consideration.

Jim Berry stated that "We are conditioned to go out there and produce credit hours. I don't know what we can do through Washington connections to push this agenda forward."

Gene answered that we need some statement that is supported by strong evidence/research that says if you do not have these elements (ISLLC standards) in place then you will not have quality. There is a need to catalog the research we now have, but also to immerse practice with this research agenda.

Dick Flanery commented that as we head towards re-authorization of ESEA. The view on capital hill that the profession hasn't done a very good job of principal-ship, and the Feds believe they have to step in to re-mediate this for us. So if we don't do this, they (the government) will.

Jim Cibulka – "As we do this work, we should keep at the forefront, the problems of low performing schools. It is very debatable whether the strategies developed for these are appropriate. Prep programs for leaders and principles are unable to produce people able to operate successfully in low performing environments and turn them around. Not saying that this is the only focus, but it should be at the forefront."

Michele and Gene thanked everyone for the meaningful discussion and participation.

V. InTASC / ISLLC / Common Core

Gene gave a brief synopsis on the focus of accountability in the school system right now and the fast time table being pushed to implement a system with higher accountability for teachers and administrators. Lightly touching on the Common Core's role in all of this, Gene introduced Peter to give a greater picture.

Peter described a brief history of the InTASC Standards. The original InTASC standards (1992) were quickly adopted by preparation programs due to the standards being initially targeted at novice teachers. Now with revised InTASC standards, we must explore how to bridge the gap between

evaluating novice teachers and teachers who have been in the field for longer.

Peter continued on to contextualize how the Common Core and ISLLC/ InTASC standards need effective measures that translate from beginning to novice to professional to master in regards to performance evaluation and instructional diagnostic assessment, that can be used for accurate evaluation as well as professional development as a tool to increase student performance. The standards themselves are not refined down to specific indicators and therefore the work ahead of us (the education system) lies in creating these indicators.

Peter also touched upon the issue of best practice and how to evolve the current workforce to meet new standards. He stated that instructional practice is describable and measurable in a classroom. To explore this topic more, all 50 states were invited to a meeting in Chicago (on the 15th) that is focused on forming a new consortium that will take on these issues. Peter stressed that all states are in major policy making roles right now around education reform and it is critical that we collaborate on solutions.

Comparing past viewpoints of the Chiefs to current, Peter described how states were collaborating to come up with 'value added measurements' until RTTT derailed them. Now states are segregated between 'winning' and 'losing' states, when they all need viable solutions. This may cause an anti-federal sentiment among losing states.

Peter answered some questions around the 'value added measurements' concept. There were concerns over the relative seriousness of chiefs given their varying experience levels as well as concerns over people who want to create value added measurements, but feel like they don't have the time under RTTT deadlines. Peter talked about the varied level of experience among chiefs and how it may effect their judgment in this issue as well as the need for states to work together in order to come up with reliable value added measurements.

Break for 10 minutes

VI. ELCC Program Standards Approval

Gene Introduced Honor Fede as well as welcomed Joe Aguerreberre

Dick Flanery gave a brief introduction on the NCATE standards. Every 7 years NCATE requires that every spire review its standards. After completing the development and revisions of the ISLLC standards in 2007, NCATE began to revise the ELCC program standards to reflect the revisions and development of the ISLLC 2008 standards. Dick then recognized everyone on the ELCC steering committee and technical advisory committee for all their hard work.

Dick then introduced Honor to continue.

Honor passed around the draft standards for review. There were two versions of the standards, a building version and a district version. She described the 2 year process of developing these standards. These standards are based off the ISLLC 2008 standards. The technical advisory group took those standards and tried to make them into programmatic standards in which program people could be evaluated in terms of their knowledge and skills. The technical advisory group actually broke this down into elements. From this draft it was sent out into the field for public comment. At that point

SASB were developing guidelines under which the advisory group had to form their standards. Guidelines layed down by SASB limited them to 7 standards and 28 Elements as opposed to the 10 standards that ISLLC uses.

Honor gave some more details on the standards, describing the 8 and how 6 came from the ISLLC Standards. Elements in these standards are defined in functional means by what a candidate should know and be able to do. At the NPBEA meeting last fall, Honor presented the previous draft. The substance from the last meeting has not changed a lot, however the formatting has been adjusted to align with the NCATE format.

Honor then highlighted some specific differences between the ISLLC standards and the new standards. Particularly the 7th standard which deals with internships (not included in the ISLLC standards), and the 8th standard which tried to encompass the content knowledge previously distributed among all the standards.

There will be assessments that go with the standards, which currently is numbered at 7, however NCATE may decrease this number to 5. Honor went into detail on a few of these assessments.

Michele asked a question: "When institutions are putting together assessments around student achievement are you assuming that this will reflect the research around leaders and how they impact students through organizational factors and teacher quality. Or are you looking at assessments that show a through line to student achievement directly?"

Honor responded that an institutions with a 1 or 2 year internship program could do this, but there is not a lot of data in this area. Michele stressed that it is important for the university community to understand the implications of this and what it means. Agnes chimed in and agreed that Michele is right in that when you push an internship assessment, people need to understand what it does and what it reflects.

Dick asked that the group (NPBEA) approved these so they can submit them to NCATE by October. He also raised two issues as the chair of the ELCC. The first issue was philosophical in NCATE requires SPA's to justify where their research rests, the research panel invested five to six hundred hours of work to justify the ELCC standards. Dick feels that this is erroneous that NCATE requires this. The second concern is that having an 8th standard that is simply 'content' will create huge confusion in the field. The last rounds of review came back as negative citing redundancy as the major issue. Anges agreed with dicks concerns.

Gene interjected and offered that the group attach language when submitting these standards expressing these concerns. General discussion on the issue ensued.

Jim C. offered to work with the ELCC to clarify the NCATE policies. Michele responded offering that the audit committee could work with NCATE to make things more transparent. Jim C. offered his regrets over the contention on NCATE's position, and clarified that the history behind this stems from the 20 different SPA's with different standard elements needing to be organized and justified due to their differences. It wasn't necessarily intended to make the research committee justify the ISLLC standards.

Dick Flanery put a motion on the table to move the document forward with a cover that expresses the concern of the NPBEA to clarify the issue of an 8th content standard and the ELCC approval process in

order to provide clarity to the field.

The motion was approved.

VII. Principal's Advanced Certificate (Joe Aguerreberre)

Gene gave a brief introduction on the Advanced Principals certification and introduced Joe Aguerreberre

Joe gave a history on the Principal advanced certification. When the issue of an advanced certification came up over a decade ago, there wasn't the support to push it forward. Eventually in 2008 NPBEA had a motion on the table to make a $25,000 contribution to this cause. In January of 2009 a conceptual framework was laid out focused on leaders but also including those outside of principal-ships. Between January and March 2009, this working group came up with concepts approved by the board, which then were developed into standards through the rest of 2009.

Principle associations have been active in recommending people to be involved. There were about 50 committee members who did the initial work, after that there was a public comment and revue period, during which they received over four thousand respondents. In the end they had 9 standards. Joe clarified that in terms of policies the board decided to mirror those that apply to teachers in terms of certification requirements.

The assessment process for this certification has begun. The goal being to build an assessment that is tied to a set of standards an is evidence based in that principals must show that they have met a standard.

In the 2010-11 school year they are embarking on a field test that will involve a minimum of 400 principles around the country from 20 different states. 1600 principles have signed up however the technical advisory group recommended using 600 to account for people who will not see the process all the way through. A diverse group of principals will be selected as well as individuals from charter schools. A typical principle is going to go through a process where they will start in September and be asked to provide baseline data on where their school is (must be submitted by October, including student performance data). Information will be collected beyond one academic year to account for the delay in data received from school results. Data collected on principals will be done electronically via both forms and video.

Joe expressed that the intent is to launch this board certification for principles in the 2011 – 2012 school year. Even though the first group wont be finished scoring, the second group (called the pilot group) will be underway. Eventually the hope is to expand this to assistant principles and teacher leaders. So far there has been very strong interest.

There were general questions over the scoring that will be used for this new certification and the cost. Currently the cost is $2500, however this could be higher after the process is field tested. Feedback will come in the form of a score, however the hope is to also provide more substantive feedback that identifies areas the leader needs to develop.

Joe closed saying: "We build the assessment for teachers but had no ramp up for teachers to achieve the higher results. In thinking about the principal ones, the idea of having a line up from the academy training to the board process is in talks. It wouldn't make sense to have this assessment process by

itself, without having it aligned".

Gene thanked Joe for the update and mentioned that as things evolve the group (NPBEA) will revisit the topic.

Gene thanked Agnes Crawford for her outstanding service to NPBEA as this was her last meeting with the group.

Gene adjourned the meeting at 1:02.